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SUMMARY

The proposition which guides this research is that there is a special role for tourism and tourism employment during times of economic transition when traditional economic sectors are declining. The rationale for this idea is that the tourism industry contains a high proportion of unskilled and semi skilled jobs and a wide variety of occupations, which together make it accessible to newcomers with human capital accumulated in other sectors of the economy.

The research was conducted in Hungary and is essentially a study of mobility into tourism including its associated motives and impacts. The study uses a sample of workers who had, during a ten year period which covers the transition, moved into tourism from other industries. The primary research instrument was a questionnaire which collected information in four broad constituencies which were: the pattern of inter-sector mobility which terminated in tourism, the motives associated with this mobility, the impact of the change on individuals and the emergence of entrepreneurship from the turbulence in the labour market. The methodology combines work biographies with scaled instruments to capture both the personal evaluation of the change and the motives which drew people towards working in tourism. The combination of the factual and motivational approaches successfully allowed the research to examine the single phenomenon of mobility from two different perspectives.

The principal finding of the study was that the pattern of mobility emanated from a wider range of industries than would normally be assumed. Agriculture was less prominent than the literature would suggest. Another finding was that there was a general overall contentment with the impacts of the mobility into tourism. This was not what might have been predicted by secondary evidence on low pay in tourism employment nor by human capital theory. However, the study accepts the finding and offers the explanation...
that what was expressed in occupational terms might have been a societal perspective derived from having survived the upheaval. The study investigated the motives which lay behind the moves into tourism using as a guide the concept of ‘orientations to work’. This concept was chosen in order to study motives during social change because it captures both society values and psychological needs. Four orientations were hypothesised, which were; instrumental utility, positive intrinsic value, refugee and entrepreneurship. The notion of tourism employment as a refuge is in line with the general proposition which guided the study. The analysis of the findings used factor analysis to explore the structure of motives and confirmed the nominated orientations as the structure of how people construe tourism employment and added an additional dimension, called ‘the wanderer’. The study suggests that a future research should use confirmatory factor analysis on the factors identified by this research.

The pattern of mobility and the structure of motivation pointed in the same direction, which was that tourism played a central role in employment during economic change. The findings on entrepreneurship, although based on a small sample, show the enabling character of the industry, which allowed workers to become small business owners and also its attractiveness to experienced entrepreneurs.
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Chapter 1.

Introduction and objectives

1.1 Introduction

This research is a study of labour mobility into tourism from other sectors of the economy. The idea which lies behind this study is that tourism employment may have a particular role to play when an economy is going through a period of economic and social transition. More specifically, tourism is conceived as an attractive and accessible industry for those who are affected by economic upheaval. The focus of the research, therefore, is the changing labour market. The study is based on Hungary where, because of the transition from communism, a period of economic upheaval can be studied. The study hopes to contribute to the general case of tourism employment by focusing on a conspicuous one. In a sense, the study is taking advantage of a unique phenomenon.

Although it is a crucial issue in tourism development, there is a paucity of literature on inter-sector labour mobility. For the most part, development concepts, such as project appraisal, concern themselves with calculations based on assumptions drawn from national level employment figures. There are few empirical studies which actually measure where labour comes from. Exceptions to this tend to focus on agriculture and the impact which tourism development has on it (Bryden, 1973).

At an early stage of this research, the focus was on agriculture (See Appendix 1.) However the land based models were not appropriate for a study of a country which can not be regarded as a developing country and where both the primary and the secondary sectors of the economy were declining.
The concept of mobility implies more than just movement; motives and impacts are also involved. **There must have been reasons for changing industries and there must be personal consequences.** The research attempts to capture both. To do so, the study uses two major theoretical constructs; human capital theory and the notion of orientations to work. These are used because the change being described is a social change at national level and both theoretical constructs offer explanations at the societal level. It is easy to conceive the impacts of such a massive change on individual human capital. Many people are likely to find their human capital redundant. The proposition here is that tourism may offer employment and the opportunity to accumulate new human capital. In a general sense, it is a refuge from declining industries.

The study is guided by a number of propositions. These are:

- Tourism is a convenient industry in times of labour market turbulence caused by political, economic and social change.
- One of the implications of economic change will be mobility, which in turn will cause dislocation from human capital.
- Tourism is convenient to the individual because of ease of access and is convenient for the economy because it absorbs surplus labour.
- Tourism, by its very characteristics, offers opportunities that might ameliorate the adverse affects of the transition.
1.2 Research objectives

As mobility has a number of facets, a comprehensive understanding of it requires that the research looks at the phenomenon from different perspectives. This has implications for the methodology which, combines a number of approaches within one instrument.

The objectives of the research are as follows:

i. To investigate the pattern of labour mobility which terminates in tourism.

ii. To evaluate the impact of the mobility on individuals.

iii. To investigate the reasons for this mobility.

iv. To investigate the nature of tourism entrepreneurship.

1.3 The structure of the study

In Chapter 2, the study begins with an overview of the economic and social transition in Hungary with particular reference to the impact on the tourism industry. Chapter 3. is in two parts. The first part reviews the literature on labour market and human capital theory and extracts those themes that underlie the propositions used in the study. The second part explores the nature of the tourism industry and argues a case for the accessibility and attractiveness of tourism employment. Chapter 4. begins with a discussion of the difficulties encountered by the research and with a theoretical justification of the concepts that lie behind the measurements used in the methodology, namely, work biography analysis and orientations to work. It then goes on to describe the research instrument, with particular reference to the three discrete measures used in the instrument to capture mobility patterns, the impact of change and the motives. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of further methodological aspects of the research. The main findings are in Chapter 5. which describes the findings structured around the first three objectives. The findings related to the fourth objective concerning entrepreneurship are presented in Chapter 6. Finally, in Chapter 7. the findings of the study are discussed and conclusions are drawn both in direct relation to Hungary and to the general case of tourism employment.
Reference

Chapter 2.

Economic and social transition in Hungary

2.1 Introduction

As the locale of the research is Hungary and the background is transition from communism to capitalism, it would be appropriate to highlight the major changes that have occurred in the country since the fall of the old regime. The conspicuous characteristics of the Hungarian route in the transition is that it has been a gradualist approach in which measures to lessen the dominance of the command economy have been taken in the decades prior to the transition. However, despite the graduality, the fall of the communist regime brought significant impacts both on the economy and on the social system. The tourism industry, like all other sectors of the economy, was not immune from the impacts.

Chapter 2. is organised in two parts. The first part deals with the notion of transition in general, while the second part discusses the major dynamics in tourism.

In the first part, the discussion begins with a brief examination of the legacy of the economic history of Hungary (Section 2.2). What follows this is an account of the major events of the transition (Section 2.3). As work is an integral part of an individual's life and because the concept of work is at the focal point of the present study, it is important to examine what meaning work carried under socialism (Section 2.4). And finally, the first part of the chapter concludes with the examination of the social impacts of the transition (Section 2.5).
The second part of the chapter begins with a portrait of tourism in Hungary under communism (Section 2.6). This is followed by a discussion of the major changes in tourism since the beginning of the transition (Section 2.7).

It would be appropriate at this juncture to point out that in the following discussion the terms communism and socialism will be used interchangeably. Although in the true Marxist sense Hungary never reached 'pure' communism, the ensuing discussion does not differentiate between the two stages of development.

2.2 The legacy of the past

Located to the East of the river Elbe, the most serious departure of Hungarian development from that of Western Europe occurred from the 16th century. The period of 'second serfdom' involved the decline of capital formation and of urban development, an increased dependence of the serf on the landlord, the extension of the feudal dues, and a general increase in payments due to the landlord. Development was further hampered by the fact that profits from trade were not converted into capital (Bernát, 1989).

The constitutional settlement with the Habsburg Empire in 1867 paved the way to a late but rapid industrialisation of the economy at the turn of the century. The process was facilitated by the accumulation of national capital, whereby the share of Hungarian capital in manufacturing increased from 40% in 1900 to 64% in 1913.

However, despite the significant industrial development in Hungary, poverty persisted. The low wage levels can be best illustrated by the fact that in the period of 1905-1909 the Hungarian wage level stood at 30% compared to that in the United Kingdom.
The distortion of the economic structure continued after the World War I. Following the conclusion of the war in which Hungary was amongst the defeated countries, the peace treaties of Saint German and Trianon did not only liquidated the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, but also handed large Hungarian territories to the neighbouring countries. As a result, more than two thirds of the territory was lost.

The implications for the economy were twofold. Firstly, the loss of land with natural resources induced the decline of the steel and engineering industries. Secondly, with the demise of the Monarchy, important markets were lost. Before the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, approximately 80% of Hungarian products were sold to other parts of the Empire. The newly independent states imposed an average of 30% duty on imports which affected the Hungarian foreign trade and thus industry dramatically (Hitchens et al., 1995).

Consequently, economic development in the post-war period was slow and national income increased by an average of only 1% per annum in the period of 1919 to 1944. The large estates of feudal origin did not allow the development of agriculture which put the agrarian population into serious poverty. Hungary, which at that time had a population of 20 million, was famously referred to as the 'country of the 3 million beggars' (Bernát, 1989). Poverty induced large numbers of Hungarians to emigrate to the United States.

Following the Great World Depression, the country saw a short period of rapid growth but the overall level of economic development still remained far behind the developed industrialised countries, with an economic structure similar to that of Spain and Portugal at that time. The contribution of industry to the Gross National Product (GNP) was 36%, while that of agriculture was 37% (Hitchens et al., 1995).
In the intra-war period 54% of the Hungarian labour force was engaged in agriculture and fishing, while 23% in manufacturing and handicrafts. With such a structure, Hungary was behind Czechoslovakia in development (40% in manufacturing and 28% in agriculture), but well ahead of other Eastern European countries where 70-80% of the population was engaged in agriculture and only 10% in manufacturing (Teichova, 1985 cited in Hitchens et al., 1995).

From 1945 the country experienced radical political, economic and social changes. With the aim of reducing the gap between Western and Eastern Europe, a forced industrialisation process was put into motion. Although to a varying degree, for decades the economic sphere was characterised by the system of central planning, state ownership and monopoly, 5-year plans and consumer product shortages.

Attempts to break away from the communist system were made on a number of occasions, the most dramatic being the 1956 revolution. While with the failure of the revolution, hopes for political independence from the Soviet Union collapsed, the obvious deficiencies in the economic system evoked attempts for reform.
2.3 The transition process in Hungary

In the Eastern European transition Hungary represents the gradual model whereby the reform process did not start with the fall of the Berlin Wall, but is a phenomenon which began in the second half of the 1960s. While other countries in the region chose the strategies of "shock therapy" or "big bang", Hungary, together with Slovenia, opted for the "gradualist" approach (Kornai, 1995).

The collapse of the communist system in Hungary was not an isolated incidence but rather a result of a long process of disintegration of the centrally planned economy (van Zon, 1996). A major milestone in the process is the beginning of the "New Economic Mechanism" in January 1968, which transformed the economy from a strict, centrally planned economy to a hybrid one, where the private sector was allowed to take part in certain sectors of the economy.

Róna-Tas (1994) proposes a model for the transition process which suggests that the transition from socialism to capitalism is preceded by a phase of erosion of the socialist system. A similar appraisal of the process is made by Kornai (1996) who distinguishes between the "reform socialist" and the "post-socialist" periods.

In the model by Róna-Tas (1994) the erosion phase is the period during which the state first fights the private economy then loosens the restrictions on it. In the case of Hungary this phase commenced with the start of the "New Economic Mechanism" in 1968. The uniqueness of Hungary within the Eastern European development process is that it is the country where the private sector developed furthest during the erosion phase. However, the private sector, despite the considerable concessions made to it, remained excluded from certain sectors of the economy, such as health care, education, banking, wholesale and foreign trade. Furthermore, there was a strong barrier erected between the state and the private sector in order to prevent the mobility of labour, capital or skills between the two sectors.
According to the model, the transition phase starts when the barrier between the state and private sector is demolished and when the establishment of the legal institutions of the market economy commences. The latter, according to Róna-Tas, is marked in Hungary by the Law of Economic Associations which took effect from January 1989. This law laid the foundation for the privatisation of state companies, allowed the formulation of private limited liability companies and demolished the sectoral limitations for private enterprises. It was at this point that the process of introducing market-oriented institutions began. These included the deregulation of the price system, the creation of a capital market, the decentralisation of the banking and insurance system, (Róna-Tas, 1994), the liberalisation of foreign trade, a dramatic reduction in subsidies, the removal of legal restrictions on the hiring and firing of labour, the privatisation of state enterprises, and the abolition of the remaining restrictions on the establishment of private enterprises (The World Bank, 1995).

However gradual, the transition from the socialist economic system to a market oriented one had dramatic effects on the Hungarian economy; the most apparent impact being a serious contraction of the economy. This can be best illustrated by the fact that between 1989 and 1993, industrial output fell 25 %, while real GDP declined by 18 % (The World Bank, 1995). The contraction was attributable to four major factors.

Firstly, it was due to a significant market loss for Hungarian companies. With the change from a state organised barter trade to a de-regulated trade in convertible currencies, demonopolised foreign trade and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the Hungarian companies faced a difficult situation. In the late 1980s 40% of Hungary's trade was realised with countries within the umbrella of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA). With the demise of the CMEA in 1989-1990, easy export markets where low quality products could be sold were lost. Secondly, the collapse of the CMEA trade also affected the supply of raw materials and energy. This disruption in supply also contributed to the decline in production.
Thirdly, the introduction of the Bankruptcy Law in 1992 meant that insolvent companies could be made bankrupt. In 1992, 2,294 companies declared bankruptcy, a figure which later increased to 3,082 (Hitchens et al. 1995 p. 162.). And finally, the drop in real income for the population lead to the decline in domestic demand which in turn affected adversely the industrial output.

The transition from communism to capitalism is closely linked to the increasing role of the private sector. This is partly achieved via the privatisation process but is also a result of the accelerated formulation of private enterprises.

In Hungary the emergence of the private sector is not a product of the transition. However small and restricted, the origins of the private economy in Hungary can be traced back as early as the 1960s, when the members and employees of state-owned farms and agricultural co-operatives were allowed to keep small household plots. Although these were aimed at covering only family consumption, the food products from the household plots found their way to the markets. By the early 1980s, about 1.4 million "small producers" were registered in a country with a population of 10.5 million and the overall production of the household plots was responsible for over one third of the total agricultural production.

The establishment of private non-agricultural businesses was made possible by the reforms in the 1970s, which were introduced to allow them to meet the demand in consumer goods and services unsatisfied by state enterprises. The constraints on private enterprises continued to ease in the 1980s, although limitations on size and type of activity prevailed until the transition (Lane, 1995).
Still in the "erosion" phase, in 1982 an important law took effect, allowing employees of state enterprises to form partnership associations, termed as "Economic Working Community Within Enterprises", or VGMK, in Hungarian. These economic working communities could, with the permission of the enterprise, undertake private work outside working hours. For this they could take advantage of the facilities and equipment of the company. The products were sometimes sold to the state enterprise itself, but most often to external companies (Román, 1991). While the net efficiency of these working communities is controversial, for workers often lowered their efficiency during official working hours in order to increase efficiency in the time dedicated to the private VGMK-work, they certainly introduced a system of free bargaining, responsibility, control and profit oriented mentality to the state enterprises.

Privatisation also started before the transition commenced. From 1988 a "spontaneous privatisation" occurred when the Corporation Act and then the Transformation Act allowed large state companies to become corporations. The process which involved decentralisation within the companies, whereby the units gained formal autonomy and the headquarters were transformed into property management centres. However reformed, these companies still remained essentially state-owned (Laky, 1994).

The wholesale privatisation of state assets started in the transition period, with the establishment of the State Property Agency in 1990. It was the Agency's task to oversee the privatisation process. Given the initial difficulties, in 1991 a 'Decentralised Privatisation Programme' started, followed by the Second Privatisation Programme in 1992. Similarly to other Eastern European countries, the privatisation process is not without controversies. Corruption and underselling state assets to foreign investors were an integral part of it.
The increasing role of the private sector is best illustrated by the fact that while in 1980, only 3.4% of the active population had a job in that sector, the figure reached 11% in 1982 and 20% in 1992 (Laky, 1995). The share of the private sector from the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) rose from 29% in 1989 to an estimated 60% in 1994 (The World Bank, 1995).

The Hungarian private sector shows a number of conspicuous characteristics. Three major aspects will be highlighted in the following discussion.

Firstly, the private sector is characterised by small businesses, a situation different from that prior to the transition. In 1989 about 20% of the firms were large (employing more than 300 people) and 40% were small companies (employing less than 20 employees). By the end of 1993 the proportions changed dramatically: less than 2% of companies were large while 80% were in the small category. This development was partly due to the rapid formation of new businesses, most of which were small enterprises and partly due to the process whereby large state companies were broken into smaller units to assists their transformation and privatisation (Lane, 1995).

Secondly, the 1993 data by the Hungarian Statistical Office shows that nearly 20% of registered small enterprises (defined as employing less than 50 people) were 'empty' enterprises which did not seem to have business activity and were, therefore, suspected to have been established with the sole aim of profiting from transactions which allow the gaining of tax relief for the owners and their families (Czakó et al., 1995).
Thirdly, the circumstances changed direction, so that for many, entrepreneurship was the only way to sustain employment (Czakó et al., 1995). It is not uncommon that companies insist on signing a contract with an 'entrepreneur', instead of offering him or her formal employment; a practice motivated by the drive to minimise social security payments by the employer.

Given the increasing role of entrepreneurship, it is interesting to examine the motivations leading towards private business in Hungary. A study of Hungarian entrepreneurs at the onset of transition by Hisrich and Vecsenyi (1990) examined the characteristics of entrepreneurs and investigated the motives for establishing a private business. The research revealed that the majority of the respondents were in the age group 30 - 49. Their educational background was spread evenly between secondary technical school, grammar school and higher education.

When queried about their motivation to become entrepreneurs, several different motivators were found. Twenty per cent of the sample became entrepreneurs because they wanted to utilise previous experience, 17% wanted to gain financial independence and 13% did not want to work for anyone else.

The majority of the enterprises were established using the owner's own capital but loans from family and friends were also utilised. Bank loans were used only at later stages of company development.

The entrepreneurs were also asked what kind of knowledge or skills they were lacking for starting and running their business. 60% of the respondents found that their were lacking information on taxation, 40% mentioned law and finance, 30% named marketing and 10% of the sample admitted to lacking of general business knowledge.
One of the conspicuous aspects of the transition, is that despite the obvious ideological problems, ex-communist cadres seem to be particularly successful in entrepreneurship. Róna-Tas (1994) argues that this is partly due to their superior education, but also due to the fact that they could take advantage of the "informal institutions in which formal institutions are embedded" (Polanyi, 1957, cited in Róna-Tas, 1994 p. 62.), or as Róna-Tas expresses, they were able to "convert past political power to economic advantage".

Before embarking on an examination of work under socialism, it would be useful to reflect upon the process of transition and upon the preceding events. As it is seen from the above discussion, the transition period in Hungary does not stand alone: it is rooted in reforms in the decades prior to 1989. However, many reforms in the pre-transition period were only half-hearted, some providing only half-solutions whilst others remained only as plans. For example, the private sector was allowed to develop but most of it remained in the black economy. The Bankruptcy Law was ready in 1981 but took effect only in 1992. The Bonds market was established in 1985 but it collapsed soon afterwards. The liberalisation of prices did help some industries to develop but with the lack of real competition inflation increased. And finally, with the introduction of the commercial banks, the banking system was decentralised in 1987 but inherited mainly 'bad loans'. By 1989 the Hungarian economy was characterised by slow and declining growth, high inflation, decreasing investment and high foreign indebtedness (Hitchens at al, 1995). It was these circumstances which formed the background of the transition.
2.4 The meaning of work under socialism

2.4.1 Introduction

Such is the scale of the transition from communism to capitalism that a true understanding of it is a matter for larger research projects and, given the time scale, probably a matter for historians. However, even though this study examines directly the impact of a particular form of change, it can not escape from a discussion of the philosophical nature of the change. The discussion begins with a theoretical perspective on what communism meant at the workplace level, followed by the implications of the transition.

2.4.2 Work in the communist system

The communist 'experiment' with regards to work lead to unwanted consequences. In social terms, it resulted in a specific social product, the "homo sovieticus" who was "...an enslaved customer of communism, who dwells on goods provided for him by this system" Tischner (1992, cited in Jung, 1995 p. 33.). At the societal level the net result was not a share of prosperity but "a more or less egalitarian distribution of hardship and stagnation" (Jung, 1995 p. 34.). It also gave rise to apathy, scepticism and dissatisfaction.

For the economy, the result was inefficiency and low productivity. Consumer demand was ignored and product shortages prevailed. Industrial output stagnated and structural problems in the economy arose. Companies were separated from economic reality and the economies from the world economy. What follows now is an examination of the major factors which lead to such an outcome.
In the socialist system, work possessed a conspicuous position: work was the right of every citizen but at the same time it was also a duty towards the society. What follows from this is that the system was based upon the mutual understanding between the citizen and the state that, whilst the former was obliged to contribute to the society with his or her own labour, the latter had the duty of providing employment.

Full employment was seen as an evidence of the successful functioning of the socialist economy, therefore its maintenance was of high priority. Guaranteed employment was maintained at great cost, but behind the scenes of full employment there was a high level of hidden unemployment or underemployment. In other words, while employment was guaranteed, work, and especially meaningful work, wasn't.

The governing socialist ideals in the socialist Hungary are summarised by Kornai (1986, cited in Rakos, 1991) as follows: Firstly, the state was concerned with the fairness in wage setting. This was expressed by the slogan of 'to everybody according to his work and equal pay for equal work'. Secondly, the system promoted solidarity. The idea was to help and protect the vulnerable. Thirdly, it was concerned with security which was to be achieved through full employment and access to community resources. And finally, the societal concern gave priority to general interest over individual or group interests.

Although the communist ideal of a society in which everyone contributes to the society according to his ability but in which everyone receives according to his needs was never achieved, instead, a system which separated effort and reward, work and ownership, and work behaviour and its consequences, was implemented.
Under communism, wages were related to appearance at work and not to productivity. Increased work efforts were not rewarded with higher wages. This, together with the absence of the threat of unemployment lead to 'minimal work behaviour' (Rakos, 1991) whereby workers exerted minimum efforts for minimum wages. This had disastrous implications for efficiency and productivity. This separation of reward from effort created the single most important shortcoming of the system; the problem of motivations.

Rakos (1991) gives an analysis of the motivational inadequacies of the socialist system. Rakos argues that the system is built upon the dangerous assumption that people would work hard because they want to work hard. Consequently, the ideology rejected the use of material incentives in the absence of which the system had to rely on moral incentives.

However, the argument follows, moral incentives are only efficient when they are paired with other effective reinforcers such as material incentives or increased responsibility. Effective pairing rarely occurred in Eastern Europe and on the contrary, moral incentives were often accompanied by averse stimuli in the form of deprivation, product shortages, long queues and waits. This was particularly counterproductive.

Furthermore, the system relied heavily on primary reinforcers, such as basic shelter and food, education, employment and health care and failed to offer sufficient secondary reinforcers. At the heart of the matter is the problem of satiation; human nature is such that primary reinforcers are not sufficient to maintain behaviour over a long period of time. People need continually changing secondary reinforcers like non-essential goods, spacious accommodation, extensive travel or opportunity for cultural, intellectual or religious expression. Although the socialist system did provide some cultural, artistic and recreational reinforcers, they were insufficient to motivate. The consequence was an unmotivated society plagued by widespread dissatisfaction and apathy.
The system also worked against responsibility because not only was the citizen satiated by reinforcers but industry and its management were also protected by state intervention. According to Kornai's (1986) theorem of 'soft budget constraints', Hungarian companies did not have to bear the financial consequences of their operation, since failing companies and even industries were rescued by the state. This meant that mismanagement and inefficiency needed only to be justified and not to be prevented or compensated for. In other words, the 'soft budget constraint' took away the burden of responsible management and decision-making from the company managers' shoulder.

The lack of private ownership further weakened the ethos of taking responsibility. Collective ownership blurred the boundaries of ownership, which lead to the paradoxical situation whereby instead of collective responsibility for collectively owned commodities, collective ownership was regarded as lack of ownership which lead to irresponsibility.

The combination of authority without responsibility at the organisational level is mirrored, as one would expect, in the powerlessness of the workers within the 'system'. Socialist workers often felt a sense of powerlessness and lack of control over their work. Blauner (1964, p. 16.) defines powerlessness as:

"A person is powerless when he is an object controlled and manipulated by other person or by an impersonal system (such as technology) and when he cannot assert himself as a subject to change or modify this domination. Like an object, the powerless person reacts rather than acts."

Powerlessness is manifested in many different forms, for example in separation from ownership of the means of production, in the inability to influence managerial policies or in the lack of control over work process.
There is a certain historical irony in the fact that communist literature pointed the finger at capitalism as the source of alienation. Marx (1843 cited in Fischer 1975) showed an early concern for the alienation of workers in the capitalist system. He argued that capitalist institutions alienated workers from the product of their own labour. What they produced was taken away from them and what was left was insufficient to satisfy their needs. To Marx, workers were alienated from their own labour in that they derived no satisfaction from it. Marx saw the creativity of work as crucial for the humanity of the individual. What differentiates man from animals was the capacity for creative production. For Marx, work was a means to self-actualisation (personal growth) and thus a source of satisfaction. Yet, in the capitalist system, work was imposed upon people to satisfy other people's material need. Furthermore, the work process was controlled by others, therefore, he argued, work did not provide real satisfaction for people. Workers were alienated from their own labour.

The opposite argument is that workers who own the means of production would not be so alienated. Were socialist workers not alienated from the product of their labour and from their own labour in socialist societies? Workers had little control over the work process and what they received for their labour was not sufficient to cover their needs. The essential problem with Marx's argument is that at the workplace level, socialist workers had as little control as capitalist workers in the Marxist view. The thrust of Marx's argument is that 'through society' workers were supposed to feel in control. The level of abstraction, it could be argued, was unrealistic.

Did people under socialism find satisfaction from their work? Wasn't work imposed on them? In the system of where work was compulsory, it can hardly be argued that people had the freedom of choice whether to work or not. Irrational management decisions often lowered motivations. Efforts were not necessarily linked to reward. The problem of excess labour was 'treated' by underemploying people, which meant that people were allocated meaningless tasks just to occupy them or left idle in order to
maintain the great socialist achievement of full employment. The system discouraged initiatives and, while on the surface promoted participation, workers rarely felt their work as of their own. It seems that despite the idealistic ideas, socialism did not solve the problem of alienation.

To criticise the socialist approach to work is not to claim that today's capitalism has created an ideal situation. The system is flawed with involuntary unemployment, discrimination, a constant need to motivate the workforce or to find ways of remunerating them in proportion to their performance. Workers do not usually own their tools and machines and the degree of control over their work varies from job to job, employer to employer, industry to industry. However, the question of whether capitalism or socialism is more realistic in terms of human nature is a matter of historical debate and evolution.

Something of the sweep of this debate is well caught by Morrow (1981) who gives a historical overview of alienation in the capitalist world. His argument is important because it puts the problem of socialism into perspective. He argues from the position that capitalism should have resulted in mass alienation - but has not done so! His explanation is that work has a primacy in life rather than a primacy in the society. In other words, it is the meaning we give to work in life that is the safeguard against alienation. By deduction it could be argued that it is the pervasiveness of socialism into out-of-work life that has allowed the possibility of life and work to come together in a way that allows life to put work into perspective. Morrow writes:

"Work is the way that we tend the world, the way that people connect." (p. 11).
2.4.3 The changes necessitated by the transition

With the transition, major changes in the economy are occurring. The wholesale privatisation and the dynamic formation of new businesses ended the era of collective ownership. With the introduction of the bankruptcy law, the 'soft budget control' has hardened. The termination of guaranteed employment and the consequent appearance of unemployment ended the feeling of unconditional job security. It is not only companies which are ailing but whole industries are declining. Foreign investment and joint ventures brought in new incentives and human resource policies. With the collapse of the CMEA-trade, former easy and safe markets were lost. This, and the increased competition from the West are urging increased efficiency and productivity in the Hungarian industry. These are just some of the changes brought about by the transition.

One of the first features of the transition was the appearance of skill shortages. Although the basic educational infrastructure for an industrialised economy was present in Hungary, skill problems arose for a number of reasons. Firstly, there was an over qualification at universities whereby the supply of highly skilled graduates exceeded demand. Secondly, the skills taught in higher education do not match the new requirements. Generally, social and economic science were an underdeveloped aspect of the higher education system. Furthermore, the transition required new skills, such as management, accounting and marketing. Despite the growing number of educational establishments offering such courses, there is need for further skill development in these areas (van Zon, 1996).
The adaptation to the new realities is a long process as it requires a change in norms and values. The change is not always met without resistance, as some see it as a threat to their position (Markóczy, 1993) and also because in the process "old habits compete with new rules". Changes in the production system, ownership patterns and system of reward often lead to conflicts at the workplace. Furthermore, on the macro level, the adaptation process is also complicated by the fact that the human capital generated by the communist system is largely inappropriate for the new system (Vecernik, 1992). While the reform of the education system is on its way, it takes time for the changes to spin over to the workplace.

If the changes are to be understood than it is necessary to consider the changes in management behaviour requested by the transition. The most realistic view of Hungarian managers is that drawn by foreign observers. A study by Markóczy (1993) provides an insight into the cultural and behavioural differences of Hungarian and Western managers. What follows here is one side of the picture; namely the major criticism of the Hungarian management style by Western respondents in the research. The findings are interesting as they point out the legacy of the communist past at the workplace and highlight the changes Hungarian managers are facing in the adaptation process to the new realities of the transition.

Firstly, Hungarian managers are seen as eager to avoid decision-making and responsibility. In the communist system managers received orders from above and thus when a problem occurred there was also somebody else one level up to refer the problem to. With the words of one respondent in the study:

"The Hungarians do not want to make a decision or take responsibility. If a problem was told to you [by a Hungarian] it becomes your problem." (p. 290).
Secondly, Hungarian managers were seen as always looking for excuses. Western managers observed that their Hungarian colleagues tend to come up with excuses for why the problem could not be solved, instead of looking into ways of solving it.

Thirdly, Western managers found it frustrating that Hungarians tend to show servility and do not like to openly express their opinions:

"We do not know whether the Hungarians agree with the decisions or they are just only good soldiers." (p. 291).

Fourthly, Hungarians insist on strict definition of tasks and prefer the bureaucratic mechanism of written communication in official style to oral agreements and brief unofficial memoranda. Finally, Hungarian managers were found to be accustomed to large meetings and collective decision-making.

The origins of such behaviour are clearly rooted in the socialist history of the country. Avoiding responsibilities and looking for excuses is a remnant of the past whereby individuals could easily become scapegoats and mistakes be turned into political issues. The solution was to avoid personal responsibility and hide behind collective decision-making. Big meetings were "partially used for the ceremony of making decisions look collective" (p. 298.). Detailed task descriptions were also used as protection by the workers, and servility was related to the system whereby the machinery worked through personal favours.
Riley (1997) suggests that in the adjustment process tourism workers play a special role for two reasons. Firstly, because Eastern European tourism workers tend to be at the forefront in encountering Western materialism and capitalist values. Secondly, the conspicuous inequity between the Eastern European service worker and the Western tourist necessitates special coping strategies from the former, as he or she is not only faced with the universal problem of how to balance service and servility but has also to cope with an additional feeling of inferiority which arises from the obvious difference in wealth and sense of liberty between him or her and the Western visitor. This is likely to lead to defensive measures such as indifference to work.

However, as Riley (1997) suggests, minimal involvement in work and instrumental values could be turned into positive instrumental attitude which can lead to entrepreneurship. This would be not only be advantageous for the employee concerned but would also greatly benefit the development of the Hungarian tourism industry itself.

Having discussed some aspects of work under socialism and the implications of the transitions for workers and managers, what follows now is an account of the major social impacts of the transition.
2.5 The social impacts of the transition

Before describing the actual social impacts of the transition, it is worth examining briefly the major dynamics in the pre-transition period.

Kornai (1995) points out that from the early 1960s, the Hungarian economic policy gave priority to the consumption function, to growth, investment and militarisation. This approach, which was possibly a response to the mass dissatisfaction postulated by the 1956 revolution, created a short period from 1966 to 1975 when the consumption of the population saw an annual increase of 5.3%. This period, which made Hungary known as the "happiest barrack in the socialist block", meant a golden period for Hungarians. This was the time when the first television sets, cars and second homes by Lake Balaton were purchased and the improving living standards created a sense of security and certain contentment in Hungary. However, it has to be noted, that while at the beginning, the policy was underpinned by a growth in economic output, later on it could only be maintained at the cost of increasing foreign debt and falling investment in infrastructure and housing.

From the 1980s, the process of income differentiation commenced. The earnings of manual workers deteriorated in relation to the non-manual workers whereby in the early 1980s non-manual workers earned about twice as much as manual workers, which ratio rose to about 2.5 by 1989. It was also this period when senior and middle management improved their earnings considerably. While in 1980, senior management earned approximately 150% of the average non-manual wage, the ratio rose to 400% by 1989. During this period certain industries such as mining, transport and agriculture, saw the decrease of wage levels as a result of wage policy liberalisation and the cancellation of state subsidies. In other industries, such as metallurgy, chemicals, food processing and foreign trade, the strong foreign and domestic trade position allowed a significant increase in incomes.
It was also this period when those paid from the state budget, such as those in education, health care and cultural services, saw their relative earnings declining (Cukor and Kővári, 1991).

Although, as seen above, the process of income differentiation started prior to the transition, it is important to point out that the most dramatic fall in real income started from 1989. This can be best illustrated by the fact that the average per capita real income decreased by about 12% between 1989 and 1993 (Andorka, 1994).

In addition to the decline in real income, the major social cost of the transition was the growing inequality in the society (Andorka, 1993a). A survey by the Hungarian Social Sciences Research Institute in 1991 (cited in Andorka, 1993a) found that in the period from 1989 to 1991, real income increased significantly for 20% of the Hungarians but at the same time a serious decline in income was experienced by 50% of the population. The dual factor of decline in real income and increase in inequality lead to the increase of poverty in Hungary. The number of people living below the subsistence minimum (calculated by the Central Statistical Office) increased from 1 million in the 1980s to 2.5 million in 1993. In other words, as a result of the income redistribution in Hungary, the rich became richer and the poor poorer (Cukor and Kővári, 1991).

The transition also affected the rural-urban wage gap. Andorka (1993b) suggests that the rural population suffered 'doubly', firstly because of the general decline in income, and secondly by the growth of rural-urban inequality. Citing the findings of a study in 1992 undertaken by the Department of Sociology, Budapest University of Economic Sciences and the Social Research Informatics Centre, he shows that those living in Budapest were most satisfied with their income, living standard and future prospects. The least satisfied were those living in detached farms and villages.
The major change brought about by the transition was the end of a paternalistic state, whose task was to look after its citizens, whatever the long term consequences. "In the past there was easy access to jobs and citizens were sheltered by an umbrella of social protection programmes" (Sziráczki and Windell, 1992 p. 471.). Employment and consumption was a civilian right and so was leisure and recreation. It is this position which changed dramatically with the transition and ended the period of state intervention and the security of guaranteed employment.

However, the change affected people differently; for some it provided opportunity while for others it brought serious loss. Berényi (1994) points out that the different social layers experienced the socio-economic transformation differently. While a considerable portion of the society was given the opportunity to become entrepreneurial and to change their social position, many preferred the safe and convenient socialist way of existence, characterised by low pay but low efforts, or as then manifested, full employment.

Until 1987, officially, the Hungarian economy operated at full employment. The most painful period was between 1990 and 1993 when unemployment showed a sharp increase, reaching nearly 13% in 1993. After 1993, the unemployment rate stabilised at around 10%.

In addition to the fact that unemployment is a new phenomenon and is clearly associated with the transition, the Hungarian unemployment possesses certain specific characteristics. Firstly, it was the young and the unskilled who were most vulnerable to unemployment. Within the manufacturing industry production jobs suffered the greatest fall, within which the share of unskilled and semi-skilled workers displayed the strongest decline (Sziráczki and Windell, 1992).
Secondly, there is a relatively high incidence of long term unemployment. And finally, the Hungarian unemployment situation is marked by large regional differences (Fazekas, 1995a; 1995b). These facts together made the Hungarian unemployment situation potentially dangerous (Berényi, 1994).

At the beginning of the transition, there was a lot of naivety about the market economy and the population had unrealistic expectations of the changes which were underpinned by equally unrealistic promises from the political parties. However, despite the hopes, in the short run the economic policy did not lead to increased efficiency and higher income levels (Van Zon, 1996).

Furthermore, the adaptation to the new situation by the labour force was hampered by old habits which did not fit in with the requirements of a market economy. Success in the new circumstances demanded attitudes and abilities, such as competence, education, adaptability and mobility, which were suppressed under the communist regime. Moreover, the human capital generated by the old system was largely redundant under the new circumstances (Vecernik, 1992).

Given these trends, it is not surprising that Hungarians in general are not satisfied with the changes. A survey in 1993 shows that not only are Hungarians the most dissatisfied amongst the former socialist countries, but also that 73% of the respondents claimed that their living standard was lower than that in 1988; in other words, prior to the transition (Andorka, 1994).
But Andorka (1994) goes further in the examination of the causes of dissatisfaction and suggests that it has other roots as well. He cites that mental health surveys show widespread neurosis and depression in the population. Added to this is the problem of high and growing suicide rate and alcoholism. What Andorka suggests is that at the root of the problem, which also induced the collapse of the socialist system in Hungary, is the anomie and alienation caused by the totalitarian and authoritarian nature of the Communist system. The evidence for this are the results of surveys from the period of 1978 to 1990 which show a growing feeling of uselessness, of senselessness of personal life, of the inability to influence one's career and a confusion of values and norms in Hungary. The result is growing criminality, low level of business ethics, high incidence of tax evasion, aggressiveness and lack of trust amongst business partners.
2.6 Tourism under socialism

According to the Socialist Constitution in Hungary, leisure time was the right of every citizen who shared equal access to leisure activities and facilities. Leisure facilities were provided by trade unions, enterprises and other institutions (Dingsdale, 1986). Restricted in their travel to the West, Hungarian citizens could expect a heavily subsidised holiday in one of the popular Hungarian resorts every couple of years. Tours to the 'friendly' socialist countries were also available, some on a commercial basis, others as a reward from the employer, trade union or the party.

The spatial distribution of tourism showed a strong bias for the capital Budapest and Lake Balaton, with Budapest attracting the largest numbers of foreign visitors but Lake Balaton recording more tourist days and enjoying longer length of stay. Budapest, a city created in 1873 by joining three cities into one administrative unit, occupies a picturesque location on the river Danube. Being the country's political, economic, social and cultural centre, Budapest attracted tourists from both Western and Eastern Europe. (Compton, 1991).

The prime tourism resort for domestic holidays was Lake Balaton. The "Hungarian sea", as it is popularly called, was surrounded by trade union, party and company holiday homes. From the late 1960s and especially from the 1970s, Lake Balaton also experienced a period of rapid second home development. The rising real income in the 1970s, the increased leisure time, the inadequate supply of state provided holiday homes and the willingness of the party to accommodate the idea of second home ownership made it possible for Hungarians to find recreation in their holiday homes (Dingsdale, 1986).
Lake Balaton is Central Europe’s largest fresh water lake. Its shallowness allows it to warm up quickly in the summer and it also make it safe for children. As a consequence, Lake Balaton is especially suitable for family holidays. Prior to 1989 Lake Balaton was frequented by tourists from the socialist block; particularly from the then Czechoslovakia, GDR and Poland (Compton, 1991).

It was also Lake Balaton which served as a meeting point for travel restricted East Germans with their West German relatives and friends during the summer months in the 1980s. Hungarian second homes provided an important source of accommodation, often in the shadow of the informal economy. Restaurants and other establishments also profited from the phenomenon. Furthermore, the lake also saw the sudden 'invasion' of German factory workers who enjoyed a truly cheap and often relatively luxurious holiday when their factory closed down for the summer holiday. In addition to the German tourists, Austria and Holland were the major origin countries for tourists.

Ideology played an important role in tourism under the socialist system. Hall (1990) summarises the objectives for tourism as seen from the socialist point of view. These are:

1) To assist in implementing the policy of equal distribution of goods, services and opportunities;
2) To improve economic performance and stimulate economic development;
3) To stimulate infrastructural improvements for the benefit of the host population;
4) To aid improving the environment;
5) To project a favourable image of the country to the outside world;
6) To promote international peace and understanding, as defined by the socialist dogma;
7) To enhance the visitor's ideological awareness by convincing them of the superiority of socialist system.
However, despite the ideological difficulties, Hungary realised relatively early the economic benefits from allowing incoming tourism from the West into the country. While the 1950s were the years of "prohibition" and the 1960s the years of "tolerance", policy makers in the 1970s realised the potential benefits from tourism (Sugataghy, 1989). In other words, from the 1960s the country gradually opened up for international tourism. The annual growth rate of tourist arrivals between 1964 and 1976 averaged 27% and so by the mid-1970s Hungary became one of Europe's most saturated countries (Böröcz, 1990).

In terms of travel to the West, Hungarians were long constrained by visa policies, low living standards and personal mobility, relatively low living standards and currency inconvertibility (Hall, 1992a).

The system of compulsory exchange was in effect until the late 1970s. It meant that an entry visa into the country was only granted to a Western visitor if either the hotel accommodation had been pre-paid in convertible currency or at least the minimum specified amount of hard currency had been exchanged for each day of stay.

Until 1981 Hungary operated a multiple exchange rate system, whereby different exchange rates were applied to official, commercial and tourist purposes. The introduction of the unified exchange rate created an undervalued Forint which made Hungary a cheap tourist destination for Western visitors. However, financial changes such as the liberalisation of the price mechanism and the concomitant high inflation made the country very expensive for tourists from the socialist countries.

Furthermore, tourists from the Eastern block countries were also hindered by restrictions on the amount of Hungarian currency they could buy. For example, the maximum amount of Hungarian currency East Germans were allowed to buy in 1988 equalled to 3,000 Forint, which at that time allowed a three-day budget stay at Lake Balaton.
Consequently, while tourist arrivals from the West showed an increase, the number of tourists from the Eastern European countries fell dramatically in 1982 (Compton, 1991). While in 1981, 9.1 million tourists arrived from socialist countries, in 1982 this figure nearly halved to 5.0 million in 1982.

It was partly the restrictions on foreign currencies which induced the widespread practices of informal activities in the Hungarian tourism industry. The limitations faced by East Germans with regards to the amount of Hungarian currency they could buy were, for example, overcome by offering savings account deposits to be used by informal Hungarian service providers on their trips to East Germany. But in the CMEA-system, currency restrictions on other Eastern Europeans were also in effect. The limitations on the importation and exportation of currencies within the CMEA-block lead during the 1970s and 1980s in Hungary to the phenomenon of "CMEA-markets". On these local markets Polish, Czechoslovak, Yugoslav, Soviet, Romanian, Bulgarian and East Germans were selling smuggled products from their various home countries.

Furthermore, the inconvertibility of the Hungarian Forint lead to the "black market" exchange of foreign currencies which provided considerable complementary income for many Hungarians.

And finally, in Hungary and especially around Lake Balaton, the provision of accommodation in private homes and holiday homes was common practice. This is best illustrated by the figure estimated by the Hungarian Economics Research Institute in 1983, which showed that only 25% to 35% of private housing units let for tourists were recorded, regulated and taxed (Börorcz, 1996).
2.7 Tourism in transition

Similarly to the overall economy, the transformation of the Hungarian tourism system started well before the real transition period. The compulsory exchange was abolished in the late 1970s and the multiple exchange rate, which differentiated between official, commercial and tourist transactions, was replaced by a unified exchange rate mechanism in 1981 (Compton, 1991).

Until 1988, Hungarian citizens were allowed to travel individually to the West only once in every three years. From January 1, 1988 travel abroad was declared as an unrestricted civilian right, guaranteed by the Constitution (Béröcz, 1996). Since then the remaining restrictions on foreign exchange have been also gradually abolished. Perhaps it is symbolic that in the same year McDonald's, for many Hungarians the symbol of Western consumerism, established a joint venture with an innovative state farm of Bábolna and the first McDonald's restaurant in Eastern Europe was opened in Budapest (Gray and Karp, 1994).

In 1989, Hungary created the conditions for the free movement of foreign capital. The liberal laws allowed the establishment of companies and the repatriation of profits. Tax concessions were also granted to attract foreign businesses.

Arrival numbers to Hungary increased from 1988 but the most dramatic change was recorded in 1990. The magnitude of the change can be best described by the fact that in the first eight months of 1990 visitor numbers to Hungary increased by 56%. In 1988, 18 million visitors to Hungary were recorded, a figure which increased to 24.9 million in 1989 and to 37.6 million in 1990. Tourist arrivals increased from 14.5 million in 1989 to 20.5 million in 1990.
It has to be pointed out at this point that these figures hide important trends in international arrivals. While total visitor numbers increased by 51% from 1989 to 1990, with 91% the largest increase was recorded in the numbers of excursionists. Tourist numbers increased by 44%. Tourist arrivals from Western countries and Eastern Europe also showed a differential increase: whilst arrivals from socialist countries increased by 48% from 9 million in 1989 to 13.3 million in 1990, the tourist arrivals from Western countries increased by 38%, from 5.2 million in 1989 to 7.2 million in 1990 (Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, 1995).

Tourism activity in Hungary increased with the start of the transition due to a number of factors. Hall (1992b) summarises the stimuli of tourism activity as follows:

1) The easing of entry, exit and of currency restrictions;
2) The new media image of Eastern Europe;
3) The increasing Western involvement in tourism development;
4) And the growing mobility of East Europeans.

However, the boom year in international arrivals in 1990 was not followed by years of steady growth. International arrivals decreased from 37.6 million in 1990 to 33.3 million in 1991, a figure which next increased only in 1993 when it reached 40.6 million. The number of tourists visiting Hungary increased from 20.5 million in 1990 to 21.9 in 1991, but it declined to 20.2 million in 1992 (Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, 1995).
The decline in arrivals from the Eastern European countries from 1991 was due to a number of factors of which the most prominent were the shift from Rouble to convertible accounts in tourism, the war in Yugoslavia, the 1991 law in Hungary which introduced stricter control of foreigners and the availability of sufficient money for their stay in Hungary and the consequent decline in 'shopping tourism' (Gergelyné Benke, 1993).

The development of tourism in Hungary and in the whole region, was hampered by the inheritance of communist period and by the uncertainty imposed by the transition. The underdeveloped infrastructure and superstructure pose a significant impediment to tourism development. The shortcomings in service quality is also a significant impediment to the development of repeat tourism. The increased competition from the neighbouring countries such as Austria, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Slovenia has also been holding back tourist arrivals.

Human resource problems in the Eastern block are pointed out by Airey (1994; 1997) who, in relation to Poland and Uzbekistan, suggests that training in the fields of business operation and particularly in finance, economics, marketing and customer care are insufficient in these countries. Similar problems are felt in the case of Hungary.

Since the transition started, the Hungarian tourism industry underwent a major privatisation process whereby large, previously state owned companies were transformed into private businesses, often with the help of foreign capital. Facilitated by a credit agreement between the Hungarian and Austrian governments aimed at the construction of high standard accommodation, amongst the foreign investors, Austrian firms were the first to enter the market. In the travel agency sector, Austrian and German firms were the first to set up joint ventures with Hungarian partners (Gray and Karp, 1994). The Hungarian airline, MALEV sold a 30% stake to the Italian carrier, Alitalia.
The privatisation of the state owned travel agencies was completed by 1993. The five state travel companies (Ibusz, Balatontourist, Cooptourist, Express and Budapest Tourist) found competition from the newcomers, such as Chemol Travel, Delta Tours, Falcon, Pannónia and Mávtours (Euromonitor, 1995). The number of small travel agencies is also 'mushrooming', many of which specialise in organising coach tours to the neighbouring Western European countries (Gray and Karp, 1994). In 1993, for example there were 755 travel agencies registered which were operating in 1206 locations. The majority (604) of the travel agencies in that year were Hungarian owned and only 18 were fully foreign owned (Hungarian Tourist Board, 1994).

The hotel sector also underwent significant changes. In 1992 nearly 60 units of two major hotel companies (Hungária Rt. and Pannónia Rt.) were sold separately. The shares of Danubius Hotels were introduced on the Hungarian stock exchange, two large hotels, the Royal and Intercontinental were sold successfully (Gergelyné Benke, 1993). The Pannónia Hotels chain was privatised with the help of the French Accor chain (Hungarian Tourist Board, 1994). The privatisation of the Hungária Szálloda Rt. was carried out with state intervention, whereby Hotel Forum, the company's flagship hotel, was to be sold separately.

In addition to the transformation of the old hotel chains, new ones were also set up. Former workers' homes were transformed into 1 and 2 star hotels and form the ERAVIS chain. From privatised state-owned hotels was created the Inn-Side chain. The former trade union homes were transformed to the National Holiday and Travel (Magyar Nemzeti Udulési Alapítvány), which established the Hunguest Rt. company. Hunguest Rt. operates 50 hotels throughout the country (Hungarian Tourist Board, 1994; 1996).
International organisations have been assisting the transformation of the Hungarian tourism industry. The European Community, through the Poland, Hungary Assistance Restructuring the Economy (PHARE) scheme, helped to set up Local Enterprise Agencies (LEAs) which are involved in the production of tourism strategy plans (Fletcher and Cooper, 1996). American Express also launched a programme for the upgrading tourism personnel skills.

2.8 Summary

This Chapter has attempted to highlight the main changes that have occurred in the transition period to date. These changes illustrated the essential character of the Hungarian experience which is gradualist. The effects of the change impact on industry, managers and workers. Although the literature on the effects is limited, it is clear that for both managers and workers the adjustment is to learn to be responsible for their own decisions.

Tourism in Hungary has gone through a number of changes. The markets have changed and contracted, but are now expanding slowly. Like other industries, tourism made the transition through privatisation accompanied by the development of small entrepreneur businesses. It is worth noting that if workers were mobile into tourism, they were not joining a well established stable industry but they were joining a rapidly changing economic sector.
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Chapter 3.

Mobility and tourism employment

3.1 Introduction

The theoretical review which follows is an attempt to find concepts and explanations for the postulated mobility behaviour which forms the basis of the research. As the concern of the research is with industrial mobility and with the impact of that mobility in the context of tourism, it follows that the theoretical framework will involve economic and social arguments in relation to mobility. There are three levels of argument to contend with: those at the level of the society, those at the level of the labour market and those at the level of the individual. The starting point for any theoretical review is to state what has to be explained. In this respect there are five broad areas where explanatory theory needs to be applied. Firstly, at the society level, the research is concerned to explain the impact of the transition. In other words, to find an explanation which connects individual and social change. Secondly, at the labour market level, it has to rationalise a postulated pattern of inter-sector mobility, whereby individuals move into tourism from other industries. In some cases this mobility occurs in unusual circumstances when individuals may be moving into conditions which are apparently worse than their previous experience. Thirdly, the question arises as to how the mobility affects the individuals and how the change is coped with. Fourthly, if society has forced individuals to be mobile with attendant compromises, what motivations were engendered by this dilemma? Fifthly, and most importantly, it is necessary to justify the choice of tourism as a destination for workers induced into mobility by economic and social change.
The chapter is concerned with two main issues; mobility and tourism employment. The first part will commence with the examination of the literature on human capital and its relationship with the notion of mobility (Section 3.2). This will be followed by the discussion of the macroeconomic need for inter-industry mobility and the behaviour of displaced workers (Section 3.3). Following on from this, the major factors influencing mobility and particularly inter-industry mobility will be highlighted (Section 3.4). That will be followed by the explanation of how inter-industry mobility is related to other types of mobility (Section 3.5). Coping with the change in transition (Section 3.6) and the effect of the transition on work orientations (Section 3.7) closes the arguments on human capital, mobility and transition.

The second part will be concerned with tourism and particularly tourism employment. At the heart of the argument is the notion that tourism employment does, on the one hand, possess certain attractive attributes for those who, for some reason, consider moving into tourism from other industries or from unemployment, and is, on the other hand, accessible for such people. The ideas of attractiveness and accessibility dominate the discussion. After the introduction (Section 3.8.1), the discussion will start with an account of the difficulties encountered when defining tourism employment (Section 3.8.2). This will be followed by an overview of the attributes that make tourism employment a destination employment. Here the discussion will centre upon the question of attractiveness and unattractiveness of tourism employment (Section 3.8.3). Afterwards, the characteristics of the industry will be examined from the point of view of accessibility (Section 3.8.4). This will be followed by the citation of some historic examples of mobility into tourism from other sectors of the economy (Section 3.8.5). Finally, the impacts of the mobility into tourism will be examined (Section 3.8.6).
3.2 Human capital and mobility

As the basis of the research is economic transition and the principal behaviour is industrial mobility, it would be appropriate to seek explanation from economic arguments in relation to mobility. At the heart of the mobility issue is the notion of human capital. In economic theory, human capital is used to explain the distribution of remuneration within a society. Within this framework, skill and pay levels would be expected to be consistent across industries with inter-sector mobility maintaining that consistency (Groshen, 1991). In a stable economic system, the effects of human capital would be subject to pressure from demand variables such as size, structure and rate of expansion-contraction. In any circumstances, patterns of labour mobility would be expected to reflect the distribution of rewards underpinned by human capital (Becker, 1975). According to the human capital theory, investments into the human capital stock in forms of education, training and experience, are made in the hope of achieving appropriate rate of return on the investment. The value of human capital is derived through the labour markets where the skills and knowledge are marketed. The price of the human capital is strongly influenced by search and migration activities which can be used to increase the value of the acquired human capital stock (Ehrenberg and Smith, 1988).

The actual process by which people acquire and use their human capital is described by a number of models. According to the reward-resource model (Tuma, 1976), individuals seek to ensure that their human capital is commensurate with their job rewards. The process through which this is realised is mobility. Whilst the model assumes that individuals have unlimited opportunities to reach equilibrium between their resources and the reward from their job, the limited opportunity model suggests that there are situations and individuals who are restricted by their lack of opportunities. In this case, the lack of a better alternative induces individuals not to use mobility but to retain their current job (Hachen, 1990).
Labour intensive industries represent conditions of limited opportunities whereas the minimum variation in wage levels across employers limits the opportunities for labour to find jobs in which provide better opportunities for the utilisation of an individual's skills (Hachen 1992).

Following the human capital argument, the decision to change job is based on a cost-benefit calculation, whereas the cost of moving (both in economic, social and psychological terms) is compared with the expected benefits such as increased income, improved working conditions or quality of work. The major aim of the worker is to maximise the return on the human capital investment (Mallier and Shafto, 1989).

When comparing employments, monetary factors are rarely the sole consideration. A useful guideline is provided by Adam Smith (1776) who pointed out the following aspects considered when an individual is choosing a job: (1) the agreeableness or disagreeableness of the employment, the hardship involved and the honourableness or dishonourableness of the employment, (2) the difficulty and expense of learning, (3) the constancy and security of employment, (4) the trust reposed in the those who perform the job and (5) the probability of success in the job.

In his study of occupational mobility of unemployed labour, Johnes (1988) distinguishes between three sets of motives underlying occupational mobility. Firstly, in the case of human capital mobility, the main motivation is to achieve the same return (earnings) that a worker with identical human capital stock receives from another occupation, termed as the "preferred occupation". In this circumstance, the job change is made with the aim of optimising one's return on the acquired stock of human capital. Secondly, "search mobility" occurs when an individual opts for a spell of unemployment in order to conduct a full-time search for the "preferred job". The human capital implication of this is the possible human capital change (human capital depreciation and the increased weight of the general human capital within the human capital stock) during the search
period. Consequently, the worker might find that his/her human capital is no longer suitable for the preferred job but there is a third job with more general human capital requirements which offers the best return. And finally, job rationing mobility occurs when the depreciation of human capital of the unemployed person falls below the human capital requirement of the preferred job, in which case the potential earnings in the preferred job drop to zero. The net result is that the job seeker must give up the idea of the preferred occupation and look for an alternative job.

Fallick (1993) points out that the pattern of inter-industry mobility is influenced by the characteristics of the worker's pre-mobility industry. At the heart of the argument is the recognition that the acquired skills in that industry and the value of those skills in the new industry are crucial for the economic well-being of the worker. In other words, the skills acquired previous to the mobility have a strong influence on the prospects and the direction of the job search in relation to the new industry. To an extent, this idea is problematic to the case of 'dislocation' where the old human capital is deemed redundant. The influence of the old skills on the new is dependent on the existence of similar job.

Maillat's (1984) idea of mobility channels suggests that jobs form linkages with each other and that any job leads only to a limited number of other jobs. In this respect each job has a particular function in the career of the individual: a job can provide stability, serve as a springboard or offer flexibility. There are also jobs which are not tied to the labour market, and loosing or giving up these jobs means an exit from the labour market. Seasonal work is one such employment.

What Fallick (1993) is saying is that there needs to be a degree of accumulation in job changes and Maillat (1984) is suggesting the local labour market confirms this by employment channels between 'similar' jobs. It is this process which is under attack by wholesale economic change.
However, although the above arguments are based on human capital theory, it must be said that the theory itself has its critics. It is argued that the distribution of the cost of training intervenes to produce market failures which cause the process of human capital accumulation to falter (Booth and Snower, 1996). Redundant human capital and skill shortages exist in Western economies. This thesis, whilst using human capital arguments in the context of an Eastern European country, does not assume that human capital theory is a comprehensive explanation that is without its own inconsistencies.

3.3 The macroeconomic need for inter-industry mobility and the case of displaced workers

Technological change leads to the development of new occupations and skills whilst old skills and occupations are no longer needed. Industrial re-structuring gives rise to new industries while old ones decline. And finally the inevitable regional differences mean that, while some regions experience strong prosperity, others remain or shift to marginality. In these circumstances, it is the function of labour mobility, and often labour mobility across industries, to play an important balancing role. It is because of this function that governments whose interest is growth tend to encourage labour mobility (Mallier and Shafto, 1989).

The need for inter-industry mobility is probably the greatest in the case of displaced workers, who find themselves in declining industries or even unemployment. The macroeconomic incentives for mobility are, however, often counterbalanced by workers' attachment to their industries. Industry specific skills might be difficult to transfer to other industries where the value of those skills is lower than in the previous industry or where the old skills are simply not needed (Fallick, 1993).
As the literature of migration talks of people suffering emotional loss through being dislocated from the identity bestowed by home and nationality (Stalker, 1994), it can be argued that people can also be separated from their human capital by similar circumstances. We express this devaluation or redundancy of human capital as a case of dislocation or displacement, when people are separated or dislocated from their accumulated previous education and experience.

The ability and willingness of displaced workers to obtain employment by using inter-sector mobility in response to the economic incentives caused by structural change, is an important determinant in the economy's ability to adjust smoothly to the new circumstances. Since the changes in the economy result in different opportunities across industries, workers can be expected to attempt to find employment in industries which offer the best prospects where the prospects are measured in terms of the probability of finding a job and in terms of the wage levels (Fallick, 1993).

Job search theory provides an explanation for the decision on inter-industry mobility. According to it, the probability of inter-industry mobility depends on two major factors. Firstly, the net expected monetary gain measured by the difference between the discounted value of expected monetary income in the current industry and the present value of the expected monetary income in the destination industry. The expected income in both industries depends on wages, the probability of lay-off (determined by seniority with the current employer and the aggregate unemployment rate) and redundancy income. Seniority also influences the expected income (Kilpatrick, 1994).

Given the fact that mobility is conditioned by human capital, in other words the availability of the necessary skills for the new job and new industry, it is plausible to suggest that expanding industries with low human capital requirements become the obvious recipient of the displaced labour. In this sense, expanding industries with low skills become the destination for the 'refugees' from other industries because entrance is
relatively easy. It is likely that an individual who has been separated from his knowledge and skills, would be disorientated and would seek employment at the earliest opportunity. Low skills industries, therefore, might offer a vehicle for such individuals to get back to the labour market. In these circumstances, the normal relationship in which geographical mobility engenders occupational mobility is likely to be exaggerated (Schroeder, 1976). Similarly, the tendency of organisation size diversity and job diversity within an industry promotes job mobility which serves to facilitate new entries (Greve, 1994). In other words, if an industry contains a wide range of enterprises of different size and a wide range of jobs, then inter-industry mobility will be encouraged.

3.4 Factors influencing inter-industry mobility

Inter-industry mobility is influenced by a number of circumstances. Firstly, the importance of personal characteristics and most importantly that of the human capital has to be stressed. The availability of skills and the transferability of skills are the important issue here. On the one hand, people with higher education might be more able to change jobs but it also provides higher risk for them (Greve, 1994). As high level of job-specific human capital decreases the probability of job mobility (Becker, 1975), it can be suggested that industry specific human capital reduces the propensity for inter-industry mobility. What follows from this argument is that it can be suggested that it is the unskilled who can move easily across those industries offering unskilled jobs. Tourism might be a good example of this.

Furthermore, other personal characteristics such as the labour force experience of the worker, age and gender are factors which influence the overall mobility of the individuals. Time is also an important factor, whereby job mobility decreases with the time spent in the job. And finally, there is support for the idea that a high number of previous jobs indicate higher propensity to leave the present job (Greve, 1994).
Secondly, wage levels are an important determinant of mobility patterns, for they are mechanisms which link industrial characteristics like job concentration, labour intensity and industrial growth to job mobility (Hachen, 1992). Inter-industry differences in wage levels are thought to have a strong explanation in industrial characteristics like employment concentration and profit rates (Groshen, 1991). Slichter (1950) found that industry differentials are consistent across skill levels and vary positively with corporate income and negatively with labour intensity. In other words, mobility produces a consistent pattern of reward for skills across industrial boundaries with only company success and employment density interfering in the process.

Thirdly, the unemployment rate was found to be related with inter-industry mobility and the relationship is explained by two, conflicting, theories. According to the first one, high rate of unemployment leads to a reduced mobility rate. The 'chilling effect' on mobility is explained by the tendency of employees to use seniority as a protection against lay-off. As opposed to this, according to the sectoral shift theory by Lilien (1982), the shift between industry sectors in terms of demand for labour and the consequent mismatch between skills offered by the unemployed and skills required, results in frictional and structural unemployment. This leads to higher unemployment which increases the incidence of inter-industry mobility.

Lilien's sectoral shift theorem is questioned by Chan (1996) who cites the example of Hong Kong which experienced a serious structural transformation in the period of 1980 to 1993. According to his figures, during this period, the employment in manufacturing fell by 47% in absolute terms (while its share from the overall employment decreased from 46% to 20%). The laid-off workforce was easily absorbed by the expanding service sector and thus the unemployment rate remained low. This is in obvious contrast with the sectoral shift theory which would suggest an increase in unemployment rate under these circumstances.
Support for the 'chilling model' is provided by the study of Osberg (1991) using Canadian data from the periods of 1980-1983 and 1985-1986. Seniority has an implication here, where individuals use seniority as a job retention strategy and where employers value firm specific human capital.

3.5 Interrelatedness of occupational, inter-industry and geographical mobility

Inter-industry mobility can not be separated from three other types of mobility. The change of industry inevitably incorporates job mobility. Job mobility and inter-industry mobility are often combined with occupational mobility, while all three mobility types often necessitate geographical mobility. A study by Schroeder (1976) shows that time is an important factor in this relation. While in the short run he found no link between occupational mobility, when taking a longer view (a five year time scale), geographical and occupational mobility were found to be concomitant events.

3.6 Coping with change in times of economic transition

Occupational change, whether it is combined with industry change or not, is an important change in an individual's working life. On the macro level, occupational change is, on the one hand, a manifestation of the changes occurring in the organisation of work while, on the other hand, it is an indicator of the technological change occurring. Moreover, and most importantly to the present study, occupational change is also a result of the expansion and contraction of certain sectors in the economy. The example of the UK shows that the manufacturing industry experienced a decline of blue-collar work but an increase in professional, managerial and technical jobs. Furthermore, the hospitality and leisure industries increased their demand for labour. The particular characteristics of Britain is that many of these jobs are organised on a part-time basis and are of low-status and with low pay.
Occupational mobility inevitably requires individuals to adapt to the change but when occupational change is combined with inter-industry change and when it occurs in the circumstances of a large scale economic and social transformation, the change also has to be coped with at the level of the society. This is the situation in the case of the present study which looks at the impacts of inter-industry mobility in the special circumstances of economic transition. It is therefore necessary to consider here the likely implications of the macro-economic transition for the study.

In competitive labour markets, labour is free to move in response to shifts in demand and supply. In transitional periods, the disrupted pattern of demand for labour might provide a change in the value of human capital which would in turn be reflected by unusual patterns of labour mobility. A transition period would take place over a number of years in which a reciprocal process, involving, on the one hand, new skills and knowledge and on the other hand, new incentives would be continuously reordering each other.

In the case of Eastern Europe, the human capital generated by the old system has proven largely inappropriate for the new system (Vecernik, 1992). While it is self-evidently the case that people in Western societies are often separated or dislocated from their accumulated skills and knowledge and that one's human capital is not used in its entirety by the current job, Eastern Europe presents a special case. The difference between Western and Eastern experience is not solely a matter of the scale of the change. To compare the problems of economic change in Western economies and those of Eastern Europe is to transpose the arguments from the local to the societal level. When the problems move from the kind of localised redundancy situation which is common in the West to one of wholesale industrial restructuring, then the psychological scale changes as much as the economic one (Trzcinski and Randolph, 1991).
In these uncharted waters, speculation is the only option but when seen from western experiences, the degree to which the local structure is supportive to the individual is a crucial variable. In the West local shut downs are devastating for those involved but it could be argued that the victims still have a consistent labour market structure at which to aim (Eliason, 1995). It may not always be beneficial to them but it is there and visible. Furthermore, it is possible for redundant workers in the West to know workers who have maintained some consistency between their training /experience and their employment. Comparisons are in the system and as such offer reassurance that the system is still working.

Whatever the scale, change has to be coped with both at individual and societal levels. Inevitably, some will lose as a result of the change, while others prosper (Archer and Rhodes, 1987). For some, the transition opens new opportunities, while others see their opportunities fading away.

### 3.7 Orientations to work and the transition

In order to explain the effect of societal change on an individual, the research requires a theoretical concept which links society and the individual in a holistic way; a perspective on society which people carry around with themselves.

Work orientation is "the meaning attached by individuals to their work which predisposes them to both think and act in particular ways with regard to that work" (Watson, 1987 p. 86.). Early writers derived work attitudes from either previous work experiences or from the workers' needs. The present study follows the theorem of Goldthorpe et al. (1968) which suggests that work orientations are rooted in society. In other words the general attitude to work is not an intrinsic variable but an external one. Family and the society play an important role in the development and shaping of work orientations which are then integrated into the overall society norms (for further discussion see Chapter 4. Section 4.4.3).
The present study is conducted in circumstances of an economy in transition where not only the economic system but also the society norms undergo serious transformation. Following decades of forced 'collectivism', the society in Hungary was suddenly confronted with individualism, opportunities and opportunism. The question which naturally arises here is if work orientations are so closely linked to the society then what happens to them in conditions when a country is experiencing severe economic, social and political transition?

The transition from communism to capitalism is a large scale process whereby the country is moving away from a bureaucratically co-ordinated economy towards a market economy (Róna-Tas, 1994). This 'creative destruction' (Kornai, cited in Andorka, 1993) embraces the dismantling of the system of central planning, the reduction of state ownership, restructuring of the economy and, importantly to the following argument, fundamental changes in the social and political institutions and the transformation of the entire culture (Andorka, 1993).

Decades of collectivism and de-monetalisation of economic life were interrupted by market reforms which accelerated the process of income differentiation and wealth redistribution (McCaeley, 1993 cited in Jung, 1995). A new economic elite is born and while some people gain wealth and see their income grow, others experience a serious decline in their earning power (Róna-Tas, 1994). In other words, the transition brought opportunities for some and limitations for others.

The transformation of the economy and the society inevitably affect the culture prevailing in the society. The post communist culture is characterised by an incoherent collage of strange elements, whereby both the humanistic elements (egalitarianism and social security) of socialist culture and the new aspirations of the post communist coexist (Jung, 1995).
It is plausible to suggest that if there is a general interruption in the society, then it has to have its reflection in the state of work orientations. Irregularities in society behaviour is likely to bring anomalies in work orientations, whereby either certain orientations become dominant or the result is a hybrid and chaotic pattern. *Perhaps a transitional economy gives rise to transitional work orientations?* In particular, two dimensions are expected to prevail under these circumstances: the new opportunities in the economy are likely to reinforce instrumentalism while the experience of loss might evoke a sense of hopelessness and/or a desire for survival.

### 3.8 Tourism as a destination in inter-industry mobility

#### 3.8.1 Introduction

The principal purpose here is to argue the case as to why tourism should be a destination industry under circumstances of economic transition. The secondary purpose is to complete the picture by considering the impact that such a pattern of mobility might have. Therefore it is necessary to examine both the push and the pull arguments which make the case and then to consider the consequences should the case be true. The arguments which support the proposition that tourism is a destination industry cluster around two aspects: firstly, the nature of tourism employment itself and secondly, the accommodating nature of the industry.

The first set of arguments suggest that there are positive reasons for moving into tourism and that these reasons centre upon the nature of the work and the skills. It will be argued that there are also negative attributes of tourism employment and that individuals have to consider both. The second set of arguments concerns the universal nature of the industry which makes it easy to be accessed by newcomers. The link between these two sets of arguments is the relative ease of learning the skills involved in tourism employment.
Within the discussion it will be argued that in some circumstances the conventional wisdom on tourism employment has to be altered to accommodate the special circumstances of Eastern Europe. Before beginning the discussion, it is necessary to consider the problems involved in defining tourism employment.

3.8.2 The problems of defining tourism employment

The first hurdle confronted by a discussion of the nature of tourism employment is the difficulty of defining tourism and tourism employment.

Tourism is a 'multiproduct industry' (Diamond, 1977) and is integrated with a number of sectors of the economy. Tourist expenditure occurs in hotels, restaurants, shops, recreational facilities (Mathieson and Wall, 1982), but tourists also use transportation, financial services, rural activities like hunting or bird watching which affect the agriculture sector while purchases in retail outlets impacts upon the retail sector. Consequently, in employment terms, tourism employment comprises jobs in the accommodation sector, the airline industry, catering, attractions etc., all sectors which show great variations in working conditions, job security and wage levels (Burns, 1993).

Tourism is not a recognised industry in the Standard Industrial Classification (Cooper et al., 1993). The complexity and the neglect with which tourism is often handled at official levels, means that there is no precise definition which leads to a lack of statistics to quantify the dimensions of tourism employment (World Tourism Organisation, 1983 p. 4). Consequently, the exact boundaries of tourism employment are as difficult to draw as it is to define tourism itself (Burns, 1993).
The definitions of tourism are plentiful, for example from the supply side, "the tourist industry consists of all those firms, organisations and facilities which are intended to serve the specific needs and wants of the tourists" (Leiper, 1979 p. 400).

Smith (1989) classifies the facilities and firms serving the tourists on two levels: one tier encompasses all those establishments whose total revenue is derived from tourists, while at a second tier are those businesses which serve both the tourists and the locals as well. This definition is helpful in considering the extent of domestic and local contribution to tourism facilities. In this respect there are great variations between countries. While in many developing countries, tourist facilities are for the exclusive use of the international tourists, in developed economies many establishments are shared between the international tourist, the domestic tourists and the local resident (Baum, 1993). Furthermore, according to the multiplier theory, tourist spending impacts upon employment at three levels. At the first level, tourist spending creates direct tourism employment in tourism establishments such as hotels, restaurant, attractions etc. The second level is concerned with the effect of the money spent by the tourist enterprises in the local economy. By buying products and services like food and beverages, banking services, building materials and services etc., which companies also purchase goods and services. In other words, the first level tourist spending creates employment in the tourism supply sectors, which is the indirect effect. And finally, at the third level, the induced employment is the result of the money circulated back into the local economy from the wages, salaries and distributed profits which were paid out at the first and second levels (Fletcher, 1993; World Tourism Organisation, 1983; Goffe, 1975 cited in Mathieson and Wall, 1982). When defining tourism employment, the interest is with the first level of employment. These approaches are concerned with the extent of tourism employment but do not help in defining it as a set of employment activities.
Another problem in defining the boundaries of tourism employment is the prevalence of the informal economy in tourism (Shaw and Williams, 1994). Multiple occupations further complicate the matter leading to misleading employment data (Cukier-Snow and Wall, 1993).

Notwithstanding the problems of defining the industry and the neglect of tourism in national statistics, it should be recognised that in all industries there are inherent problems in classifying jobs. The main problem is expressed by Boehm et al (1976, p. 30) who argue that although a job title may partially define a job, it contains no information structured in a consistent way which manpower managers can analyse. This is the view from manpower planning. Basically, in any attempt to analyse labour the researcher is presented with some problems, which are:

i. The job title does not convey job content  
ii. An industry has a diversity of job titles  
iii. There may be a diversity of job content under the same job title  
iv. How far are job titles indication of what people actually do?

These problems affect the field of tourism employment. Within the job title of chef or tour guide, there is a great diversity of job content. Added to this is the problem of a large range of diverse jobs within the area of tourism.

Despite the wide range and diversity of tourism related employment, the discussion on tourism employment in the literature tends to be focused on hotel employment (Burns, 1993). The present research interprets tourism employment in its wider context comprising of the following sectors of the industry: (1) hotels, (2) guest houses, (3) restaurants, (4) cafes, (5) travel agency, (6) transportation, (7) other; mainly souvenir shops. However, despite the efforts to follow this approach, the ensuing discussion will reflect the emphasis given to the hotel sector in the literature.
3.8.3 Attributes of tourism employment that make it a destination employment

3.8.3.1 Introduction

The literature review which follows is an attempt to examine the major attributes of tourism employment. Since in the present study tourism is nominated as a destination industry in the inter-industry mobility flow, tourism employment has to be examined from the perspective of attractiveness. It will be argued that while there are certain negative characteristics of tourism employment which have to be considered by those wishing to take up a job in tourism, on balance tourism employment can be an attractive employment option.

3.8.3.2 The image of tourism employment and the status derived from tourism jobs

The image of occupations is an important stimulus in career choice decisions. Coxon and Jones (1978) suggest a close relationship between the image of occupations, the duties which have to be carried out by its practitioners and both the occupation's contribution to society and the level of remuneration and life-style enjoyed. It is not surprising, therefore, that occupations with poor image tend to be unattractive, whereas occupations which enjoy positive image are attractive.

The image of tourism employment appears to be split: on the one hand tourism jobs possess a certain image of glamour, while on the other hand, they are deemed as of low status and of low skill. A report by the National Economic Development Council (1992) on the UK tourism market states that the positive characteristics attributed to tourism by career teachers include opportunities to travel, meeting people, foreign language use and variety. However, the reports also suggests that the industry's traditional image of low pay, long hours and minimal training still prevail.
Airey and Frontistis (1997) found that Greek pupils have a glamorous (and unrealistic) view of tourism employment. Working in pleasant environment, maintaining contact with tourism and often emulating them, is likely to have certain attraction. While the resultant social impacts are often negative on the community (Mathieson and Wall, 1982), this aspect has a certain attractiveness for many.

In the tourism literature tourism is generally described as a low-skill industry (Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Jafari, 1990). A report by the International Labour Office (1989b, p. 9.) states that despite the improvement in the overall image of the industry in recent years, "in some countries the sector is not yet viewed favourably as an employer owing to poor employment and working conditions and high levels of unskilled employment". Jobs in tourism are often seen as "menial and low level for unskilled hands" (Brachmann, 1988 cited in Sindiga, 1994) and many of them are regarded as demeaning.

The link between the high 'service' content of certain jobs and their consequently low status clearly emerges from the study by Corcoran and Johnson (1974). Status models of society (Runciman, 1968) confer social status by the prestige of the job, the related life-style and the required educational qualifications. Tourism jobs usually require low level of qualification, pay low wages and, therefore it is not surprising if tourism employment in general does not enjoy high status. The tourism employee is often seen as "uneducated, unmotivated, untrained, unskilled and unproductive" (Pizam, 1982 p. 5.).
Although status and earnings are clearly linked together, they can move in separate directions. It is possible to trade a decrease in status for higher pay or accept lower pay in order to possess higher status (Coxon and Jones, 1978). The implication of this in inter-industry mobility is that people might give up higher prestige occupations for lower prestige jobs in tourism if they are compensated by higher pay or by other convenience factors. This is an important circumstance for the present study.

Given the complexity of tourism itself which results in a wide range of occupations, it is plausible to suggest that there is considerable variation in the image of particular tourism occupations and that the image of the industry as an employer might differ from that of certain tourism jobs. This notion is supported by a study by Airey and Frontistis (1997) into attitudes to tourism careers in the UK and Greece. The findings suggest that people have a different view of employment in general to that of particular tourism occupations. UK pupils in the study viewed individual occupations more positively than tourism employment in general, while their Greek counterparts had a better image of tourism employment in general than of particular jobs.

The way people perceive the external reality is a process which includes the person himself and the social structure which he or she is part of. In this sense the 'self' acts as a boundary to the recognition of the outside world (Neisser, 1967). Furthermore, the fact that different individuals can have different images of the same construct is not only attributable to different propensities but also to different stock of experiences and observations (Ossowski, 1963 cited in Coxon and Jones, 1978).
The importance of individual experience in the process of image construction of occupations is an important issue for the present study. If people from different industries and with different career histories and educational background take up jobs in tourism, they are likely to have different images of the same tourism occupations. When, for example, an engineer is considering to become a taxi driver, he is likely to be concerned with the lower status that the new job will offer, whereas for a factory worker the same job is unlikely to cause status problems.

Hotel work is often associated with marginality which causes serious damage to the image of the related occupations. Hotel work is often viewed as an occupation for drifters (Saunders, 1981) and socially or psychologically marginal people (Mars, Bryant and Mitchell, 1979). Although it is not clear whether the industry attracts people with inclinations to deviant behaviour (drinking problems, pilfering and other illegal activities) or it is the nature of the work and the working arrangements that induce people towards it (Wood, 1992), hotel work is inevitably associated with these activities.

Alpert (1986) draws a rather unfavourable picture of the US restaurant labour force. People working in the sector tend to be young, without family obligations and less well educated than the typical worker. For most employees, the sector is not a career option but rather is a preparation for a career in an other sector of the economy. Alpert sees the sector as a predominantly women's sector for whom it provides a convenient opportunity to gain work experience, training and some income. This is not a flattering image of the restaurant sector.
As opposed to the above view, the study by Corcoran and Johnson (1974) found that career teachers saw the job of cooks and chefs as of favourable image while the jobs of room maids, waiters and porters were regarded as of unfavourable image. The international research 'Tourism as a Factor of Change: A Sociocultural Study' fostered by the Vienna Centre, which encompassed seven countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Spain, United Kingdom, United States and Yugoslavia) found that generally, tourism jobs did not possess a great deal of status and respect and the most respected occupations in the industry were hotel and restaurant managers, tourist guides and mountain refuge managers. A significant finding in the study is that despite the image problem, the majority of the respondents in each country expressed a willingness to take up a job in tourism (Jafari et al, 1990).

A useful analysis of the status of jobs and professions across the different sectors of tourism and across a number of countries is provided by a report by the World Tourism Organisation (1983). In broad terms, the findings on the major tourism occupations were as follows.

The study concludes that government organisation professions generally enjoy good status which probably results from the entry requirements, career opportunities and conditions of employment. In the accommodation sector, managers and supervisors enjoy an improved status which is the results of growth in organisational size, higher entry requirements, development of vocational education and training and the involvement of regulatory and voluntary bodies. Lower level jobs in the sector do not enjoy similar positive characteristics. Many occupations in the transport sector and particularly those in the air transport segments enjoy favourable status. Those whose work is related to tourist attractions and entertainment facilities rarely enjoy high status, the exception being those associated with the most prestigious tourist attractions. In the tour operator segment those engaged in central operations enjoy reasonable status because of the career opportunities they have, whereas the field staff suffer from low
status. The status of travel agency occupations is generally relatively low. The status of tourist guides varies from country to country. They tend to be self-employed, often work only part-time or seasonally. In some countries it provides career opportunity, in others it is seen as an opportunity to travel before settling down. The status of guides is enhanced by the fact that the work usually requires considerable language skills. The status of the job is the highest in countries with strong cultural values and where the entry requirements into the profession are high.

The variation in the appraisal and image of tourism occupations is probably most apparent in the comparison of developing and developed economies. Cukier-Snow and Wall (1993) note that although most of the hotel jobs are menial, in developing countries they pay better wages than occupations in agriculture and are, therefore, appraised relatively favourably. It is well documented that in these countries the younger generation prefers tourism jobs to work in traditional industries. Diamond (1977) points out that the appraisal of the skill level of tourism jobs depends on the general skill and educational level of the country.

As a summary, it can be concluded that tourism employment possesses a controversial image. Its appraisal shows variation between countries and depends on the circumstances of the person who makes the judgement. Furthermore, the image of various tourism occupations shows a great variation.
3.8.3.3 Major characteristics of tourism employment which determine its attractiveness

Despite its controversial image, tourism employment does possess certain qualities which make it attractive for those considering a transfer into tourism from other sectors of the economy. Accessibility of tourism occupations is one such factor (See Section 3.8.4), whereby the industry accommodates those with a great variety of skills, with low skill levels or with non relevant skills. In other words, tourism employment might be attractive because of the relative ease of entry.

The ever changing nature of consumer demand in tourism results in a work environment where routine plays a minor role and where improvisation and flexibility are important parts of the job. When compared to monotonous occupations such as factory work where the factory line dictates and where the work is impersonal and mechanic, tourism occupations might offer a more attractive alternative for many. This is supported by Riley (1986) who found a strong element of 'not factory' in the orientation of hotel workers to their industry. The lack of routine and close supervision awoke a positive attitude amongst employees to their low-paid work.

A distinct characteristic of tourism work is that the boundaries between work and leisure time are often obscured. Marshall (1986 cited in Urry, 1990 and Shaw and Williams, 1994) found that restaurant employees did not see their job as a real work because of the strong amalgamation of work and leisure. In hotel and restaurant work part of the working hours constitute leisure when customers, many of whom are friends or acquaintances, are entertained. Furthermore, much of leisure time is spent at the workplace, further obscuring the boundaries between work and leisure. This suggests that businesses like restaurants might gain loyalty of their peripheral employees from the fact that the 'symbolic boundaries between work and leisure' are weak.
Riley (1984) argues that tourism workers are 'isolated' by their unsocial hours and that this increases their sense of own occupational community and thereby increases the attractiveness of the industry.

The fact that a large proportion of tourism jobs involve direct contact with customers is a further possible attractive aspect of tourism work. While it has to be acknowledged that the high level of interpersonal contact involved in tourism jobs is not without negative consequences (Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Shamir, 1981), it is attractive for those who enjoy dealing with people. Mars, Bryant and Mitchell (1979, cited in Wood, 1992, p. 18.) suggest that the hotel industry tends to attract those who "...derive satisfaction in situations in which a large number of ephemeral but jovial relationships can be made".

Labour flexibility is at the very heart of tourism employment. Given the seasonal and periodic variations in demand in tourism, seasonal (Ball, 1989) and part-time work is common in the industry (Jafari, 1990; International Labour Office, 1989b). This inevitably has a negative effect on job security, career prospects and pay and makes tourism employment unattractive for those who are looking for permanent full-time jobs with clear career opportunities. However, there is another side of the coin which has to be considered. It can be argued that part-time and seasonal work offer certain flexibility which might be attractive for certain segments of the labour market. Women and students are cited most often to take up part-time work opportunities, while seasonal jobs are also thought to attract people from the periphery of the labour force (Mathieson and Wall, 1982). Shaw and Williams (1994) point out that despite the inevitable inconvenience caused by unpredictable variations in work and the insecure nature of part-time and seasonal employment, there is a certain attraction attached to such occupations. They suggest that two factors be considered. Firstly, that often there is no better alternative job in the local labour market and secondly, that non-material benefits like accommodation, tips and the psychological income derived from working and
sometimes living in an attractive environment provides a valuable trade-off for low wages and insecure jobs. Furthermore, the social expectation of women to have dual careers as mothers and family care-takers means that they are unavailable for full-time jobs or can only be engaged in occupations with fixed working hours.

While tourism employment might be attractive for a number of reasons, pay is a conspicuous factor. Tourism jobs are notorious for their low pay level (Urry, 1990; Mathieson and Wall, 1982). The literature pays particular attention to relative pay level in the hotel and restaurant sector, which compares unfavourably with other sectors of the economy (Alpert, 1986; Taylor et al., 1983; Robinson and Wallace, 1984).

Bull (1995 p. 157.) suggests six reasons for low pay in tourism:

1) The majority of jobs are unskilled
2) Employers tend to treat jobs as unskilled, even when some degree of skill is used in the job
3) Employment is often transitory and labour turnover is high
4) Weak unionisation and collective bargaining
5) As a result of the transitory character of labour and the weak unionisation, minimum wage regulations (where they exist) can be disobeyed without reprisal
6) in areas where there is no alternative employment to tourism, in the lack of competitive employment opportunities, the industry can behave in a monopolistic way and depress wages
Examining the case of the hotel and catering industries, Riley (1991a) argues that the large proportion of unskilled labour creates an excess labour supply which exerts a downward pressure on the pay levels. Alpert (1986) points out that, in the case of the restaurant sector, the need to cut costs leads to standardisation and simplification of the product which allows the use of lower skilled and lower paid workers. The importance of de-skilling strategies for employers in labour cost adjustments is discussed by Riley and Jones (1992).

However, caution has to be made when condemning the industry for low pay. The main factors to be considered are as follows.

Firstly, in the hotel and restaurant sector, the basic pay is often supplemented by fringe benefits (subsidised food, subsidised lodging), tips and 'fiddles' (Alpert, 1986; Wood, 1992), a fact which cannot be ignored. This might be a compensation for low basic pay rates in certain occupations.

Secondly, within the UK hotel and restaurant industry, there is a clear gender segregation whereby while women tend to be confined to lower paid jobs, the expansion in the industry provides opportunities for men in relatively highly paid occupations (Robinson and Wallace, 1984).

Thirdly and most importantly, it is plausible to suggest that the non-monetary characteristics of tourism employment might counterbalance the disadvantage of low pay. This is supported by the fact that studies into job satisfaction within the industry generally find relatively high levels of job satisfaction amongst tourism employees.
3.8.4 Attributes of the industry that make it a destination industry

3.8.4.1 Introduction

Having discussed tourism employment from the perspective of attractiveness, what follows now is the examination of the industry itself in terms of how accessible it is for those wishing to join it from other industries. At the heart of the ensuing arguments is the accommodating nature of tourism for such people.

3.8.4.2 Functional, organisational and skill diversity in the industry

Tourism offers a wide variety of jobs with diverse human capital requirements. The different sectors of tourism, such as accommodation, catering, leisure facilities, transportation and other services, are associated with a wide range of occupations which require different types and levels of skills. Additionally, tourism employment spreads across a number of industries, for example agriculture, retailing, passenger transport, business services and local government (Messenger, 1991), which further enriches the diversity in employment opportunities.

Furthermore, at the establishment level there is diversity in size, business type and in the extent of fluctuation of customer demand. What follows from this is that the establishments which vary by so many factors also show a diversity in the types and degrees of skills they require and, consequently, are characterised by organisational diversity (International Labour Office, 1989b). It is therefore not surprising that the different sectors within the tourism industry have different forms of employment, whereby contracts, working conditions and pay vary considerably (Burns, 1993). There are also variations in employment conditions according to organisational size.
This diversity, be it sectoral, functional or organisational, is linked to a diversity in the type of workers employed in the industry. Standard of service, size of enterprise, type of product, type of clientele, location, seasonality and required level of skills are the most apparent differentiating factors here. Additionally, the industry offers jobs both on a full-time and part-time basis and requires stable and casual, seasonal and migrant labour (International Labour Office, 1989a).

The major benefit from the variety inherent in tourism employment is that it provides choice in terms of occupations, skills, working conditions and, to some extent, pay. It can be argued that such a variety might be attractive when viewed with inter-industry mobility in mind, whereby people with varying pre-tourism work experience might find something suitable for themselves. The fact that the industry can accommodate a wide range of skills can be seen as an enticing characteristic for those who want to or have to move away from non-tourism employment. In other words, the skill and job diversity makes entry into the industry relatively easy.

3.8.4.3 The skill structure

Following the human capital argument, which stresses the importance of skills to mobility, the industry's skill structure is an important issue here. Despite the fact that there is scope for highly skilled labour in tourism, it is generally accepted that the industry is characterised by a skills structure which favours the unskilled and semi-skilled (Riley, 1991a). Although damaging to the image of tourism, the availability of low skilled jobs facilitates entry and thus attracts low skilled labour.

In addition to being of low level, the nature of the skills in tourism is such that they can be easily learnt 'on the job' and consequently employers often take unskilled labour and rely on 'on the job training'. This means that not only is entry easy but there is also a promise of skill development within the industry. Part of the ethos of the hotel industry,
for example, is that even a busboy can rise to become a hotel general manager with diligence and hard work. This might be an attractive option for some.

It is often argued that, particularly in the hotel industry, the skills needed are those which women obtain naturally outside of their jobs in their role as wives and mothers, therefore women can join the industry for certain occupations without any formal training. Tasks like serving meals, working in kitchens and making beds are similar to those undertaken in the household and similar jobs in hotels are traditionally regarded as female occupations (Shaw and Williams, 1994). This view is largely capitalised on in developing countries with low levels of education and large numbers of women outside the formal labour market.

3.8.4.4 The nature of demand and the flexibility in employment

As noted earlier, there is a high seasonal element and a large demand fluctuation in tourism. Alpert (1986) writing about the restaurant industry states that demand fluctuates by hours of the day, by days, weeks, seasons and is influenced by special occurrences and events. Whilst part of the fluctuations in consumer demand is predictable to a certain extent, there is also a 'stochastic' element in demand. The predicted change in demand calls for the employment of part-time and seasonal workers (International Labour Office, 1989a) while the stochastic element in demand necessitates 'the labour insurance of standby workers' (Alpert, 1986).

There are two major consequences of this. The negative consequence from the employee' point of view is that the need to employ a buffer supply of labour for peak hours forces employers to push wages down (Alpert, 1986) and that it works against full-time core jobs. However, it can be argued that the availability of part-time and seasonal jobs contributes to the accommodating nature of the industry as it provides employment opportunity to those not able to or not wanting to commit themselves for full-time jobs.
3.8.4.5 Mobility patterns and skill structure

The tourism workforce is notorious for its mobility but it is the hotel sector where mobility is most endemic. This can be best illustrated by the fact that the industry experiences multiple manifestations of mobility. Firstly, there is mobility into and out of the industry. Secondly, there is mobility within the industry and between companies and establishments (units) which is closely related the phenomenon of labour turnover. And thirdly, there are high levels of upward mobility within the units. What follows is a brief overview of this network of mobility flows.

The fact that the hotel industry can easily draw labour from other industries lies in the skill structure of the industry which favours the unskilled. The relatively low skill requirements and the tradition of on-the-job training clearly facilitates entry while the existence of weak internal labour markets in the industry leads to entry opportunities at all skill and occupational levels (Riley, 1991a). The multiple ports of entry (Doeringer and Priore, 1971) also allows entry for those with ample human capital.

Hotels are characterised by high labour turnover (Knight, 1971; Riley, 1980, 1991a, 1991b; Johnson, 1981, 1985) which means that there is high level of mobility into and out of units and consequently, between units. It has to be noted that the mobility into and out of units can mean entry into or exit out of the industry itself.

Whether high labour turnover is viewed as a malaise to the industry (Johnson, 1981) or a useful process which facilitates successful operation (Bowey, 1976) or a necessary evil (Larmour, 1982), the opinions divide. Some even suggest that the ability of the industry to accommodate those seeking temporary employment is welcome by certain part of the labour force (Forte, 1986).
At the centre of the labour mobility and turnover issue in the hotel and catering industry lies the notion of skills which is approached from two major aspects. Firstly, the industry is characterised by seasonality and large fluctuation of consumer demand (Ball, 1989) which gives rise to the need to control the supply of labour. One way to manipulate labour supply is to capitalise on the unskilled labour force with its large external labour market (Alpert, 1986). Being able to take on unskilled labour who can be easily trained on the job means that labour does not present a constraint on the organisation's ability to adjust to the changes in consumer demand. The other way to adjust labour supply is to create a core-periphery labour situation (Guerrier and Lockwood, 1989) where the periphery (those in part time and seasonal jobs) is used as a variable labour supply. Their, voluntarily or forced, mobility is self-evident.

The second approach to mobility between units is concerned with skill accumulation and is manifested in mobility between units. Riley's (1980, 1991a, 1991b) skills model postulates that workers in the industry use mobility to accumulate skills. The reason for this is that each unit has a limit to the level of skills which can be mastered and once the maximum level of skills in use in a particular unit are acquired, the worker has to move to a different unit with higher standards for skill development. A further need for mobility between units stems from the notion of occupational rigidity within the units. The difficulty of changing occupation within one unit means that those wishing to do so have to use mobility (Riley, 1991a). Riley's 'skill model' is a universal one because it is built up from crucial characteristics of the hotel industry.

And finally, the weak internal labour markets and the lack of promotion criteria leads to a high level of upward mobility. This is the major manifestation of within-unit mobility.
Since mobility is so established in the industry, it can be argued that *it helps to accommodate mobile labour from other industries*. The abundance of low skilled jobs results in a large external labour market while the reliance on 'on the job' training facilitates skill acquisition. The availability of part-time jobs and seasonal jobs accommodates those who would not join the primary labour market. To put it simply, high labour turnover means that outsiders can always find a door open to enter the tourism industry.

### 3.8.4.6 Tourism - a route to entrepreneurship

The service sector, by its very characteristics, seems to grow through small businesses. Goffee and Scase (1983) argue that service industries encourage the formation of small businesses for a number of reasons. Firstly, they tend to be labour intensive. Secondly, service markets are responsive to changes in demand and fashion. Thirdly, the presence of large numbers of small-scale enterprises makes it difficult to enforce statutory requirements which constrain large scale organisations. And finally, a widespread use of cash is associated with the operation of the informal or black economy. These conditions enable those working in the industry to test the market, acquire rudimentary skills and accumulate a small capital which can later be used for the purposes of establishing a small private business. This type of skill accumulation is supported by Chivers (1973), who suggests that restaurant chefs are noted for becoming owners of restaurant businesses.

In addition to those already working in the industry, tourism is also receptive to prospective entrepreneurs without relevant skills. Shaw and Williams (1990) cite two studies in support of this. Stalinbrass's (1980) study found that only one third of hotel owners in Scarborough had previous experience in tourism and Brown's (1987) study established that only few hoteliers in South-East Dorset had relevant experience or qualifications. In other words, as in the case of tourism employment, entry into tourism entrepreneurship is also facilitated by relatively low skill requirements.
In addition to having relatively low entry barriers in terms of skills, the industry also facilitates entrepreneurial activity by the relatively low capital outlay required for most tourism businesses. Although hotel projects involve large capital investment and are characterised by a relatively long payback period, in the case of small accommodation establishments, the business function is combined with the provision of a family home (Shaw and Williams, 1994).

Small tourism businesses often operate in the shadow of the informal economy. Consequently, tourism entrepreneurship, tourism employment and the informal economy are often linked together. Cukier and Wall (1994b) state that a substantial portion of tourism employment in developing countries occurs in the informal sector. The informal sector is characterised by "ease of entry, dependence on indigenous resources, family ownership, small scale of operation, nonformal training of workers, unregulated and competitive markets and intensive labour" (Kermath and Thomas, 1992 cited in Cukier and Wall, 1994b). In other words, entry into the tourism industry and into entrepreneurship might be facilitated by the informal economy.

**3.8.4.7 Growth and expansion in the industry and economic transition**

An important characteristic of tourism that it is often a growth industry (Cooper et al., 1993; Inskeep, 1991; Latham, 1992, 1994). An industry can grow though the emergence of new firms and the increase in the size of the existing firms. Industry growth, irrespective of the mode, increases the demand for labour. Declining industries, on the other hand, curtail production which leads to a decrease in the demand for labour (Hachen, 1992).

Shahid and Azhar (1987) provide an overview of the theories related to the determinants of employment expansion in the service sector. They contrast two opposing hypotheses. According to the demand side view, the expansion in demand for services induces the growth of the service sector. By contrast, the supply side view suggests that at the heart
of the phenomenon is the high and increasing population pressure in rural areas and the expected wage differentials between rural and urban earnings. These two circumstances serve as a 'push' factor in the rural-urban migration. Furthermore, Meier (1976) suggests that "as other sectors failed to provide sufficient employment to absorb increases in the labour force, the service sector acted as an employer of the last resort with increasing numbers in small-scale, self-employed types of trade, commerce, domestic service and government employment." (cited in Shahid and Azhar, 1987. p. 26.).

Although the supply side hypothesis is more clearly aligned to the objectives of this study, what is common to both approaches is that they both suggest that the labour intensive service sector plays an important absorptive role in times of sectoral shifts in an economy.

Following the argument, it is, therefore, plausible to suggest that industries which are expanding will take labour from declining industries. Low entry barriers into the expanding industry clearly facilitates the mobility. As seen from the previous discussions, tourism satisfies both requirements; it is growing and it has relatively low human capital requirements.
3.8.5 Historic evidence of the mobility into tourism from other sectors of the economy and the comparative employment conditions

Mobility into tourism from other sectors of the economy is a phenomenon experienced by many countries in different parts of the world. While the circumstances might differ from those experienced by Hungary, which is in the focal point of the study, it is worthwhile examining the major dynamics involved in such mobility.

The examples quoted in the following are mainly from less developed countries. This will be done with the aim of highlighting the need to consider the case of tourism employment in the context of the general development level of the country and to emphasise the subjectiveness of the appraisal of tourism employment.

Cukier-Snow and Wall (1994a) argue that despite the Western researchers' view of tourism as a low-paying, low skill and low value-added industry, this might not always be true in developing countries. The prima facie evidence for this is the fact that the labour mobility into tourism from the traditional sectors is, in many places, induced by the comparative advantage of tourism employment as opposed to work in agriculture and fisheries. What follows now is an account of some of the examples of mobility of this kind.

Lever (1987) examined the case of a small Spanish community which provides migrant workers to the resort of Lloret de Mar. While the migration involved both genders, the affect on women was more dramatic than that on men. Young women who previously were engaged in embroidery, saw their earnings multiplied when moving into tourism. The mobility into tourism was the first opportunity for these women to enter the formal labour market.
From the 1960s on the Canary islands, the launching of tourism caused the economy to shift away from agriculture as demand for labour in tourism increased. The inter-industry mobility from agriculture to tourism, commerce and construction was combined with geographical mobility whereas labour from the small islands moved to the touristic islands and within the islands from the middle and high lands to the low lands and metropolitan areas where tourism development took place. The number of people actively involved in agriculture and fishing fell from 54% of the total population in 1960 to 19.4% in 1981, while the comparable figures for the service industry are 27.2% in 1960 and 61.1% in 1981. Parallel to this, agriculture contributed to 32.3% of the Gross National Product in 1960 which decreased to 7.0% by 1981 while the share of services increased from 43.3% in 1960 to 72.5% in 1981 (Garcia-Herrera, 1987).

(Cukier-Snow and Wall, 1994a) describe that in Indonesia, from the 1970s, the development of mass tourism drew people away from villages to the resort areas of Kuta, Sanur and Nusa Dua in the southern part of Bali and the main attraction was the higher wages compared to those earned in the traditional sectors such as agriculture. In Bali, those employed directly in tourism earn more than those in the primary and secondary sectors of the economy. This is the main reason why Balinese people are relinquishing agricultural employment for a job in tourism. According to the Comprehensive Tourism Plan for Bali (UNDP, 1992 cited in Cukier-Snow and Wall, 1994a), the productivity of agricultural employment is lower than that of tourism.

In Margarita island (Venezuela), the opening of the free port which attracted the development of domestic shopping tourism to the island, was paralleled with the decline of agriculture. The conspicuous finding of the study is the strong gender difference in opportunities which arose with tourism development. The inter-industry mobility pattern is such that while men moved to the construction, transportation and the hotel sectors, women did not find employment in the hotel sector. Female unemployment is significantly higher than male unemployment, which has caused large scale female
outmigration from the island. The reasons are largely unexplained but lack of education and transportation costs might be responsible (Monk and Alexander, 1986).

In the former Yugoslavia, hotel and catering workers were paid lower wages than those employed in other sectors of the economy (with the exception of leather, textile, slate and tile workers) but the other sectors of the tourism industry are characterised by a very competitive wage structure when compared to the rest of the economy (Allcock, 1986).

On the Greek islands, tourism development occurred in areas with a long tradition of agriculture, cattle breeding and fishing. In Crete, for example, in the 1950s approximately 70% of the population were subsistence farmers living in rural areas. This has been dramatically changed by the 1980s when more than 50% of the islands Gross Regional Product is generated by the service sector. This shift in economic activity brought economic prosperity to the islanders and but also caused significant social changes (Tsartas, 1992; Kousis, 1989).

In many places the development of tourism did not necessarily draw people away from agriculture but the two activities were and still are pursued simultaneously. This is particularly characteristic to mountainous and other non-coastal areas. The examples are manifold. Redclift (1972) cites the case of a Spanish village in the Pyrenees where the provision of accommodation to visitors was regarded a secondary source of income which supplemented the earnings derived from agriculture.
3.8.6 The impacts of mobility into tourism

Mobility into tourism impacts both at individual and societal levels. For the individual, the impacts are economic, social and psychological. The impacts can be evaluated from an outsider's point of view and can be judged by relying on the individuals' subjective evaluation.

Whatever the evaluation approach, for some individuals, the mobility results in improved income and living standards, while others might accept lower income in order to get back into or remain in the labour market. It can be hypothesised that in some cases the individual's human capital will be seriously devalued in the new job, while in other cases tourism might provide a vehicle for basic skill accumulation. The comparative difference between the working and employment conditions between the pre-tourism job and the one in tourism is also an important factor in the overall impact of the mobility for the individual.

The psychological literature uses the notion of “well-being” which is derived from people's perceptions of various domains of their contemporary situations which include the self, standard of living, family life, marriage, work and social relationships. A study into the effects of job transfer on well-being found that mobile employees were more satisfied with their lives, families, marriages than stable employees, but were less satisfied with their social relationships (Brett, 1982). Another study of well-being (Andrews and Inglehart, 1979) suggest that despite the underlying similarities between countries, whereby, for example income and living standards are generally closely related in people's evaluations, there is a cross-cultural aspect to the subject. Their study showed clear basic similarities between the structures of well-being assessment in nine Western societies and raised the question of whether non-western countries would show similar patterns.
Unemployment, redundancy and near-redundancy position clearly affects individual's well-being. Poor financial situation and uncertainty about the future is shown to be linked to impaired mental well-being (Viinamaki et al., 1993) and redundant workers tend to manifest great personal distress (Stokes and Cochrane, 1984). The economics literature on redundancy focuses on the individual's experience in the labour market. Amongst other aspects, the economist is interested in the extent of occupational and geographical mobility and the relationship between the post-redundancy jobs and the redundant ones (Wood, 1977).

What follows from these arguments is that when evaluating the impacts of the mobility into tourism on the individual, the impacts have to be considered in their complexity. The change in employment situation, job characteristics, general living standard, status and human capital utilisation are the most obvious ones. In the subjective evaluation of the changes, the pre-tourism experience, in other words, employment or unemployment, and the identity of the pre-tourism industry, is likely to have an effect on how the change is evaluated by the individual.

At the macro level, the impacts of inter-industry mobility into tourism has to be examined from two perspectives. Firstly, the possible displacement effect on the departure industries has to be considered. Secondly, the relative productivity difference between the departure industry and tourism must be taken into account.

Mobility into tourism is harmful when labour which is in demand in other industries, abandons their occupation in order to take up a job in tourism (Bryden, 1973; Inskeep, 1991). At most risk in this respect are the traditional industries such as agriculture and fisheries.
An early concern in the tourism literature with regards to the shift from agricultural work towards tourism occupations was voiced in the Ninth West Indian Agricultural Economics Conference in 1974, where the discussion was centred upon the issue of competition for resources (land, capital and labour) and the hypothesised concomitant displacement effect of tourism on the traditional sectors of the economy.

At that conference, Brown (1974) argued that in Jamaica tourism development affected agriculture in two ways. Firstly, it accelerated the rural-urban migration of labour and secondly, the ease with which skills needed for tourism jobs could be acquired, made tourism a significant user of migrant labour from agriculture. An additional problem arose, however, when many who left agriculture in the hope of finding employment in the growing tourism sector were unsuccessful (Brown, Alleyne, Bryden, 1974). Examining the case of Barbados, Alleyne (1974) warned that tourism attracted labour away from agriculture, increasing the reserve price of labour in agriculture. This, he suggested, is likely to "generate a dying farm sector" on the island. However, despite the considerable concern expressed at the conference, a Workshop report concluded that, firstly, the drift from agriculture might have started before the tourism industry reached significance in the economy and, secondly, that part of the problem was in agriculture itself, which was characterised by low wages and poor working conditions. The third conclusion was, that the movement from agriculture might not have been directly to tourism. Despite this, it was acknowledged that the fact that tourism was able to absorb large numbers of unskilled and semi-skilled workers, was an attraction for unskilled farm workers (Workshop Report II., 1974).
Although, as Latimer (1985) suggests, it is highly questionable whether the mobility into tourism from agriculture caused the decline of agriculture in the Caribbean or whether the development of tourism and the claimed decline in agriculture was simply a coincidence, it is not difficult to understand why tourism employment did enjoy such attraction in the Caribbean, when compared to agricultural work. Winpenny (1982, p. 219) states:

"In most countries traditional agriculture cannot compete, since most producers and workers are very happy to abandon the hard and poorly rewarded work in farming for what they perceive as the easier life in the various tourism sectors."

As opposed to a labour scarcity situation, when the mobility into tourism involved excess labour in other industries, the labour absorbent capacity of tourism is beneficial for the economy. The opportunity cost of employing such worker is the economic value of the output the worker would have produced in the alternative occupation, which may only be part-time work or underemployment (Curry and Weiss, 1993). Hungary is suspected to fall into this category where the contraction of the economy and the decline of certain industries which followed the collapse of the communist system, has resulted in an excess labour supply.

When evaluating the effect of the inter-industry mobility of labour, the comparative productivity between the destination industry and tourism is an important issue. Arguably, if labour moves from more productive industries into tourism, this has a negative impact on the economy. However, the measurement of labour productivity in tourism poses considerable difficulties. At the industry level, productivity is measured by the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the industries. Given the controversy around the definition of tourism and the difficulty in drawing its exact boundaries, GDP figures related to tourism have to be treated with care (International Labour Office, 1989b).
Expressed in a simplified way, at the enterprise level, it is the ratio between the total output and the labour used to produce it (Lipsey, 1989).

The problem arises when attempting to obtain exact figures on the labour input. As Alpert (1986) points out, managers in the restaurant sector (but this is also true to other sectors of the tourism industry), tend to be improvisers in the maintenance of productivity in the daily management function whereby labour is used in the most flexible way. What follows from this is that the link between employment levels in the industry and growth is often obscured.

3.9 Summary

This chapter has attempted to provide theoretical support for the research propositions. It has taken theory from a number of disciplines, which is justified by the complex nature of the behaviour involved and the scale of the transition in which it takes place. Ideas which are imported into the research are human capital theory, orientations to work, psychological well-being and the attractiveness and accessibility of the tourism industry.
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Chapter 4.

Methodology

4.1 Introduction

Investigating certain aspects of economic transition, the research often entered uncharted waters where established economic laws were not readily applicable and where common Western wisdom often failed to interpret what was happening in the country. The situation can be best summarised by acknowledging that while the economic transition provided an exciting background to the study of mobility into tourism, it also confronted the research with difficulties and hindrances not encountered in research studies conducted in Western environments.

It is important at the outset to restate the main objectives of the research. Firstly, the study is interested in examining the pattern of mobility into tourism. The major task of the methodology is to identity the last industry prior to tourism and to measure the rate of inter-industry mobility within the set time period (1987-1996). Secondly, since the mobility into tourism is, to a large extent, a behavioural manifestation of the motives towards work and towards mobility, the methodology has to explore the motives behind the decision to take up a job or start a business in tourism. Thirdly, the change of industry inevitably impacts upon the lives and working conditions of the subjects. The measurement of the rate and direction of change as a result of the mobility is, therefore, an integral part of the methodology. And finally, given tourism’s close link to small business formation, the study is to look at two aspects of tourism entrepreneurship, which are skill and capital acquisition.
Chapter 4. will follow a logical sequence starting with the discussion of the difficulties encountered by the research. Some of these problems were foreseen before the research design took place, while others arose without anticipation (Section 4.2). This will be followed by a brief account of the research process up to the point when the decision on the data collection technique was made (Section 4.3). Here the sequence will be interrupted by a theoretical rationalisation of the research methodology (Section 4.4), which will be necessary for the understanding of the research instrument. The next step will be to introduce the reader to the design of the research instrument (Section 4.5) and then to the composition of the sample (Section 4.6). This will be followed by the description of the survey process (Section 4.7) and an account of the forms of analysis (Section 4.8) which lead to the findings of the study. And finally, the chapter will conclude with some comments on the research design and on the sample (Section 4.9)
4.2 Difficulties faced by the research

4.2.1 Introduction

While the economic and social transition inevitably provided an interesting locale for the research, the transition also presented it with a number of difficulties. Amongst the most difficult ones were the uncertainty over the degree of turbulence in the Hungarian economy, the insufficient supply of secondary data and the intrusion of the informal economy into the everyday life. What follows now is a detailed account of the above problems.

4.2.2 Unspecified degree of turbulence

The main impact of the unknown degree of turbulence in the economy was on the design of the data collection instrument. All data collection instruments require specific parameters so that the resulting data can be ordered in some way. As the research was about mobility, the danger was that the instrument may be too restrictive to capture an unusually high level of labour mobility. Furthermore, it was hypothesised that official job titles might no longer represent the work activities in the economy.

4.2.3 Insufficient secondary information

4.2.3.1 Introduction

In order to draw a reliable picture of the economic transition affecting the present research, secondary data was consulted, whereby the major thrust was placed on the official statistics by the Hungarian Statistical Office. Despite the seemingly abundant data, it became apparent that the research would face three major hindrances: the changes carried out in the statistical system as a response to the new requirements raised by the transition, the impacts of the informal economy on the data reliability and the difficulty to define tourism.
4.2.3.2 The statistical system in transition

Statistical data referring to the period prior to the 1990s was collected with the aim of satisfying the need of the old communist system. As Chernyshev (1994) points out, the main purpose of economic statistics was to enable the authorities to draw national plans, give directives to enterprises and to monitor the implementation of the plans. This has been radically changed with the introduction of the market-oriented reforms, when new types of data and different data collection methods were required.

According to the Marxist philosophy, the economy consists of the so called 'material' and 'non material' branches and the corresponding breakdown of the economy into industries is as follows:

**Material branches:**
- Mining, manufacturing, electricity
- Construction
- Agriculture and forestry
- Transport, post and telecommunications
- Trade
- Water works and supply
- Other material activities

**Non-material branches:**
- Personal and economic services
- Health and social care, culture
- Community services, public administration
- and other services

The above approach was in use until 1992 when it was replaced by the following system:

**Industries:**
- Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing
- Mining and quarrying
- Manufacturing
- Electricity, gas, steam and water supply
- Construction
- Wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and household goods
- Hotels and catering
- Transport, storage and communication
- Financial intermediation
- Real estate, renting and business activities
- Public administration and defence, compulsory social security
- Education/health and social work
- Other community, social and personal service activities
The inevitable differences between the two systems made the compilation of reliable time-series data impossible. The discrepancies affected both the industrial employment and the earnings data.

The wage-fixing mechanism of the old regime, whereby wages and salaries were calculated by dividing the total number of funds given to a particular enterprise by the number of employees, was replaced by the system of negotiations based on the principle of tripartism. These changes and the emergence of the private sector gave rise to radical changes with regards the wage data collection system (Csernyshev, 1994). Until 1987 the Hungarian economy was officially working at full employment but the market reform-led economic restructuring in the country induced the appearance and then the rapid rise in unemployment. In 1992, the new Labour Force Survey was launched which, for the first time, collected labour statistics on a household basis (Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, 1994).

To summarise, the present research was conducted at the point when these revolutionary changes in the Hungarian statistical system became operational. However, the retrospective design of the research meant that data prior to the reform period was also needed. Given the radical changes in the type of data collected and in the methodological considerations, the comparison of data from different periods proved to be extremely difficult and the production of time series data was often prohibited by these circumstances.
4.2.3.3 The impacts of the informal economy on data reliability

It is well documented that the grey or informal economy is deeply rooted in the economic life of Hungary. A large proportion of the population is undertaking primary or secondary jobs which remain undeclared while companies often find ways of remunerating their employees in ways which avoid the official channels.

Ekes (1993) in her study of the hidden economy and hidden earnings, gives a list of the prevailing forms of illegitimate employment. These are:

**Hungarian national working unregistered**
The worker is not registered with the tax or with the social security authorities. The wage is usually paid in cash at the end of each working day.

**Hungarian national in half-legalised status**
The worker is registered with the tax and social security authorities at the official minimum wage and any further amount paid to the employee remains unregistered.

*'Home worker'*
Needlework by women and home repairs. The earnings and the employment remains unregistered.

**Refugee working unregistered**
The most defenceless form of all informal employment. The, often illegal, refugee is lacking any form of social protection. His/her pay is below that paid to the nationals.

During the preliminary fieldwork in Hungary, it was found that many smaller tourism businesses tend to employ people who fall into the category of unregistered workers. Particularly apparent was the practice of traders selling souvenirs to employ Rumanian refugees, many of whom were suspected to be without legal permit of residence.
The practice of informal or 'black' employment in the tourism industry implies that a considerable number of people who work in the industry are not represented in the employment figures and that a large amount of income to tourism workers remains unreported and thus invisible for the statistics.

4.2.3.4 The problems of defining tourism

The present research defined tourism as a fragmented industry comprising a number of economic sectors and activities, namely: accommodation, catering, transport, retail, travel agencies and other services like tour guiding. In contrast to this, the Hungarian statistical system does not regard tourism as an industry on its own. Generally, the heading “HOTELS and CATERING” is intended to represent tourism as an economic activity while the other segments of the tourism industry are amalgamated into the more traditional industries. As a consequence, when using official statistics, the data relating to the hotel and catering sector were used as a general indicator of tourism. The disadvantages of this practice was recognised, but in the absence of more appropriate data, the approach was adopted. This decision has two important consequences.

The study needed to use information on earnings and employment. Using the earnings in the hotel and catering sector as a general indicator of earnings in tourism meant that no allowance could be made to possible higher wages in other sectors of the tourism industry.

In the case of the employment figures, the use of hotel and catering as an indicator of employment in tourism was rejected. Given the size of the non hotel and catering element of the tourism industry, this decision is easily justifiable. In order to overcome this problem, official statistics on tourism employment by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office and official estimates by the Hungarian Tourist Board were used by the research.
4.2.4 The presence of the informal economy

The inevitable intrusion of the informal economy presented the research with a number of difficulties. Its impact upon the official earnings and employment figures have been discussed in Section 4.2.3.3. However, in addition to the already outlined problems, the informal economy affected the research process as well.

It was realised that income and earnings were a sensitive issue in the country. The regular practice of invisible incomes and of tax evasion meant that people were hiding the exact amount of their earnings. This meant that any direct question on the actual earnings would have evoked suspicion and, in the fear of the tax authorities, cooperation with the research could not be expected.

Although the information on actual earnings was regarded as vital to the research for the above reason, the question on salary was omitted from the final version of the questionnaire. Since the real interest of the research was to establish how the incomes changed as a result of the move into tourism, a different approach to the income was adopted. Instead of asking to state the present salary and that in the last job prior to tourism, the research instrument was designed to measure the change in income when taking up a tourism job or starting a tourism business.

Having eliminated the possible cause of fear from the tax authority by not asking the actual earnings, the questionnaire still contained some sensitive questions. The entrepreneurs, for example, were asked to state the source of their original business capital but not the amount. In many respects this was more sensitive information than asking about salaries.
4.3 The research process

4.3.1 Introduction

The research question developed out of the general case of tourism - employment relationship and took its final form through the application in the specific context of Hungary. In this respect, the starting point was the general view of tourism as being a useful source of employment and an industry which can accommodate labour, which is either entirely excluded from the labour market or exists marginally on its periphery. From this notion evolved the proposition that this role of tourism may be 'amplified' in circumstances of labour market turbulence caused by economic transition.

What follows now is the description of the sequence of stages which led to the finalisation of the research question and to the design of the research instrument. The sequence was as follows:

i. Development of the research question from within the general question of the role of tourism in national employment

ii. Identification of the specific problem issues in Hungary

iii. Review of appropriate literature

iv. Definition of objectives

v. Definition of concepts and variables

vi. Decision on data collection technique
4.3.2 Development of research instrument

The basic proposition of the research was, that by a dual factor of attraction and accessibility, tourism is well placed to provide a special contribution to the transition by offering refuge for the victims of the transition while also fostering personal or economic advancement amongst those who opt for it as a source of employment.

From the number of countries experiencing the transition from communism to capitalism, Hungary has been chosen as the locale of the research for the following reasons:

i. Hungary is a country which pioneered the economic and social transition from communism to capitalism

ii. Hungary has a significant tourism industry

iii. There has been virtually no research done into tourism employment issues in Hungary

iv. On the basis of the initial literature research, tourism was thought to play an important role in the economic re-structuring of Hungary

v. The fact that the researcher is a Hungarian national provided a personal interest in the study
4.3.3 Identification of the specific problem issue in Hungary

There is a built-in conundrum with tourism employment and the concept of change. Tourism capitalises on low skills but change requires a degree of education to make the adaption process work. In many developing countries this conundrum can be problematic to tourism development.

However, the position of Hungary, and the Eastern block countries is slightly different because of their levels of education. This characteristic had to be anticipated by the methodology because, in the first place, the educated workforce might adjust to change rather well while, in the second place, the high educational level might be a complication in the process of adapting to the industry. In other words, the conundrum might work in reverse in the case of Hungary.

4.3.4 Review of the appropriate literature (See Chapters 2. and 3.)

The literature research was carried out with the aim of summarising the existing body of knowledge in the field which the present study was to build upon. The literature review was concentrating on three major areas which were: (1) tourism employment, (2) economic and social transition in Hungary and (3) labour mobility. With these three areas of study in the focal point, the literature review embraced a number of disciplines, such as economics, sociology and economic psychology. The tourism literature consulted for this study was largely concerned with tourism development issues and in its approach was sociological and economical.
The fundamental task of the literature review was to provide information on the pattern of labour mobility into tourism in the case of both developed and developing economies. In this respect it was of special concern to identify which industries supplied labour for tourism and what were the proportions involved. Despite the numerous studies related to the issue, what was found was an unusual combination of common wisdom suggesting an agriculture - tourism angle and a lack of empirical evidence to support this.

In addition to the general literature review, secondary data was needed for drawing a background picture to the study. The secondary data sought was primarily concerned with economic and tourism development, employment and earnings. To this end, the official statistics by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office were consulted. The problem involved in using secondary data was described in Section 4.2.3.

4.3.5 Revision of research problem and formulation of research objectives

The final set of research objectives was refined after a review of the literature. Four themes were particularly influential on the line of thought and as such proved to play an important role in the process leading to the final research objectives.

The conventional wisdom of economic approaches hypothesises mobility from agriculture into tourism. However, no empirical evidence could be found of actual mobility patterns that supported this thesis. Therefore it was necessary for the research to identify the source of labour supply, since, in the first place, it is the pattern of mobility which forms the basis for the understanding of the motives for and the impacts of the mobility into tourism and, in the second place, the impacts depend on where labour came from.
The scale and process of the transition in the economy suggested that not all mobility would be voluntarily. This led to the need to test for motives of the mobility otherwise the evaluation of the change could not be fully understood. To this end, the study introduced the concept of ‘motivational orientations to work and to mobility’ which has evolved from the important concept of ‘orientation to work’ (Goldthorpe et al., 1968).

The methodology had to take account of certain specific aspects of the economic and social development which conditioned the study and which were not to be encountered in normal circumstances. High level of education, industrial re-structuring, the appearance of unemployment (unusual for a communist country) and the intrusion of the informal economy into everyday life were the most prominent aspects here.

Tourism is noted for its association with entrepreneurship. The relationship is characterised by a mutual interdependence whereby tourism encourages the formation of small businesses which in return enables the industry’s growth. Given the importance of small businesses to tourism, the study of labour mobility into tourism would be incomplete without investigating the mobility of human and business capital towards tourism entrepreneurship.

The above themes informed the research process and led to the definition of the objectives. These were as follows:

I. To investigate the pattern of labour mobility which terminates in tourism
ii. To evaluate the impact of the mobility on individuals
iii. To investigate the reasons for this mobility
iv. To investigate the nature of tourism entrepreneurship
4.3.6 Defining concepts and variables

At the heart of the research is the concept of change which was to be explored through mobility. The mobility into tourism inevitably impacts upon the lives and working conditions of the ‘migrants’; for some this change is beneficial while for others it might be detrimental or a combination of the two. The subjective evaluation of the change leads to the question of the ‘acceptance’ of the change which occurs both in one’s private life and, more broadly, at the societal level.

No mobility, even forced mobility, occurs without motives. The study of the patterns of mobility is, therefore, inseparable from the examination of the motives which provide the impetus for the motion. Furthermore, the study intended to explore the proposition that behind the discernible motives there is an underlying structure. This hypothesised structure was to be examined from the perspective of motivational orientations to work and to mobility.

The study looked at a ten year period ranging from 1987 to 1996. The design of the time scale was influenced by two, somewhat contradicting, objectives. On the one hand, the adopted methodology of autobiographical memory imposed a constraint on the length of time which the subject could be expected to be able to recall with reasonable accuracy. On the other hand, this circumstance was counterbalanced by the need to capture the entire transitional period which, given the lack of a memorable single occurrence, was somewhat difficult to define. While perfectly acceptable for the purposes of historical writing, the arbitrary starting date of the transition of 1989 was treated with caution. The official acknowledgement of the phenomenon of unemployment is dated to 1987, which was regarded as a suitable reference point for the study.
The definition of the principal concepts in the study lead to the design of the variables to be used on the research instrument. The variables can be categorised as follows:

**BIOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES**
(age, education, gender, tourism qualification, language skills)

**EMPLOYMENT VARIABLES**
(present and first employment in tourism)

**PATTERN OF MOBILITY VARIABLES**
(identity of industry of employment for each year in the period of 1987-1996)

**VARIABLES MEASURING THE MOTIVES FOR THE MOBILITY**
(30 statements)

**VARIABLES MEASURING THE IMPACTS OF MOBILITY**
(10 dimensions)

**VARIABLES EXPLORING THE SKILL AND CAPITAL ACQUISITION BY TOURISM ENTREPRENEURS**
Following the convention, these variables can be classified along the line of categorical, independent and dependent variables, which results, in the following grouping:

**Categorical variables:**
Biographical variables
Employment variables

**Independent variables:**
Biographical variables
Employment variables
Pattern of mobility variables
Variables measuring the motives for the mobility
Variables exploring the skill and capital acquisition by tourism entrepreneurs

**Dependent variables:**
Pattern of mobility variables
Variables measuring the motives for the mobility
Variables measuring the impact of mobility

As depicted above, the peculiarity of the design is the considerable interplay within the categories where a number of variables hold a dual function. Whilst being categorical variables, the biographical and employment variables also operate as independent variables. More precisely, it is anticipated that variables like age, gender, education, location and employment status will be key explanatory variables for the analysis of the dependent variables examining the motives for and the impacts of the mobility into tourism.
The primary function of the mobility pattern variables is to serve as independent variables in the context of the examination of the impacts of the mobility while, at the same time, they are also dependent in relation to the variables measuring the motives of the mobility.

There is strong evidence to support the notion that motivational orientations are rooted in the society (Goldthorpe et al, 1968). What follows from this argument is that the variables measuring motivational orientations are primarily independent in the context of the study. However the motives to move into tourism are influenced by the conditions in the pre-tourism employment and thus the variables capturing the motives are dependent on which industry the respondent moved from. Consequently, the motivational variables are both independent and dependent variables, depending on the context of the analysis.

*Figure 4.1* illustrates the interrelatedness of the variables. The relationship between the variables is indicated by the direction of the arrows which are pointed from the independent variables towards the dependent variables.
4.3.7 Decision on data collection technique

The decision on the data collection technique was conditioned by two major circumstances. Firstly, the set objectives of the study necessitated the collection of a large amount of information from the respondents. Secondly, the data to be collected was eclectic in its character.

The decision to use a questionnaire was a pragmatic one based on the assessment of the only other alternative, namely, an ethnographic style interview. The balance between a questionnaire or a structured interview was, in effect, a balance between emphasis of objectives. If we emphasised the impact of the change, then that would have pointed towards an in-depth interview possibly involving families. Since, however, the emphasis was on the role of mobility, the historical and factual detail about mobility was to become paramount.

Furthermore, once the priority became factual data on mobility, then the sample size dictates a larger sample, more suited to a questionnaire approach. On balance, a questionnaire was preferred.

The information sought on the past career of the subjects required the retrieval of detailed factual events in the past, whilst the measurement of motivational orientations to mobility and that of the impacts of mobility was more qualitative in nature. In this respect, this combination of qualitative and quantitative data led to the dilemma as to whether interviews or a questionnaire survey would produce more accurate data for the study. The decision was based on priorities, whereby the need for reliable factual information overrode the concern with the more qualitative data. This is not to say that the information on the motives and the impacts was to be jeopardised by the decision but in fact to emphasise the importance of the factual data.
At the heart of the research design was the problem of recall of chronological information which suggested the questionnaire method. In this respect the time allowed for the subject for responding to the questions was regarded to be crucial to the quality of the information retrieved.

Finally, the questionnaire survey has been seen as a relatively quick and low-cost way of collecting information. Data collection by interviews from the four selected regions would have required a great deal of travel - requiring considerable amount of time and financial resources. Using the questionnaire method, the data could be obtained without the physical presence of the researcher and thus saving valuable time and money for the research.

Despite its inevitable advantages, the questionnaire method also presented certain limitations and problems to the research. First of all, the elimination of the interviewer meant that flexibility was lost in the data collection. Secondly, it was also recognised that little control could be asserted concerning the identity of the respondent and in relation to the circumstances of the questionnaire completion. The need to secure anonymity for the questionnaire also meant that missing information could not be rectified by contacting the respondent again, and that no follow-up research on the same sample could be administered.

The largest problem of the questionnaire method has been identified as the possibly low response rate. This has been seen as an important consideration and the following measures were taken to overcome the problem. Firstly, the covering letter has been carefully worded and tested on Hungarian subjects with the aim of achieving maximum possible co-operation. Secondly, sensitive questions like income were eliminated from the questionnaire. And finally, the survey process was carefully designed and monitored (for further details on the survey process See Section 4.7).
For the practical considerations of the research instrument design and for the discussion of the pilot study see Appendix 2.

The final version of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix 3.

4.4 Some theoretical aspects of the methodology

4.4.1 Introduction

Three major theoretical considerations infuse the study. Firstly, the method of biographical memory provides the rationale for collecting information on the work history. Secondly, the concept of orientation to work provides the basis for the examination of the motives for entering tourism. And thirdly, the advances in scaling techniques facilitated the design of the appropriate measurements for the examination of the motives for and impacts of the mobility into tourism.

4.4.2 Autobiographical memory and work history

At the heart of the matter here is the question - 'how clearly can work histories be recalled?'. The specific requirements of the study are that subjects recall:

i. The identity of the industries the respondents worked in during the period of 1987-1996
ii. The identity of the last industry prior to tourism
iii. Details of the last pre-tourism job
iv. Details of the first job in tourism

The arguments that people can remember details of their work history are outlined below.
The reason d'etre of the work history analysis lies in the recognition that the past can often help to understand the present. A person’s working life accumulates into a part-explanation of many aspects of that person’s life e.g. status, social identity, friendship pattern etc. Work history has a strong empirical track record and has proved particularly effective in the area of career analysis (Riley, 1990, Riley and Ladkin, 1994) and employment and labour market analysis (Baker and Elias, 1991, Burchell, 1993, Riley, 1995).

Work history recall is studied through the concept of biographical memory (Robinson, 1992). A number of basic assumptions have developed around the concept of biographical memory. These are:

1) That events that are internalised and that are part of the ‘self ‘ are likely to be remembered.

2) That activities which are directed by goals are likely to be remembered (Reiser, Black and Abelson, 1985).

3) That the pleasantness/unpleasantness of an event influences the probability of recall.

4) That chronological order assists event dating.

5) That if the past event exists in some form in the present, then that continuity with the past assists recall.

In the case of work history, it follows naturally from the last assumption that if a person is currently working, then there is a continuum present which will assist in the recall of the past employment events.
However, it is the first assumption which needed some elaboration. If an activity or an event is internalised, that is, it becomes part of the self, then it is more likely to be recalled than something external (‘happening to me’). An illustrative distinction is the contrast between work and pay. Work is something ‘done’ and whilst it is possible to bow in the direction of the Alienation School (Blauner, 1964), work is nevertheless an internalised activity. It might be that only the sweat and toil is recalled because as an activity it is more likely to be remembered. Add to this any continuity with work in the present and a strong case emerges that work can be recalled. Contrast this with an externally imposed condition - pay. Pay is evaluated against work and therefore increases the image of work in the memory but is subject to inflation which makes it difficult to recall in accurate detail.

In fact the recall task required by the subjects in the study was not arduous. Put simply, it was a case of what were they doing in chronological order.
4.4.3 Orientations to work

The basis for the measurement of motivational orientations was provided by the work of Goldthorpe et al. (1968) who investigated an unprecedented number of aspects of working life, connecting it to social and political attitudes. The outcome of the study can be expressed with his words: "Until one knows something of the way in which workers order their wants and expectations relative to their employment - until one knows what meaning work has for them - one is not in the position to understand what overall assessment of their job satisfaction may most appropriately be made in their case." (p.36).

The traditional view of attitudes to work is that they are derived, on the one hand, from experiences at work and, on the other hand, from needs. The interpretation of these needs varies between the different schools, while Taylor’s (1911) philosophy of scientific management stresses the importance of the economic aspects, the human relations school (Mayo, Hawthorne, Pareto) emphasises salience of the social needs (Watson, 1987).

As opposed to this, Goldthorpe et al. (1968) suggest that the values and attitudes exerted by workers towards work are in fact rooted in society, in other words it is the world outside the workplace - family, the local community - which largely determine the attitudes to work and not the role and tasks the worker has in relation to his employment. In other words, the work attitudes are derived from and are reinforced by the society. He calls these ‘large scale’ attitudes to work as “orientations to work”.
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The relevance of this idea to the research is obvious. If there are such things as 'orientations to work' and they are rooted in society, what happens to them when society is disrupted by social change? In other words, how does a society in transition impact upon the work orientations? If the society is changing and old values are replaced by new ones, it is likely that work orientations are also affected. The dilemma here is whether the result would be stronger and clearer orientations, or some kind of hybrid or evolving new ones. It is possible to suggest that in transitional times people are in search of orientations, and that mobility might be the behavioural manifestation of the process.

Indeed it is worth remarking that Goldthorpe et al. explained these orientations in part through the mobility patterns of their subjects. At the heart of the present study is the notion of inter-industry mobility. The particular interest here is to investigate the motives underlying the mobility decision. What is proposed is that the motives for mobility are derived from the orientations to work. In other words, the way people think about their work and about the meaning of work in their life, influences their decision to change jobs and, in our case, to change industry. For example, if work is seen as a means to an end, in other words is an instrument to achieve economic advancement, the mobility which might enhance the opportunity is also seen as a utility.

The present study is in search of orientations to work and to mobility which act as motivational influences on the mobility. To this end the concept of motivational orientations were developed. At the outset, a number of contrasting orientations were proposed and an instrument aimed at testing the hypothesis was designed. For its ability to discover underlying structure within a data set, the data was planned to be factor analysed.
The proposed orientations to work and thus to mobility were derived from the work of Goldthorpe et al (1968) who suggest a three-dimensional structure of (1) Instrumental, (2) Bureaucratic and (3) Solidaristic orientations. Whilst supporting the validity of this structure for the study of work orientation, the present study required a modified model.

However, before elaborating on the orientational framework developed for the research, it is worth pointing out that it was the study of attitudes towards work which led Goldthorpe et al. to the concept of orientations to work. Their research was aimed at job satisfaction and ‘orientations’ was an unpredicted outcome. For this reason the questions used in the study were, not in the main, related to those used in the original study. That said, the measurement on the impacts of the mobility was based directly on the relevant questions by Goldthorpe et al. (1968).

The proposed four-dimensional model and the working definitions for the dimensions is as follows:

(1) **Instrumental utility**

Tourism employment is perceived solely as a means to the achievement of economic advancement (exactly analogous to Goldthorpe’s definition).

(2) **Positive commitment to tourism**

Tourism employment is favoured for the intrinsic value of the jobs it offers, for example their image, the pleasant surroundings, the variety of tasks they involve and the potential for job satisfaction.
(3) Refugee orientation

Tourism employment offers an escape route from a declining industry, an unpleasant job or even unemployment. For some, tourism is the 'least worst' option whereas for others it is seen as an opportunity for improvement. Tourism is seen as a contingency or convenience.

(4) Entrepreneurial

Tourism employment is appreciated for its suitability for one's private business or at least is seen as a potential avenue towards entrepreneurship.

In similar manner to Goldthorpe et al. (1968), the orientations were not expected to 'stand in total contrast' but to work together in some rational manner. The major tasks in relation to the motivational orientations were as follows:

i. To test the existence of the four dimensional structure of the motivational orientations

ii. To establish whether there are any dominant orientations

iii. To examine dynamics of the interaction between the orientations

4.4.4 General problems of scaling

Since the questionnaire applies a Likert scale for two measurements [motives for the mobility (Question 5.1) and the impacts of the mobility (Question 5.3)], it is appropriate here to highlight the major considerations of the scale design.

Generally speaking, scaling is possible whenever degrees can be ordered to the objects in question. Scales are especially suitable when the concepts to be measured are relative and subjective. The choice of the Likert scale was based on the assumption that, in the case of attitudes to mobility, there were a variety of dimensions related to work and that these had a complex but coherent relationship with each other. For example the need to
earn money has a relationship to the need for some kind of job satisfaction. In a similar
way, the case of evaluating change carries the assumption that it is made up of a number
of dimensions such as better off / worse off - more money / less money etc.

The literature is clear on the kind of dimensions that are involved in the person’s
decision to move job and in the evaluation of that move. In this respect the research is,
of necessity, fairly conventional.

The Likert scale is appropriate when the researcher is reasonably confident that the
dimensions under measurement actually exist. On that assumption the scale can then go
on to accommodate the relative nature of the judgements against the dimensions.

A Likert scale works by proving the existence of the dimensions ‘by proving that they
are coherent’. Because attitudinal dimensions run in groups, their existence is validated
through establishing a statistical level of coherence between the dimensions. (It could
also be validated by external means). If the attitudes are grouped than the dimensions
and the statements which represent them should correlate. (Clark et al., 1998, seen in
draft form). Furthermore, at the heart of the scale is the concept of unidimensionality,
i.e. the aim to ensure that all items measure the same thing.

Generally, the scale comprises five degrees of relative agreement: strongly agree, agree,
uncertain, disagree and strongly disagree. Although smaller and larger scales (for
example 4-point, 7-point and 9-point) scales also exist, they do not necessarily prove to
be advantageous (Oppenheim, 1984).
When used in a pure attitude survey, the major outcome of the scale is that it orders subjects into two major segments: those whose attitude is positive and whose is negative. The proportions between the two camps give an indication of the overall attitude of the sample. However, since the same overall score can be obtained in a number of different ways, it is often the pattern of responses which provides more information than the overall score. This approach to the scale is not relevant to the survey.

The concepts to be measured in the present study are relative and are subjective. The motivational orientations are suspected to form a coherent structure where the dimensions in the hypothesised structure are expected to be related and to work together in some rational manner.

The evaluation of the impacts of the mobility is also relative and subjective. It is hypothesised that some people see impacts of the mobility as positive while others as negative or neutral. In both measurements there is a clear opportunity to order degrees or relative values to the statements. As a conclusion, both measurements lend themselves to the application of the Likert scale. What follows now is the discussion of some important considerations when applying the method.

The reliability of the scale is evaluated using such well-established measures as Cronbach’s Alpha, the ‘half-split method’ and the Spearman-Brown formula. The scale tends to provide good reliability with a reliability coefficient of 0.85 often achieved (Oppenheim, 1984).
Despite its apparent advantages, the scale also poses a number of problems.

Firstly, the question which arises is whether to assume equal intervals within the scale.
In other words, whether the distance between scale points 2 and 3 is the same as between scale points 4 and 5.

Secondly, there is an uncertainty over the inter-subject judgement of the scale. Does an ‘agree’ answer from subject A mean exactly the same as an ‘agree’ from subject B for the same statement? (Clark et al., 1998, seen in draft form).

Thirdly, a further complication of the Likert scale is the position of the middle point itself. The question which arises is whether the middle point can be regarded as the real midpoint between the two extremes poles of agreement and disagreement. Termed usually as ‘uncertain’ or ‘neither agree nor disagree’ or ‘neutral’, there is a strong case to suggest that it often simply reflects lack of knowledge or in fact lack of interest on the part of the respondents.

Fourthly, as attitudes are abstract phenomena, validating their measurement is not an easy task. The usual attempts include comparisons with older well-known tests or established facts, previous research findings or overt or expected behaviour, none of which provides a unique validation solution.
4.5 The research instrument

4.5.1 Introduction

Having described the process by which the objectives were refined and having described in brief the theory behind the methodology, it is now appropriate to discuss the design of the final research instrument. The main tasks of the research instrument were:

I. To measure the extent and direction of job mobility
ii. To identify explanatory variables
iii. To evaluate the effect of job mobility
iv. To capture the ‘orientation to work and to mobility’
v. To identify the circumstances in which entrepreneurs start their tourism business

The nature of the questionnaire is ‘before’ and ‘after’, for it is collecting data about the present and about the past. As the research is to evaluate the impact of change, it had to capture the various forms of change. Change of industry, change of job, change of status and that of location and the change in working and living conditions were the most obvious ones.

To explain the patterns of mobility and consequent change, a number of explanatory variables were evoked. The main explanatory variables nominated were age, gender, level of education, industry prior to tourism, geographical location and employment status.

The principal outputs of the study are the pattern of mobility, the evaluation of change and the orientation to work and mobility. The first of these outputs required every type of labour mobility to be captured. The second required an evaluation framework based on the ‘better off’, ‘worse off’ and used fairly standard variables to measure it. The third, more exploratory output exists in its own right and consists of a 30 item questionnaire.
What follows now is the introduction of the research instrument. The discussion will follow the structure of the questionnaire which consists of the following six constituents of data:

**Section 1.** About you (demographic variables)

**Section 2.** Your present job (employment variables)

**Section 3.** Your first job in tourism (mobility)

**Section 4.** Your past career (mobility)

**Section 5.** Your move into tourism (motivational and change data)

**Section 6.** Questions to the Entrepreneurs
4.5.2 Section 1. - About you (demographic variables)

The demographic variables are: gender, age, level of education, tourism qualification and foreign language skills. Section 1. of the questionnaire is reproduced below.

1.1 After completing your education, was your first job in tourism? Yes / No

IF YES, there is no need for you to complete the questionnaire. Thank you for your co-operation.

IF NO, please go on completing the questionnaire.

1.2 Female / Male (please circle)

1.3 Which age group are you in? (please tick the appropriate box)

| 16 - 25 | 26 - 35 | 36 - 45 | 46 - 55 | 56 - 65 |

1.4 What is your highest educational qualification? (please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 8 grades of primary school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Do you have any qualifications in tourism? Yes / No

1.6 Do you speak any foreign language? Yes / No

Question 1 (Q 1.1) asked whether the respondent started his/her career in tourism. This question was designed with the aim of screening out respondents who were not targeted by the research.
The gender of the respondents was asked in order to allow for gender comparisons within the data set. It was thought that the gender variable might explain possible within-sample differences in the case of the motivational and impact data (Q 1.2).

The age of the respondents was a vital piece of information to the research, since it was expected to be an important explanatory variable. The literature review suggested that younger people, with their more up-to-date qualifications, language skills and better adaptation ability, tend to survive the transition better than their older counterparts.

When designing the questionnaire, age was recognised as a sensitive issue. To overcome this problem, the respondents were asked to tick one of the five age categories (16-25, 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56-65) to state their age (Q 1.3).

The educational qualification was equally important because it was suspected to have a strong influence on the motives for the mobility and on the impacts of the change (Q 1.4).

And finally, the respondents were asked whether they had any tourism qualification (Q 1.5) and whether they spoke any foreign languages (Q 1.6). The hypothesis was that, given the high value attached to official qualifications by Hungarian employers, a large proportion of respondents would possess some form of tourism qualification. Similarly, a high proportion of tourism workers were expected to speak foreign languages.
4.5.3 Section 2. - Your present job (employment variables)

Section 2. was concerned with certain particulars of the current job and of the current employer of the respondents. The reproduced section is shown below. The main variables here are: sector of tourism, job status, type of job, type of organisation, location of job and distance between work and home. The relevant part of the questionnaire is reproduced below.

2. Your present job

2.1 Type of the business you work in and your job:  (please tick the appropriate box for each section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Type of the business</th>
<th>II. Your position in the business is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>The owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest house</td>
<td>A managerial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>An employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency</td>
<td>III. The job is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (airline, coach, taxi etc.)</td>
<td>Your main job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>Your secondary job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Your present job title: .................................................................

2.3 How many people work in your hotel / restaurant café etc.?  (please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>under 11</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-50</th>
<th>51-300</th>
<th>more than 300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 How many people work for the entire company / company chain (if different from above)?  (please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>under 11</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-50</th>
<th>51-300</th>
<th>more than 300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 In which town / village do you work? .............................................

2.6 How far is it from where you live? .................................................km
The first question (Q 2.1) consisted of three sections. The section on the left is designed to establish which sector of tourism the respondent worked in at the time of data collection. For categorisation purposes seven categories were used, which were: (1) Hotel, (2) Guest house, (3) Restaurant, (4) Café, (5) Travel agency, (6) Transport and (7) Other. While the first five categories are self-explanatory, categories 6 and 7 require further explanation. The transport category was designed to accommodate both the Hungarian Airline company (Malev) and the other forms of transportation, such as taxis and coach companies. The 'other' category was mainly designed for small businesses like souvenir shops and for those engaged in special services like guiding or hairdressing for tourists. The seven categories were developed with the aim of covering all sectors of the tourism industry. At this point it is worth stating that for the purposes of the present research the following definition of tourism developed by Leiper (1979 p. 400.) was adopted:

"The tourist industry consists of all those firms, organisations and facilities which are intended to serve the specific needs and wants of tourists."

When adopting the above definition, the researcher was aware of the inherent problem of any supply-side definitions of tourism, namely that it does not make any provision to distinguish between businesses who cater solely for the tourists and those who serve both the tourists and the local population. For the purposes of the present research it was decided to target mainly those businesses whose main activity was in tourism.

The section on the top was concerned to establish the employment status of the respondent. The three categories given were: (1) Entrepreneur, (2) Manager and (3) Employee. The lower right section explored whether the tourism job in question was the respondent's main or secondary job.
Question 2.2 asked for the current job title of the respondent. Questions 2.3 and 2.4 inquired about the number of employees at the establishment and at the company, respectively. The distinction between the two has been made with particular reference to the hotel companies and travel agencies, where the two figures often differ significantly.

Question 2.5 asked where (geographical location) the job was situated, whilst Question 2.6 inquired about the physical distance between the place of work and residence.

4.5.4 Section 3. - Your first job in tourism (mobility)

It was expected that in some cases the present job would differ from the first job in tourism. Section 3. was therefore designed to investigate certain aspects of the first tourism job - if it was different from the current job. The reproduced Section 3. is shown below.

### 3. Your first job in tourism

In this section we are interested in your first job in tourism. IF YOUR PRESENT JOB IS YOUR FIRST JOB IN TOURISM, PLEASE GO TO SECTION 4.

3.1 In which year did you have your first job in tourism? ..............

3.2 Type of the business and your job was: (please tick the appropriate box for each section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Type of the business was</th>
<th>II. Your position in the business was</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>The owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest house</td>
<td>A managerial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>An employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency</td>
<td>III. The job was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (airline, coach, taxi etc.)</td>
<td>Your main job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>Your secondary job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.................................................................
Question 3.1 asked the year when the respondent started their first tourism job.

Question 3.2 asked about three aspects of the first tourism job, namely the sector of the tourism industry the job was in, the employment status of the respondent in that job (entrepreneur, manager, or employee) and whether it was a primary or secondary job. In its design, Question 3.2 replicated Question 2.1 which was done for comparative purposes.

4.5.5 Section 4. - Your past career (mobility)

Section 4. is concerned to describe the career of the respondents in the past ten years. The information was collected with the aim of providing answer for the following questions:

I. To identify the industry the respondent worked in prior to moving into tourism
ii. To calculate the incidence of industry changes within the ten year period
iii. To calculate the year in which respondents entered tourism

The relevant part of the questionnaire is reproduced below.
4. Your past career

4.1 Were you employed prior to entering tourism? Yes / No
   If NO, were you: □ Unemployed □ Housewife
   □ Other (please specify): ..............................................................

4.2 Which sector(s) of the economy did you work in during the last 10 years? (please indicate the sector of the economy you were working in by ticking the appropriate sector box for each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration, social security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (as employment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A job in tourism is defined as working in hotels, restaurants, cafés, travel agencies and in transport and shops for tourists.
The respondents were asked to state for each year in the 10 year period which industry they had worked in. The final version of the question was a result of the pilot study which showed that the open-ended approach, used in the pilot study, whereby the respondents were asked to give details of certain jobs they have had, resulted in inconsistent and unreliable information. The benefit of the applied matrix format was that it allowed the collection of a large amount of complex information in a concise format with the minimum possibility of misinterpretation.

The classification of industries was, with minor modifications, based upon the official classification of industries by the Hungarian Statistical Office. The official Hungarian classification contained 13 industry categories (See Section 4.2.3.2) of which 11 were retained in their original form, albeit occasionally shortened (e.g. 'electricity, gas, steam and water supply' was shortened to 'energy and water supply'). Modification was carried out on the category 'wholesale and retail trade, repair of motor vehicles and household goods', which was split into two categories, whereas trade was given an independent category.

Given the adopted definition of tourism for the purposes of the present study (See Section 4.5.3), the official category 'hotels and catering' was replaced by the category of tourism. The respondents were reminded here that any work in hotels, restaurants, travel agencies and tourist shops should be treated as a job in tourism.

Periods away from the labour market were captured by two categories. The inclusion of the unemployed category allowed to gain information on involuntary absence from the labour market, whilst the 'other' category allowed the respondents to state any voluntary (e.g. overseas stay or full-time study) or compulsory (e.g. national service) absence from the labour market. To allow for this, the official 'other' category was slightly modified from describing 'other community, social and personal service activities', to cater for
both the above described absences from the labour market and for any possibilities not allowed for in the 14 categories used on the questionnaire.

Question 4.2 examined the employment history of the respondents for a ten year period ranging from 1987 to 1996. The decision on the length of the period was influenced by two major factors.

Firstly, the study was primarily interested in mobility patterns after the collapse of the communist system. In order to achieve the first criteria of coinciding the time span with the course of the transition, first the timing of the change in the political and economic system had to be determined. In the case of Hungary it is difficult to find a time which, like watershed, divides the two periods. The 'collapse of communism' can be regarded as a transitional process rather than a well defined event. However, Bögel et al. (1997) argue that while until 1989 the transformation of the socialist economies was incremental and adaptive, the events of 1989 brought about an unpredicted and fundamental change in the system. This provided the case for accepting 1989 as the turning point. Consequently, when setting the time scale for the mobility research, the period from 1989 was inevitably to be included. However, in order to capture some of the pre-transitory period, the year of 1987 has been set as the starting point for the data collection.

Secondly, when setting the time period, we had to take into account the fact that the information was to be retrieved by using the memory of the respondents. In order to achieve co-operation and to maximise the reliability of the information to be gained, it was important to design a time span which the subjects could be reasonably expected to be able to recall.
Cohen (1993) suggests that memories are interconnected and one retrieved item leads to another. Furthermore, he also points out that memory works best when the first event to be recalled is linked to the present and from that, memory is asked to work backwards towards the past. On the basis of this wisdom, Question 4.2 was designed to allow the recall process to work from the present to the past.

As a summary, the choice of the period from 1987 to 1996 provided the research with information on mobility patterns for the two years preceding 1989, while also benefiting the study by allowing to examine the whole period up to 1996. The ten year span of the data collection was also regarded as a length of time in which the respondent's memory could be trusted to retrieve reliable information.

4.5.6 Section 5. - Your move into tourism (motivational and change data)

4.5.6.1 Introduction

Section 5. consists of two parts. The first part was designed to explore the motivational orientations underlying the mobility decisions (Section 4.5.6.2), whilst the second part measured the impacts of the mobility (Section 4.5.6.3).

4.5.6.2 Motives to move into tourism

The first part of Section 5. on the questionnaire is concerned with the motives for moving into tourism. Question 5.1 presented 30 statements, each describing a possible reason for taking up a job or starting a business in tourism. The respondents were asked to try to recall the time when they moved into the industry and to state on a on a 5-point Likert scale the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements. Each statement was designed to fit with the introductory words: 'I have chosen tourism because:'.
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The statements were designed through a process which was initially influenced by the ideas of ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors from the literature of mobility. The original instrument contained 20 statements which were measured on a three-point Likert scale. The statements were designed to fit the two dimensions set by the push-pull model.

Following the pilot studies, two strategic decisions were taken. First, the cluster analysis carried out on the data and the examination of the correlations alerted the research to the possibility of an underlying structure in the data set. To this end, the decision has been taken to refine the instrument to make it suitable for factor analysis. Secondly, and resulting from the above, the number of statements were increased to 30, and the three-point Likert scale was replaced by a five-point Likert scale. It was at this point that the original two dimensional push-pull structure was developed into a four dimensional model. The model was based on the idea of motivational orientations developed by Goldthorpe et.al. (1968) (See Section 4.4.3). The 30 statements were designed along the nominated dimensions of instrumental utility, positive commitment to tourism, entrepreneurial and refugee. To some extent, these retained the idea of push and pull model, the refugee dimension representing the push factor, whereas the other three proposed dimensions representing the pull factor. The proposes four dimensions and the relevant statements are summaried below.

**Instrumental utility**

1. I earned too little in my previous job.
3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.
5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.
10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.
15. I needed extra money quickly.
17. I wanted an appropriate income.
20. I wanted to leave my previous job.
30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.
Positive
4. I wanted better working conditions.
6. I wanted an interesting job.
11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.
12. I wanted to travel more.
13. I wanted to use my language skills.
18. I wanted a job that suited my education.
21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.
26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.

Entrepreneurial
2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.
7. My family had a business in tourism.
8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.
22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.
28. I wanted to establish my own business.
29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.

Refugee
9. I was unemployed and needed a job.
16. The industry I worked in before was declining.
19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.
23. I could not get a job elsewhere.
24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualifications.
25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.
27. I like to try different jobs.

Question 5.1 which contains the 30 statements is reproduced below.
5. Your move into tourism

5.1 Please try to remember the time when you decided to move into the tourism industry. The table below contains 30 statements. To what extent do you agree with them?
(please tick the appropriate box for each statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I chose tourism because:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I earned too little in my previous job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wanted better working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I wanted an interesting job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My family had a business in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was unemployed and needed a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I wanted to travel more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I wanted to use my language skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I needed extra money quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The industry I worked in before was declining.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I wanted an appropriate income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I wanted a job that suited my education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I wanted to leave my previous job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I could not get a job elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to try different jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I wanted to establish my own business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When designing the *scale*, two major circumstances had to be taken into account. Firstly, how the Hungarian audience would interpret the measurement and secondly, how easily the questionnaire could be translated into Hungarian. It was found that despite the relative novelty of using such a scale in Hungary, no major problems with the interpretation were to be expected but care had to be taken with the translation. The obvious middle point for the proposed scale would have been 'neither agree nor disagree'. This, however, could not be translated into Hungarian. For this reason, the word 'neutral' had been used as the middle point. Thus the measures on the 5-point Likert scale were: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, neutral = 3, agree = 4, strongly agree = 5.

The sequence of the scale ranged from the most negative to the most positive. It was thought that presenting the respondents with the agreement 'pole' would encourage them to state their agreement, without considering the other possible options. By changing the scale around, the respondents were first confronted with the negative answers. It was thought that respondents were less inclined to hasten into disagreement and, therefore, the reversed scale would encourage them to consider their true position.

**4.5.6.3 Impacts of mobility**

The second part of Section 5. was concerned with the *subjective evaluation of the impacts of the mobility* into tourism by the respondents. To this end, subjects were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (significantly improved = 1, improved = 2, no change = 3, worsened = 4, significantly worsened = 5) the magnitude and direction of the change they had experienced as a result of their move into tourism.

The impacts were measured by a set of ten fairly standard variables which represented three major dimensions.
The dimensions and the corresponding variables were as follows:

i. Living conditions

1. Social status
2. Standard of living
3. Income

ii. Working conditions

4. Job security
5. Career prospects
6. Physical environment at work
7. Control over work
8. Convenience of working hours
9. Job satisfaction

iii. Human capital

10. Compatibility between job and education

The mean score of the ten variables was calculated and the resulting score was the eleventh variable, termed as:

11. Overall change
Question 5.3 is reproduced below.

5.3 Here we are interested in the changes that occurred when you moved into tourism. Please compare your last job prior to entering tourism with your first job in tourism.

(please tick the appropriate box for all 10 categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Significantly improved</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Worsened</th>
<th>Significantly worsened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your control over your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of working hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility of your job with your education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the heart of the measure was the comparison of two jobs; the first job in tourism and the immediate preceding job in another industry. This was similar to the approach by Goldthorpe et al (1968) who, in their study of UK industrial workers, were interested in identifying the reasons why workers -if they did- preferred some previous jobs to the current one. From the thirteen reasons identified by Goldthorpe et al., five were included in the research instrument. The original variables and their equivalent in the present study are as follows:

"greater autonomy, room for initiative" - termed as "control over work"
"better physical conditions" - termed as "physical environment at work"
"better pay" - termed as "income"
"more security" - termed as "job security"
"better promotion chances" - termed as "career prospects"
In addition to these, five more variables were designed for the purposes of the present study. What follows now is the justification for their inclusion into the research instrument.

Arising from the proposition of tourism being both a refugee and an instrumental industry, it was hypothesised that some people would trade their social status for either reasons of lack of opportunity or for pure instrumental considerations. To this end, the change in social status was measured.

Having already included the variable of income change, it was of interest to the study to investigate the appraisal of living standard change by the respondents. The fall in real wages during the transitional period indicated that the change in living standard might diverge from the change in income. To test this hypothesis, the variable 'living standard' was incorporated into the measure.

The measure of overall satisfaction of the industry change would not be complete without the examination of how the move into tourism affected the job satisfaction of the respondents. As job satisfaction in the sense of work tasks and roles can not be associated directly with attachment to employment, whereby the latter is influenced by satisfaction with the job (Goldthorpe et al, 1968), one can argue that the satisfaction with tourism as employment is affected by the satisfaction with the job itself. To this end, the job satisfaction variable was regarded vital as for the overall appraisal of satisfaction with the mobility into tourism.

The variable measuring the comparability between job and education was designed to capture any possible human capital loss as a result of the mobility into tourism.
Jobs in tourism are notorious for the long and often unsocial working hours they involve. How the working hours changed when moving into tourism was therefore of a natural interest to the study.

The variable *overall change* was calculated as the mean score of the ten variables with the aim of obtaining an overall indication of the appraisal of the change.

### 4.5.7 Section 6 - Entrepreneurs

The last section of the questionnaire was targeted at tourism entrepreneurs. The concern was with two aspects of tourism entrepreneurship: skill and capital acquisition. More specifically, the interest was focused on how the entrepreneurs acquired general business skills (Question I.) and the specific skills needed for a tourism business (Question II.). Furthermore, the entrepreneurs were asked which skills / knowledge they found most useful when running their business (Question III.). And finally, the last question was aimed to find out where the initial business capital originated from (Question IV.).
The relevant part of the questionnaire is reproduced below.

Questions to the Entrepreneurs

I. When first establishing your business in tourism, where did you learn the skills needed for having a business? (please tick maximum 2 boxes)
  ☐ 'on the job'.
  ☐ in previous employment(s)
  ☐ at previous business
  ☐ at school
  ☐ other (please specify): .............................................

II. When first establishing your business in tourism, where did you learn the skills needed for having a business in tourism? (please tick maximum 2 boxes)
  ☐ 'on the job'.
  ☐ in previous employment(s)
  ☐ at previous business
  ☐ at school
  ☐ other (please specify): .............................................

III. In running your business in tourism, which of the following skills do you find most useful? (please tick only maximum 3 boxes)
  ☐ a knowledge of finance & accounting
  ☐ a knowledge of economics
  ☐ a knowledge of marketing
  ☐ ability to handle people
  ☐ ability to make contacts
  ☐ a knowledge of the tourism industry
  ☐ ability to speak foreign language(s)
  ☐ ability to use computers
  ☐ other (please specify): .............................................

IV. When first establishing your business in tourism, where did the capital come from? (please tick the appropriate boxes)
  ☐ personal savings from previous tourism job(s)
  ☐ personal savings from previous non-tourism job(s)
  ☐ inheritance
  ☐ borrowings from financial institution
  ☐ borrowings from family, friends
  ☐ business outside tourism
  ☐ other (please specify): .............................................

Thank you very much.
4.6 The sample

4.6.1 Introduction

The composition and size of the sample is important for every social research design. The discussion which follows is structured around three major areas: first, the problems of choosing the appropriate sample will be highlighted. Second, the determination of the target sample and thirdly, the sample size calculation will be presented.

4.6.2 The problems

While it is not unusual for target populations to present difficulties to researchers setting a sample, the circumstances in this case were particularly difficult. Firstly, because the population of tourism workers does not exist in national statistics, therefore the estimation of its size is problematic. Secondly, and following directly from the first circumstance, the estimation of the size of the discrete population which has moved into tourism is difficult. Furthermore, there remains the particular problem of locating a sample of ‘into tourism’ workers from tourism workers who have spent their entire career in the industry.

4.6.3 The target population

Given the focus of the study on labour mobility into tourism, it was inevitable that the sample should be taken from the population of present tourism workers and entrepreneurs who, prior to their present job in tourism, have transferred into tourism from another sector of the economy.
As previously noted, tourism work has been defined as 'a job in firms, organisations and facilities which are intended to serve the specific needs and wants of tourists'. Based on this definition, tourism work was interpreted rather broadly and included working in:

i. Accommodation sector (hotels, guest houses)
ii. Catering (restaurants, cafes, confectionery etc.)
iii. Travel agency
iv. Transport sector
v. Other (mainly retail outlets for tourists)

The study identified four areas of the country which, although different, were thought likely to contain tourism workers who had migrated from other industries. The areas were: (1) Budapest, Lake Balaton, Western Hungary and Northern Hungary. Lake Balaton was chosen because it is an established tourist area and Western Hungary for its relatively high level of development and its entrepreneurial legacy. Northern Hungary was included into the sample because the area is developing tourist attractions and has suffered from the decline in other industries.

The major concern when constructing the sample was its representativeness. Given the lack of information on the exact size of the tourism labour force (See Sections 4.2.3.3 and 4.2.3.4) and, more importantly, on its composition, it was impossible to devise a sample which precisely represents the target population. In order to secure the maximum possible representativeness of the sample, the following measures have been taken:
i. Data was collected from four geographical locations. The regions were carefully selected in order to represent the various levels of economic and tourism development in the country.

ii. The sample was to cover all the sectors of the tourism industry, with an emphasis on the accommodation sector.

iii. The questionnaires were distributed to a random sample of tourism workers and employees.

The sample excludes tourism workers who started their career in tourism. The exclusion of those whose entire working life was confined to tourism is self-explanatory but the elimination of the 'return migrants', in other words those who after a career start in tourism left the industry and then returned to it, was a result of much consideration. Although these subjects have moved into tourism from another sector of the economy and thus qualify to be included in the sample, they present two problems to the research.

Firstly, subjects who took up their first job in tourism are likely to have planned a tourism career and have gone through formal tourism education. Since the research is interested in subjects who made a detour into tourism from their career path, these subjects were justifiably excluded.

Secondly, 'return migrants' have entered tourism on two occasions. The circumstances and reasons for joining the industry might differ considerably but the research would only be concerned with the reasons for and the impacts of the second entry. Even assuming that respondents can clearly distinguish between the two episodes, it is plausible to assume that the second entry was strongly influenced by the experience of the first tourism job. The exclusion of these respondents from the sample thus prevents the inherent bias in the information sought.
4.6.4 The sample size

As no reports or studies were obtainable on tourism workers it was decided to make the ‘best possible estimates’ by adopting two approaches. The first approach used whatever figures were available to get as close as possible to an estimation of the size of the target population. The second approach was a purely statistical method based on the statistical error of the population. What follows now is the description of both approaches to the sample size calculation.

**APPROACH I.**

Working from the larger scale, the first useful figure was the working population of the country in 1993 which was: 4,352,000 (Central Statistical Office, 1995). According to the official figures, approximately 4.35% of them changed industries in that year (Central Statistical Office, Unpublished Report), amounting to 189,312 people. The total number of people employed in the tourism industry is estimated at 250,000 - 300,000 (Hungarian Tourist Board, 1994). The proportion of tourism workers to the working population is 6.8%.

If this proportion of 6.8% is transferred from the static population to the mobile population, it is possible to estimate the target population. If the proportion of tourism workers to the working population is 6.8%, and if it is assumed that the proportion will remain the same for workers in transit from other industries, then 6.8% of 189,312 gives a number of tourism workers changing industries of 12,873. This is considered to be the rough estimation of the population who moved into tourism in 1993. A reasonable estimate of the sample size, without any parameters for guidelines, might be 2-3% of this population, which gives the range of 257-386.
APPROACH II.
A complementary approach would be to estimate the population percentage working from limited information. If it can be said, that 4.35% of the workforce changed industry, then it could be argued that within the tourism workforce, at least 5% could be expected to have come from other industries. On the other hand, they could all be from other industries! However, this figure could be used to estimate an appropriate sample size. Because the assumption is that tourism might be a refugee industry, it could be expected to carry more than its share of workers imported from other industries. Therefore, the estimate for error would be quite high. The study used 5% error as a guidance.

To estimate the sample size, it is necessary to use the standard error of the proportions ($\sigma_p$). The population percentage ($\pi$) will be estimated within the desired error ($z\sigma_p$).

\[
\text{STEP 1. } \sigma_p = \sqrt{\frac{\pi(100 - \pi)}{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_p^2 = \frac{\pi(100 - \pi)}{n}
\]

\[
\text{STEP 2. } n = \frac{\pi(100 - \pi)}{\sigma_p^2}
\]

where $\sigma_p^2 = \left(\frac{\text{desired error}}{z}\right)^2$ (since $z\sigma_p = \text{desired error$, $\sigma_p = \frac{\text{desired error}}{z}$

and therefore

\[
\text{STEP 3. } n = \frac{\pi (100 - \pi)}{\left(\frac{\text{desired error}}{Z}\right)^2}
\]
If it is assumed that the estimate of the proportion is within $\pm 5\%$ of the true proportion, at a confidence level of $5\%$, then: $z = 1.96$

\[
\text{therefore}
\]

\[
2\sigma_p = 5\% \\
1.96 \sigma_p = 5\% \\
\sigma_p = \frac{0.05}{1.96} \times 100 = 2.55\%
\]

The sample size would be at its largest when $\pi = 50$:

\[
n_1 = \frac{50 (100 - 50)}{2.55^2} = 385
\]

A lower estimate would be when $\pi = 20$, in which case:

\[
n_2 = \frac{20 (100 - 20)}{2.55^2} = 246
\]

On the basis of the above calculation, the sample size should be between 246 ($n_2$) and 385 ($n_1$).

The two approaches resulted in similar estimates, namely: a range of 258-386 (I.) and a range of 246-385 (II.). Given the special circumstances of economic transition and the lack of reliable statistical data, this is regarded as a sufficient estimation and any sample size within this range will be satisfactory.
4.7 The administration of the survey
4.7.1 Introduction
The survey consisted of two major parts. The main survey was conducted in the summer of 1996 when, during a personal visit to Hungary, the questionnaires were distributed amongst the target population. This survey resulted in a satisfactory response rate but the obtained sample was severely skewed towards tourism employees. In order to optimise the entrepreneurial sample, a second survey was organised. To this end, in the Autumn of 1996 a set of questionnaires were posted to tourism entrepreneurs.

4.7.2 The main survey
Prior to the visit to Hungary, a number of influential tourism managers were contacted through a letter seeking their assistance for the research. Amongst them were Directors and Personnel Directors of the major hotel companies, the Managing Directors of two travel companies, the Director of the Hungarian Hotel Association, the President of the Chamber of Caterers and the Personnel Managers of the Hungarian Airlines. To the letter, a one-page summary of the research was attached in English and in Hungarian. The research summary is shown in Appendix 4. With the exception of one manager, the responses were favourable.

At the outset of the fieldwork, the co-operating managers were paid a personal visit during which the details of the study and the technicalities of the questionnaire distribution were discussed. Dependent on the size of the company, each manager was given a set of questionnaires (ranging from 5 to 50) which were to be distributed amongst their employees. In addition to these pre-arranged visits, further tourism managers were contacted via telephone and were asked for their assistance with the questionnaires. In the cases when the managers undertook the task of the questionnaire distribution within their company, the completed questionnaires were picked up by the researcher within an average of 10 days after distribution.
Whilst the above method was efficient for medium to large companies, it was regarded as impractical in the case of small businesses. Geographically dispersed and often not listed in official catalogues, small businesses presented a special difficulty for the data collection. Concentrating only on those in promotion material or trade catalogues would have meant that the smallest businesses would be excluded from the sample. For this reason it was decided to visit small businesses on a random basis and administer the questionnaire to the prospective respondents by the researcher herself. The subjects were asked to complete the questionnaire either immediately or within a short period of time, until the return of the researcher. Prompt response was sought in order to minimise the risk of non-completion.

During the main survey, 600 questionnaires were distributed to tourism employees and entrepreneurs. 351 completed questionnaires have been returned, which corresponds to a 58.5% response rate. This sample contained data from 327 employees and 24 entrepreneurs.

4.7.3 The second survey

Given the small size of the entrepreneurial sample, it was decided to carry out a second survey with the sole aim of gaining information from tourism entrepreneurs. To this end a postal survey was conducted in the Autumn of 1996 when 60 questionnaires were mailed to tourism entrepreneurs. With 18 returned questionnaires, this survey resulted in a 30% response rate.

For the second mail survey the names and addresses of entrepreneurs were obtained from three sources. These were: (1) hotel/motel directory, (2) The Chamber of Restaurateurs and (3) The Trade and Catering Training Institute. The questionnaires were mailed to the addresses with a self-addressed, pre-paid envelope to be sent back to the researcher's address at the University of Surrey.
4.8 Forms of analysis

4.8.1 Data input

The returned questionnaires were numbered and then scanned in using the 'Formic' software package. The data were then imported into the Excel® and SPSS® software packages which were used for the data analysis.

4.8.2 The major statistical methods applied

The quantitative nature of the study meant that a vast amount of data was collected. Its analysis required a wide range of statistical techniques. In the following the statistical methods used for the data analysis will be summarised.

1. Descriptive statistics

   A. Measure of central tendency

      Mean

   B. Measures of dispersion

      Range
      Interquartile range
      Standard deviation
      Variance

2. Statistical analyses

   A. Pearson product-moment correlation

      This method was used to investigate the strength of the linear relationship between two variables. It was particularly useful for the examination of the appropriateness of the factor analysis method for the data on motivational orientations.
B. **Chi-square test**
This was used for the analysis of data in contingency tables to test the null hypothesis that the raw and column classifications were independent.

C. **Independent sample t-test**
This was applied to test the null hypothesis that the data were from a population in which the mean of the variable in question was equal in two independent samples. This method was used when there were only two groups to be compared.

D. **One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA)**
This was applied to test the null hypothesis that the data were from a population in which the mean of the variable in question was equal in the sub-samples. This method was used when there were more than two groups to be compared.

Since when multiple comparisons are made, the probability of finding at least one significant difference increases, the **Bonferroni test** was applied. The test adjusts the observed significance level based on the number of comparisons made. In the One-Way ANOVA procedure using SPSS® software, the significant differences were marked with an asterix.

E. **Factor analysis**
In order to justify the existence of the four-dimensional structure of motivational orientations, the motivational data (Question 5.1) was subject to exploratory factor analysis. The method which was used for the 'orderly simplification of a number of interrelated measures' (Burt, 1940, cited in Child, 1970), was hoped to discover the hidden structures within the data set.
The factor analysis used principal component analysis for the extraction of factors. The factor rotation applied was Orthogonal (Varimax). Governing criteria for the analysis were that it satisfied both Kaiser's criterion of selecting only factors with a minimum eigenvalue of 1 and the 'percentage of variance' which requires that the extracted factors account for a minimum of 60% of the total variance (Hair et al. 1995).

**F. Scale analysis**

A number of methods were applied for the examination of the scaled data. Particular attention was paid to the motivational data which was planned to be subjected to factor analysis.

*Scale mean if item deleted:* the average value for the scale was calculated without the item in question.

*Corrected item-total correlation:* the Pearson correlation coefficient between the item in question and the sum of remaining scale items was obtained.

*Squared multiple correlation:* the multiple regression equation was calculated where the item in question was the dependent variable and the other items the independent variables. The measure gave an indication of how well the given item could be predicted from the other items.

*Cronbach's alpha:* was used to measure the internal consistency of the scale. The measure is based on the average covariance of the scale items.

*Alpha is item deleted:* the alpha without the item in question was also calculated. This was an indication of how the given item affected the scale reliability.

*Half-split method:* the sample was split into two parts and alpha was calculated for each part. It was noted that the coefficient depends on the allocation of variables.
4.9 Comments on the research design and the sample

The research instrument is a 'heavy' one in that it carries both factual data and attitude data. It asks subjects to recall facts, reflect upon experience and think about their personal motives. However, it was felt that the sequencing and the design facilitated the process of recall, reflection and enquiry.

The danger inherent in the design lies in the way it has to use 'old' official categorisation in circumstances of transition. The most important problem faced by the research was related to sampling. The unknown nature of the population and the practical difficulties in getting to it carry the risk of the sample not being truly random. No lists, no personnel records were available and there was no easy way to screening out life-long tourism workers other then vigilance at the questionnaire distribution stage.
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Chapter 5.

Findings 1.

5.1 Introduction and objectives

The presentation of the findings follows a dual structure, beginning with the discussion of the secondary data, which forms the background evidence to the objectives of the study. This data is primarily economic and has been extracted from national statistics. Its purpose is to draw a portrait of the condition of employment and the role which tourism employment plays within it. When the background has been drawn in, the findings will then proceed to the primary data of the survey.

Before proceeding to the presentation of the detailed findings, it would be worthwhile re-stating the objectives of the study, which are as follows:

i. To investigate the pattern of labour mobility which terminates in tourism
ii. To evaluate the impact of the mobility on individuals
iii. To investigate the reasons for this mobility
iv. To investigate the nature of tourism entrepreneurship

These general objectives have within them more specific objectives and hypotheses which will be presented at the point when the data is being explored.
Representing the backbone of Chapter 5., the primary data will be presented in the following order:

i. Description of the sample

ii. Description and analysis of the patterns of mobility

iii. Analysis of the evaluation of change

iv. Analysis of the motivational data in respect of tourism employment

The findings on tourism entrepreneurship will be presented separately in Chapter 6.

It should be recognised at the outset that each area examined will have an impact on other areas of analysis and, therefore, there will be a degree of exchange and integration between the data sets.

5.2 Findings on secondary data; the economic background to the survey

5.2.1 Introduction

In Chapter 2. the general economic and social background of Hungary has been discussed. Here, the purpose is to present a statistical portrait of the employment situation in Hungary. The information presented is limited in the sense that the information which forms the basis of this discussion is primarily to do with wages and employment. It should be noted that in terms of official information, the statistics are incomplete and that tourism is not recognised as official category by the Hungarian Statistics Office. The evidence presented here suffers from this deficiency in secondary data.
5.2.2 Structural changes in the economy after 1989

Characterised by an overemphasised industrial base and an underdeveloped service sector, structural changes were inevitable in the Hungarian economy by the end of the 1980s. The following two aspects of the structural adjustment process have major implications for the present study.

Firstly, it was accompanied by a serious contraction of the economy which can be best described by the fact that over the 4 year period from 1989 to 1993, the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) fell by 20%.

Secondly, the structural changes between 1989 and 1993 were a consequence of a differential contraction of all industries rather than a net result of growth in some industries and a decline in others. While the GDP of the so called 'material branches' of the economy (manufacturing, construction and agriculture) fell by 28% during this period, that of the service sector dropped only by 5%. (Pukli, 1994). The resulting change in the GDP structure from 1989 to 1992 is shown in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Share of GDP in 1989 (%)</th>
<th>Share of GDP in 1992 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Change in GDP structure from 1989 to 1992
Table 5.1 shows clearly that while manufacturing, construction, agriculture and the transport/communication sector experienced a decrease in their GDP share during this period, trade and other services enjoyed a relative increase. Although manufacturing in 1992 is still the largest contributor (32%) to the Gross Domestic Product, with a 27% share, other services are not far behind. Furthermore, the combined contribution of trade and other services accounts for 45% of the GDP in 1992 as opposed to 36% in 1989.

The dual phenomenon of a contracting economy, and structural changes at such a scale are likely to impact upon the employment situation. Therefore what follows next is a portrait of the changing industrial employment structure in Hungary during the examined period.
5.2.3 Employment by industries 1991-1995

In order to examine the changing structure of employment, data for two years have been extracted from the national statistics. Since 1991 is the first year when data are available in the breakdown adopted by the present study, this year will serve as the starting point for the comparison. These figures will be compared with the latest available data for 1995. Figure 5.1 shows the percentage of workers in the major economic sectors in 1991 and 1995.

Figure 5.1 Employment by industries 1991-1995

Figure 5.1 shows, that in line with the structural changes outlined in Section 5.2.2, the employment share of the primary and secondary sectors of the economy fell, while certain service industries showed a modest relative increase. With a 4% decrease,
agriculture is the main loser, followed by manufacturing, which experienced a 3% fall in employment share. The largest increase (4%) occurred in the case of public administration, but education, health, finance and the transport industries all show a modest relative employment growth. The trade and the hotel/restaurant sectors retained their relative employment positions.

Having looked at the major structural changes in the GDP and the employment situation in the main industries, what follows next is the picture of unemployment.

5.2.4 The unemployment situation in Hungary

Officially, until 1987 the Hungarian economy worked at full employment, after which the country slipped into a situation of falling employment and rising unemployment. Figure 5.2 shows the change in the employment figures between 1985-1995. According to the official Hungarian classification, the 'source of labour force' consists of the working age population (14-60 for men and 14-55 for women) and of those being employed over the working age while the term 'employed' compiles the active earners, persons on child care leave and the employed pensioners.

![Figure 5.2 Source and utilisation of Hungarian labour force (1985-1995)](image)

As depicted in Figure 5.2, the 10 year period is characterised by a slightly decreasing but largely stable source of labour force. Consisting of active earners, people on child care leave and employed pensioners, the number of employed shows a sudden drop in 1991, and continues to decline afterwards. The period between 1991 and 1993 is the most critical one when the employment figure decreased by almost a million, from 5.30 million to 4.35 million. This, given the size of the labour force, is a significant change.

With 6,400 unemployed, the unemployment rate started off at a negligible level in 1987 but increased rapidly between 1990 and 1993. By 1993 unemployment peaked at 663,000, equalling to a 12% unemployment rate, after which it settled at 519,600 in 1995.

Behind the unemployment figures there are two major aspects of the unemployment in Hungary. The relatively high proportion of long-term unemployment is accompanied by large regional differences in employment opportunities and unemployment rate. While in 1993 the north-eastern county of Szabolcs-Szatmar-Bereg faced a 22.2% unemployment rate, the more developed Western part of the country had a much lower unemployment rate of 8.3%. Budapest, the economic and financial centre of the country enjoyed the best position with a 6.6% unemployment rate. Although the magnitude of regional imbalances decreased slightly since 1993, the differences in employment opportunities between geographical regions still persist. This fact has been taken into account at the research design by selecting four regions of differing levels of economic and tourism development. The effect of locational variables will be examined for the impact data (See Section 5.3.4), where significant differences between the answers from the four region are expected.
According to the official figures, there is a clear connection between educational attainment and unemployment. *Table 5.2* shows a relationship between level of education and unemployment rate in 1995.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational attainment of the unemployed</th>
<th>1995 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less then primary school</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>34.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>56.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.2. Educational attainment and unemployment 1995*


*Table 5.2* shows that in 1995 the majority (56.98%) of the unemployed had attended secondary school and that those with only primary school-level education constitute the second largest unemployed group.
5.2.5 Earnings in the major industries

Unfortunately, secondary information on industrial labour conditions was found to be incomplete. However, the pay data do indicate a position which is emphatic. Table 5.3 shows the relative pay based on the official Hungarian classification. Tourism workers are distributed in a number of classes but for the purpose of analysis the category ‘hotel and restaurant’ has been used as the general indicator of pay levels in tourism. The monthly net earnings are shown in Hungarian currency, the Forint (Ft).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5,408</td>
<td>8,817</td>
<td>10,001</td>
<td>11,710</td>
<td>14,127</td>
<td>18,261</td>
<td>21,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,256</td>
<td>18,907</td>
<td>23,426</td>
<td>28,560</td>
<td>31,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>6,172</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>12,316</td>
<td>14,976</td>
<td>17,924</td>
<td>22,573</td>
<td>25,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,989</td>
<td>18,498</td>
<td>22,174</td>
<td>27,897</td>
<td>31,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>10,586</td>
<td>12,014</td>
<td>14,332</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>21,292</td>
<td>22,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>5,409</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>12,754</td>
<td>15,656</td>
<td>18,376</td>
<td>22,722</td>
<td>24,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL/REST</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,067</td>
<td>13,844</td>
<td>16,274</td>
<td>20,052</td>
<td>20,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>6,301</td>
<td>9,844</td>
<td>13,101</td>
<td>16,403</td>
<td>19,047</td>
<td>24,456</td>
<td>27,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,681</td>
<td>26,329</td>
<td>31,663</td>
<td>38,542</td>
<td>41,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,561</td>
<td>17,546</td>
<td>21,860</td>
<td>26,888</td>
<td>29,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,003</td>
<td>15,479</td>
<td>17,033</td>
<td>22,463</td>
<td>24,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,397</td>
<td>14,580</td>
<td>16,059</td>
<td>21,127</td>
<td>22,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>12,889</td>
<td>15,628</td>
<td>18,397</td>
<td>23,424</td>
<td>25,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Monthly net earnings by industries in Hungary in Hungarian Forints

(1985-1995)

Source: Compiled from statistics by the Hungarian Office of Statistics

Table 5.3 clearly indicates that during a period of wage inflation, tourism was one of the lowest paid categories. More conspicuous is the fact that while in 1991, agriculture paid the lowest wages, followed by tourism, in 1995 tourism became the lowest paying industry.
In order to reflect upon the relative difference of tourism earnings compared to those in the rest of the economy, Table 5.4 replicates part of Table 5.3, showing the monthly net earnings in 1995 in the first column, while the second column compares each industry with tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Monthly net earnings in 1995 (Ft)</th>
<th>Difference from tourism (Ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>41,659</td>
<td>20,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>31,924</td>
<td>11,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>31,895</td>
<td>11,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>29,462</td>
<td>8,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>27,351</td>
<td>6,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>25,891</td>
<td>5,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>25,790</td>
<td>4,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and repair *</td>
<td>24,359</td>
<td>3,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24,095</td>
<td>3,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22,915</td>
<td>2,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>22,496</td>
<td>1,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>21,338</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTEL REST</td>
<td><strong>20,829</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4. Monthly net earnings in 1995 (Hungarian Forint)
Source: Central Statistical Office, Hungary
*In official statistics trade and repair are in one category as opposed to the present research which separated the two industries

According to Table 5.4, in 1995 the three top paying industries were finance, energy and mining, followed by public administration and the transport industry. The pay in the manufacturing industry closely corresponds to that of the national average. The remaining industries pay below the national average but above tourism.
Notwithstanding the absence of other employment data which might offset the implications of Table 5.4, it is very clear that a move into tourism would, for most people, involve a decrease in pay. How far the official figures depart from actual earnings is not known but even a severe underestimation would still leave tourism employment close to the bottom of the earnings ladder. The unemployment picture is such that it might suggest that with other industries declining, tourism might be a source of employment no matter what the pay.

5.2.6 Summary
The secondary data on the macro-economic conditions in Hungary clearly forms a picture of an economy in transition. The new phenomenon of unemployment, structural changes and a contracting economy for most of the examined period suggest that labour was seriously affected by the changes. The low official pay in the hotel and restaurant sector suggests that mobility into this sector would involve a pay decrease, questioning the motives behind such a mobility. It also supports the idea of tourism being a 'refuge' for those having to leave other, declining, industries.

The notion of low official pay in tourism will be contrasted with two elements of the primary data. The analysis of the motives (See Section 5.3.5) behind the decision to move into tourism will shed light on the motivational dilemma, while the real change in income and in living standards will be examined by analysing the impact data in Section 5.3.4.

Having highlighted the relevant aspects to the study of the macro-economic conditions, the following sections of the Chapter deal with the presentation of the findings from the primary data.
5.3 Findings of the study; primary data
5.3.1 Introduction

The presentation of the research findings will proceed in the following sequence:

- Firstly, the main characteristics of the sample will be described.

- Secondly, the patterns of mobility will be examined, with particular reference to the last industry the subjects were employed in prior to tourism, the frequency of industry change during the period of 1987-1996 and the year of the mobility.

- Thirdly, the data on the subjective evaluation of the impact of change experienced by the respondents when moving into the tourism industry will be presented. In this part of the analysis, certain key explanatory variables such as gender, age, education, location, industry before tourism, time of mobility and employment status will be tested.

- Fourthly, the evidence from the motivation data describing the structure of individual motivation towards tourism employment will be examined.

Given its importance and its distinctive characteristics compared to the rest of the data, the findings on entrepreneurship will be presented separately in Chapter 6.

Each part of the analysis will be concluded with a summary. Although the analysis is to be presented in discrete sections, it is anticipated that certain themes will run throughout the analysis. The main theme is:

The study is conducted with the aim of examining the role of tourism employment in economic upheaval and is particularly interested in subjects who have undergone radical changes. The data will be analysed to try to find such a group.
5.3.2 The sample

The main survey was conducted in four regions of Hungary during the summer of 1996 and was completed by means of an additional postal survey during the autumn and winter of 1996. The selected geographical areas were the capital Budapest, Lake Balaton, Western Hungary and Northern Hungary. The self-completed questionnaires were distributed to employees in the tourism industry encompassing the following sectors: (1) Hotel, (2) Guest house, (3) Restaurant, (4) Café, (5) Travel agency, (6) Transportation and (7) Other. Regarding the employment status, the sample consists of three main groups: (1) Entrepreneurs, (2) Managers and (3) Employees.

5.3.2.1 Sample size

The survey consists of 351 questionnaires, to which were later added an additional 18 questionnaires from the second postal survey. The main survey of 351 respondents includes data from 262 employees, 65 managers and 24 entrepreneurs.

The second survey was targeted specifically at tourism entrepreneurs. Since the entrepreneurial sample constitutes a distinct cohort, it was treated separately from the main sample. The findings on entrepreneurship will be presented in Chapter 6.

For the sample size calculation See Section 4.6.4 in Chapter 4.
5.3.2.2 Sample characteristics

Age distribution and gender

Age distribution

The five age groups used in the research instrument were: (1) 16-25, (2) 26-35, (3) 36-45, (4) 46-55 and (5) 56-65. Given the general observation that younger people tend to be more mobile than older ones, it was expected that the majority of the sample would be in the younger age groups. The age distribution of the sample is presented in Figure 5.3.

![Age Distribution Graph](image)

Figure 5.3 The age distribution of the sample (n=351)

Using the class middle points in the calculation, the average age was 37.05. Although in line with the expectations, in which the second group (26-35) proved to be the mode, the conspicuous characteristic of the data was the large proportion of respondents over the age of 35.

Gender

The gender distribution of the sample was 58% female and 42% male respondents.
Educational level and tourism qualification

Educational level

The four categories used in the classification of the educational background of the sample were: (1) Uncompleted primary, (2) Primary, (3) Secondary and (4) Higher Education. The distribution of the four categories in the sample is shown in Figure 5.4.

Figure 5.4 Educational level of sample (n=351)

Figure 5.4 indicates that the most common educational attainment in the sample is secondary education (221 respondents = 62.96%), followed by higher education (92 respondents = 26.21%).

Tourism qualification

The respondents were not asked to specify the level of tourism qualification they possessed but the possible tourism qualifications range from certificate achieved via evening classes through secondary school level vocational education to degree level qualification.
While the focus of the study on inter-industry mobility would suggest a general lack of tourism related qualifications in the sample, the high value attached to official qualifications by Hungarian employers would assume a high incidence of relevant qualifications. The actual proportion of respondents with tourism qualifications is a low 26%. The majority (69%) of the sample does not possess tourism qualification, while 5% declined to answer this question.

Language skills

Over 50% of the sample speaks at least one foreign language.

Tourism sectors

The proportions of tourism in the sample do not necessarily represent the actual proportions present in the economy. This is largely due to the fact that the boundaries of the tourism industry in official Hungarian statistics differ significantly from those adopted for this research and, therefore, the real proportions of the tourism sectors remain a subject of estimation. Due to the lack of reliable figures, it was decided that, while every attempt would be made to include a wide range of tourism sectors, the study had to proceed without stratification.
The classification of the tourism sectors on the questionnaire was as follows: (1) Hotel, (2) Guest house, (3) Restaurant, (4) Café, (5) Travel agency, (6) Transportation, (including the Hungarian airlines and taxis) and (7) Other. The actual distribution of the sectors is shown in Figure 5.5.

![Diagram showing the distribution of tourism sectors](image)

**Figure 5.5 Representation of tourism sectors in the sample (n=351)**

Accounting for 67% of the sample, the hotel sector is the largest contributor to the research, while the remaining 33% represents the non-hotel sectors.
Establishment size

The five categories used for the identification of establishment size were as follows: (1) Less than 11 employees, (2) 11-20 employees, (3) 21-50 employees, (4) 51-300 employees and (5) More than 300 employees. The distribution of the establishment size categories are summarised in Figure 5.6.

![Establishment size (n=351)](image)

**Figure 5.6 Establishment size (n=351)**

Accounting for 71% (46% + 25%) of the sample, the majority of the respondents work in companies with more than 50 employees which fact can be explained by the dominant representation of the hotel sector within the sample. 12% work in small companies employing less than 11 employees.
As described earlier, four geographical locations have been selected for the research, namely: (1) Budapest, (2) Western Hungary, (3) Lake Balaton and, finally, (4) Northern Hungary. The number of completed questionnaires from each region and their relative representation in the study is shown in Figure 5.7.

**Figure 5.7 Geographical distribution of the sample (n=351)**

*Figure 5.7* shows that with 55% of the respondents, the majority of the sample comes from Budapest which has been set with the purpose of reflecting upon the role of Budapest as the economic and tourism centre of the country. The remaining 44% of the sample is from three other parts of the country.
5.3.3 Mobility

5.3.3.1 Introduction

At the heart of this thesis is the study of the pattern of mobility from other sectors of the economy into tourism. The dominant question here is: where did the respondents come from? Given the amount of re-skilling in the economy at the time, a supplementary question might be: which industries shed their labour and had it been taken up by tourism?

There are five distinct aspects to the analysis of mobility:

i. The identity of the last industry before tourism.

ii. The extent of mobility. To this effect, a 10 year period from 1987 to 1996 was examined. All job changes during that period were recorded.

iii. The identity of the actual year within the decade that the change to tourism took place. It is envisaged that this would have an influence on the evaluation of the change by the respondents.

iv. The literature suggests a relationship between occupational mobility and geographical mobility. Given the stark contrast between rural life and metropolitan Budapest, it was thought useful to examine the relationship between inter-sector mobility and geographical mobility.

v. In the turmoil suggested by the macro data, it was envisaged that there would be a job status mobility.
Before commencing with the discussion of the findings, certain methodological considerations have to be reflected upon. On the questionnaire, the respondents were asked to state for each year of the period between 1987 and 1996 which industry they worked in. This provided the information on the last industry before tourism and was the basis for the computation of the number of industry changes during the 10 year period.

In 68 cases the mobility into tourism occurred prior to 1987. This fact was of two consequences. Firstly, it provided a control group for the evaluation of the impact of mobility by dividing the sample into two groups: one which moved into tourism before 1987 and the other whose mobility took place during the period of 1987-1996. Secondly, and more importantly to the subject of present discussion, it defined a sub-sample of 68 people whose inter-industry movements were not recorded and who, therefore, were excluded from certain parts of the analysis. For clarification purposes, the actual sample size will be given for each part of the analysis.

It would be useful at this point to re-state the sample size. The total number of questionnaires analysed was 369. However, the main sample which forms the basis of the following analysis contained 351 questionnaires.

5.3.3.2 Inter-sector mobility - industry prior to tourism (n=283)

Based on the experience of other countries, the study was expected to identify a fairly restricted number of industries providing workers for tourism. Amongst the most likely industries were agriculture, and the manufacturing industry. Furthermore, in line with the hypothesised role of tourism as a refuge for the victims of the transition, it was anticipated that a number of respondents would have exchanged their unemployed position with a job in the tourism industry.
Based on the 10 year period of mobility data, the last industry before tourism was recorded and a frequency distribution of the industries drawn. The result is one of the most unexpected findings of the study.

As opposed to the expectations, the frequency distribution revealed a wide range of industries virtually embracing the whole economy. The number of respondents coming from each sector and their proportion to the sample are shown in Table 5.5, where the industries are shown in their declining ranked order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry prior to tourism</th>
<th>Number of respondent</th>
<th>Percentage of sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>283</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 Industry prior to tourism (n=283)

What emerges from Table 5.5 is a startlingly wide range of industries. The wide range of industries can be best illustrated by the fact that, with the exception of mining, mobility into tourism occurred from every other sector of the economy. Providing 20.85% of the relevant sample (n=283), there is a clear influx of people from trade.
According to the Hungarian terminology, trade includes both retailing and foreign trade companies. It has to be noted that there is little difference between retail outlets serving the local population and those shops targeting tourists; a fact which probably promotes mobility between the two sectors. The major difference in the skill requirement lies in the need for language skills in the tourism industry. Foreign language skills is probably the reason why people from the once prospering but now defunct centralised foreign trade companies find their way into the travel agencies and hotel companies.

The second category, termed as 'other', amalgamates those coming from the service sector (e.g. hairdressers, beauticians), those who were living abroad, housewives and those on maternity leave. With 13.78%, they represent a considerable proportion of the sample.

The third industry on the list is manufacturing, from where 12.01% of the sample came. The decline in manufacturing industries, with the resulting redundancies, is the likely inducement of this mobility.

The conspicuous character of the data lies in the fact that the list of industries continues to exhaust nearly the whole economy. Education (9.19%) is the fourth sector, indicating that deteriorating social status and low pay in education makes tourism an attractive option for many teachers. 6.71% of the sample who left unemployment used employment in tourism as a channel back into the labour market. And finally, it is worth noting that finance, the best paying industry, contributed 3.18% of the respondents to the sample.
The wide range of industries and their gradual distribution is illustrated in Figure 5.8.
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Figure 5.8 Industry prior to tourism (n=283)

Arising from the fact that tourism is a fragmented industry consisting of several well distinguishable sectors, the inter-industry mobility has to be examined at a sectoral level. After having established the range of industries preceding tourism, it is important to investigate the direction of inter-industry mobility flows into the various tourism sectors. Given the similarities of skill requirements between certain industries and the tourism sectors (for example working in retail outlets for the general public and in souvenir shops serving the tourists or being employed in public transport and becoming a taxi driver), it is plausible to hypothesise that certain industry-tourism sector routes prevail, while others are virtually non-existent.
In order to investigate the direction of this mobility flow, the relationship between the pre-tourism industry and the present tourism sector has been scrutinised and the results are summarised in Table 5.6. Each row in the table represents an industry which provided workers for tourism, while the cells show what percentage of the respondents from that particular industry work in the relevant tourism sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Hotel (%)</th>
<th>Guest house (%)</th>
<th>Restaur. (%)</th>
<th>Cafe (%)</th>
<th>Travel agent (%)</th>
<th>Transport (%)</th>
<th>Other (%)</th>
<th>Missing data (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 Industry - tourism sector route

As seen from Table 5.6 and in line with the dominance of the hotel sector in the sample, the majority of respondents from each industry are now working in hotels. However, the actual representation of the hotel sector varies across the industries. With 94% of the respondents working now in hotels, the construction industry is on the top of the list, while, with 42%, the transport industry is at the bottom.

Education is the economic sector which provides workers for every sector of the tourism industry whilst those from health care and the construction industry moved only either to hotels or one other tourism sector.
As seen in Section 5.3.3.2, at the inter-industry level the trade-tourism route proved to be the most prominent one. As suggested earlier, it was expected that those with previous experience in commerce, would move into tourism related shops. What was found was that only 7% of those from trade are now in the other category (which contains the souvenir shops). The 12% in travel agencies is probably due to those who worked in foreign trade companies before and who are now capitalising on their language skills.

The hotel sector and the restaurant sectors of the tourism industry have taken workers with the widest variety of previous industry experience.

The traditional agriculture - tourism route was of natural interest to the study. As expected, a high proportion (75%) of respondents from agriculture moved into the hotel sector, some (5%) into restaurant and 6% are in the other category. Conspicuously, the highest proportion of missing values is attributable to this group.

In order to investigate the association between the industry prior to tourism and the sector of tourism which the respondents worked in at the time of data collection, these two variables have been cross-tabulated.
Table 5.7 is a contingency table, where the rows represent the industry prior to tourism and the columns represent the tourism sector which the respondents worked in at the time of data collection. It has to be noted that the table is based on the same information as Table 5.6, but for the purposes of the present analysis, instead of percentages, the figures indicate the number of respondents in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Guest house</th>
<th>Restaur.</th>
<th>Cafe</th>
<th>Travel agent</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Missing value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufact.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Contingency table between variables INDFROM and TOURSECT

The relationship between the two variables (INDFROM and TOURSECT) could have been established using a Chi-Square Test, but given the large number of cells with values below 5, the Test could not be carried out. As a consequence, the relationship between the industry prior to tourism and the identity of the tourism sector remains a matter of judgement.

An examination of Table 5.7 suggests that there is a certain relationship between the last industry prior to tourism and the current tourism sector. A teacher, for example, can move into any of the tourism sectors, whereas a hospital nurse will most likely take up a job in a hotel or a souvenir shop.
This relationship between the pre-tourism industry and the tourism sector is probably due to a dual factor of attraction and opportunity, where the comparative advantage in working conditions and in pay influence the attractiveness of the tourism sectors, while the skill differences and similarities between the pre-tourism and the tourism job condition the opportunities.

5.3.3.3 Year of mobility into tourism (n=283)

Based on the 10 year period of data, spanning over the period of 1987-1996, the year of mobility into tourism has been established by recording the first reported year in tourism for each respondent. Naturally, only data from respondents whose mobility occurred during this period has been useful for this part of the analysis. The distribution of sample by year of mobility is shown in Figure 5.9.

The conspicuous characteristic of this data is the fact that one third (34%) of the respondents moved into tourism in 1996, while the previous years showed an even pace of mobility, ranging from 7% in 1988, 1991 and 1992 to 10% in 1990 and 1995.
5.3.3.4 Incidence of industry changes during the period of 1987-1996 (n=283)

The incidence of industry changes has been computed by counting for each respondent the number of industry category changes over the 10 year period. Unemployment was one of these categories on the questionnaire. Since the aim of the present analysis was to establish the propensity of the sample to be mobile, mobility into or out of unemployment was considered as a mobility equivalent to that into or out of an industry.

Given the traditional immobility of the Hungarian labour force, it was expected that the majority of the sample would have changed industry only once during the ten year period. This assumption ignores the possible effects of economic upheaval. The findings are summarised in Table 5.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of industry changes</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of sample (n=283)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>74.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.8 Incidence of industry changes (1987-1996)

With 74.2% of the sample having indicated one industry change over the period in question, the hypothesis was largely justified. The incidence of two, three and four industry changes was significantly lower, representing 16.26%, 7.42% and 2.12% of the sample respectively. Given the economic conditions discussed at the macro level, this is perhaps a surprising finding.
5.3.3.5 Geographical mobility (n=351)

On the questionnaire, geographical mobility has been treated separately from the inter-industry data resulting in data availability for the overall sample. As a consequence, this section of the findings is based on the total sample of 351.

Accounting for 11.11% of the total sample of 351, 39 respondents reported that the mobility into tourism was accompanied by geographical mobility. The distances range from 8 km to 500 km, resulting in an average distance of 137 km for those who moved.

The sample was split into two sub-samples on the basis of the timing of the mobility, whereby the first sub-sample contains the respondents (n= 68) who moved into tourism prior to 1987, and the second (n=283) which is formed from those whose mobility occurred since 1987. The findings are as follows:

1. From those who moved into tourism prior to 1987, geographical mobility occurred in 8.8% of the cases.

2. From those who moved into tourism since 1987, geographical mobility occurred in 11.7% of the cases.

What the findings indicate is a somewhat increased level of geographical mobility for the those who moved into tourism since 1987.

It was hypothesised that certain inter-industry routes would be associated with geographical mobility, for example the change from agricultural occupation would entail a geographical re-location. Information on the last industry prior to tourism was obtained from those respondents whose mobility into tourism occurred since 1987, therefore this part of the analysis is based upon the data from the 283 respondents who moved to tourism during the period of 1987 to 1996.
The proportion of the geographically mobile respondents from each industry have been computed and the results are shown in Table 5.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry from</th>
<th>Geographically mobile (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9 Geographical mobility of respondents by industry prior to tourism

Table 5.9 illustrates that geographical mobility ranges from 28.6% for those from health care to 0% in the case of those from energy, construction, finance and public administration. In order to investigate whether there was any statistically significant association between the industry prior to tourism and the accompanying geographical mobility, the data was subjected to cross-tabulation and a Chi-Square Test was carried out. The two variables examined were: Industry prior to tourism (INDFROM) and Geographical mobility (GEOMOB). The significance level for the test was set at 5%.
Table 5.10 contains the contingency table which served as the basis for the Chi-Square Test. The figures in the table indicate the number of respondents in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry prior to tourism</th>
<th>Moved geographically (No of resp.)</th>
<th>Did not move geographically (No of resp.)</th>
<th>Total (No of resp.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 Contingency table for variables INDFROM and GEOMOB

The results from the Chi-Square Test are shown in Figure 5.10.

H₀: Variables INDFROM and GEOMOB are independent
H₁: Variables INDFROM and GEOMOB are dependent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td>12.9190</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.37489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Expected Frequency - .702
Cells with Expected Frequency < 5 - 12 OF 26 (46.2%)

Number of Missing Observations: 0

Figure 5.10 Chi-Square Test of Variables INDFROM and GEOMOB
Given the large observed significance level of 0.37489 (indicating that $\chi^2 < \chi^2_{0.05}$), the null hypothesis can not be rejected. It has to be concluded that there is not enough statistical evidence to prove the association between the last industry before tourism and the incidence of geographical mobility.

5.3.3.6 Employment status mobility ($n=351$)

The change in employment position was examined by comparing the current employment status (at the time of completion of the questionnaire) and that prior to moving into the tourism industry. The three categories of employment status were as follows: (1) Entrepreneur, (2) Manager and (3) Employee. A 1 $\rightarrow$ (2) $\rightarrow$ 3 change is regarded as a downward while the 3 $\rightarrow$ (2) $\rightarrow$ 1 direction as an upward mobility. It is acknowledged that although this classification is somewhat arbitrary, whereas the relative status of entrepreneur is dependent on circumstances, it was plausible to suggest such a measure for the purposes of the study.

It has been anticipated that while the majority of the sample would probably retain their employment status, the mobility into tourism would induce certain upward and downward status mobility. This assumption has been largely justified by the data.

No change has been found for 68.9% of the sample (242 respondents), an advancement occurred in the case of 14.8% (52 respondents) of the sample and a decline was reported by 7.7% (27 respondents). Information on status mobility was not available for 8.6% of the cases (30 respondents).

It was of particular interest to the study whether there was any relationship between the measured change in employment status and the sector of the economy which the respondent worked in before moving into tourism. To this end, the data has been subjected to cross-tabulation. This part of the analysis is based on the responses from those respondents who have moved into tourism since 1987 ($n=283$).
The contingency table for variables industry prior to tourism (INDFROM) and employment status mobility (STAMOB) is shown in Table 5.11. The figures in the table indicate the number of respondents in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry prior to tourism</th>
<th>Employee → Entrepr.</th>
<th>Employee → Manager or Manager → Entrepr.</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Entrepr. → Manager or Manager → Employee</th>
<th>Entrepr. → Employee</th>
<th>Missing value</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactur.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>283</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11 Contingency table for INDFROM and STAMOB variables

The examination of Table 5.11 does not reveal any obvious relationship between variables INDFROM and STAMOB. A Chi-Square Test would have been a helpful technique to establish the association between the two variables, but given the high number of cells with a value below 5, the test was regarded impractical and was therefore not carried out.
5.3.3.7 Summary

Section 5.3.3 was concerned with three major aspects of the mobility into tourism, namely the pattern of inter-sector mobility, the incidence of geographical mobility and the employment status mobility. The following summary has been produced in order to highlight the major findings and to facilitate the understanding of the findings of the overall study.

Major findings:

- With the exception of mining, mobility into tourism occurred from every sector of the economy.
- Accounting for 20.85% of the sample (n=283), the largest flow originated from trade.
- Even the highest paying industries provided workers for tourism.
- The hotel sector absorbed labour from every industry.
- Education provided labour for every tourism sector.
- There was an association between the industry prior to tourism and the tourism sector which the respondent worked in at the time of the completion of the questionnaire.
- 74.20% of the sample (n=283) changed industry only once during the period of 1987-1996.
- In 11.1% of the sample (n=351) the inter-industry mobility has been accompanied by geographical mobility.
- A somewhat lower incidence of geographical mobility was found for those who moved into tourism prior to 1987 compared to those whose mobility occurred since 1987.
- 68.9% of the sample (n=351) retained their employment status.
The evidence to support the proposition that changes in the economy would result in instability in the labour market is mixed. The level of unstable job-changing is low and there is a conspicuously high number of people who changed industry only once in the 10 year period. Against this is the range of inter-industry mobility, with tourism workers coming from almost every part of the economy. **These data are sending out mixed signals on the basic proposition.**

Having described the pattern of mobility into tourism, the presentation of the findings will now continue with an examination of how the respondents evaluated the impact of the mobility on their working and living conditions.
5.3.4 Findings on the subjective evaluation of the impact of change brought about by inter-industry mobility

5.3.4.1 Introduction

Having established the pattern of mobility in Section 5.3.3, what follows now is the presentation of the findings on the direction and magnitude of change which occurred as a result of the mobility into tourism. The analysis is based upon the subjective evaluation of the impacts of the change by the respondents. Ten dimensions were examined which were as follows:

(1) Job security
(2) Career prospects
(3) Social status
(4) Physical environment
(5) Standard of living
(6) Control over work
(7) Working hours
(8) Job satisfaction
(9) Compatibility between education and skills required by the job in tourism
(10) Income

The average score over the 10 dimensions was also calculated for each respondent, resulting in an additional variable termed as:

(11) Overall change
The ten dimensions have been evaluated by the respondents on a 5-point Likert scale. The coding of the scale was carried out in the following way: 1 = Significantly improved, 2 = Improved, 3 = No change, 4 = Worsened, 5 = Significantly worsened. Consequently, when interpreting the results, higher mean values imply a higher degree of worsening, while lower mean values indicate a higher degree of improvement.

The presentation of the findings will commence with the discussion of the results for the overall sample, followed by an analysis of the effects of the change using key explanatory variables. These were:

(A) Age  
(B) Gender  
(C) Educational level  
(D) Location  
(E) Industry prior to tourism  
(F) Year of mobility into tourism  
(G) Employment status.

The proposition which guides the analysis of change is that during the economic transition, there would be the assumption that some people would enter tourism as a contingency and that their level of satisfaction would be low.
5.3.4.2 The total sample (n=351)

As the first step in the analysis, the mean values and standard deviations for the change items have been computed. It was expected that the direction of the impact would vary by the examined dimensions.

The macro level pay data (Table 5.4) suggests a relative pay disadvantage for those working in the hotel and restaurant sector as opposed to those engaged in other economic sectors. Given the fact that two thirds of the sample moved into the hotel and restaurant sector, worsening living standards and pay decreases were anticipated for the majority of the sample. On the other hand, tourism jobs generally enjoy a favourable image in Hungary. However, it was thought that this positive evaluation might be counterbalanced by those who (voluntarily or forcibly) gave up jobs of higher social status. Given the intrinsic characteristics of tourism jobs (involving long and unsocial working hours), the dimension of working hours was expected to be appraised as one with a negative change.
The mean values and standard deviations (SD) derived from the five point scale for the change items are shown in Table 5.12. In order to facilitate the interpretation of the data, the direction of change as set by the mean value will be given in the fourth column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Valid cases (n)</th>
<th>Direction of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.567</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.624</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.431</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.366</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.842</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12 Means and standard deviations for 11 dimensions (n=351)

The picture set by Table 5.12 is one of general contentment which can be best illustrated by the fact that, despite the hypothesis, none of the dimensions were found to have worsened. The overall change for the total sample has been calculated at 2.510 with a standard deviation of 0.6. The mean values for the remaining 10 dimensions range from 2.239 for job satisfaction to 2.842 for working hours.

Despite the hypothesised relative pay disadvantage when moving into tourism, as suggested by the official earnings data (see Table 5.4 in Section 5.2.5), with an average value of 2.347, income is rated as having improved! The standard of living (2.431) improved slightly less than income, a difference probably due to a general feeling of worsening in the living conditions of wage earners in Hungary.
The least positive change calculated was for *working hours* (2.842), followed by the *match between education and the skills* required in the present job (2.726). However, the standard deviations of 1.1 and 0.9 respectively indicate that despite the general positive evaluation for the two variables, there are considerable numbers of people who appraised the impact of mobility on the two variables as detrimental.

The most positive impact of the mobility into tourism for the total sample was reported on the *job satisfaction* variable. With a mean value of 2.239 (SD=0.8), for the majority of the respondents, the industry change had resulted in increased job satisfaction.

The question which naturally arises from these findings is whether the general positive impact of the inter-industry mobility would contradict the proposed position of tourism as a refugee industry. Without an examination of the motives for moving into tourism, it would be too early to attempt to answer this question. What can be concluded at this stage, is that regardless of whether the mobility was a voluntary one, initiated in the hope of achieving better working and/or living conditions or was a refugee move, the impacts are generally positive. Whether this uniform positive evaluation is due to a real improvement or to being content with surviving during economic upheaval is an unanswered question.

A better understanding of the problem is expected to be gained after the results of the motivational data are incorporated into the findings presentation. However, before proceeding to the discussion of the motives for the mobility, the impact data will be examined in the light of the relevant explanatory variables. The study seeks within-sample variances.
5.3.4.3 Analysis of impact data by explanatory variables

Given the uniformity of the change data, implying a general contentment with the impacts of the job change, it was necessary to see whether certain explanatory variables throw any light on the general level of satisfaction. More specifically, it was hypothesised that behind the general contentment with the impacts of the mobility into tourism, there might be some groups of people who experienced a less favourable change. The seven key variables selected for sample split purposes were as follows:

(A) Age
(B) Gender
(C) Education
(D) Geographical location
(E) Industry prior to tourism
(F) Year of mobility into tourism
(G) Employment status

The examination of the impact data by the seven key explanatory variables revealed that despite the general positive outlook by the overall sample, there are differences of two kinds within the data set. Firstly, there are a number of dimensions which worsened for certain groups of people and secondly, there is a difference in the degree of positive change between the sub-groups.

In order to investigate whether the differences between the sub-samples were statistically significant, two statistical methods have been employed. The mean values for the two gender groups and for the two sub-samples set by the time dimension of mobility were compared by using an independent sample t-test, while in the case of the remaining five variables, a One-Way ANOVA analysis using the Bonferroni-test has been conducted. Both analyses were set at 5% significance level.
The findings from the tests will be summarised for each explanatory variable. For the detailed results See Appendix 5.

A. Age

The findings for the five age groups are summarised in Table 5.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>16-25 (n= 59)</th>
<th>26-35 (n= 111)</th>
<th>36-45 (n= 87)</th>
<th>46-55 (n= 80)</th>
<th>56-65 (n= 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.50 Positive</td>
<td>2.71 Positive</td>
<td>2.51 Positive</td>
<td>2.54 Positive</td>
<td>2.21 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.38 Positive</td>
<td>2.55 Positive</td>
<td>2.67 Positive</td>
<td>2.76 Positive</td>
<td>3.08 Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.67 Positive</td>
<td>2.51 Positive</td>
<td>2.72 Positive</td>
<td>2.80 Positive</td>
<td>3.23 Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.19 Positive</td>
<td>2.25 Positive</td>
<td>2.33 Positive</td>
<td>2.43 Positive</td>
<td>2.29 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.44 Positive</td>
<td>2.33 Positive</td>
<td>2.48 Positive</td>
<td>2.33 Positive</td>
<td>2.29 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.46 Positive</td>
<td>2.30 Positive</td>
<td>2.35 Positive</td>
<td>2.43 Positive</td>
<td>2.29 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.78 Positive</td>
<td>2.95 Positive</td>
<td>2.90 Positive</td>
<td>2.78 Positive</td>
<td>2.29 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.25 Positive</td>
<td>2.15 Positive</td>
<td>2.18 Positive</td>
<td>2.43 Positive</td>
<td>2.00 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>2.76 Positive</td>
<td>2.62 Positive</td>
<td>2.69 Positive</td>
<td>2.82 Positive</td>
<td>3.07 Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.36 Positive</td>
<td>2.24 Positive</td>
<td>2.42 Positive</td>
<td>2.46 Positive</td>
<td>2.08 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.48 Positive</td>
<td>2.46 Positive</td>
<td>2.53 Positive</td>
<td>2.60 Positive</td>
<td>2.46 Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13 Impact of mobility by age

Table 5.13 indicates that there is little difference between the first four age groups. Their evaluation of the impacts of the mobility is positive. The last age group (56-65) reported a negative change on three dimensions: Career prospects, social status and education / job match. However, the same age group indicated a significant improvement in their job satisfaction, and even in their income.
In order to establish whether there were any significant differences between the five age groups in terms of their evaluation of the effects of industry change, a series of One-Way ANOVA tests were carried out using the Bonferroni method. The significance level for the tests was set at 5%. The summary of the findings is summarised below (for the detailed results See Appendix 5.).

**DIMENSION**

**RESULT FROM ANOVA**

Job Security: No difference  
Career prospects: No difference  
Social status: Improved for the 26-35 age group while it worsened for the 56-65 age group.  
Physical environment: No difference  
Standard of living: No difference  
Control over work: No difference  
Working hours: No difference  
Job satisfaction: No difference  
Education/job match: No difference  
Income: No difference  
Overall change: No difference
B. Gender

The findings for the two gender groups are summarised in Table 5.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Female (n=202)</th>
<th>Male (n=149)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.64 Positive</td>
<td>2.47 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.57 Positive</td>
<td>2.70 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.66 Positive</td>
<td>2.72 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.35 Positive</td>
<td>2.24 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.48 Positive</td>
<td>2.37 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.44 Positive</td>
<td>2.27 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.87 Positive</td>
<td>2.81 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.19 Positive</td>
<td>2.31 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>2.63 Positive</td>
<td>2.85 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.37 Positive</td>
<td>2.32 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.52 Positive</td>
<td>2.51 Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.14 Impact of mobility by gender

Table 5.14 indicates that there is little difference between the two gender groups. The computed values for the overall change are nearly identical, with 2.52 for the female sub-sample and 2.51 for the male sub-sample. The largest improvement reported by the female respondents was for the job satisfaction dimension, whereas for their male counterparts, the physical environment had that largest improvement. The least improvement was reported for women on working hours, while for men on the education/job match.

In order to establish whether there were any statistically significant differences between the two gender groups in terms of their evaluation of the effects of the industry change, a series of t-tests was carried out. The summary of the findings is summarised as follows (for detailed results See Appendix 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>RESULT FROM t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work:</td>
<td>Improved slightly more for men than for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match:</td>
<td>Improved slightly more for women than for men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Education

The splitting of the sample into sub-samples according to level of education was expected to result in groups whose view on the impact of mobility would differ. It was hypothesised that two groups, one with the lowest level of education and the other with the highest one, would experience a worsening position. The findings are summarised in Table 5.15 which show the change dimensions by level of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Less than primary school (n=4)</th>
<th>Primary school (n=34)</th>
<th>Secondary school (n=221)</th>
<th>Higher education (n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
<td>3.1 Negative</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>3.3 Negative</td>
<td>3 No change</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.88 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 Impact of mobility by level of education

As seen in Table 5.15, the hypothesis was largely justified for the lower end of the education scale but not supported for those with higher education. Those with or without primary school education reported two negative changes (social status and career prospects) and no change for six items. With only one 'no change' item (working hours), those with higher education did enjoy a general positive change but the conspicuous winners are those with secondary school education who reported positive change for every dimension.
In order to establish whether there were statistically significant differences between the four educational groups, a series of One-Way ANOVA tests were carried out for the 11 change variables using the Bonferroni method. The significance level for the tests was set at 5%. The summary of the findings is summarised below (for the detailed results see Appendix 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>RESULT FROM ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects:</td>
<td>Improved for those with higher and secondary education, while the prospects did not change for those with primary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status:</td>
<td>Improved more for those with higher education than for those with primary school education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Geographical location

Given the differences in economic development, unemployment situation and relative prosperity of industries, differences across the four regions were expected. More specifically, it is well documented that people working in the capital, Budapest, are generally in the best position to survive the economic transition, while those in the Northern part of the country are the most disadvantaged. The results for the four geographical sub-samples are shown in Table 5.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Budapest (n=195)</th>
<th>Western Hungary (n=74)</th>
<th>Lake Balaton (n=44)</th>
<th>Northern Hungary (n=38)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>3.1 Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>3.0 No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.16 Impact of mobility by geographical location

As Table 5.16 shows there is a clear difference between the Northern Hungarian sub-sample and the rest of the sample. While the first three regions reported only positive changes, the experience of those in Northern Hungary is considerably less favourable. Their living standard had worsened and career prospects, social status and income did not change.
In order to establish whether there were any statistically significant differences between the four regions in terms of the evaluation of the change variables, a series of One-Way-ANOVA tests has been carried out using the Bonferroni method. The significance level for the test was set at 5%. The summary of the findings is summarised below (for the detailed results See Appendix 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>RESULT FROM ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects:</td>
<td>Those living in Budapest reported a more positive change than those in northern Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment:</td>
<td>Improved least for those living in northern Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living:</td>
<td>Worsened for those living in northern Hungary while the other three groups reported an improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work:</td>
<td>Improved less for those in northern Hungary compared to those in Budapest and by Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balaton</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction:</td>
<td>Improved less for those in northern Hungary than for those in western Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>Slightly worsened for those in northern Hungary while it improved for those in the three other regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change:</td>
<td>Improved less for those living in northern Hungary than for those in the three other regions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**E. Industry prior to tourism**

Given the differences in employment conditions across the industries, the move into tourism is likely to have varying impacts on the working and living conditions of the respondents, depending on which industry they came from.

The findings for the 13 sub-groups are summarised in Table 5.17. Without attempting to give an exhaustive account of the results, in the following only the most interesting aspects of data will be described.

The *overall change* ranges from 2.3 (most positive change) for those from public administration to 2.9 (least positive change) for their counterparts from finance.

Worsening dimensions have been reported by six groups. They were:

i. Agriculture - Job security
ii. Energy - Education/job match
iii. Construction - Working hours
iv. Transport - Working hours
v. Finance - Job security, Standard of living, Income
vi. Education - Education/job match

The largest number of dimensions with a negative impact was detected in the case of those coming from finance. This group is also of particular interest due to the fact that finance is on the top of the earnings list in the official statistics (see Table 5.4). As expected, the subjective evaluation of the change by this group shows a worsening position for both *income* and *living standard*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Manuf.</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Const.</th>
<th>Repair</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Constr.</th>
<th>Financ</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17: Impact of mobility by industry prior to tourism.
In order to establish whether there were statistically significant differences between the groups of respondents coming into tourism from different industries, a series of One-Way ANOVA-tests were conducted. The significance level for the test was set at 5%.

The summary of the findings is as follows (for detailed results See Appendix 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>RESULT FROM ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match:</td>
<td>Those who moved from education into tourism reported a worsening position on the education/job match variable. This differs significantly from those who came from trade; in their case the education/job match has improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Year of mobility

As proposed in Section 5.3.3.1, the time dimension of mobility has been used for sample split purposes. It was decided to use 1987 as the cut-off point, resulting in two sub-samples. The first sub-sample consists of those whose mobility occurred before 1987, while the second contains those who moved into tourism since 1987.

It was hypothesised that the two groups show differences when evaluating the impacts of the mobility. The findings are compiled in Table 5.18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Moved before 1987 (n=68)</th>
<th>Moved since 1987 (n=283)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.18 Impact of mobility by year of mobility

Table 5.18 shows both groups reporting positive impacts for all dimensions. The most favourable impact variables for both groups were the physical environment and job satisfaction.

In order to establish whether there were statistically significant differences in the evaluation of the change variables between those who moved into tourism before 1987 and those who moved after 1987, a t-test was carried out. The summary of the findings is summarised as follows (for detailed results See Appendix 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>RESULT FROM t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status:</td>
<td>Improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work:</td>
<td>Improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours:</td>
<td>Improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match:</td>
<td>Improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change:</td>
<td>Improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G. Employment status

The findings for the three groups are summarised in Table 5.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Employee (n=262)</th>
<th>Manager (n=65)</th>
<th>Entrepreneur (n=24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.9 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.8 Positive</td>
<td>3.1 Negative</td>
<td>3.2 Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.3 Positive</td>
<td>2.1 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>2.7 Positive</td>
<td>2.5 Positive</td>
<td>3.3 Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.2 Positive</td>
<td>1.9 Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
<td>2.4 Positive</td>
<td>2.6 Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.19 Impact of change by employment status

* Contains data on entrepreneurs only from the main sample

Table 5.19 shows that with a range of 2.4 to 2.6, the overall change is very similar across the three groups. Job satisfaction and the physical environment improved most significantly for the employee group, job satisfaction and career prospects for the managers and income for the entrepreneurs.

Working hours worsened for both the managers and the entrepreneurs. The most serious negative change discovered was the education/job variable by the entrepreneurs.

In order to test the hypothesis that statistically significant differences between the three groups can be found, a series of One-Way ANOVA-tests using the Bonferroni method were carried out. The significance level for the test has been set at 5%. The summary of the findings is summarised as follows (for detailed results See Appendix 5.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>RESULT FROM ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects:</td>
<td>Improved more for managers than for entrepreneurs and employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status:</td>
<td>Improved more for managers than for entrepreneurs and employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours:</td>
<td>Worsened for managers while slightly improved for employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match:</td>
<td>Worsened for entrepreneurs while it improved for two other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income:</td>
<td>Improved most significantly for the entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change:</td>
<td>No difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The examination of the change data by the explanatory variables revealed certain between-group differences. The findings are summarised in Table 5.20. A tick in a cell indicates that at least one statistically significant difference between the relevant sub-samples has been found for the relevant dimension by the relevant explanatory variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Industry from</th>
<th>Year of mobility</th>
<th>Employm. status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.20 Effects of explanatory variables on the 11 dimensions

☑: statistically significant effect on the dimension

Table 5.20 shows that, as expected, despite the overall positive evaluation of the impacts of mobility by the total sample, there is considerable variation within the data set. This can be best illustrated by the fact that every explanatory variable examined had an effect at least on one dimension. The greatest amount of variance was detected between the four geographical regions. The time of the mobility and the present employment status also seem to affect how the impacts were appraised. Surprisingly, the least difference has been found by age and between groups coming from different industries. What is even more conspicuous is that this explanatory variable has no effect on the income or the living standard change.
Given the assertion that there would be insecurity in times of transition, it is surprising that no difference was found between any groups for the job security dimension. The education/job match dimension shows variations by four explanatory variables.

Differences in the overall change have been found between the geographical locations and the two groups set by the time of the mobility.

Having detected the largest number of dimensional differences, the following three explanatory variables have been selected for further scrutiny: (1) Location, (2) Year of mobility and (3) Employment status. The analysis will be based on variables with statistically significant differences over the relevant sub-samples.

In terms of the locational variable, the direction of difference is very clear. Respondents in the north-eastern part of Hungary are in the worst position in terms of the change in their physical environment, living standard, income, and the overall change compared to the respondents from the other three regions. The job satisfaction change is less favourable for them that for the group in the Western part of the country, while their control over work improved less than that for those living in Budapest and in the lake Balaton region. And finally, their career prospects improved less than that of those in Budapest.

The time of the mobility is of a particular concern here. Did those who moved into tourism later evaluate the impacts more favourably than those who moved into the industry earlier? The data shows that those who moved since 1987 have reported a less positive change on their social status, control over work, working hours, education/job match and even on the overall change than their counterparts whose mobility occurred before 1987.
Using the **employment status** variable as the sample split, the findings are as follows. The **career prospects** and the **social status** improved most for the managers. The change in **working hours** differs between managers and employees; while the hours have slightly improved for employees, there is a worsening impact on this dimension for the managers. The entrepreneurs experienced a different **education/job match** change from the other two groups. While the match for them has slightly worsened, the direction of the change for the match variable is positive for both managers and employees. And finally, as expected, entrepreneurs reported the most positive change in terms of their **income**.

### 5.3.4.4 Summary

*Section 5.3.4* was concerned with the subjective evaluation of the impacts of mobility by the respondents. In order to facilitate the understanding of the characteristics of the data, the major findings have been summarised and are presented as follows:

**Major findings:**
- The data suggests an overall contentment with the impacts of mobility.
- Behind the general positive evaluation, there are differences amongst the sub-samples.
- For the total sample **job satisfaction** improved most while **working hours** showed the least improvement.
- Those with secondary education enjoyed a positive change for all 11 dimensions, while those with a maximum of primary school education reported mixed impacts.
- Respondents in the north-eastern part of Hungary got less well off than the rest of the sample.
- Which industry the respondents moved into tourism from affected only the education/job match.
- Surprisingly little difference was found between the different age groups.
• Those who moved into tourism since 1987 evaluated the changes less favourably than those whose mobility occurred before 1987.

• The education/job match worsened for the entrepreneurs while it improved for both managers and employees.

So far the study has found some strong features in the patterns of mobility (See Section 5.3.3) but the findings on the impacts of change are less emphatic and in general not what was expected according to the picture of economic transition.
5.3.5 Findings on the motivation for mobility into tourism

5.3.5.1 Introduction

Having examined the pattern of inter-sector mobility and the effect of the change, it is appropriate to investigate the motives for moving into the tourism industry. It was hypothesised that behind the decisions there is an underlying motivational structure which can be detected by using appropriate statistical methods. In line with the discussion in Chapter 4., four motivational orientations are proposed which are:

(1) Instrumental utility orientation
Tourism employment is perceived as a means to the achievement of economic advancement.

(2) Positive commitment to tourism
Tourism employment is favoured for the intrinsic value of the jobs it offers, for example their image, the pleasant surrounding, the variety of tasks they involve, the potential for job satisfaction.

(3) Refugee orientation
Tourism employment offers an escape route from a declining industry, an unpleasant job or even unemployment. For some tourism is the ‘least worst’ option whereas for others it is seen as an opportunity for improvement. Tourism is seen as a contingency or convenience.

(4) Entrepreneurial orientation
Tourism employment is appreciated for its suitability for one’s private business or at least is seen as a potential avenue towards entrepreneurship.
The methodology assigned particular statements to represent the nominated orientations.

The proposed motivational orientations and the relevant statements are listed in Table 5.21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Proposed motivational orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I earned too little in my previous job.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wanted better working conditions.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I wanted an interesting job.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My family had a business in tourism.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was unemployed and needed a job.</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I wanted to travel more.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I wanted to use my language skills.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I needed extra money quickly.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The industry I worked in before was declining.</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I wanted an appropriate income.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I wanted a job that suited my education.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I wanted to leave my previous job.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I could not get a job elsewhere.</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualifications.</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to try different jobs.</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I wanted to establish my own business.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.</td>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.21 Thirty statements and the proposed motivational orientations
It is important to recognise that the four dimensions are not thought to be mutually exclusive, therefore it is possible that they could be applied in combinations. For example, someone who moved into tourism in order to earn more money than they did before, might well see it as an opportunity to set up a private business - in which case the instrumental utility orientation is applied together with the entrepreneurial one. Alternatively, there is no reason why the instrumental utility orientation could not be paralleled with a positive commitment to the industry. However, it is hypothesised that subjects would display a dominant orientation.

In a search for the proposed motivational structure, the data was first subjected to factor analysis. This was followed by the examination of how the structure was applied by the respondents and to this end the factor correlation matrix has been examined. Having established differential application of factors, the sample was re-formed into groups according to dominant factors.

5.3.5.2 Presentation of raw data (n=351)

The respondents were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale the degree of their agreement or disagreement with the 30 statements describing possible motives for taking up a job in the tourism industry. The coding of the scale was carried out in the following way: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree. Consequently, when interpreting the results, higher values imply agreement whereas lower values indicate disagreement.
In order to examine their relative importance, the 30 statements have been ranked by their mean score. The means and standard deviations (SD) for the 30 statements are shown in Table 5.22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I wanted an interesting job.</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.</td>
<td>3.880</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wanted better working conditions.</td>
<td>3.657</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I wanted an appropriate income.</td>
<td>3.628</td>
<td>0.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to try different jobs.</td>
<td>3.601</td>
<td>0.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.</td>
<td>3.570</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.</td>
<td>3.506</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.</td>
<td>3.474</td>
<td>0.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I wanted a job that suited my education.</td>
<td>3.409</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I wanted to leave my previous job.</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I wanted to use my language skills.</td>
<td>3.337</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.</td>
<td>3.243</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I earned too little in my previous job.</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>1.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I saw good business opportunities in tourism.</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I wanted to travel more.</td>
<td>2.997</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.</td>
<td>2.994</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.</td>
<td>2.970</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.</td>
<td>2.965</td>
<td>0.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The industry I worked in before was declining.</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>1.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>1.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I needed extra money quickly.</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.</td>
<td>2.557</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I wanted to establish my own business.</td>
<td>2.461</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.</td>
<td>2.413</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I could not get a job elsewhere.</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>0.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualifications.</td>
<td>2.257</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My family had a business in tourism</td>
<td>2.234</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was unemployed and needed a job.</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.22 Means and standard deviations for the 30 statements

*based on pairwise deletion of cases with missing values*
This level of analysis suggests a strong preference for the positive orientation and the instrumental orientation towards tourism employment. However, preferences and priorities are not the sole basis of the structure of motives and, therefore, in order to understand the underlying structure, the data was submitted to factor analysis.

5.3.5.3 Factor analysis

5.3.5.3.1 Introduction

Factor analysis was applied to detect any underlying structures in the data. It was hoped that the emerging factors would justify the hypothesised four dimensional structure of the motivational orientations. The analysis included all the 30 statements for the 351 respondents.

The discussion of the findings will be presented in the following sequence:

i. Examination of the factor model adequacy for the data.

ii. Presentation of the resultant factors.

iii. Having established the underlying factor structure, the dynamics of factor usage will be investigated.

iv. And finally, the sample will be re-formed into groups based on dominant factor usage.
5.3.5.3.2 Examination of factor model adequacy

A. Inter-item correlation (Pearson Product-Moment Correlation)

The first step in the examination of the factor model adequacy was to examine the inter-item correlation matrix because without satisfactory correlation no factor solution can be expected. To this end, the inter-item correlation was regarded as a preliminary indication of the factor model adequacy where a high correlation indicates the existence of common factors.

Table 5.23 presents the inter-item correlation matrix.
Table 5.23 inter-item correlation matrix.
The strongest correlation found was $r = 0.61$ between variables 17 and 30. The two variables are as follows:

17: “I wanted to achieve an appropriate income”
30: “I wanted to achieve a better living standard”

On the basis of the proposed motivational structure, both variables represent an instrumental utility orientation and are, therefore, expected to correlate with each other. The fact that they show the highest correlation indicates the extent of relatedness between income and living standard improvement in the minds of the subjects.

Six items were found to be correlated at the 0.5 level. The variable pairs and the relevant correlation coefficients are as follows:

14: “I saw good business opportunities in tourism.”
22: “I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.”
$r = 0.56$

5: “Tourism offered good earning opportunities.”
10: “I saw tourism as a profitable industry.”
$r = 0.55$

7: “My family had a business in tourism.”
8: “I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.”
$r = 0.52$

12: “I wanted to travel more.”
13: “I wanted to use my language skills.”
$r = 0.52$
3: "I needed extra income in order to improve my living standard."
15: "I needed extra money quickly."
\[ r = 0.52 \]

8: "I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business."
28: "I wanted to establish my own business."
\[ r = 0.51 \]

An examination of these correlations reveals that the statement pairs were in line with the hypothesised orientations. **Instrumental utility, entrepreneurial and positive orientation** are the ones represented here. The fact that the strongest correlation was along the hypothesised motivational dimensions is the first supporting evidence for the factor model adequacy.

The mean correlation between the items is 0.1322 which, given the relatively large sample size, is not insignificant. At the 5% level with a sample size of 300, the suggested significance level for the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient is 0.11 (Child, D 1970, p 40). The fact that the average correlation and the majority of the items falls above this threshold encourages the application of the factor model.

**B. Bartlett test of sphericity**

3086.8090, significance=0.0000

The large value and the small significance level indicate that, the hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix (i.e. that the diagonal values are 1 and the off-diagonal ones are 0), can be rejected. In other words, the measure supports the notion that the correlation matrix has significant correlation for at least some variables.
C. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy

According to Kaiser's (1974) classification, the computed value of 0.78747 for the KMO measure is close to the 'meritorious' category of 0.8 which supports the adequacy of the factor analysis method for the data.

D. Reliability analysis - Cronbach's alpha

The reliability of the scale was of great concern. To this end, first the relationship between the scale and the items have been examined, followed by an investigation of the internal consistency of the test. The scale-item results are summarised in Appendix 6.

The internal consistency of the test is proven by a relatively high Cronbach's alpha of 0.8139 and standardised alpha of 0.8204. When applying the split-half method, the Cronbach's alpha from the separate parts are as follows: Alpha for part 1 = 0.7557 and Alpha for part 2 = 0.6424. Although these values are highly dependent on the allocation of items to the two halves, they still provide a satisfactory justification of the reliability of the scale. This provides further support for the application of the factor model.

5.3.5.3.3 Methodology for the factor analysis

A. Justification of the factor extraction method

When selecting the factor extraction method, the relative merits of the two basic models (common factor analysis and principle component analysis) have been carefully examined. Principal component analysis has been selected for its ability to extract the minimum number of factors accounting for the maximum proportion of the variance in the data set (Hair, et al., 1995 p. 376).
It has to be noted here that the author is aware of the fact that the method results in 'hybrid' factors where (especially in the case of the later factors) the unique variance overlaps with the common variance (Child, 1970 p. 44). Nevertheless, this approach was taken because the nature of the factor analysis is exploratory.

B. Factor rotation

Orthogonal (Varimax)

The Varimax rotation method has been chosen for its ability to minimise the number of variables having a high loading on a factor and thus facilitating the interpretation of the resultant factors.

C. Missing values

A pairwise exclusion of missing values was applied.

D. Number of factors to be extracted

In order to arrive at an optimum number of factors, several suggested criteria have been examined. As none is known to provide a single reliable criterion for the determination of the number of factors to be extracted, it was decided to examine and contrast the implications of the various methods.

First of all, the number of factors could be selected prior to the analysis. In line with the research hypothesis, the number of factors could have been set at four. However, an a priori selection of four factors was felt to impose unjustifiable restrictions for the analysis and thus was rejected.
Secondly, Kaiser's criterion suggests that only factors with eigenvalues of greater than or equal to 1 be considered. The importance of the criterion for our data is supported on two counts: Firstly, it is considered to be particularly suitable for the principle component model and secondly the number of variables (30) falls within the region of 20-50, for which the criterion is most reliable (Child, 1970 p. 43).

The number of factors with a minimum eigenvalue of 1 is nine, suggesting that the factor extraction should stop after the 9th factor. (See Table 5.24).

Thirdly, according to the percentage of variance criterion, the number of factors to be extracted is related to the cumulative percentage of variance which they account for. The 9 factor solution suggested by Kaiser's criterion accounts for 63.9% of the variance. Following the suggestion of Hair et al (1995 p.378) regarding the acceptability of a 60% threshold in social sciences, the 9 factor solution seems to be justifiably supported. Table 5.24 displays the major properties of the nine factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 1</td>
<td>5.50864</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 2</td>
<td>3.40147</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 3</td>
<td>2.25554</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 4</td>
<td>1.88157</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 5</td>
<td>1.37529</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 6</td>
<td>1.29750</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 7</td>
<td>1.26734</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 8</td>
<td>1.13772</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 9</td>
<td>1.04044</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.24. The 9-factor solution
Another way to look at the problem is the application of the scree test which offers a visual solution to determine the number of factors to be extracted. The graph is obtained by plotting the eigenvalues against the number of factors in the order of their extraction. Where the line first begins to straighten is the cut-off point, indicating the number of factors to be extracted. This is the point when the amount of unique variance begins to dominate the common variance structure. The scree plot is displayed in Figure 5.11.

![Factor Scree Plot](image)

**Figure 5.11 Scree plot**

In Figure 5.11 the line first straightens at the 5th factor, suggesting that five factors could be extracted. However, the five factors would only account for 48.1% of the variance. Given this low percentage and the general support for the nine-factor model, the five-factor model was rejected and the nine-factor model retained.

### 5.3.5.3.4 Findings from factor analysis

On the basis of the above mentioned criteria, factor analysis using the principal component method resulted in a 9 factor solution. The assignment of variables to factors has been facilitated by the simple structure of factor loadings, wherein every variable showed high loading on a solitary factor. The factor loadings are shown in Table 5.25; the shaded area indicates the assignment of variables to a factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATM17</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM30</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM1</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM5</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.202</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM10</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM3</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM13</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM11</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM12</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM21</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.165</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM6</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.241</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM29</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM14</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM28</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM22</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.228</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM2</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM9</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM23</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM24</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM8</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM7</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM19</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM16</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM26</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM18</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM4</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM20</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM15</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>-0.176</td>
<td>-0.430</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM25</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM27</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.25 Factor loadings following Varimax rotation - a 9 factor solution
The factor loadings in the shaded area range from 0.409 to 0.777. Using a rough but conservative criterion, for a sample size of 350, at 80% power and 5% significance level, the significance level for factor loadings is 0.30 (Hair et al., 1995 p. 385). As a consequence, all the utilised factor loadings can be regarded as significant. Although some of the remaining loadings in the rows do reach the significance level, they do not alter the uniform pattern of factor loadings.

In the shaded area, all but one factor loadings are positive. The only negative loading is carried by Variable 15 on Factor 8. The fact that Variable 20 has a positive loading on the same factor indicates the need for quick extra money (Variable 15) and the wish to leave the previous job (Variable 20). Both are motives which work in opposite directions.

**The naming of the factors**

The naming of the factors did not prove to be an arduous task, since it could be performed along the lines set by the original hypothesised motivational orientation structure. The first 8 factors showed clear association with the proposed structure, allowing naming after the proposed four orientations.

The factors and their names are shown in *Table 5.26*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 1</td>
<td>Instrumental utility 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 2</td>
<td>Positive 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 3</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 4</td>
<td>Refugee 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 5</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 6</td>
<td>Refugee 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 7</td>
<td>Positive 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 8</td>
<td>Instrumental utility 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR 9</td>
<td>The wanderer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.26 The named factors*
The factors and the relevant variables are listed below.

**Factor 1 - Instrumental utility 1**
1. I earned too little in my previous job.
3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.
5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.
10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.
17. I wanted an appropriate income.
30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.

**Factor 2 - Positive 1**
6. I wanted an interesting job.
11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.
12. I wanted to travel more.
13. I wanted to use my language skills.
21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.

**Factor 3 - Entrepreneurial 1**
2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.
22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.
28. I wanted to establish my own business.
29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.

**Factor 4 - Refugee 1**
9. I was unemployed and needed a job.
23. I could not get a job elsewhere.
24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualification.

**Factor 5 - Entrepreneurial 2**
7. My family had a business in tourism.
8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.

**Factor 6 - Refugee 2**
16. The industry I worked in before was declining.
19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.

**Factor 7 - Positive 2**
4. I wanted better working conditions.
18. I was looking for a job that suited my education.
26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.

**Factor 8 - Instrumental utility 2**
15. I needed extra money quickly.
20. I wanted to leave my previous job.

**Factor 9 - "The wanderer or drifter"**
25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.
27. I like to try different jobs.
Given the fact that each proposed motivational orientation is represented by two factors, serial numbers 1 and 2 were used for distinguishing purposes. For example, Factor 1 and Factor 8 both fit the category of instrumental utility orientation and were, therefore, named “Instrumental utility 1” and “Instrumental utility 2”, respectively. The naming and numbering of the remaining factors followed the same pattern.

The 9th factor did not conform with any of the proposed orientations but could be easily interpreted as a 'drifter' or 'wanderer' approach.

The factor analysis has largely justified the proposed model of motivational orientations in the study of labour mobility into tourism, but it also added a fifth dimension. The resultant five dimensions are, therefore, as follows:

(1) Instrumental utility orientation
(2) Positive commitment to tourism
(3) Refugee orientation
(4) Entrepreneurial orientation
(5) ‘Wanderer’ orientation

The factor analysis resulted in nine factors which were named. The nine factors represent five dimensions and, therefore, it can be concluded that the analysis confirmed the hypothesised underlying four dimensional structure but it added a fifth dimension to the proposed model. What follows now is an analysis of the application of the factor structure by the respondents.
5.3.5.3.5 Application of factor structure by subjects

The factor analysis shows that there is a structure but it does not show how the structure is applied. If it is accepted that the nine factors represent nine motivational orientations, the important question is how they are applied by the subjects. Is there any dominant motivation? Are the orientations alternatives? For example, does a positive orientation to tourism exclude an instrumental utility motivation? To answer these questions, it was necessary to recalculate the raw data based on the factorial distribution of questionnaire items from Question 5.1, and to compute the responses of each subject for each factor. This provides the data for answering the question of how the orientations interact.

The re-calculation was based on the fact that the factor analysis now allocated the 30 statements to the 9 factors (See Appendix 7). On that basis, by adding up the relevant raw scores for each factor for each subject, a new data set was produced. Every respondent now had a score on each of the factors. These computed scores on the nine factors were correlated to see how they associate. What is being accomplished here is a re-drawing of the original data in terms of the newly found sub-structure. Table 5.27 shows the correlation matrix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
<th>FACTOR 4</th>
<th>FACTOR 5</th>
<th>FACTOR 6</th>
<th>FACTOR 7</th>
<th>FACTOR 8</th>
<th>FACTOR 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility 1</td>
<td>0.4307</td>
<td>-0.2477</td>
<td>0.0731</td>
<td>0.1882</td>
<td>0.1151</td>
<td>0.2998</td>
<td>0.4158</td>
<td>0.1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility 2</td>
<td>0.2477</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2775</td>
<td>0.0731</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
<td>0.0948</td>
<td>0.3729</td>
<td>0.0787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive 1</td>
<td>0.2477</td>
<td>-0.1674</td>
<td>0.2376</td>
<td>0.2376</td>
<td>0.2024</td>
<td>-0.0721</td>
<td>0.1265</td>
<td>0.1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive 2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2376</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.2838</td>
<td>0.0518</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>0.1341</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrep 1</td>
<td>-0.1674</td>
<td>-0.2376</td>
<td>0.2838</td>
<td>0.2376</td>
<td>-0.0115</td>
<td>0.0518</td>
<td>0.1341</td>
<td>0.0103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuge 1</td>
<td>0.0731</td>
<td>0.6731</td>
<td>0.0948</td>
<td>0.6731</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrep 2</td>
<td>0.1882</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
<td>0.0948</td>
<td>0.3729</td>
<td>0.2602</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee 2</td>
<td>0.1151</td>
<td>0.0331</td>
<td>0.0948</td>
<td>0.3729</td>
<td>0.2602</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility 2</td>
<td>0.2988</td>
<td>0.3729</td>
<td>0.1712</td>
<td>0.1265</td>
<td>0.1341</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility 2</td>
<td>0.4158</td>
<td>0.3729</td>
<td>0.1712</td>
<td>0.1265</td>
<td>0.1341</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanderer</td>
<td>0.0787</td>
<td>0.2277</td>
<td>0.1738</td>
<td>0.1265</td>
<td>0.1341</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.27 Correlation matrix based on the calculated factor scores for each subject.
In Table 5.27 a lack of correlation is interpreted as an indication that the factors were applied independently, while a negative correlation would suggest that the factors were alternatives. Positive correlation would indicate that the factors work together.

It would be expected that factors representing the same motivational orientation be most closely related, therefore it is plausible to expect that factor pairs like Instrumental Utility 1 - Instrumental Utility 2, Entrepreneurial 1 - Entrepreneurial 2 and Positive 1 - Positive 2 and Refugee 1 - Refugee 2 show the strongest correlation.

As anticipated, the highest correlations between factors were found along the above lines. They are:

i. Entrepreneurial 1 - Entrepreneurial 2
   \[ r = 0.4358 \]

ii. Instrumental Utility 1 - Instrumental Utility 2
   \[ r = 0.4158 \]

iii. Positive 1 - Positive 2
    \[ r = 0.3729 \]

In addition to these, there were also significant correlations across orientational dimensions. This supports the thesis that certain motivational orientations work together. The correlations found were:

i. Entrepreneurial 1 - Instrumental Utility 1
   \[ r = 0.4307 \]

ii. Entrepreneurial 1 - Instrumental Utility 2
    \[ r = 0.3864 \]
What this pattern indicates is the considerable degree of association between the entrepreneurial and Instrumental utility orientations indicating the opportunistic view of entrepreneurship.

In addition to the strong positive correlations, negative ones showing opposite movements between the factors, were also found:

i. Refugee 1-Positive 1
   \[ r = -0.1674 \]

ii. Refugee 1-Positive 2
    \[ r = -0.0721 \]

iii. Refugee 2 - Entrepreneurial 2
    \[ r = -0.0115 \]

The negative correlation between the Refugee 1 factor and the two Positive and the one Entrepreneurial factor can be interpreted as an indication of the conceptual distance between the refugee orientation from the positive and the entrepreneurial orientations.

Having examined the factor structure, the question was how the factor structure was applied. To this end, the raw data was re-calculated. The calculation was based on the fact that the factor analysis has allocated the 30 statements to the 9 factors. On this basis, by adding up the relevant scores for each factor for each subject, a new data set was produced. Every respondent has a score on each of the 9 factors. The scores on the 9 factors were then ranked and the inter quartile range was computed. We defined 'factor usage' as a score being in the top 25%, which implies that a factor is 'in use' by an individual. This interpretation is arbitrary but rational.
In the context of factor usage, the first question which naturally arises is how many factors did the respondents use. Did they use a number of factors or only one or two? To answer this question, the number of factor scores falling above the 25% cut off point have been computed for every respondent.

It was found that 93 respondents (26.5% of the sample) did not use any factors, while the remaining 258 subjects used 1 to 6 factors. Table 5.28 shows the frequency of single and multiple factor usage for the 258 subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor usage</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of factor using sample (n=258)%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 factor</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>47.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 factors</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 factors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 factors</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 factors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 factors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.28 The intensity of factor usage by the respondents (n=258)

*Table 5.28 shows that nearly 50% of the factor-using sample is actually using a single factor. This is an important finding. What is also conspicuous here is the high occurrence of single and double factor usage in the sample, accounting for 73.65% (47.29% + 26.36%) of all factor usage. The question which naturally arises here is whether this conspicuous preference for a simple structure is supported by the existence of a few dominant factors. To this end, the single factor using groups were further examined.*
Table 5.29 shows the factor pattern of the first group using a single factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of sample (n=122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instrumental utility 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Entrepreneurial 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Refugee 1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Entrepreneurial 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Refugee 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Positive 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instrumental utility 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The wanderer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.29 The pattern of single factor usage

Table 5.29 shows that Refugee 1 factor is the most dominant single factor followed by Factor 9 which describes a 'Wanderer' or 'Drifter' approach by the respondent.

Given the fact that every motivational orientation is represented by two factors, the above table can be summarised by adding up the frequencies for factors representing the same motivational orientation. For example, 38 respondents used the Refugee 1 factor while Refugee 2 was used by 5 subjects, resulting in 43 people who used a Refugee factor. Table 5.30 shows the rearranged frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivational orientation usage</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of sample (n=122)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental utility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wanderer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.30 Single motivational orientation usage (summarised)
Table 5.30 shows that the most frequently used single motivational orientation was the Refugee, followed by the Positive and the Wanderer orientations. Instrumental utility and Entrepreneurial orientations were used by the smallest proportions of respondents.

The single usage of a motivational orientation can be interpreted as a strong influence on the decision to move into tourism. The question which naturally arises here is whether people with clearly different motivational orientations differ from each other in this respect. To answer this question, the five groups formed by single usage of motivational orientation have been compared based on two of the study's main variables:

i. The industry they came from and
ii. The evaluation of the impact of the change brought about by the move into tourism.

Table 5.31 summarises the information on the pre-tourism industry for the five groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry from</th>
<th>Instrumental utility (n=14)</th>
<th>Positive (n=28)</th>
<th>Entrepr. (n=9)</th>
<th>Refugee (n=43)</th>
<th>'Wanderer' (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved into tourism before 1987</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.31 Industry prior to tourism for the five single motivational groups (n=122)
Table 5.31 demonstrates a fairly random distribution of pre-tourism industries along the five groups. In order to establish whether there was sufficient statistical evidence to indicate the association between the last industry before tourism and the single motivational orientation, a Chi-Square Test would have been helpful. However, given the high number of cells with a value below 5, the test was regarded impractical and was therefore not carried out.

Table 5.32 summarises the data on the evaluation of the impact of the job change for the five groups using single motivational orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Instrumental utility (n=14)</th>
<th>Positive (n=28)</th>
<th>Entrepr. (n=9)</th>
<th>Refugee (n=43)</th>
<th>The wanderer (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.5714</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>2.7442</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.1786</td>
<td>2.5556</td>
<td>2.7209</td>
<td>2.6786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.7857</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>2.8095</td>
<td>2.8929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.6429</td>
<td>2.1429</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>2.3721</td>
<td>2.3214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.5357</td>
<td>2.8889</td>
<td>2.6829</td>
<td>2.6071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.0370</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>2.6977</td>
<td>2.3929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>2.7500</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>2.7442</td>
<td>3.0357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.3571</td>
<td>1.8571</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>2.3929</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
<td>2.7073</td>
<td>2.8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2.1429</td>
<td>2.6296</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.6279</td>
<td>2.5357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.6143</td>
<td>2.3560</td>
<td>2.7667</td>
<td>2.6499</td>
<td>2.5857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.32 Impact of mobility by single motivational orientation
In order to establish whether statistically significant differences exist between the five groups, a series of ONE-WAY ANOVA analysis using the Bonferroni test has been conducted. The analysis was set at 5% significant level. The findings are summarised in Table 5.33 where a ‘✓’ shows when statistically significant difference between at least two groups have been found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Result from One-Way ANOVA test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.33 One-Way ANOVA on change items for the five groups using single motivational orientation

Table 5.33 shows that the statistical analysis found only two dimensions which show the effect of the sample split by the use of single motivational orientation. These were the career prospects and the control over work.

The analysis provided a further evidence of the uniformity of the change data. The major conclusion here is that whatever the single motivation for moving into tourism, the subjective evaluation of the impact of the change does not vary significantly.
5.3.5.4 Summary

Section 5.3.5 was concerned with the examination of the motivations behind the mobility decisions. The findings provide a vital piece of information to the overall picture gained by the present study. The most important findings from this data set are summarised as follows:

- The factor analysis confirmed the existence of a motivational model but added a fifth dimension to it. The resultant five dimensions are:
  
  (1) Instrumental utility orientation
  (2) Positive commitment to tourism
  (3) Refugee orientation
  (4) Entrepreneurial orientation
  (5) ‘Wanderer’ orientation

- The factor structure is shown to be ‘operative’ by the fact that 73.65% of the factor-using sample used one or two factors only.

- The operationalisation of the factor structure suggests that the theme of dominant factor, combined factors and factors as alternatives is substantiated by the evidence. In this respect, instrumental utility and entrepreneurial orientations work together whilst the refugee and positive orientations appear to be alternatives

- Refugee, positive and ‘wanderer’ factors were the most prominent findings
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Chapter 6.

Findings 2.

6.1 Introduction

Chapter 5. presented the first part of the findings from the primary data, based on information gained from tourism managers and employees. What follows in Chapter 6. is the presentation of the findings from the entrepreneurial sample.

The research instrument used for the collection of the entrepreneurial data is identical to that applied for the main survey with the only difference being the inclusion of a section specifically designed to explore certain aspects of business establishment in tourism.

Similarly to Chapter 5., findings will be presented in the following order:

i. Description of the sample

ii. Description and analysis of the patterns of mobility

iii. Analysis of the evaluation of change

iv. Analysis of the motivational data in respect of tourism employment

It has to be pointed out at this point that the analysis of the entrepreneurial sample was constrained by the sample size, and that for that reason certain types of analysis used in the analysis of the main sample could not be applied here.
6.2 The sample

6.2.1 Sample size

The sample contains information from 42 tourism entrepreneurs. This has been achieved by using 24 questionnaires from the main sample and adding a further 18 questionnaires obtained through the postal survey targeted specifically at tourism entrepreneurs.

6.2.2 Sample characteristics

Age distribution and gender

Age distribution

The 5 age groups used in the research instrument were: (1) 16-25, (2) 26-35, (3) 36-45, (4) 46-55, (5) 56-65. The age distribution of the sample is shown in Figure 6.1.

![Figure 6.1 The age distribution of the sample (n=42)](image)

As seen from Figure 6.1, the 36-45 age group is the mode, followed by the 26-35 and then the 46-55 age categories. Using class middle points in the calculation, the average age was computed at 40.48.

Gender

Representing 69% of the respondents, the sample is dominated by the male gender.
Educational level and tourism qualification

The four categories used for the classification of the educational background of the sample are: (1) Uncompleted primary, (2) Primary, (3) Secondary and (4) Higher education. The distribution of the 4 categories in the sample is shown in Figure 6.2.

![Figure 6.2 Educational level of sample (n=42)](image.png)

The dominance of secondary and higher education within the sample is shown clearly in Figure 6.2. The 38 respondents in these two groups account for 90.5% of the sample but what is even more conspicuous is the high proportion (47.6%) of the respondents with higher education.

Tourism qualifications

Despite the generally high level of education, it was expected that only a small proportion of the sample would possess specific tourism related qualifications. With 75.6% of the respondents devoid of formal tourism qualification, the hypothesis was largely justified.

Foreign language skills

The majority (61%) of the entrepreneurs speak at least one foreign language.
Tourism sectors

Similarly to the main survey, the entrepreneurial sample could not be stratified to the actual distribution of the tourism sectors in the economy. The representation of tourism sectors in the sample is shown in Figure 6.3.

![Figure 6.3 Representation of tourism sectors in the sample (n=42)](image)

Figure 6.3 shows, that similar to the main survey, the sample is characterised by a high representation of the accommodation sector. Accounting for 38.1% of the sample, the guest house sector is the largest one within the sample. The transport sector (23.8%) comprises the taxi drivers. The remaining tourism sectors are all represented in the sample, with a share ranging from 7.1% to 9.5%.
Establishment size

The five categories used for the identification of establishment size were as follows: (1) Less than 11 employees, (2) 11-20 employees, (3) 21-50 employees, (4) 51-300 employees and (5) More than 300 employees. The distribution of the establishment size categories are summarised in Figure 6.4.

![Figure 6.4 Establishment size (n=42)](image)

As seen from Figure 6.4, the sample is dominated (83.8%) by small businesses employing less than 11 people. The representation of medium and large enterprises remains low.
Geographical location

The data collection has been carried out in the same four locations as in the case of the main survey. The locations were as follows: (1) Budapest, (2) Western Hungary, (3) Lake Balaton and, finally, (4) Northern Hungary. The distribution of the four regions in the sample is shown in Figure 6.5.

![Figure 6.5 Geographical distribution of sample (n=42)](image)

As seen from Figure 6.5, with 59% of the sample coming from Budapest, the dominance of the capital as the economic and tourism centre of the country is reflected in the sample. The remaining 41% of the sample is from the three other parts of the country.
6.3. Findings on mobility patterns

6.3.1 Introduction

The inter-sector mobility pattern of tourism entrepreneurs has been traced back to the same 10 year period spanning from 1987 to 1996, as in the case of the main sample. One respondent moved into tourism before this period and one omitted the relevant section of the questionnaire. As a result, the analysis of inter-sector mobility for the entrepreneurial sample is based on data from 40 respondents.

6.3.2 Inter-sector mobility - industry prior to tourism (n=40)

As described in Section 5.3.3.2, the main survey identified a wide range of industries providing workers for tourism. For that sample, with the exception of mining, the spectrum of industries embraced the whole economy. Similar findings were expected for the entrepreneurial sample. In order to facilitate the comparison, the first column of Table 6.1 reproduces the findings for the main sample, while the second column contains the comparable findings for the entrepreneurs. The figures in the table are percentages, showing the percentage of respondents coming into tourism from the given industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Main sample (n=283) (%)*</th>
<th>Entrepreneurs (n=40) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 Industry prior to tourism for both samples (n=283), (n=40)

* The main sample contains 24 entrepreneurs who are also included in the entrepreneurial sample.
As seen from Table 6.1, the hypothesis concerning the **wide range of industries** prior to tourism has been justified when, similarly to the main sample, with the exception of the mining industry, respondents came from all sectors of the economy.

The actual distribution of industries shows slight differences between the two samples. Whilst the largest proportion of respondents in the **main sample** moved from trade (20.85%), followed by the 'other' category (13.78) and then the manufacturing industry (12.01), for the **entrepreneurial sample**, the largest proportion of entrepreneurs came from trade (15%), education (15%) and the 'other' category (15%). Repair (2.5%), finance (2.5%), public administration (2.5%) and health care (2.5%) provided the least number of entrepreneurs.

Having described the range of industries preceding tourism, what follows next is the examination of the relationship between the pre-tourism industry and the current tourism sector. In order to establish a possible link between a pre-tourism industry and a tourism sector, a mobility matrix has been compiled. The findings are shown in **Table 6.2**.

It has to be pointed out here, that given the relatively small sample size, drawing major conclusions from **Table 6.2** would be a mistake. As a consequence, the proportions are to be regarded as indicative and no inference between the sample and the population is to be made.
The rows in the table show the range of industries prior to tourism, while the columns contain the tourism sectors. The cells show the number of entrepreneurs coming from a particular industry and setting up a business in the given tourism sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Guest house</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Cafe</th>
<th>Travel agent</th>
<th>Transp.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufact.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Industry-tourism sector route (n=40)

*Table 6.2* depicts that the accommodation sector is represented in the sample by the guest house owners who, with the exception of health care and unemployment, came from all sectors of the economy. Represented by taxi drivers, the transport sector of the tourism industry seems to attract entrepreneurs with a wide range of industry experience.

Given the traditional mobility pattern from agriculture into tourism, it was of interest to the study whether there were any entrepreneurs who exchanged their business or job in agriculture for a business in tourism. The sample contains two such entrepreneurs; one who set up a guest house and the other who started a restaurant business.
Respondents from trade, education and the transport sector seem to have been able to establish businesses in the widest range of tourism sectors, while other sectors, such as construction, repair, health care, finance and public administration seem to have channelled people to a single tourism sector.

6.3.3 Year of mobility into tourism (n=40)
Based on the experience from the main sample, a fairly even distribution of the year of mobility was expected. The findings justify this hypothesis.

The year of mobility into tourism shows an even distribution for the entrepreneurial sample, with respondent numbers per year ranging from 2 (5.1%) in 1994 to 7 (17.9%) in 1991. Although the range is wide in percentage terms, the small numbers per year hampers the justification for drawing major conclusions from this data.

6.3.4 Incidence of industry changes during the period of 1987-1996 (n=40)
The majority of the entrepreneurs (78%) reported only one industry change during the period, while 17.1% changed industries twice and 2.4% three times. The finding would suggest a low role for the ‘wanderer’ motivational orientation.
6.3.5 Employment status mobility

The aim here is to investigate whether there is a specific characteristic that entrepreneurship in tourism was preceded by entrepreneurial experience in another industry or that tourism provided a venue toward entrepreneurship for those coming from an employment situation. Table 6.3 shows the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Number of resp.</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur → entrepreneur</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager → entrepreneur</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee → entrepreneur</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3 Change in employment status (n=42)

As seen in Table 6.3, 50% of the respondents were entrepreneurs before moving into tourism. For them, moving into tourism meant transferring business capital from another industry into tourism. This is an interesting finding, as it implies the comparative attractiveness of tourism for private business. The question which arises here is, to what extent did the previous non-tourism business contribute to the establishment of the present tourism business. The question will be examined in Section 6.6.

19.05% of the sample worked as managers and 21.43% as employees prior to setting up a tourism business. In their cases tourism provided an avenue for the establishment of private business.
6.4 Findings on the evaluation of the impact of change brought about by the mobility

6.4.1 Introduction

Similarly to Chapter 5, having examined the mobility data, the logical sequence of the presentation of the findings leads to the findings on the direction and magnitude of change which occurred as a result of mobility into tourism. The data collection for entrepreneurs was identical to that for the main sample, but for the sake of clarity, the main points will be summarised in the followings.

The ten examined dimensions were as follows:

(1) Job security
(2) Career prospects
(3) Social status
(4) Physical environment
(5) Standard of living
(6) Control over work
(7) Working hours
(8) Job satisfaction
(9) Compatibility between education and skills required by the job in tourism
(10) Income.

The ten dimensions have been evaluated by the respondents on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from: (1) “Significantly improved” to (5) “Significantly worsened”.

The average score over the ten dimensions was also calculated, resulting in an additional variable termed as:

(11) Overall change.
6.4.2 Findings

Before commencing with the presentation of the findings for entrepreneurs, it would be worthwhile summarising the major findings for the main sample. With a mean of 2.5, the overall change was computed to be positive, as it also was over the other 10 dimensions. The largest improvement was reported on the job satisfaction variable (mean = 2.2), followed by the physical environment (mean = 2.3). The least improvement was found for the working hours dimension (mean = 2.8).

In case of the entrepreneurial sample, slightly different results were expected. Control over work and career prospects were suspected to be improved most, while a worsening position was anticipated for the working hours. The findings are summarised in Table 6.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change dimension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Valid cases (n)</th>
<th>Direction of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/job match</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall change</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 Means and standard deviations for the 11 dimensions

As seen from Table 6.4, the overall change has been calculated at 2.4 which indicates a general contentment with the impacts of the mobility.
Although most of the dimensions have been noted as improving, one dimension has worsened and another did not change. As expected, the working hours variable has worsened (3.2) for the entrepreneurs, while control over work did improve (2.0).

No change was reported on the education/job match variable. This finding differs from what was found in the main sample, in which the entrepreneurial sub-sample indicated a negative change.

The largest improvement has been declared for income (1.7), followed by standard of living (1.9), while the least improvement was recorded on the job security dimension (2.7).

Given the significant rise in income and improvement in living standard, the question which naturally arises here is the degree of salience of the instrumental utility consideration in the mobility decision for entrepreneurs. This will be examined in Section 6.5.2.
6.5 Motivation

6.5.1 Introduction

Having examined the pattern of inter-sector mobility and the effect of the industry change for the entrepreneurs, what follows now is the investigation of the motives for joining the tourism industry.

Although factor analysis will not be carried out for this data, the suggested motivational orientational model will be used in the interpretation of the data.

Before looking at the table it is worthwhile re-examining the scale and its coding. The respondents have been asked to state on a 5-point Likert scale the degree of their agreement or disagreement with the 30 statements which describe possible motives for joining the tourism industry. The coding of the scale was as follows: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly agree. Consequently, when interpreting the results, higher averages imply agreement while lower mean values indicate disagreement.
6.5.2 Findings

The major concern of the analysis here was to establish the degree of salience of the 30 statements in the decision to establish a tourism business. To this end, the mean values and standard deviation (SD) for the 30 statements have been calculated. Table 6.5 shows the 30 statements in their declining rank order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I wanted to establish my own business.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I saw good business opportunities in tourism.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I wanted an appropriate income.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I wanted an interesting job.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to try different jobs.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wanted better working conditions.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I earned too little in my previous job.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I wanted to leave my previous job.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I wanted to use my language skills.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I wanted to travel more.</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The industry I was working in before was declining.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I wanted a job that suited my education.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I needed extra money quickly.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualification.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My family had a business in tourism.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I could not get a job elsewhere.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was unemployed and needed a job.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 Means and standard deviations for the 30 statements
With the highest mean of 4.2, the statement 'I wanted to achieve a better standard of living' is on the top of the list, followed by 'Tourism offered good earning opportunities', 'I saw tourism as a profitable industry' and 'I wanted to establish my own business'.

With the lowest mean of 1.9, statement 'I was unemployed and needed a job' received the highest level of disagreement.

When interpreting the findings in the light of the motivational orientational model, the ranking of the statements indicate an 'instrumental utility', 'entrepreneurial' and 'positive' orientation by the sample. The 'refugee' and 'wanderer' related statements were mostly disagreed with.
6.6 Skill and capital acquisition for tourism entrepreneurship

6.6.1 Introduction

The last section of the questionnaire contained questions specifically for the entrepreneurs. The questions were aimed at examining certain aspects of business establishment in tourism. The results from the four multiple choice questions are presented in the following.

6.6.2 Findings

Question 1.

'When establishing your business in tourism, where did you learn the skills needed for having a business?'

The five possible answers were:

1) On the job
2) In previous employment(s)
3) At previous business
4) At school
5) Other (please specify)

When answering the question, the respondents were limited to a maximum of two choices.
The findings are summarised in Table 6.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'On the job'</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In previous employment(s)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At previous business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6  Business skill acquisition (n=42)

*Table 6.6* depicts that the majority of the entrepreneurs have learnt the general business skills 'on the job'. About one third of the sample indicated that their previous employment or formal education equipped them with the necessary business skills. Given the number of respondents who have had their own business in other economic sectors, it is surprising that only few entrepreneurs have learnt useful business skills from their previous business.
**Question 2.**

'When first establishing your business in tourism, where did you learn the skills needed for having a business in tourism?'

The five possible answers were:

1) On the job
2) In previous employment(s)
3) At previous business
4) At school
5) Other (please specify)

When answering the question, the respondents were limited to a maximum of two choices. The findings are summarised in Table 6.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'On the job'</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In previous employment(s)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At previous business</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7  Skill acquisition for tourism business (n=42)

*Table 6.7* shows that specific skills for tourism business were mostly acquired ‘on the job’, followed by formal education. Similarly to the general business skills, previous business experience was not regarded as an important part of the skills accumulation process for owning a tourism business.
Question 3.

'In running your business in tourism, which of the following skills do you find most useful?'

The possible answers were:
1) A knowledge of finance & accounting
2) A knowledge of economics
3) A knowledge of marketing
4) Ability to handle people
5) Ability to make contacts
6) A knowledge of the tourism industry
7) Ability to speak foreign language(s)
8) Ability to use computers
9) Other (please specify)

When answering the question, the respondents were limited to a maximum of three choices. The findings are summarised in Table 6.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to handle people</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make contacts</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to speak foreign languages</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge of finance &amp; accounting</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge of marketing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge of the tourism industry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A knowledge of economics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use computers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8 Useful skills for tourism business (n=42)
Table 6.8 illustrates the overwhelming need in tourism business for inter-personal skills; the 'ability to handle people' and 'to make contacts' were regarded as the most important skills for a tourism entrepreneurs. Foreign language skills are fairly important as 50% of the sample indicated the need for them. The knowledge of finance & accounting and marketing is somewhat helpful but a knowledge in economics and computing is not regarded as important. Surprisingly, the respondents gave a low priority to the knowledge of the tourism industry itself. This can be interpreted as an indication that entrepreneurs are concerned with the dynamics of their own tourism sub-sector but not with the overall state of the tourism industry.
Question 4.

'When first establishing your business in tourism, where did the capital come from?'

The possible answers were:
1) Personal savings from previous tourism job(s)
2) Personal savings from previous non-tourism job(s)
3) Inheritance
4) Borrowing from financial institution
5) Borrowing from family, friends
6) Business outside tourism
7) Other (please specify)

When answering the question, the respondents were not limited in their choices.

The findings are summarised in Table 6.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Number of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal savings from previous non-tourism jobs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings from family, friends</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowings from financial institution</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business outside tourism</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal savings from previous tourism job(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9 Origins of business capital (n=42)

Table 6.9 illustrates that in the majority of the cases, business capital originated from personal savings, from previous non-tourism jobs and from borrowings from family and friends. Some entrepreneurs also used borrowings from financial institutions. 29% of the sample used previous business capital for the establishing their tourism business.

Given the fact that 50% of the entrepreneurs had their own business in other economic
sectors prior to starting their tourism business, this finding needs some interpretations. The likely explanation here is that the pre-tourism businesses were small scale and with low capital investment.

6.6.3 Summary

Chapter 6. presented the findings from the entrepreneurial sample. While the relatively small sample size limited the analysis, the research gained an insight into the topic of emergence of entrepreneurs in the tourism industry under the special conditions which underlie the study. The findings are summarised below.

- The entrepreneurs were found to be somewhat older than the respondents in the main sample.
- They tended to be of a higher level of human capital (secondary school and higher education).
- The majority of the businesses employed less than 11 people.
- They tended to come from trade, education, and ‘other’ sectors, while very few came from repair, finance or health care.
- 50% of the entrepreneurs had their own business in other industries prior to coming into tourism.
- Standard of living and income improved most as the result of the mobility into tourism.
- Working hours have worsened as the result of the mobility into tourism.
- The overall change was evaluated as positive.
- The most important motives for establishing a business in tourism were related the ‘instrumental utility’, ‘entrepreneurial’ and ‘positive’ motivational orientations.
- The 'refugee' and the 'wanderer' orientations were not relevant to the mobility decision.

- The most common skill accumulation method was 'learning the skills on the job'.

- The most useful skills in running a tourism business are the inter-personal skills.

- The majority of the capital came from personal savings, borrowings from family and friends. Some borrowed money from financial institutions or transferred capital from previous non-tourism businesses.

- The skills and capital acquisition methods indicates that the previous non-tourism business was often small scale and of low capital intensity. Its contribution, both in terms of skills and capital, to the current tourism business is relatively low, possibly due to the small-scale nature of the previous non-tourism business.

Having presented the findings from the data analysis in Chapters 5. and 6., what follows in Chapter 7. is a discussion of the findings and the conclusions which can be drawn from the study. Furthermore, the research methodology will be reviewed and suggestions will be made with regards to future research.
Chapter 7.

Discussion and conclusions

7.1 Overview of the research

7.1.1 The general case

The basic proposition of the research was that tourism might play a special role during times of economic transition. As labour is shed from declining industries, it was suggested that tourism might be in a position to absorb some of the excess labour, partly because it is attractive but also because it is accessible. The rationale for this proposition, while not particularly flattering to the industry, is that the skills structure of tourism is such that it favours the unskilled (Riley, 1991). Key concepts in the analysis were, human capital theory, change and motivation.

Given the relatively low human capital requirement, tourism is accessible for those with low levels of human capital, but also for those with abundant but now defunct human capital. This inevitably facilitates mobility into tourism. A major task for the research was to differentiate between the mobility into tourism from other sectors of the economy which was imposed upon people by the circumstances and that mobility which was motivated by the intrinsic characteristics of the industry and the employment it offers. A question of equal importance to the study was how the mobility into tourism impacted upon the individuals; did they perceive themselves to be better or worse off?

Since it was hypothesised that in many cases the mobility was induced by the decline in other industries, from the perspective of human capital theory, the primary concern of the study was with the group which came into tourism with high levels of human capital. While a mobility into tourism for such people might be beneficial, as it
provides employment and income, it might be detrimental from the human capital point of view. In other words, for people with high levels of human capital, the mobility might result in human capital dislocation or devaluation.

The findings of the study only partly support this thesis. While the mobility pattern was such that it showed an intake of labour from a wide range of industries and thus suggested that human capital would be affected, the data on the subjective evaluation of the impacts of the mobility on the individuals did not provide strong support. The general satisfaction with the impacts of the mobility into tourism implied that whatever the reasons were for the mobility and whatever the loss of human capital, the net outcome for the overall sample was positive.

Furthermore, the specific question designed to evaluate personal opinion on the individual's state of human capital which was termed as 'education/job match', indicated that, when examining the whole sample, subjects did not see their human capital being severely dislocated or devalued. It is the case of - did they not suffer or did it not matter?

However, a closer look at the 'education/job match' responses from the specific groups within the sample indicated that there might be certain sub-groups whose human capital did suffer from the mobility. The most conspicuous group here were those coming from the education sector (mostly ex-teachers), followed by those from the energy sector. Furthermore, those with the lowest level of education (uncompleted primary and primary) also seem to be fairly dissatisfied with the match between their education and their job. And finally, entrepreneurs are an important group which reported a slight mismatch.
The 'education/job match' variable was intended to measure any negative impact on human capital, either a dislocation or devaluation. In other words, the measure indicates when a mismatch occurs but it does not show whether the departure is from the level of education or from the specific area of education. It can, therefore, only be hypothesised that, for example when ex-teachers indicated a mismatch perhaps of both types, they were in work that was of a lower educational level and required none of their specific educational skills.

The case of those with the lowest level of education is somewhat difficult to interpret. Primary school education provides only general knowledge and does not teach any vocational skills. Therefore in economic terms, an unskilled job in tourism should not be regarded as a human capital loss for these people. It is possible, however, to suggest that what these respondents express is their dissatisfaction with the type of job they have in tourism. It is possible, for example, that previously they could get jobs which were seen as better.

The entrepreneurial data is also conspicuous. The smaller entrepreneurial cohort in the main sample reported a worsening position on the variable, while the special entrepreneurial sample showed 'no change'. From this, it can be proposed, that in many cases, entrepreneurs have traded their human capital for the inevitable advantages of tourism entrepreneurship. For example, the researcher can recall the example of a respondent who had opened a small souvenir shop in Budapest after completing a postgraduate course at the London School of Economics.

The conclusion drawn in relation to the human capital argument is that the findings do not suggest a severe wholesale departure from human capital, however they indicate that there are groups and individuals who have suffered from the mismatch between their human capital and the requirements of their tourism job. This mismatch raises issues of job adaptation, issues such as seeking consolation and finding positive attributes. These
are important here, specifically because the overall impact of the change was found to be positive. For example, for some the positive intrinsic value of the tourism job or increased earnings might provide compensation. For others, sustained employment in economic transition might be a consolation.

The research observed less than the anticipated impact on human capital from the mobility into tourism might be partly attributable to the characteristics of the industry itself. Perhaps it is the diversity inherent in the tourism industry which mitigates the possible negative effects of the mobility. It is possible to suggest that the industry enables people to cross industry boundaries without dramatic occupational change. The high level of influx from trade supports this thesis whereby the industry requires only a minor skills upgrade (in terms of language skills) for those coming from the retail sector. For those from the former foreign trade companies, the occupational change is larger but the skills utilised in the original occupations and in the tourism industry are very similar.

Possibly the most important finding of the study was that tourism took labour from a wide range of industries. This is taken as an indication that tourism had a role in the restructuring process and that the breakdown of barriers to mobility was a key part of that process. Further evidence was provided by the increased levels of geographical mobility reported after 1987, when the impact of the transition began to be felt. This geographical mobility indicates that whatever the motives were for moving into tourism employment and whatever the consequences were for human capital, for some, additional sacrifices were necessary.
The argument has been made in the literature review that tourism is accessible. The fact that it has attracted workers from a wide range of economic sectors appears to prove this. It could be argued that because these displaced workers have ‘surplus’ human capital that they are adaptable and that this has facilitated the process. By way of illustration, the workers from education, who suffered a real mismatch, actually found work in every sub-sector of the tourism industry. This could be interpreted by the idea that the very fact that they had to sacrifice human capital actually expanded their choice of occupations; the price had its compensation.

Although the proposition which guides this research postulates tourism employment as a ‘refuge’ it does not exclude positive motives for entering the industry. Indeed the literature does indicate that for many of its workers tourism, has intrinsic value and it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that this value may be acquired even by those who enter it by some form of forced choice. The study found evidence of this kind of positive motivation. In this respect, the findings very much confirm the general case (Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Marshall, 1986; Riley, 1986; Wood, 1992).

Although the tourism development literature assumes the phenomenon of mobility of labour into tourism from other sectors of the economy, it rarely provides empirical evidence of such mobility beyond the conspicuous trend for tourism workers to come from agriculture. The literature offers no measure of the actual proportions involved and tends to use national level proportional employment figures in its forecasting and project assessment work. This study offers a glimpse as to what the real proportions might be in the circumstances described.
The influx of labour from such a wide range of industries raises the question of how tourism itself is affected by this additional level of diversity. Clearly, in such circumstances, it is as valid to talk about the adaptation and socialisation processes of the industry as it is to talk of training and learning. Newcomers bring with them experience which is likely to be very different from what confronts them in their tourism jobs. The literature on the social psychological effects of a movement from production to service clearly shows that a considerable degree of adaptation is required (Riley, 1991). It is possible to suggest that the consequences of a labour force in the process of adaptation to service work is lack of service, wrong attitudes and lack of competence (Airey, 1994; Airey and Shackley, 1997; Riley, 1997).

The question which arises out of the findings is how much the tourism industry in Hungary is different from any other tourism industry? It is not difficult to imagine that most tourism industries have a proportion of their workforce arriving from other industries. The question is what proportion? The industry is often conceived in terms of training needs but this study shows that socialisation processes which teach newcomers the meaning of their work, organisation and industry are of equal importance. Socialisation processes ameliorate change and it is possible to suggest that the experiences of each atomised individual going through a socialisation process in their first job in tourism will have a generalised affect on their attitude to change.

There were two surprising findings for the impacts of the mobility. Firstly, the fact that there was a general level of contentment and secondly, that this level of contentment did not vary significantly by the industry from which the respondents came.
Despite the fact that the research found secondary evidence to the effect that moving into tourism would result in a lower standard of living, the overall evaluation of the impact of change was positive. This finding was contrary to expectation and needs interpretation. It could be that the secondary data was incorrect and that people are better off than they were in their previous industries. At this juncture, it is worth noting that the black economy may play a part in this.

Equally valid is the argument that people have simply adapted to their new circumstances and find them satisfactory. If this is the case, then there is evidence that the socialisation process works fairly quickly because there were no significant differences on levels of satisfaction by time spent in the industry.

Although outside the range of this research, the explanation might come from the societal level in that what people may be expressing is a sense of being content at having survived the transition. To an extent, the sheer level and pervasiveness of the change may have exerted a downward pressure on the process of cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). In other words, the sheer scale brings about social pressure to 'cope' with the negative aspects of the change. In such circumstances the intensity of relative deprivation is reduced (Runciman, 1966). There is an 'all in the same boat' feeling about the change, resulting in people accepting 'their lot' because others are in the same or a worse situation. Here, the sense of community engendered by the old system would be helpful to the adaptation to the new. It could also be true that the general level of satisfaction is a result of a post decisional justification of actions brought about by pressure to remove dissonance. It is worth noting that the findings are at odds with the suggestion by Andorka (1994) regarding the general dissatisfaction of the Hungarian population with the impacts of the economic and social transition on their lives (See Chapter 2.).
It was expected that reactions to working in tourism would vary according to the type of industry they came from. Clearly the level of human capital demanded by the previous industry was the key factor here. This proposition was not borne out by the findings.

It has already been suggested that higher levels of education might ease the adaptation process. This is supported by the evidence on the impact of change which showed that the individuals with secondary school education and above seemed to have expressed the highest degree of satisfaction. This in fact contradicts the notion from human capital theory that, while those with higher levels of human capital are in the best position to be mobile, they are the group who are at most risk from their mobility. Yet here they express higher satisfaction.

The fact that Hungary is a country which has always displayed a high level of relative deprivation, with Budapest having a higher standard of living than the regions, is reflected in the findings on the impacts of the change. The northern part of Hungary displayed the lowest level of satisfaction with the change and recognised that their standard of living had actually fallen.

Notwithstanding the general lack of variation in the impact of change findings, it was considered important to the research to see if tourism employment played any significant role in the level of contentment so expressed. The highest level of improvement (across the ten dimensions) was recorded on the job satisfaction dimension and, unsurprisingly, the strongest deterioration was on the working hours dimension. The prominence of the job satisfaction dimension brings to the fore issues of the attractiveness of tourism and the motivation to join the industry.
The original proposition suggested that tourism would soak up surplus labour from a changing economy through mobility. As mobility implies motivation, the proposition went further to suggest, rather unflatteringly, that tourism would be a refugee sector. There was, it was suggested, an 'any port in a storm' feeling to motivation towards tourism. The study used the sociological conception of 'orientations to work' (Goldthorpe et al., 1968) to study and classify motivation. The expectation was that a set of clearly differentiated motivations would be found. The study used the literature to justify the existence of the proposed four-dimensional model, and used factor analysis to identify the structure. In fact, the resultant factor structure added a fifth dimension to the model. The five dimensional model which emerges is as follows:

1) Instrumental utility orientation
2) Positive commitment to tourism
3) Refugee orientation
4) Entrepreneurial orientation
5) The 'wanderer'

These orientations form the structure of motivational drives in the area of occupational choice and occupational evaluation.

The findings largely substantiate the original model. In fact the new model goes further in capturing a form of orientation which exactly fits the high mobility character of the tourism industry, the 'wanderer'.

The 'wanderer' orientation can be defined as an ad-hoc approach to the mobility, whereby the identity of the industry or the job is not of great consideration. In other words, the mobility into tourism is a mere contingency and not a result of a careful cost-benefit analysis of the possible options.
The research found that although the orientations were differentiated in line with the Goldthorpe model, some orientations worked together in a mutually reinforcing way, for example, the instrumental, utility and entrepreneurial orientations seemed to work together. That said, the fact that there were singletons in action can not be underrated. In around 35% of the cases, the individual's structure of motivation to work in tourism was very simple and dominated by one dimension. These cases were dominated by the refugee, the positive and the wanderer orientations. Even casual analysis of any tourism industry might recognise people being in their jobs because they needed a job, because they wanted that particular job or because they drifted into it.

The question which naturally arises here is, that if people move into tourism as a contingency or because of lack of better alternative, will they stay there or will they move on at the first opportunity? While mobility is endemic to the tourism industry and the academic debate as to whether high labour turnover is desired or not in tourism continues (Knight, 1971; Riley, 1980, 1991b; Johnson, 1981, 1985), it can be argued that a satisfied and well-trained labour force would benefit the Hungarian tourism industry. A certain stability within the labour force would make human capital investments more effective. However, this is not to suggest that stability be maintained by returning to the socialist idea of guaranteed employment and an artificially maintained job security. That would work against motivations and skill development.

A broad review of the evidence from this research suggests that there is a case for suggesting that tourism is a 'refugee' sector in times of economic upheaval. The main indicators are the findings on inter-sector mobility and the factored motivational data. These point in the same direction. In truth, the term 'refugee' is unnecessarily pejorative. Here is an industry which allows easy access to workers from elsewhere in the economy and can provide jobs even, as in the case of Hungary, when it is expanding at a relatively slow pace. Its usefulness is, to an extent, determined by the relative performance of other parts of the economy. The evidence from the impact data supports the idea of 'refuge' as a pleasant place where contentment can be found.
At this juncture it is worth pointing out that to denote tourism as a 'refugee' industry in Hungary is not to say that tourism is a 'refuge' for every tourism worker in that country. It is perfectly plausible to suggest that a considerable portion of the tourism labour force enters tourism professions as a first choice. What the research findings suggest is that tourism might play an important role for those who see their employment declining in other industries. For them tourism might be a 'second best option'; but even so it might be one which evokes satisfaction.

7.1.2 The special case of entrepreneurs

In addition to the general case of labour mobility into tourism, the study looked at the formation of small businesses in the industry. The basic proposition was that tourism is not only receptive to prospective workers but it also encourages entrepreneurship. The general case seems to have justified the notion of low entry barriers into the industry from the point of view of human capital. What is proposed here is an extension of the idea for entrepreneurship, whereby the relatively low requirements in terms of skills and knowledge are accompanied by further favourable circumstances to entrepreneurship. These are the need for relatively low capital investment and the profitability of the industry in Hungary.

While the small sample size limits the conclusions which can be drawn from the research, the entrepreneurial sample provided some conspicuous findings. The typical entrepreneur in the sample was over the age of 35 and mostly male with secondary or higher education. This implies that newcomer tourism entrepreneurs possess relatively high levels of human capital which, on the one hand, are likely to have assisted them at the formulation of their business but, on the other hand, is suspected to have been affected adversely. Depending on the type and size of the business, entrepreneurs with relatively high levels of specialised human capital are suspected to have experienced a human capital dislocation. This might not necessarily be a devaluation of the human capital but a departure from the specific skills and knowledge they have accumulated in
their previous career. The findings have indicated that in many cases the establishment of a tourism business meant a significant departure from the accumulated human capital.

Furthermore, it was hypothesised that because of the relatively low entry barriers, tourism is likely to provide an avenue from employee status towards entrepreneurship. Given the focus of the study on inter-industry mobility, it did not examine how tourism employees become entrepreneurs in Hungary, but what it explored was the possibility of crossing industry boundaries for both employees and entrepreneurs and of establishing a tourism business.

It was somewhat surprising to find that 50% of the entrepreneurs in the sample were not first time entrepreneurs. They had simply transferred business capital from other economic sectors into tourism. This can be interpreted as a perceived relative advantage or attractiveness of the industry for private business when compared to other industries. However, for 40% of the respondents, tourism did offer the opportunity to establish a private business, a finding which should not be overlooked.

Although, because of the small sample size, the motivational data could not be factor analysed, the basic analysis of the motivational variables show high importance of the instrumental utility and of the positive motivational orientations. It also indicates that tourism is seen a profitable industry.

The change data seems to indicate that the expectations in terms of monetary gain were met. A high level of improvement was found in income and in living standard for the entrepreneurs. Not surprisingly, control over work has also improved significantly, while working hours worsened. These findings largely justify what was expected.
The skill acquisition of entrepreneurs provides an indirect indication of the entry barriers for tourism entrepreneurs. High degrees of skills acquisition 'on the job' would indicate that entry requirements are low and that the skills needed are such that they can be easily learnt. The findings support this thesis, as a high proportion of respondents admitted that both the general business skills and the specific skills for tourism were learnt 'on the job'. Interestingly, despite the fact that 50% of the entrepreneurs had their own business in other industries prior to moving the capital into tourism, a low proportion of the respondents indicated the importance of the skills acquired in previous businesses.

The entrepreneurs were also asked which skills are most useful when running their tourism business. The three most important skills were reported as the ability to handle people, to make contacts and to speak foreign languages, while economics and computing were rated as of little or of almost no significance. What this finding shows is that, with the exception of languages, the most important skills are in fact the ones which can be learnt 'on the job'. They also highlight the importance of interpersonal skills. The importance of foreign languages is supported by the fact that the majority of entrepreneurs in the sample speak at least one foreign language.

The fact that the majority of capital came from personal savings from previous non-tourism jobs or was borrowed from family and friends indicates the relatively small and family oriented character of the businesses. It is not surprising that only 30% of the entrepreneurs used bank loans for the establishment of their business, as the difficulties in getting and financing bank loans in Hungary are well-known.
As a conclusion, the entrepreneurial sample indicated that tourism is not only seen as a profitable industry for a small business but that the expectations with regards to monetary gain are largely met. The sample provided evidence for the relatively low entry barriers in terms of skills required to become tourism entrepreneurs and for the possibility of skills accumulation 'on the job'.

7.2 Overview of the methodology
The thrust of the methodology adopted for this research was the collection of primary data via self-completed questionnaires from present tourism workers. Since the focus of the study was inter-industry mobility into tourism, the sample has been drawn from those tourism workers who have moved into tourism from other sectors of the economy.

The data collection method combined factual autobiographical information on mobility patterns with data on the subjective evaluation of the impacts of the mobility and with motivational data. This approach allowed the examination of the phenomenon of mobility into tourism from a number of perspectives and to balance the relative merits and shortcomings of the different techniques.

While the methodology has proved to be largely successful for the purposes of the study, it was not without its limitations. What follows now is an overview of the major limitations which constrained the study.
The limited amount of previous research into the issue of labour mobility into tourism and particularly into that phenomenon within the Hungarian context meant that the methodology designed for this study was a pioneering one in many aspects. The lack of knowledge in the field of tourism employment in Hungary deprived the study of reliable information, both in terms factual data such as the numbers employed in tourism in Hungary or the size of the tourism population who have moved into tourism from other industries. Whilst this gave the research the opportunity to explore the unknown, it also limited it.

With the lack of reliable data on tourism employment, the sample size calculation had to rely on estimates. Furthermore, the fact that in the Hungarian statistical system, tourism is represented only by the hotel and restaurant sector and that no employment figures on the different sub-sectors of tourism were available, meant that the sample could not be stratified to the true sectoral proportions within the tourism industry.

The second limitation of the study was caused by the informal economy. As described in Chapter 4, the intrusion of the informal economy not only into tourism but also into the everyday life impelled the methodology to omit questions on actual earnings and profits. Factual information would have enabled the study not only to evaluate the change but also to compare the data earnings from the sample with the secondary information which was available. The comparison would have allowed the research to examine how far the actual earnings depart from the official figures, a finding which would have been a significant contribution to the study of informal earnings and employment in the Hungarian tourism industry.
With the lack of primary data on earnings, the study had to rely on the subjective evaluation of the change in income and living standards as a result of the mobility into tourism. As suggested earlier, this evaluation might be biased because of the very nature of the human memory. And finally, more accurate information on earnings and profits would have provided the research with an additional link between the impacts of the mobility and the motivational orientations.

Since the research was a pioneering one in the study of motivational orientations to the mobility into tourism, the findings of this study can not be compared with those from other studies. Had the motivational orientations to mobility into tourism been studied in other countries, the present research could have evaluated how far the Hungarian transition affected the motivational orientations. In other words, it could have been established how specific the findings are to Hungary and to what extent they reflect the general case.

The above limitations were largely due to external factors which, while recognised by the researcher, could only be taken into account at the research design stage, but could not be eliminated. However, while every care has been taken when designing the research instrument and planning the data analysis, the research carries two shortcomings.

Firstly, the instrument was designed to enable the research to discover a link between the last job prior to tourism, the first tourism job and the job the respondent worked in at the time of the data collection. While the research instrument collected reliable information for the first and the last part of the link, the information obtained from the respondents in Section 3 of the questionnaire on the first tourism job was largely inconsistent and, as such, was omitted from the analysis. Consequently, the analysis used only information on the present tourism job and on the last job prior to moving into tourism.
Secondly, the measure on the job status mobility adopted by the research was somewhat arbitrary and can only be regarded as an exploratory evaluation of the issue. In the methodology the employee → manager → entrepreneur change was regarded as an upward mobility, while the entrepreneur → manager → employee status change was regarded as a downward mobility. While this approach was adequate for the purposes of the present study, the measure could be further developed. The refinement of the measure would necessitate the examination of what constitutes advancement and what are the circumstances which have to be taken into account. In other words, this would require the design of an instrument that would capture the phenomenon in its complexity.

7.3 The contribution of the research

This research examined a phenomenon for which very little empirical evidence is available from previous studies. Given the specific circumstances of economic and social transition from communism to capitalism, which provided the background to the study, the research was carried out on largely uncharted waters.

The findings enrich the body of knowledge in the field of study of the Hungarian transition and of tourism employment under such circumstances. There are four sets of findings from this research that have contributed to this area. Firstly, the range and relative importance of pre-tourism industries have been established. Secondly, the motivational orientations of an important part of the tourism labour force to mobility into tourism has been explored. Thirdly, the impacts of the mobility into tourism on the individuals have measured. And finally, the findings provide indirect information on the adaptation process to the new realities induced by the Hungarian transition.
In its approach the research was multi-disciplinary as it built upon theories taken from a number of fields. Sociology, economics, psychology and tourism were the most important ones. It is appropriate, therefore, that apart from providing factual information, the research also contributed to a number of areas and disciplines.

Firstly, it contributed to the study of tourism employment and of inter-sector mobility of labour. A methodology for the measurement of inter-sector mobility flows of labour has been developed. The methodology can be applied for economic studies concerned with the displacement effect of labour mobility into tourism and to the shadow price calculation of labour.

Secondly, the study introduced the concept of orientations to work and mobility into the tourism literature. While the model itself needs testing in other countries and in different economic circumstances, the concept of motivational orientations is a useful tool for studies in the field of human resource management and manpower planning.

Thirdly, the research has extended the method of factor analysis to factor usage and application. It has shown how the application of factors by the subjects can be examined.

And finally, the research has shown how factual quantitative and motivational data can be used together. The combination of the two approaches provides a tool whereby the same phenomenon can be examined from different perspectives and the findings can be evaluated against each other in a complementary way.
7.4 Further research

Given the scarcity of research into the issue of labour mobility into tourism, further studies are suggested to examine the phenomenon. Particularly important would be to explore the issue in locations at different levels of economic and tourism development. Further studies in different countries would not only allow comparisons to be drawn between regions and countries but also to evaluate the effects of external factors, such as the transition or level and pace of tourism development, on the findings. It would, therefore, allow comparisons to show to what extent the findings of the present study are applicable to other countries and to what degree are they unique to Hungary and to the Hungarian transition. Primary data on the proportions of tourism workers coming from other sectors of the economy in different countries would provide useful information for the study of labour market behaviour. Empirical data on the direction and intensity of labour mobility flows into tourism would allow studies examining the economic impacts of tourism development to reduce the amount of estimation used for the calculation of shadow prices of labour. And finally, information on the actual composition of the labour force entering tourism employment from other sectors of the economy would also benefit tourism planners and developers and those responsible for the development of human resources in the tourism industries.

Further research is also suggested on the consequences for the skill levels of mobility from other industries. Can the structure of training within the tourism industry cope with an influx of newcomers with differing human capital? How exactly does the socialisation process work? This is particularly important because for many the change from industry to service involves a change of social identity.
On a similar theme, it would be worthwhile comparing the performance of those with vocational training with those who simply entered the industry by other means. The argument here works both ways. While, under normal circumstances, a tourism vocational education would lead to higher level of competence, the traditional neglect of the issues of service attitude in the training suggests that the industry might benefit from the influx of labour which is ready to learn and to adapt to the new circumstances.

The research examined certain aspects of the emergence of tourism entrepreneurs in Hungary. The results provide an insight into the phenomenon and raise certain questions. However, given the small sample size, the findings of the study on entrepreneurs can only be regarded as indicative. It is suggested that the issues raised by the study in relation to tourism entrepreneurs be further explored by future research.

To an extent this research is directly connected to methodologies of tourism development in that it is concerned with inter-sector mobility. The research created an instrument for the measurement of ‘motives for joining tourism’. The data from this instrument was factor analysed which confirmed the hypothesised model for the motives. Two points arise from this: Firstly, that given the fact that tourism attracts labour with a diverse background, the usefulness of the concept of ‘orientations to work’ has to be recognised. It copes, in a rigorous way, with variation whilst also capturing psychological intrinsic variables. It is suggested here that sociological measurement of this type is as valuable to tourism research as the more commonly used psychological measures. Widely accepted in research at the industry level of analysis, it should be adopted in future studies on tourism.

Secondly, no major conclusions can be drawn from the instrument until it has been replicated by further studies. The instrument needs to be applied further, as is the study, on the general tourism population in order to contrast the findings. The findings of any further studies using the instrument need to be submitted to confirmatory factor analysis.
If further studies produced the same factor structure then it would be possible to conclude that the instrument is reliable and that the five dimensional model is valid for tourism.

In terms of methodology, the research provided further evidence of the usefulness of collecting work biographies. It has also shown how autobiographical memory can be used for the analysis of labour mobility. The application of work biographies for the study of labour market activities is, therefore a line of research which is worth pursuing.
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Appendix 1.

Preliminary research proposal
Labour Mobility from agriculture towards tourism - the effects of tourism development on the labour, the households and on the society

BACKGROUND
The mobility of labour from agriculture towards tourism inevitably induces significant changes in the economy and society of the area concerned. Although tourism is generally acknowledged as a generator of employment, it is also condemned for reinforcing the previously established patterns of dependence and inequality.

In the 70s the literature was almost unequivocally hostile about the impacts of tourism development on the agricultural labour. Bryden (1973) as one of the most influential writers described that Tourism in the Commonwealth Caribbean has drawn labour and land from the agriculture - and therefore it contributed greatly to the decline of agricultural activity. On the other hand, the same study included a survey of the hotel staff in the Cayman Island which survey showed that of 100 employees 48 came from previous job in the same sector and 24 had no previous job - no mention was made about any coming from the agriculture (Latimer, 1985).

On the basis of the little research made in the past, it is at least questionable whether tourism development has in every case driven labour directly from the agriculture, and that it always had a negative impact on the agriculture and on the agrarian labour. So the following assumptions can be made:

1. When Tourism Development starts somewhere - part of the labour engaged before in the agriculture enters firstly the construction industry and only later on moves into the tourism industry.

2. The pattern of mobility and its effects vary according to the geographical characteristics of the area - ie it is different in the case of the small island economies with limited resources and the continental countries where resources are less scarce.

3. That it is expected that the status of some individuals will change from employed labour to entrepreneur.
Furthermore, the shift from agriculture towards tourism changes the employment opportunities and income levels. The notoriously underpaid employee in the tourism industry usually still earns more than he did before living from agriculture. Moreover, the entering of women into employment brings extra income into the households.

And finally, the new employment patterns, the rise in income and the very presence of tourists brings changes into the traditional family structure and into the lifestyle, and brings new values into the society. It is the economic and social process which produces the change which is the essential focus of the research.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. The pattern of mobility
   - Agriculture - Tourism v.
   - Agriculture - Construction industry - Tourism v.
   - Tourism - Tourism
   - rural - urban migration
   - expatriates/foreign labour
   - the effects of seasonality
   - labour to small businesses

2. The changes in home economics
   - income levels, wages compared to those from the agriculture
   - disposable income
   - marginal propensity to consume and to save
   - change in employment status

3. Changes in the social relations within the family
   - family size and structure
   - women at work
4. The impact upon local culture
   • values
   • lifestyle
   • feelings about tourism and tourists

METHODOLOGY
Secondary data (past surveys and statistics) for the initial analysis of the changes occurred as a result of the shift from agriculture towards tourism. The collection of primary data would include a survey of employees in the tourism industry to explore which sector or industry they are from - and further investigation in the case of those who originate from agriculture. The research would include a survey of the changes in the household economics caused by the change in the employment, and would explore the social impacts of the migration of labour from agriculture into tourism.

At this stage, it is only possible to suggest appropriate samples but one sample from Eastern Europe and one from the West which has comparable characteristics is the preliminary prospect.

SOURCES
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The pilot study
Part 1.
The design of the research instrument

Part 2.
The pilot study

Part 3.
The refinement of the research instrument

PART 1. THE DESIGN

When designing the research instrument, the major aim was to collect all the necessary information using the minimum possible number of questions. The final version of the questionnaire consists of 6 sections, 5 of which targets the whole sample and 1 which is specifically designed for gaining information from tourism entrepreneurs.

The design process had to take account of the fact that, although the instrument was initially designed in English, the concepts and the wording of the final version of the questionnaire had to be understandable by the Hungarian target audience. To this end, throughout the design process, the Hungarian terminology and way of thinking was into account taken.

Probably the most interesting translation problem was the word 'tourism' itself. The established Hungarian terminology for tourism is 'idegenforgalom', a term which is a mirror translation of the German word 'Fremdenverkehr'. Having consulted Hungarian tourism experts, it was found that, while the general population still uses it, those working in the industry prefer the word 'turizmus' because it avoids the reference to 'strangers or foreigners'. As a consequence, since the questionnaire was targeting the tourism professionals, the word 'turizmus' was used.
PART 2. THE PILOT STUDY

In order to assess the performance of the research instrument, the questionnaire had to be piloted on an audience similar to that of the actual research. Given the relatively small size of the target population for the present study, testing the questionnaire in Hungary would have made it unavoidable to approach the same audience twice. This was seen as a major threat to the credibility of the research and, therefore, an alternative approach was sought.

It has been decided to test the questionnaire first in England and then in a country which showed close similarities to Hungary. After having considered the possible alternatives, Poland has been selected as the second country for it has a considerable tourism industry and is experiencing the similar process from communism to capitalism as Hungary.

In England, 80 questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of tourism employees working in hotels, travel agencies, tour operators and consultancy companies. 40 questionnaires were returned completed, which represents a 50% response rate.

In order to pilot the questionnaire in Poland, the questionnaire first had to be translated into Polish. The Polish version of the questionnaire has been sent out to 80 tourism workers in hotels, travel agencies and tour operators. 30 questionnaires have been returned, which corresponds to a 37.5% response rate.

The English and the Polish versions of the pilot questionnaire is shown as follows:
Questionnaire

This questionnaire forms part of a study undertaken at the Department of Management Studies, University of Surrey. The questionnaire is aimed at learning about your way into the tourism industry. Your answers - which will be treated as strictly confidential - are vital for the study. Thank you very much for your time and effort.

1. About you

1.1 Male / Female

1.2 Age:

1.3 Married / Single

1.4 Do you have any children under the age of 15? Yes / No

1.5 Where do you live (town / village etc.)?

2. The establishment you work at

2.1 Which town/village do you work in?

2.2 What type of establishment are you currently working at?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe / Patisserie etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (e.g. coach, taxi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Is it your family business? Yes/ No

   If Yes, do you have any employees? Yes / No

2.4 How many people work for the company?

2.5 How far is your workplace from where you live? miles

3. Your hours of work

3.1 Are you working in a full-time job? Yes / No

   If No, how many hours you work in a week?

   how many months do you work in a year?
This section is concerned with your past career from 1986 to 1995. Within the questions we will ask you about your gross monthly earnings. This information - just as the entire questionnaire - will be treated as confidential.

4.1 First we would like to know a few details about your present job (1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present job title</th>
<th>Year when started</th>
<th>Town/village</th>
<th>Gross monthly earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.2 Secondly, please tell us what were you doing in 1986.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title or Other * in 1986</th>
<th>Sector of economy</th>
<th>Town/village</th>
<th>Gross monthly earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- If you were out of work in 1986, please indicate the reason (in education/maternity leave/unemployed etc.).

4.3 And finally, please tell us what were you doing between the above two jobs (1987-1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title or Other</th>
<th>Year when started</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Town/village</th>
<th>Gross monthly earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
5. Your move into the tourism industry.

5.1 Where did you work or what were you doing last before you started working in the tourism industry?
- in education / unemployed / at home (for example housewife or maternity leave) / worked in agriculture / industry / service sector
- other (please specify): ..................................................

5.2 Did you have to move (geographically) when taking up your first job in the tourism industry? Yes / No
If Yes, how far did you move? ......................... miles

5.3 Did you work abroad in the tourism industry? Yes / No
If Yes, in which country? .................................................................
What was your job? .................................................................
Which year? .................................................................

5.4 Below you will find a list of statements which represent particular circumstances. We would like to know whether these circumstances played a part in your decision to enter the tourism industry.
(Please tick the appropriate box for each question.)

1 = Strongly influenced the decision
2 = Played some part in the decision
3 = Played no part in the decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My earnings were too low in my previous industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the tourist you tend to work in nice surroundings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to get away from agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By entering tourism I could improve my earnings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to work at times that suited me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family has a business in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted a job which gave me the opportunity to travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted a job that involved meeting people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to start a business in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in tourism are easy to learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism is a business with lots of opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to get jobs in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted extra income to improve my standard of living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could not find a job elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were no prospects in my previous industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted a job that suited my education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My previous industry was declining.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to get away from working in a factory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism is an expanding industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to accumulate capital to start my own business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Your education

6.1 Since leaving school, how many years have you spent in full time education? .........................

6.2 What is your highest level of education? ..............................................................................

6.3 What is your highest qualification? ........................................................................................

6.4 Do you have any formal education in tourism? Yes / No

7. Your opinion

We would like to know how much do you agree with the following statements. (Please tick the appropriate box for each question.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is good to work in a busy, dynamic environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in a risky business is OK as long as it pays well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have to take responsibility for your own future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowadays you only make good money by trading.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't mind where I work as long as it pays good money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowadays to get ahead you have to try different jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to have a job that matches your education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning your own business is the only secure future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing money is not a good way to start a business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to be my own boss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings should not be tied to performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change leads to opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good product sells itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A key to success is knowing what your customers want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd rather earn less money to have a secure job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising is a total waste of money.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be successful you have to think long-term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The customer comes first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be successful you have to be innovative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An unrecognised opportunity is a loss for a business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much.
Appendix

In order to indicate your Gross monthly earnings at the jobs, please find the appropriate earning level and put only the Code into the boxes in Questions 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Gross Earnings (Ft)</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 5,000</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 6,000</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 7,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001 - 8,000</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 10,000</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,001 - 40,000</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 - 50,000</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,001 - 75,000</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,001 - 100,000</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,001 - 200,000</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,001 -</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ankieta

Ten kwestionariusz jest częścią studiów prowadzonych przez Departament Studiów Zarządzania Uniwersytetu w Surrey (Anglia). Jego celem jest zbadanie Pana/Pani drogi do usług turystycznych. Odpowiedzi Państwa - które będą traktowane jako ścisłe poufne - są niezbędne dla naszych studiów. Dziewięramy bardzo za Pana/Pani czas i wysiłek.

1. O Pani/Panu

1.1 Kobieta/Meszczyzna

1.2 Wiek:......................

1.3 Wolna(y) / Zamezna(Zonaty)

1.4 Czy ma Pani/Pan dzieci w wieku poniżej 15 lat? Tak./Nie

1.5 Gdzie Pani/Pan mieszka (miasto / wies etc.) ? ..........................................................

2. Gdzie Pani/Pan pracuje?

2.1 W jakim mieście wsi Pani/Pan pracuje ? ..........................................................

2.2 W jakiego typu firmie ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Restauracja</th>
<th>Biuro Podroży</th>
<th>Kawiarnia / Ciastkarnia etc.</th>
<th>W transportie (n.p. autobus, taxi)</th>
<th>Inne (Prosze sprecyzować):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.3 Czy jest to Pana/Pani biznes rodzinnym? Tak / Nie

Jesli Tak czy zatrudnianie Państwo kogoś? Tak / Nie

2.4 Ile pracowników pracuje w firmie ?......................

2.5 Jaka jest odległość miejsca pracy od Pani/Pana domu ? ....................... kilometrów

3. Godziny Pracy

3.1 Czy pracuje Pani/Pan na całym etacie? Tak / Nie

Jesli Nie, to ile godzin w tygodniu Pani/Pan pracuje ?..............................

Ile miesięcy w roku Pani/Pan pracuje ?..............................
4. Poprzednie Zatrudnienie

W tej części pytamy Panię/Pana o zatrudnienie (kariere) od 1986 do 1995. W tym kwestionariuszu bedziemy pytac o miesięczne wynagrodzenie brutto (to znaczy przed opłaceniem podatku). Te informacje - podobnie jak I cały kwestionariusz - beda traktowane w sposób poufny.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zajmowane stanowisko/ rodzaj pracy</th>
<th>Od kiedy</th>
<th>Miasto/Wies</th>
<th>Dochody Miesieczne (brutto)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Teraz, proszę nam powiedzieć co Panię/Pan robili(a) w roku 1986.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanowisko/rodzaj pracy * w 1986</th>
<th>Dział gospodarki</th>
<th>Miasto/Wies</th>
<th>Dochody Miesieczne (brutto)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Jeśli Panię/Pan nie był(a) zatrudniona(y) w roku 1986, proszę podać przyczyny (np. studia (szkola)/ urlop macierzyński/bezrobocie, itp.)

4.3 I na zakończenie, proszę nam powiedzieć co Panię/Pan robili(a) pomiędzy dwoma powyższymi zatrudnieniami (1987-1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanowisko/rodzaj pracy</th>
<th>Rok rozpoczęcia</th>
<th>Dział gospodarki</th>
<th>Miasto/Wies</th>
<th>Dochody Miesieczne (brutto)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Początek Pani/Proszę o podanie danych dotyczących początku Pani/Proszę o podanie danych dotyczących początku Pani/Pana kariery w przemyśle turystycznym.

5.1 Gdzie Pani/Pan pracowali(a) lub co Pani/Pan robili(a) bezpośrednio przed rozpoczęciem pracy w przemyśle turystycznym?

- Byłem/łam(a): w szkole / bezrobotna (y) / w domu (np. gospodyni domowa lub na urlopie maciejskim)
- Pracowałem/łam(a) w rolnictwie / przemyśle/ usługach
- Inne (proszę wymienić):

5.2 Czy musiał(a) Pani/Pan zmienić miejsce zamieszkania aby rozpocząć pierwszą pracę w przemyśle turystycznym? Tak / Nie

   Jeśli Tak, to jak daleko się Pani/Pan przeniosł(a)? ......................... kilometrow

5.3 Czy pracowali(a) Pani/Pan w przemyśle turystycznym za granicą? Tak / Nie

   Jeśli Tak, to w jakim kraju? ........................................................................................................
   Jaka była Pani/Pana praca? ...........................................................................................................
   W którym to było roku? ..............................................................................................................

5.4 Poniżej znajdzie Pani/Pan liste stwierdzeń. Chcielibyśmy się dowiedzieć ktorą z tych okoliczności odegrała rolę w Pani/Pana decyzji aby rozpocząć pracę w przemyśle turystycznym? (Proszę postawić X przy odpowiednim pytaniu, w kolumnie odpowiadającej wadze tej okoliczności według poniższego klucza)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Okoliczność</th>
<th>1 = Bardzo wpłynęła na moją decyzję</th>
<th>2 = Troche wpłynęła na moją decyzje</th>
<th>3 = Nie wpłynęła na moją decyzje</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moje zarobki były zbyt niskie w poprzedniej pracy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponieważ w turystyce pracuję sie w ładnym otoczeniu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chciałem/ła pracować w godzinach które mi odpowiadały.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moja rodzina miała biznes w przemyśle turystycznym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szukali/am(ę) pracy która dawała okazje do podróży.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chciałem/ła pracować w której spotykam sie wielu ludzi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponieważ łatwo jest rozpoczynacz biznes w przemyśle turystycznym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponieważ łatwo sie nauczyć pracy w przemyśle turystycznym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Przemysł turystyczny daje wiele szans na rozwój kariery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łatwo jest dostarczyć prace w przemyśle turystycznym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chciałem/ła pracować w której dostarczane są standardy życia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nie mogłem/ła znaleźć pracy gdzie indziej</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nie było żadnych perspektyw w mojej poprzedniej pracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chciałem/ła pracować w której mojej wykształceniu wymagało</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branża w której pracowałem(em) upadła</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nie chciałem/ła pracować w przemyśle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turystyka jest szybko rozwijajaca sie branża</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chciałem/ła nagromadzić kapitał aby rozpoczynac własny biznes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6. Pani/Pana wykształcenie

6.1 Od opuszczenia szkoły podstawowej, ile lat Pani/Pan spędzili(a) kształcić się?

6.2 Jakie jest Pani/Pana wykształcenie (podstawowe, średnie, wyższe)?

6.3 Jakie posiada Pani/Pan kwalifikacje?

6.4 Czy ma Pani/Pan wykształcenie w turystyce? Tak / Nie

7. Pani/Pana zdaniem

Chcielibysmy wiedzieć jak bardzo zgadza się Pani/Pan z poniższymi stwierdzeniami

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>zdanie</th>
<th>Bardzo zgadzam</th>
<th>Zgadzam się</th>
<th>Nie zgadzam</th>
<th>Absolutnie nie zgadzam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dobrze jest pracować w dynamicznym, ruchliwym otoczeniu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Można pracować w ryzykownym biznesie, o ile dobrze płaci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Każdy musi brać odpowiedzialność za swoją przyszłość</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzisiaj można dobrze zarabiać tylko jak się handluje</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nie ważne gdzie się pracuje, jeśli tylko płaca dobrze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzisiaj, aby się posuwać do przodu trzeba próbować nowych</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wazne jest, aby praca odpowiadała wykształceniu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pewna przyszłość ma się tylko jeśli się posiada biznes na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozyczanie pieniędzy nie jest dobrym sposobem na rozpoczęcie biznesu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chce być swoim własnym szefem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarobki nie powinny zależeć od wyników w pracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zmiany w życiu dają nowe możliwości</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobry produkt sam się sprzeda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiedza czego klient chce jest kluczem do sukcesu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolałbym (wolałbym) mniej pieniędzy ale pewną pracę</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reklama to całkowita strata pieniędzy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aby odniesć sukces, trzeba myśleć długookresowo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klient jest najważniejszy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aby odniesć sukces trzeba być pomysłowym</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nie rozpoznana okazja jest strata dla biznesu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dziękujemy Pani/Panu bardzo
**Dodatek**

W celu wykazania Panstwa miesięcznych zarobków, proszę odnaleźć Panstwa poziom zarobków (brutto) w poniższej tabeli i wstawić tylko odpowiedni kod w pytaniach 4.1, 4.2 i 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miesięczny Zarobek (Zł) (nowe złote)</th>
<th>Kod</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 300</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 400</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 - 500</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 600</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601 - 700</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 - 800</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 - 1000</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 - 1200</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 - 1600</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601 - 2000</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 - 2400</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2401 - 3200</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201 - 4000</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001 - 10000</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001 -</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 Pound Sterling = 3.7 Zloty. Average monthly salary is 650 Zlotys. Salary of the Pizza Hut manager is ca. 1400 (in Town). Monthly rent for 2 bedroom flat in town is 300.
PART 3. THE REFINEMENT OF THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The pilot study has largely justified the validity of the research instrument but pointed out several areas which needed refinement.

Originally the mobility pattern was attempted to be captured by asking the respondents to give certain details of their current job, their job in 1986 and of any jobs between the two. What the pilot study has shown was that the open ended character of the questions gave rise to a varied interpretation of the questions and that respondents often omitted parts of the questions. Moreover, the analysis of the questionnaire showed that certain details like the geographical location and job title in each job were unnecessary for the research.

The motivational section of the questionnaire originally contained twenty statements and was measured on a 3-point Likert scale. While the majority of the statements were maintained, an additional ten statements have been included in order to achieve a better functioning of the planned factor analysis. The original 3-point scale was modified for a 5-point scale which was hoped to provide a more sensitive measurement.

The largest change has been made on the last section (Section 7) of the questionnaire which was designed to measure the degree of market orientation of the respondents. The analysis of the data showed that this information would be interesting for a cross-cultural comparative study but its contribution to the present research is limited. Moreover it has been recognised that without a comparative study, this measurement was not adequate to achieve Objective 3 which set to evaluate the impact of the mobility into tourism on the persons involved. To this end, a new measurement was devised which replaced the original Section 7.

It was at this point when the questionnaire has been modified for allowing the data to be scanned and thus saving valuable time and effort for the analysis.
Appendix 3.

The questionnaire
(English and Hungarian versions)
QUESTIONNAIRE

TO EMPLOYEES AND ENTREPRENEURS

IN TOURISM

1996

DOCTORAL RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF SURREY
This questionnaire forms part of my Doctoral Research undertaken at the University of Surrey, UK. The questionnaire is designed to examine certain aspects of employment and entrepreneurship in tourism. If you are currently working in tourism and previously have been working in other sector(s) of the economy, please help my research by completing the questionnaire. The questionnaire is anonymous and the answers will be treated as strictly confidential.

Thank you very much for your help with my research.

"A job in tourism is defined as working in hotels, restaurants, cafes, travel agencies and in transport and shops for tourists"

Edith Szivás

Department of Management Studies
University of Surrey
Guildford
GU2 5XH
United Kingdom

Tel: 01483 300 800 / 3118
Fax: 01483 259 387
Email: msp1es@surrey.ac.uk
Questionnaire

1. About you

1.1 After completing your education, was your first job in tourism? Yes / No

IF YES, there is no need for you to complete the questionnaire. Thank you for your co-operation.

IF NO, please go on completing the questionnaire.

1.2 Female / Male (please circle)

1.3 Which age group are you in? (please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16 - 25</th>
<th>26 - 35</th>
<th>36 - 45</th>
<th>46 - 55</th>
<th>56 - 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.4 What is your highest educational qualification? (please tick the appropriate box)

- Less than 8 grades of primary school
- Primary school
- Secondary school
- Higher education

1.5 Do you have any qualifications in tourism? Yes / No

1.6 Do you speak any foreign languages? Yes / No

2. Your present job in tourism

2.1 Type of business you work in and your job: (please tick the appropriate box for each section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Type of the business</th>
<th>II. Your position in the business is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>The owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest house</td>
<td>A managerial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>An employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency</td>
<td>III. The job is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (airline, coach, taxi etc.)</td>
<td>Your main job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>Your secondary job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Your present job title: .................................................................

2.3 How many people work in your hotel / restaurant / café etc.? (please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>under 11</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-50</th>
<th>51-300</th>
<th>more than 300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.4 How many people work for the entire company / company chain (if different from above)? (please tick the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>under 11</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-50</th>
<th>51-300</th>
<th>more than 300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5 In which town / village do you work? ..........................................................

2.6 How far is it from where you live? ............................................km

3. Your first job in tourism

In this section we are interested in your first job in tourism. IF YOUR PRESENT JOB IS YOUR FIRST JOB IN TOURISM, PLEASE GO TO SECTION 4.

3.1 In which year did you have your first job in tourism? ............

3.2 Type of the business and your job was: (please tick the appropriate box for each section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Type of the business was</th>
<th>II. Your position in the business was</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>The owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest house</td>
<td>A managerial position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>An employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency</td>
<td>III. The job was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (airline, coach, taxi etc.)</td>
<td>Your main job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td>Your secondary job</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.................................................................
4. Your past career

4.1 Were you employed prior to entering tourism? Yes / No
   If NO, were you: □ Unemployed □ Housewife
   □ Other (please specify): ......................................................

4.2 Which sector(s) of the economy did you work in during the last 10 years? (Please indicate the sector of the economy you were working in by ticking the appropriate sector box for each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and real estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration, social security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (as employment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A job in tourism is defined as working in hotels, restaurants, cafés, travel agencies and in transport and shops for tourists.

4.3 Prior to moving into tourism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was your position?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The owner of a business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A managerial position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Your move into tourism

5.1 Please try to remember the time when you decided to move into the tourism industry. The table below contains 30 statements. To what extent do you agree with them?

*(please tick the appropriate box for each statement)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I chose tourism because:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I earned too little in my previous job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wanted better working conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I wanted an interesting job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My family had a business in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I was unemployed and needed a job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I wanted to travel more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I wanted to use my language skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I needed extra money quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The industry I worked in before was declining.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I wanted an appropriate income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I wanted a job that suited my education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I wanted to leave my previous job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I could not get a job elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I like to try different jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I wanted to start my own business.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Did you have to move geographically in order to get a job / establish your business in tourism? **Yes** / **No**

If **Yes**, how far did you move? ..................km

5.3 Here we are interested in the changes that occurred when you moved into tourism. Please compare your **last job** prior to entering tourism with your **first job in tourism**.  
*(please tick the appropriate box for all 10 categories)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significantly improved</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Worsened</th>
<th>Significantly worsened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your control over your work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience of working hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility of your job with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Questions to the entrepreneurs

6.1 Do you have a business in tourism? **Yes** / **No**

If **NO**, thank you very much for your help.

If **YES**, please answer the questions on the next page.
Questions to the Entrepreneurs

I. When first establishing your business in tourism, where did you learn the skills needed for having a business? 
(please tick maximum 2 boxes)

☐ 'on the job'.
☐ in previous employment(s)
☐ at previous business
☐ at school
☐ other (please specify): .............................................

II. When first establishing your business in tourism, where did you learn the skills needed for having a business in tourism? 
(please tick maximum 2 boxes)

☐ 'on the job'.
☐ in previous employment(s)
☐ at previous business
☐ at school
☐ other (please specify): .............................................

III. In running your business in tourism, which of the following skills do you find most useful? 
(please tick only maximum 3 boxes)

☐ a knowledge of finance & accounting
☐ a knowledge of economics
☐ a knowledge of marketing
☐ ability to handle people
☐ ability to make contacts
☐ a knowledge of the tourism industry
☐ ability to speak foreign language(s)
☐ ability to use computers
☐ other (please specify): .............................................

IV. When first establishing your business in tourism, where did the capital come from? 
(please tick the appropriate boxes)

☐ personal savings from previous tourism job(s)
☐ personal savings from previous non-tourism job(s)
☐ inheritance
☐ borrowings from financial institution
☐ borrowings from family, friends
☐ business outside tourism
☐ other (please specify): .............................................

Thank you very much.
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1. Néhány Önre vonatkozó kérdés

1.1 Tanulmányai befejezése után az első munkahelye a turizmusban volt? Igen / Nem
   Ha IGEN, nem kell kitöltenie a kérdőivet. Köszönjük szépen segítőkészségét.
   Ha NEM, kérjük folytassa a kérdőív kitöltését.

1.2 Nő / Férfi (kérjük karikázza be a helyes választ)

1.3 Melyik életkori csoportba tartozik? (kérjük tegyen pipajeleit a megfelelő kategóriába)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Mi a legmagasabb iskolai végzettsége? (kérjük tegyen pipajeleit a megfelelő kategóriába)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8 általánosnál kevesebb</th>
<th>Általános iskola</th>
<th>Középiskola</th>
<th>Egyetem/ főiskola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5 Rendelkezik valamilyen idegenforgalmi képesíttéssel? Igen / Nem

1.6 Beszéli idegen nyelvet? Igen / Nem

2. Jelenlegi állása a turizmusban

2.1 A vállalat jellege és az Ön állása: (kérjük töltse ki mindhárom kategóriát)

I. A vállalat jellege
   - Szálloda
   - Panzió
   - Étterem
   - Cukrászda, kávézó stb.
   - Utazási iroda
   - Szállítás (légitársaság, taxi stb.)
   - Egyéb (kérjük részletezze):

II. Az Ön jogállása
   - Üzlet tulajdonosi vállalkozó
   - Vezető beosztású alkalmazott
   - Alkalmazott

III. Az állás
   - Főállás
   - Mellékállás
2.2 Jelenlegi beosztása: ..............................................................

2.3 A vállalatnál foglalkoztatottak száma: (kérjük tegyen pipajelel a megfelelő kategóriába)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-50</th>
<th>51-300</th>
<th>300-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Az anyavállalatnál foglalkoztatottak száma (ha különbözik az előzőtől): (kérjük tegyen pipajelel a megfelelő kategóriába)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-50</th>
<th>51-300</th>
<th>300-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5 Melyik településen van az Ön munkahelye? ..........................................................

2.6 Ez milyen messze van a lakóhelyétől? ........................................ km

3. Az első munkahelye / vállalkozása a turizmusban

A kérdőív ezen szakasza a turizmusban betöltött első munkahelyével / vállalkozásával foglalkozik. AMENNYIBEN JELENLEGI ÁLLÁSA MELEGYEZIK A TURIZMUSBAN BETÖLTOTT ELSŐ ÁLLÁSÁVAL, KÉRJÜK HAGYJA KI EZT ÉR RÉSZT, ÉS FOLYTASSA A 4. SZAKASSZAL.

3.1 Melyik évben kezdett el először a turizmusban dolgozni? 19...........

3.2 A turizmus melyik szektorában kezdett el dolgozni, és mi volt az Ön jogállása? (kérjük töltse ki mindidrom kategóriáit)

I. A vállalat jellege

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a következő volt:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Szálloda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panzió</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étterem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cukrászda, kávéző stb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utazási iroda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szállítás (légitársaság, taxi stb.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyéb (kérjük részletezze):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Mi volt az Ön jogállása?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Üzleltulajdonos/vállalkozó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vezető beosztású alkalmazott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalmazott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Főállás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Mellékállás</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Korábbi pályafutása

4.1 A turizmust közvetlenül megelőzően állásban volt-e? Igen / Nem

Ha NEM, mi volt a jogállása: □ Munkanélküli □ Háztartással
□ Egyéb (kérjük részletezz):

4.2 Mely gazdasági szektor(ek)ban dolgozott az elmúlt 10 év során? (kérjük pipajellel jeleze hogy melyik évben mely gazdasági szektorban dolgozott)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turizmus *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezőgazdaság</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bányászat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldolgozóipar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energiaszektor és vízellátás</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Építőipar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kereskedelem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javítás, karbantartás</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szállítás, raktározás, posta és távkölzés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pénz- és ingatlanügy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Közigazgatás, társadalombiztosítás</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oktatás (mint munkabély)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egészségügy és szociális ellátás</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkanélküli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyéb (kérjük részletezz):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A turizmusba beletartozik a szálloda, étterem, cukrászda, utazási iroda valamint a turistákat ellátó bolt és a turisták szállítása

4.3 A turizmusban való munkavállalást vagy üzletalapítást közvetlenül megelőzően:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mi volt az Ön jogállása?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Üzleteltájékozó/vállalkozó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vezető beosztású alkalmazott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkalmazott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. A turizmusban való munkavállalás / vállalkozásalapítás

5.1 Kérjük próbáljon visszamélyézni arra az időre, amikor úgy döntött, hogy a turizmusban fog munkát vállalni vagy vállalkozást kezdeni. Az alábbi táblázat 30 állítást tartalmaz. Milyen mértékben ért egyet velük?

(kérjük értékelje mind a 30 állítást oly módon, hogy pipajelét tesz a megfelelő kategóriába)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Azért választottam a turizmust, mert:</th>
<th>Egyéni állítás nem érték</th>
<th>Egyéni állítás érték</th>
<th>Semleges</th>
<th>Egyéni állítás</th>
<th>Krókeny állítás</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. az előző munkahelyemen túlcsorgóan keveset kerestem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a turizmusban könnyű volt saját vállalkozást indítani.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. kiegészítő jövedelemre volt szükségem életszínvonalam javítása céljából.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. jobb munkafeltételeket akartam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. a turizmus jó kereseti lehetőségeket kínált.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. változatos munkát akartam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. a családomnak a turizmusban volt vállalkozása.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. tőkét akartam győjeni egy későbbi vállalkozáshoz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. munkanélküli voltam és állásra volt szükségem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. a turizmust jövedelmező üzletágnak láttam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. a turizmus image-e vonzott.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. többet akartam utazni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. használni akartam nyelvtudásomat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. jó vállalkozási lehetőségeket láttam a turizmusban.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. gyorsan kellett kiegészítő jövedelem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. az iparág, amelyben korábban dolgoztam, hanyatlóban volt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. megfelelő jövedelemre akartam szert tenni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. képesítéseimnek megfelelő állást kerestem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. előző iparágamban nem láttam lehetőségeket.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ott akartam hagyni előző állásomat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. olyan munkát akartam, ahol emberekkel lehet foglalkozni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. a turizmust lattam a vállalkozás szempontjából a legjövedelmezőbb üzletágnak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. más gazdasági szektornak nem kaptam állást.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. olyan munkára volt szükségem, amelyhez nem kellett különösebb képesítés.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. úgy adódott, hogy a turizmusban ajánlották az első állást.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. kellemes környezetben akartam dolgozni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. szeretek kiprobláni különböző munkákat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. saját vállalkozást akartam alapítani.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. jó üzleti érzékel van, és úgy vélem, hogy a turizmusban ezt jól ki tudom használni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. jobb életszínvonalat akartam elérni.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 A turizmusban való munkavállalás/vállalkozáskezdés érdekében kellett-e költöznie? Igen / Nem

Ha IGEN, milyen messze költözött? .................km

5.3 A turizmusba való jövetel kapcsán milyen változások következtek be munkájában és életkörülményeiben? Kérjük hasonlítsa össze a turizmust közvetlenül megelőző munkáját a turizmusban betöltött első foglalkozásával és értékelje a változás irányát az adott szempontokra vonatkozóan.

(kérjük értékelje mind a 10 körülményt oly módon, hogy pipajelet tesz a megfelelő kategóriába)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jelentősén javult</th>
<th>Javult</th>
<th>Nem változott</th>
<th>Rosszabbodott</th>
<th>Jelentősen rosszabbodott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A munkahely biztonsága</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karrierlehetőségei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Társadalmi státusza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkakörülményei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Élelszinvonala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkája feletti kontrollja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkaidőbeosztása</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munkájával való elégedettsége</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A munkája és iskolai végzettsége közti megfeleles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jövedelme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Néhány kérdés a vállalkozók számára

6.1 Rendelkezik-e saját vállalkozással a turizmusban? Igen / Nem

Ha NEM, köszönöm szépen a kutatáshoz való hozzájárulását!

Ha IGEN, kérem fordítson a túloldalon lévő kérdésekhez.
Kérdések a vállalkozókhoz

I. Első turizmusbeli vállalkozása alapításakor honnét szerezte a vállalkozáshoz szükséges ismereteket? (kérjük maximum 2 négyzetet jelöljön)

☐ a mindennapi tapasztalatok során
☐ korábbi állás(ek) kapcsán
☐ korábbi vállalkozás tapasztalata
☐ iskolai tanulmányok során
☐ egyéb (kérjük részletezze):..................................................

II. Első turizmusbeli vállalkozása alapításakor honnét szerezte az idegenforgalmi vállalkozáshoz szükséges ismereteket? (kérjük maximum 2 négyzetet jelöljön)

☐ a mindennapi tapasztalatok során
☐ korábbi állás(ek) kapcsán
☐ korábbi vállalkozás tapasztalata
☐ iskolai tanulmányok során
☐ egyéb (kérjük részletezze):..................................................

III. A turizmusban lévő vállalkozása menedzselése során mely ismereteket és képességeket találja a leghasznosabbnak? (kérjük maximum 3 négyzetet jelöljön)

☐ pénzügyi és könyvelési ismeretek
☐ közgazdaságtani ismeretek
☐ marketingismeretek
☐ emberekkel való sikeres bánásmód
☐ jó (üzleti) kapcsolatteremtő képesség
☐ a turizmus mint üzletág ismerete
☐ idegennyelvtudás
☐ számitástechnikai ismeretek
☐ egyéb (kérjük részletezze):..................................................

IV. Amikor az első vállalkozását alapította a turizmusban, honnét származott az alapításhoz szükséges tőke? (kérjük tegyen pipajelet a megfelelő négyzetekbe)

☐ korábbi turizmusbeli állás(ek) során történt megtakarítás
☐ korábbi állás(ek) során történt megtakarítás
☐ családi örökség
☐ pénzintézetttől felvett kölcsön
☐ családi kölcsön
☐ korábbi, turizmuson kívüli üzleti tevékenység
☐ egyéb (kérjük részletezze):..................................................

**Köszönöm szépen a kutatáshoz való hozzájárulását!**
Appendix 4.

Research summary
Introduction

The purpose here is to describe a study which is currently being carried out at the Department of Management Studies at the University of Surrey, UK. The research is undertaken by Edith Szivás for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy and is supervised by Dr Michael Riley.

Research objectives

The research looks at Hungary and is concerned with inter-sector labour mobility which has terminated in the tourism industry. The objectives of the research are threefold. Firstly, it is aimed at examining the pattern of inter-sector mobility prior to entering the tourism industry. Secondly, it investigates the reasons for entering tourism, and thirdly, it examines the impacts of the transition on the individual and for the economy.

Rationale

Labour moves into tourism for a variety of reasons. For some, tourism might serve as an escape route from routine work, hard work, declining industries, bad employers or from unemployment. For others, tourism employment might be seen as a utility for gaining economic or other benefits. And finally, tourism might attract those with entrepreneurial 'flair' and might offer these people opportunities not readily available elsewhere in the economy. The research accepts that all three cases will apply but a particular proposition is at stake which is, that tourism, because of relative ease of access and entrepreneurial nature, may be both a 'refugee' sector which is of benefit to national employment and a 'economy' sector for potential entrepreneurs which is of benefit to growth.

The impact of the mobility on the individual may include a rise or decline in income, human capital enrichment or devaluation, positive or negative change in employment status or career opportunities. As a consequence, for some people the net result is loss while for others it is an unquestionable gain.
The mobility of labour impacts on the economy. By offering jobs which, by their skill requirements are relatively easily accessible, tourism, on the one hand, has an ability to absorb access labour while, on the other hand, it can also take labour away from other industries. While in the second case tourism displaces other industries by bidding for one of the factors of production, in the first case the contribution of tourism to development is positive.

The sample profile

The research focuses on individuals currently working in the tourism industry who have worked in other sectors of the economy in the last ten years. The research requires access to employees who fit the profile.

The case of Hungary

By being an economy in transition, Hungary presents a special case for the study of labour mobility into tourism. The labour force which was traditionally immobile, suddenly found both the opportunity and the necessity to move from employment to employment and from one industry to an other. The present research will put the study of labour mobility towards tourism into the context of an economy in transition, for which Hungary offers an interesting and challenging locale.

Contact Address:

Edith Szivás
University of Surrey
Department of Management Studies
Guildford GU2 5XH United Kingdom
Tel: 44 1483 300 800 ext. 3118
Fax: 44 1483 259 387
email: msp1es@surrey.ac.uk
Appendix 5.

The effect of explanatory variables on the change dimensions

Results from the statistical tests
A. Explanatory variable: AGE

Statistical test: ANOVA

Variable: Job security

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of job security change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of job security change} \]

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job security change by age

Variable: Career prospects

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of career prospects change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of career prospects change} \]

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for career prospects change by age
Variable: Social status

H₀: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of social status change
H₁: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of social status change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>16-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>16-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.26 One-Way ANOVA for social status change by age

Social status improved the 26-35 age group while it worsened for the 56-65 age group.

Variable: Physical environment

H₀: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of physical environment change
H₁: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of physical environment change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for physical environment change by age
Variable: Standard of living

$H_0$: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of standard of living change
$H_1$: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of standard of living change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for standard of living change by age

Variable: Control over work

$H_0$: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of control over work change
$H_1$: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of control over work change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for control over work change by age

Variable: Working hours

$H_0$: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of working hours change
$H_1$: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of working hours change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for working hours change by age
Variable: Job satisfaction

H₀: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of job satisfaction change
H₁: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of job satisfaction change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job satisfaction change by age

Variable: Education/job match

H₀: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of education/job match change
H₁: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of education/job match change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for education/job match change by age

Variable: Income

H₀: There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of income change
H₁: There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of income change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for income change by age
Variable: Overall change

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of overall change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the five age groups in their evaluation of overall change} \]

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for overall change by age
B. Explanatory variable: GENDER

Statistical test: t-test

Variable: Job security

H₀: There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of job security change
H₁: There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of job security change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean for women</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean for men</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>2.6418</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>2.4662</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>df: 347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t-test for job security change variable by gender

Given the large observed significance level of 0.134, H₀ must be accepted and H₁ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for job security change between men and women.

Variable: Career prospects

H₀: There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of career prospects change
H₁: There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of career prospects change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean for women</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean for men</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career prospects</td>
<td>2.5700</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>2.4662</td>
<td>0.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>df: 346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t-test for career prospects change variable by gender

Given the large observed significance level of 0.183, H₀ must be accepted and H₁ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for career prospects change between men and women.
Variable: Social status

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of social status change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of social status change} \]

Mean for women: 2.6633  SD: 0.726  
Mean for men: 2.7192  SD: 0.828 

t-value assuming equal variances: -0.66  df: 343 
2-tail significance level: 0.507

**t-test for social status change variable by gender**

Given the large observed significance level of 0.507, \( H_0 \) has to be accepted and \( H_1 \) be rejected. There is *not enough statistical evidence* to prove the differences in the mean values for social status change between men and women.

Variable: Physical environment

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of physical environment change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of physical environment change} \]

Mean for women: 2.3532  SD: 0.818  
Mean for men: 2.2416  SD: 0.913 

t-value assuming equal variances: 1.20  df: 348 
2-tail significance level: 0.231

**t-test for physical environment change variable by gender**

Given the large observed significance level of 0.231, \( H_0 \) has to be accepted and \( H_1 \) be rejected. There is *not enough statistical evidence* to prove the differences in the mean values for physical environment change between men and women.
Variable: Standard of living

H₀: There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of standard of living change
H₁: There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of standard of living change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean for women:</th>
<th>Mean for men:</th>
<th>t-value assuming equal variances:</th>
<th>df:</th>
<th>2-tail significance level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living</td>
<td>2.4750</td>
<td>2.37116</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-test for standard of living change variable by gender**

Given the large observed significance level of 0.248, H₀ has to be accepted and H₁ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for standard of living change between men and women.

Variable: Control over work

H₀: There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of control over work change
H₁: There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of control over work change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean for women:</th>
<th>Mean for men:</th>
<th>t-value assuming equal variances:</th>
<th>df:</th>
<th>2-tail significance level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control over work</td>
<td>2.4400</td>
<td>2.2653</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-test for control over work change variable by gender**

Given the small observed significance level of 0.031, H₀ can be rejected and H₁ be accepted. The data provides enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for control over work between men and women.

Control over work improved slightly more for men than for women.
Variable: Working hours

\[ H_0: \text{ There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of working hours change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{ There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of working hours change} \]

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for women:</td>
<td>2.8700</td>
<td>SD: 1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for men:</td>
<td>2.8054</td>
<td>SD: 1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal differences:</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>df: 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level:</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-test for working hours change variable by gender**

Given the large observed significance level of 0.581, \( H_0 \) has to be accepted and \( H_1 \) be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for working hours change between men and women.

Variable: Job satisfaction

\[ H_0: \text{ There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of job satisfaction change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{ There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of job satisfaction change} \]

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for women:</td>
<td>2.1850</td>
<td>SD: 0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for men:</td>
<td>2.31108</td>
<td>SD: 0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal variances:</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>df: 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level:</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-test for job satisfaction change variable by gender**

Given the large observed significance level of 0.166, \( H_0 \) has to be accepted and \( H_1 \) be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for job satisfaction change between men and women.
Variable: Education/job match

$H_0$: There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of education/job match change

$H_1$: There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of education/job match change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean for women:</th>
<th>Mean for men:</th>
<th>t-value assuming equal variances:</th>
<th>2-tail significance level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6332</td>
<td>2.8514</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tail significance level: 0.025

t-test for education/job match change variable by gender

Given the small observed significance level of 0.025, $H_0$ can be rejected and $H_1$ be accepted. The data provides enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for the education/job match variable change between men and women.

The education/job match variable has improved slightly more for women than for men.

Variable: Income

$H_0$: There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of income change

$H_1$: There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of income change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean for women:</th>
<th>Mean for men:</th>
<th>t-value assuming equal variances:</th>
<th>2-tail significance level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3650</td>
<td>2.3219</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-tail significance level: 0.675

t-test for income change variable by gender

Given the large observed significance level of 0.675, $H_0$ has to be accepted and $H_1$ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for income change between men and women.
Variable: Overall change

H₀: There is no difference between men and women in their evaluation of overall change
H₁: There is a difference between men and women in their evaluation of overall change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for women</td>
<td>2.5211</td>
<td>0.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for men</td>
<td>2.5050</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal variances</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the large observed significance level of 0.796, H₀ has to be accepted and H₁ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for the overall change between men and women.
C. Explanatory variable: EDUCATION

Statistical test: ANOVA

Variable: Job security

$H_0$: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of job security change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of job security change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job security change by education

Variable: Career prospects

$H_0$: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of career prospects change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of career prospects change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Less then primary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4396</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2.4396</td>
<td>2.6273</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>3.0606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6273</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>Less then primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0606</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for career prospects change by education

Career prospects for those with higher and secondary education improved while the prospects did not change for those with primary education.
Variable: Social status

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of social status change

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of social status change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Less then primary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5870</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2.5870</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>3.0303</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
<td>3.0303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0303</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>Less then primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.26 One-Way ANOVA for social status change by education

Social status improved more for those with higher education than for those with primary school education.

Variable: Physical environment

H<sub>0</sub>: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of physical environment change

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of physical environment change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for physical environment change by education
Variable: Standard of living

$H_0$: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of standard of living change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of standard of living change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for *standard of living* change by education

Variable: Control over work

$H_0$: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of control over work change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of control over work change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for *control over work* change by education

Variable: Working hours

$H_0$: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of working hours change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of working hours change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for *working hours* change by education
Variable: Job satisfaction

H₀: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of job satisfaction change
H₁: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of job satisfaction change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job satisfaction change by education

Variable: Education/job match

H₀: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of education/job match change
H₁: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of education/job match change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for education/job match change by education

Variable: Income

H₀: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of income change
H₁: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of income change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for income change by education
Variable: Overall change

H₀: There is no difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of overall change
H₁: There is a difference between the four educational groups in their evaluation of overall change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.050 level.

One-Way ANOVA for overall change by education
D. Explanatory variable: LOCATION

Statistical test: ANOVA

Variable: Job security

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of job security change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of job security change} \]

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job security change by location

Variable: Career prospects

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of career prospects change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of career prospects change} \]

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Western Hungary</th>
<th>Lake Balaton</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5492</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>2.5492</td>
<td>2.5541</td>
<td>2.7674</td>
<td>2.9737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5541</td>
<td>Western Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7674</td>
<td>Lake Balaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9737</td>
<td>Northern Hungary *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for career prospects change by location

Those living in Budapest reported a more positive change on their career prospects than those in northern Hungary.
Variable: Social status

$H_0$: There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of social status change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of social status change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05% level.

One-Way ANOVA for social status change by location

Variable: Physical environment

$H_0$: There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of physical environment change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of physical environment change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Western Hungary</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Lake Balaton</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1216</td>
<td>Western Hungary</td>
<td>2.1216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2474</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>2.2474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3636</td>
<td>Lake Balaton</td>
<td>2.3636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8947</td>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td>2.8947</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for physical environment change by location

Physical environment improved least for those living in northern Hungary.
Variable: Standard of living

H₀: There is no difference between the four locational groups in the evaluation of standard of living change
H₁: There is a difference between the four locational groups in the evaluation of standard of living change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Western Hungary</th>
<th>Lake Balaton</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2973</td>
<td>Western Hungary</td>
<td>2.2973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3409</td>
<td>Lake Balaton</td>
<td>2.3409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3711</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>2.3711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1389</td>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for standard of living change by location

Standard of living worsened for those living in northern Hungary while the other three groups reported an improvement for the variable.
Variable: Control over work

H₀: There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of control over work change
H₁: There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of control over work change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lake Balaton</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Western Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1591</td>
<td>Lake Balaton</td>
<td>2.1591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2984</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>2.2984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4595</td>
<td>Western Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7632</td>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for control over work change by location

Control over work improved less for those in Northern Hungary than for those in Budapest and by the Lake Balaton.

Variable: Working hours

H₀: There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of working hours change
H₁: There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of working hours change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for working hours change by location
Variable: Job satisfaction

H₀: There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of job satisfaction change
H₁: There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of job satisfaction change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Western Hungary</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Lake Balaton</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0822</td>
<td>Western Hungary</td>
<td>2.0822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2216</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>2.2216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2955</td>
<td>Lake Balaton</td>
<td>2.2955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5676</td>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td>2.5676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for job satisfaction change by location

Job satisfaction improved less for those in Northern Hungary than for those in western Hungary.

Variable: Education/job match

H₀: There is no difference between the four locational groups in the evaluation of education/job match change
H₁: There is a difference between the four locational groups in the evaluation of education/job match change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for education/job match change by location
Variable: Income

H₀: There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of income change
H₁: There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of income change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Western Hungary</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Lake Balaton</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2329</td>
<td>Western Hungary</td>
<td>2.2329</td>
<td>2.2461</td>
<td>2.3864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2461</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3864</td>
<td>Lake Balaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0263</td>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for income change by location

Income slightly worsened for those in Northern Hungary while it improved for those in the three other regions.

Variable: Overall change

H₀: There is no difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of overall change
H₁: There is a difference between the four locational groups in their evaluation of overall change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Western Hungary</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Lake Balaton</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4455</td>
<td>Western Hungary</td>
<td>2.4455</td>
<td>2.4585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4585</td>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5462</td>
<td>Lake Balaton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8956</td>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for overall change by location

Overall change was less favourably appraised by those living in Northern Hungary than by those in the three other regions.
E. Explanatory variable: INDUSTRY FROM

Statistical test: ANOVA

Variable: Job security

\[ H_0: \] There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of job security change
\[ H_1: \] There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of job security change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job security change by industry from

Variable: Career prospects

\[ H_0: \] There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of career prospects change
\[ H_1: \] There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of career prospects change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for career prospects change by industry from

Variable: Social status

\[ H_0: \] There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of social status change
\[ H_1: \] There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of social status change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for social status change by industry from
Variable: Physical environment

H₀: There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of physical environment change
H₁: There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of physical environment change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for physical environment change by industry from

Variable: Standard of living

H₀: There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of standard of living change
H₁: There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of standard of living change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for standard of living change by industry from

Variable: Control over work

H₀: There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of control over work change
H₁: There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of control over work change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for control over work change by industry from

Variable: Working hours

H₀: There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of working hours change
H₁: There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of working hours change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for working hours change by industry from
Variable: Job satisfaction

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of job satisfaction change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of job satisfaction change} \]

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job satisfaction change by industry from

Variable: Education/job match

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of education/job match change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of education/job match change} \]

There is a significant difference between the two groups. The difference is indicated by "*" sign. Table shows the only difference found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Industry from</th>
<th>Trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3077</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.5593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for education/job match change by industry from

Those who moved from education into tourism reported a worsening position on the skill(education)/job match variable. This differs significantly from those who came from trade- in their case the education/job match has improved.

Variable: Income

\[ H_0: \text{There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of income change} \]
\[ H_1: \text{There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of income change} \]

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for income change by industry from
Variable: Overall change

$H_0$: There is no difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of overall change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the groups coming from different industries in their evaluation of overall change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for overall change by industry from
F. Explanatory variable: YEAR OF CHANGE

Statistical test: t-test

Variable: Job security

H₀: There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of job security change
H₁: There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of job security change

| Mean for those who moved after 1987: | 2.5836 | SD: 1.106 |
| Mean for those who moved before 1987: | 2.5000 | SD: 0.985 |
| t-value assuming equal variances: | 0.57 | df: 347 |
| 2-tail significance level: | 0.568 |

Given the large observed significance level of 0.568, H₀ has to be accepted and H₁ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for job security change between the two groups.

Variable: Career prospects

H₀: There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of career prospects change
H₁: There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of career prospects change

| Mean for those who moved after 1987: | 2.6441 | SD: 0.867 |
| Mean for those who moved before 1987: | 2.5373 | SD: 0.893 |
| t-value assuming equal variances: | 0.90 | df: 346 |
| 2-tail significance level: | 0.368 |

Given the large observed significance level of 0.368, H₀ has to be accepted and H₁ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for career prospects change between the two groups.
Variable: Social status

H₀: There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of social status change
H₁: There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of social status change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean for those who moved after 1987:</th>
<th>SD: 0.777</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved before 1987:</td>
<td>2.547</td>
<td>SD: 0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal variances:</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>df: 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level:</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-test for social status change variable by year of change**

Given the small observed significance level of 0.039, H₀ can be rejected and H₁ be accepted. The data provides enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for social status change between the two groups.

Social status improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987.

Variable: Physical environment

H₀: There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of physical environment change
H₁: There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of physical environment change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean for those who moved after 1987:</th>
<th>SD: 0.885</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved before 1987:</td>
<td>2.1324</td>
<td>SD: 0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal variances:</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>df: 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level:</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-test for job physical environment change variable by year of change**

Given the large observed significance level of 0.064, H₀ can not be rejected and H₁ has to be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for physical environment change between the two groups.
Variable: Standard of living

\( H_0: \) There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of standard of living change  
\( H_1: \) There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of standard of living change  

| Mean for those who moved after 1987: | 2.4591 | SD: 0.828 |
| Mean for those who moved before 1987: | 2.3134 | SD: 0.802 |
| t-value assuming equal variances: | 1.30 | df: 346 |
| 2-tail significance level: | 0.194 |

**t-test for standard of living change variable by year of change**

Given the large observed significance level of 0.194, \( H_0 \) has to be accepted and \( H_1 \) be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for standard of living change between the two groups.

Variable: Control over work

\( H_0: \) There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of control over work change  
\( H_1: \) There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of control over work change  

| Mean for those who moved after 1987: | 2.4050 | SD: 0.766 |
| Mean for those who moved before 1987: | 2.2059 | SD: 0.636 |
| t-value assuming equal variances: | 1.98 | df: 345 |
| 2-tail significance level: | 0.048 |

**t-test for control over work change variable by year of change**

Given the small observed significance level of 0.048, \( H_0 \) can be rejected and \( H_1 \) be accepted. There is enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for control over work change between the two groups.

Control over work improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987.
Variable: Working hours

H₀: There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of working hours change
H₁: There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of working hours change

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved after 1987:</td>
<td>2.9146</td>
<td>SD: 1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved before 1987:</td>
<td>2.5441</td>
<td>SD: 0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal variances:</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>df: 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level:</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t-test for working hours change variable by year of change

Given the small observed significance level of 0.011, H₀ has can be rejected and H₁ be accepted. There is enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for working hours change between the two groups.

Working hours improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987.

Variable: Job satisfaction

H₀: There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of job satisfaction change
H₁: There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of job satisfaction change

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved after 1987:</td>
<td>2.2750</td>
<td>SD: 0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved before 1987:</td>
<td>2.0882</td>
<td>SD: 0.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal variances:</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>df: 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level:</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

t-test for job satisfaction change variable by year of change

Given the large observed significance level of 0.099, H₀ has to be accepted and H₁ be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for job satisfaction change between the two groups.
Variable: Education/job match

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>After 1987</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Before 1987</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.7814</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>df: 345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_t-test for education/job match_ change variable by year of change

Given the small observed significance level of 0.020, H\(_0\) can be rejected and H\(_1\) be accepted. There is enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for education/job match change between the two groups.

The education/job match has improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987.

Variable: Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>After 1987</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Before 1987</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.3525</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>2.3235</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>df: 344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_t-test for income change variable by year of change

Given the large observed significance level of 0.82, H\(_0\) has to be accepted and H\(_1\) be rejected. There is not enough statistical evidence to prove the differences in the mean values for income change between the two groups.
Variable: Overall change

H₀: There is no difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of overall change
H₁: There is a difference between those who moved into tourism before and after 1987 in their evaluation of overall change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved after 1987:</td>
<td>2.5495</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for those who moved before 1987:</td>
<td>2.3681</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-value assuming equal variances:</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>df: 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-tail significance level:</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t-test for overall change variable by year of change**

Given the small observed significance level of 0.020, H₀ can be rejected and H₁ be accepted. There is *enough statistical evidence* to prove the differences in the mean values for *overall change* between the two groups.

The *overall change* dimension improved slightly more for those who moved into tourism before 1987.
G. Explanatory variable: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Statistical test: ANOVA

Variable: Job security

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of job security change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of job security change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job security change by employment status

Variable: Career prospects

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of career prospects change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of career prospects change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Entrepreneur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1385</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>2.1385</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7302</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>2.7302</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7619</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>2.7619</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for career prospects change by employment status

Career prospects improved more for managers than for employees and entrepreneurs.
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Variable: Social status

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of social status change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of social status change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Manager 2.3692</th>
<th>Employee 2.7480</th>
<th>Entrepreneur 3.9524</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3692</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7480</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9524</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for social status change by employment status

Social status improved more for managers than for entrepreneurs and employees.

Variable: Physical environment

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of physical environment change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of physical environment change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for physical environment change by employment status
Variable: Standard of living

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of standard of living change
H₁: There is a difference between the three educational groups with different employment status in their evaluation of standard of living change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for standard of living change by employment status

Variable: Control over work

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of control over work change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of control over work change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for control over work variable by employment status

Variable: Working hours

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of working hours change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of working hours change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Employment prospects</th>
<th>Employee 2.7747</th>
<th>Manager 3.1385</th>
<th>Entrepreneur 3.1905</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7747</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1385</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1905</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for working hours change by employment status

Working hours worsened for managers while they slightly improved for employees.
Variable: Job satisfaction

$H_0$: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of job satisfaction change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of job satisfaction change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for job satisfaction change by employment status

Variable: Education/job match

$H_0$: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of education/job match change

$H_1$: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of education/job match change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Employee</th>
<th>Entrepreneur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5231</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>2.5231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7291</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>2.7291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2857</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for education/job match change by employment status

Education/job match worsened for entrepreneurs while it improved for the two other groups.
Variable: Income

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of income change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of income change

There are significant differences between the following groups. The differences are indicated by "*" sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Entrepreneur 1.8500</th>
<th>Manager 2.1907</th>
<th>Employee 2.4387</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8500</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1905</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4387</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Way ANOVA for income change by employment status

Income has improved more for entrepreneurs than for employees.

Variable: Overall change

H₀: There is no difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of overall change
H₁: There is a difference between the three groups with different employment status in their evaluation of overall change

No two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA for overall change by employment status
Appendix 6.

Scale-item results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Scale Mean</th>
<th>Scale Variance</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Squared</th>
<th>Squared Multiple Correlation</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATM1</td>
<td>89.3402</td>
<td>125.8321</td>
<td>.3934</td>
<td>.4048</td>
<td>.8057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM2</td>
<td>90.0069</td>
<td>129.1172</td>
<td>.3388</td>
<td>.2305</td>
<td>.8082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM3</td>
<td>89.5704</td>
<td>124.8321</td>
<td>.4264</td>
<td>.4827</td>
<td>.8042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM4</td>
<td>88.9003</td>
<td>127.8624</td>
<td>.3608</td>
<td>.3690</td>
<td>.8072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM5</td>
<td>89.0515</td>
<td>126.6215</td>
<td>.4408</td>
<td>.5182</td>
<td>.8045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM6</td>
<td>88.5670</td>
<td>131.0257</td>
<td>.2590</td>
<td>.4781</td>
<td>.8109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM7</td>
<td>90.3196</td>
<td>130.2596</td>
<td>.2380</td>
<td>.3940</td>
<td>.8118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM8</td>
<td>90.1237</td>
<td>126.0329</td>
<td>.4492</td>
<td>.5206</td>
<td>.8039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM9</td>
<td>90.3952</td>
<td>132.1985</td>
<td>.1271</td>
<td>.3698</td>
<td>.8167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM10</td>
<td>89.0137</td>
<td>127.3722</td>
<td>.4437</td>
<td>.5063</td>
<td>.8048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM11</td>
<td>88.9450</td>
<td>128.8521</td>
<td>.3008</td>
<td>.4266</td>
<td>.8095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM12</td>
<td>89.5120</td>
<td>125.8783</td>
<td>.3999</td>
<td>.4196</td>
<td>.8055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM13</td>
<td>89.1856</td>
<td>125.5930</td>
<td>.3808</td>
<td>.4699</td>
<td>.8062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM14</td>
<td>89.4674</td>
<td>124.5119</td>
<td>.5395</td>
<td>.5374</td>
<td>.8008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM15</td>
<td>89.9794</td>
<td>127.2685</td>
<td>.3687</td>
<td>.4485</td>
<td>.8069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM16</td>
<td>89.6907</td>
<td>130.0764</td>
<td>.1789</td>
<td>.3757</td>
<td>.8156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM17</td>
<td>88.9038</td>
<td>127.4735</td>
<td>.4088</td>
<td>.5694</td>
<td>.8057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM18</td>
<td>89.1581</td>
<td>129.5887</td>
<td>.2547</td>
<td>.3351</td>
<td>.8113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM19</td>
<td>89.3024</td>
<td>128.3289</td>
<td>.2674</td>
<td>.4820</td>
<td>.8112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM20</td>
<td>89.1100</td>
<td>129.8086</td>
<td>.2237</td>
<td>.3707</td>
<td>.8128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM21</td>
<td>88.7904</td>
<td>130.0835</td>
<td>.2456</td>
<td>.4360</td>
<td>.8115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM22</td>
<td>89.5773</td>
<td>124.4449</td>
<td>.5524</td>
<td>.5168</td>
<td>.8004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM23</td>
<td>90.2887</td>
<td>131.5647</td>
<td>.1775</td>
<td>.4341</td>
<td>.8141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM24</td>
<td>90.2887</td>
<td>131.2405</td>
<td>.1704</td>
<td>.3356</td>
<td>.8148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM25</td>
<td>89.8282</td>
<td>132.0669</td>
<td>.1222</td>
<td>.2632</td>
<td>.8173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM26</td>
<td>88.6873</td>
<td>132.5881</td>
<td>.2069</td>
<td>.3559</td>
<td>.8123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM27</td>
<td>88.9622</td>
<td>129.0779</td>
<td>.2806</td>
<td>.3024</td>
<td>.8103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM28</td>
<td>90.0893</td>
<td>125.7230</td>
<td>.4318</td>
<td>.5107</td>
<td>.8043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM29</td>
<td>89.5979</td>
<td>126.8481</td>
<td>.3918</td>
<td>.4012</td>
<td>.8060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATM30</td>
<td>88.7938</td>
<td>127.3229</td>
<td>.4523</td>
<td>.5325</td>
<td>.8046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.

Factors and the assigned statements
**Factor 1 - Instrumental utility**
1. I earned too little in my previous job.
3. I needed extra income in order to improve my standard of living.
5. Tourism offered good earning opportunities.
10. I saw tourism as a profitable industry.
17. I wanted an appropriate income.
30. I wanted to achieve a better standard of living.

**Factor 2 - Positive**
6. I wanted an interesting job.
11. I was attracted by the image of tourism.
12. I wanted to travel more.
13. I wanted to use my language skills.
21. I wanted a job in which I could deal with people.

**Factor 3 - Entrepreneurial**
2. It was easy to start a business in tourism.
22. I saw tourism as the most profitable industry for a business.
28. I wanted to establish my own business.
29. I have good business skills and I thought I could use them well in tourism.

**Factor 4 - Refugee**
9. I was unemployed and needed a job.
23. I could not get a job elsewhere.
24. I needed a job which did not require any particular qualification.

**Factor 5 - Entrepreneurial**
7. My family had a business in tourism.
8. I wanted to accumulate capital for establishing my own business.

**Factor 6 - Refugee**
16. The industry I worked in before was declining.
19. I did not see many prospects in my previous industry.

**Factor 7 - Positive**
4. I wanted better working conditions.
18. I was looking for a job that suited my education.
26. I wanted to work in pleasant surroundings.

**Factor 8 - Instrumental utility**
15. I needed extra money quickly.
20. I wanted to leave my previous job.

**Factor 9 - "The wanderer or drifter"**
25. The first job I happened to be offered was in tourism.
27. I like to try different jobs.
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