

Examination of the perceptions of managers from individualistic and collectivistic national cultures in a culturally diverse hospitality organization regarding the humane organization and the meaningful workplace

Danielle Dimitrov
The George Washington University
21504 Tamarack Ridge Sq.
Sterling, VA 20164
Home phone: 703-430-9075
Work: 703-569-8060
Cell: 703-850-9344

Overview

If diversity implies any difference among people based on a given criteria, this paper's assumption is in accord with Levi's (2001) statement that "different types of diversity have different effects" (p. 233). Today's global society enjoys heterogeneity based on various diversity categories. Levi (2001), e.g., recognized three of them: demographic (gender, race, nationality, age, social status, religion, sexual orientation, and physical ability), psychological (values, beliefs, attitudes; personality, cognitive and behavioral styles; knowledge, skills, and abilities), and organizational (status, occupation, department division, and tenure). If culture is "the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another" (Hofstede, 1997, p. 5) or that "complex whole that includes knowledge, beliefs, art, law, morals, customs, capabilities and habits acquired by a man as a member of society" (Adler, 1997, p. 14), national cultural diversity is of specific interest to the present study.

Thus, the meaning of cultural diversity is considered to be the difference based on national cultural origin in combination with a particular value system. In this line of thoughts, the study's geographic boundaries entail the US (American) society as a unique example of the "global village", a "melting pot" of national cultures. As Peshkin (1991) conjured, the American society is a multi-ethnic one: "We once were overwhelmingly a nation of people from Europe, which meant that when newcomers learned to act and speak 'properly', most could become interchangeable parts with those citizens whose ancestors had arrived earlier. A basic fact today is that most of our newcomers do not come from Europe, and they do not look like their

European predecessors. Will these newcomers become interchangeable parts with the already Americanized Americans?" (Peshkin, 1991, p. 260-261).

Tossi (2002) made a review of the US labor force change between 1950-2050. She concluded that the US labor force is expected to become more and more diverse. The diversification in the past 50 years (because of increased immigration) has been one of the major factors affecting the labor force trends. This makes the growing racial and ethnic diversity of the labor force to continue being one of the major labor force influencers in the future (Tossi, 2002). Speaking in numbers, by 2050 Tossi (2002) expects the white non-Hispanics to comprise around 54% of the civilian non-institutional population, Hispanics to make 23%, black population to become 15%, and Asian and others to make 10%. (The author's presumption is that the participation shares in the labor force, based on cultural diversity, are mostly even.)

Cultural diversity in organizations is inevitable, just as much as cultural diversity at a national level becomes more and more common. The 21st century that we live in abounds with variety of new organizational forms: international, multinational, and transnational or global organizations. Of these, multinational companies are the ones that value diversity more and function on the idea that locals know what is best (Marquardt, Berger, & Loan, 2004). Global companies operate without geographic boundaries to develop global thinking, global learning, global corporate structure, and culture. The new millennium belongs to the latter type of geocentric and world-oriented organizations.

The tourism industry, per se, is one of the most diverse industries - its purpose being the service of people by other people in different cultures and geographic location. In this line of thoughts, since hospitality pertains to travel and tourism, it is characterized by the same trend of cultural mingling for the purpose of providing and receiving good service. The hotel business is the industry of cultural diversity because in its global essence it connects people from different nations through the most humane qualities - hospitality and friendliness. Today, employee behavior has to be tailored to the culturally specific needs of the customers. Furthermore, the new business trends in tourism are for culturally diversifying the product: ethnic tourism, minority tourism, tourism for senior citizens, and couples with small kids. Cultural awareness is springing from the decoration and design of facilities down to menu content and room equipment. Examples are the numerous Marriott International brands of hotel service (Ritz Carlton, Marriott Hotels and Resorts, Renaissance, Courtyard by Marriott, Towne Place Suites, Residence inn, Fairfield Inn, Springhill Suites by Marriott and others) that mirror walking with diversity.

This study holds an assumption that the inevitable diversity within work teams, customer populations, and stakeholders is part of the reason why it is difficult for organizations to answer everybody's needs for meaning or happiness, as discussed by Csikszentmihalyi in 1990. It is more and more difficult for organizations in general to recruit, retain and develop highly competent and qualified professionals. As Gayle (1997) confirmed, simply using economic monetary incentive approach is insufficient. In a quick historic review of the need for motivation and satisfaction of employees, one can see the progression from addressing material needs (monetary rewards) to focusing on more intrinsic motivators (respect, achievement, meaningful work) that correspond to a higher level of self-actualization needs (Maslow, 1970). Following the ideas of motivation and content theorists (Alderfer, 1972; Herzberg et al., 1959; Herzberg, 1968; Maslow, 1994; McGregor, 1960; McLelland, 1953; Rogers, 1959, 1961; Vroom, 1964) gives direction in the search for meaningfulness in life and in the workplace. The organization today is the main home of the working individual. This is measured not only by the time one

spends at work, but also by the enormous significance of work for the identity formation and maintenance of the contemporary person (Turner, 2005). Thus, it is logical for people to aspire towards making their new home a comfortable place where they can find rest, support, meaning, and personal fulfillment. The quest for meaningful workplace (Chalofsky, 2003) is a more and more discussed topic in our era of human resources development (Gayle, 1997; Turner, 2005), whose role “is to develop human capabilities in the workforce and society” (Cseh, 2006). These thoughts inevitably remind of the humane workplace idea (Chalofsky et al., 2003), hence logically of the humane organization.

The purpose of the present study is to define the concept of the humane organization (HO), according to the different perceptions of individualistic and collectivistic (I & C) cultural perspectives as displayed by hospitality managers. An example of a hospitality organization that, to a certain extent, has managed to provide a meaningful workplace (according to the classification of Fortune Magazine in 2005) is Marriott International. Marriott International is the organizational background of this case study research.

Problem Statement

Leisure and commercial recreation studies (Goodale & Godbey, 1988; Kelly & Kelly, 1994; Neulinger, 1974) show that the field of hospitality is meant for the creation of pleasure and satisfaction of people through the service of other people. Human happiness and meaning are central for the existence of organizations in the tourism field (Bond, 2005). Furthermore, the quality of the service mission of hospitality organizations relies heavily on a diverse pool of employees and the way they are treated by employers (Kriegl, 2000; Maxwell & Quail, 2002; Oakley, 2004). Nevertheless, Bronwell (1998) and Cushing (200) attest that there is a prevailing perception about hospitality organizations concerning the long-hours culture of the business, the exploitation, and the lack of work-life balance for employees. Schneider and Bowen (1993) point out that the key to managing employees’ experiences is through human resources development (HRD) dimensions like: work and career facilitation, organizational status building, and new employee socialization. However, there is little evidence in practice for embracing the principle of HRD at a strategic organizational level in the hospitality industry (D’Annunzio-Green, Maxwell, & Watson, 2002; Maxwell & Quail, 2002). The latter alludes to inadequate meaningfulness of the workplace for hospitality employees, according to the existing sociology and psychology literature on the concepts of meaning, meaning of work, and the meaningful workplace (Chalofsky, 2003; Chalofsky, 2004; Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Fox, 1994; Gibbons, 1999; Levering, 1988; Pauchant, 2002).

How can hospitality organizations be humane towards their employees (internal customers) the way they are striving to be towards their guests (external customers)? As Chung (1998) and Freeman (2004) suggested, there is a culturally diverse pool of people that constitutes hospitality organizations. Thus, the question becomes more specific - how can these employers (hospitality organizations) be humane such as to provide a meaningful workplace by coming closer to the needs of employees from different cultural backgrounds?

The concepts of meaning of work, meaningful workplace, and humane organization are not used interchangeably neither in previous research, nor in this study. In addition, they are not fully explored in the existing literature, which led Chalofsky (2003) to recommend: refining the construct of meaning of work; determining its impact on “individual performance and organizational effectiveness” (p. 80); learning more about the components of meaningful work; the relationship of concepts like values, balance, and integrity; investigating levels of intrinsic motivation; and sharing best practices about actual examples of a meaningful workplace. Csikzentmihalyi (1990) talked about the meaning of work as an optimal experience of flow in which people get so involved that nothing else seems to matter for them. Fox (1990) referred to the meaning of work as the joy from giving and helping others, as well as to spirituality at work. Still some recent literature (Pouchant, 2002) pointed to how the meaning of work is shaped by the opportunities an organization provides for learning. Chalofsky’s (2003) definition of the meaningful workplace entails the way people express the meaning and purpose of their lives through their work activities. Thus, an organization providing individuals with a feeling of happiness and “integrated wholeness” (Chalofsky 2003) could be considered a meaningful workplace. And although Chalofsky, Brooks, Hatcher, Kuchinke, Lee, McLagan, and Vaill (2003) agreed on considering humane the workplace providing a work-life balance, flexible schedules, less overwork, and protection for workers, a gap still exists in theory, empirical research, and organizational practice in the understanding of the humane workplace concept. Furthermore, there are no empirical or any other studies perusing the meaning of work, meaningful workplace, and humane organization in relation to the hospitality business.

Purpose Statement

Considering the cultural diversity in a US hospitality organization, the purpose of this case study will be to explore the way hospitality management employees from different national cultures (individualistic or collectivistic) perceive the meaningful workplace, as well as the way they define a humane organization. At this stage of the research, the meaningful workplace will be considered the ideal collection of characteristics that makes a working individual feel happy, content, and fulfilled. An organization that provides a meaningful workplace for its employees will be considered humane until other definitions are obtained from participants.

Research Questions

Central Question

How are individualistic and collectivistic national values displayed in managers’ perceptions of what a meaningful workplace and a humane organization are in the hospitality industry?

Associated Sub-questions

1. How do hospitality managers from (born and or/raised in) individualistic and collectivistic national cultures perceive a workplace that is meaningful (ideal)?
2. How do hospitality managers from individualistic and collectivistic national cultures describe a hospitality organization that is humane?
3. How do hospitality managers perceive their own organization in terms of being humane?

Theoretical Framework

Theoretical Perspectives

The present study will be informed mainly by the theoretical stances of Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) flow concept of meaning, Chalofsky's (2003) meaning of work and humane workplace concepts, as well as Triandis (1995) and Hofstede's (1980a, 1980b) work on the cultural dimension of individualism-collectivism (IND). [As suggested by Creswell (2003), the above listed perspectives will be used as an advocacy lens for guiding the proposed research questions.

Meaning and Meaningful Work

Interested in the state of happiness of human beings, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) suggested that only people who can control their "inner experience" would be able to determine their lives' quality (happiness). This is what the author called creating of meaning - to bring order in the significance of things (the contents of the mind) and to have purpose. Thus, according to Csikszentmihalyi (1990), the ideal work is a flow experience: "the state in which people are so involved in an activity that nothing else seems to matter" (p. 8); an activity in which the mind, the soul, the whole being have found purpose for that moment of life. This perspective is relevant to the purpose of the present study exploring managers' perceptions about what is a meaningful workplace in hospitality.

Meaningful Workplace and Humane Workplace

Based on a review of the motivation theories and how past literature about meaning and work has influenced the meaning of work concept (including an analysis of the gaps in the body of knowledge), Chalofsky (2003) introduced the model of "integrated wholeness" that represents the meaning of work as an equation between the sense of self (what one brings to his workplace), the work itself (includes challenge, creativity, learning, continuous growth, purpose, autonomy, and empowerment), and the sense of balance (balance between work and self, balance between self and others). Hence, for the purposes of this study, a meaningful workplace is the organization or the place of work where one is enabled, encouraged, and supported to achieve the state of integrated wholeness (i.e., meaningful work).

Furthermore, Chalofsky, Brooks, Hatcher, Kuchinke, Lee, McLagan, & Vaill's (2003) contribution to the concept of humane workplace informed the proposed study from a couple of perspectives: critical feminist theory, ethics, integrity and social responsibility perspective, radical humanistic, democratic, organizational, and humanistic leadership perspectives. According to these authors, the humane workplace is "creating empowering work at the individual level and building caring organizations at the organizational level" (p. 483). Hence, a humane organization is every employer who provides a humane workplace by performing Chalofsky et al.'s (2003) recommendations.

Individualistic and Collectivistic National Culture

In this paper, cultural diversity is viewed from the perspective of the difference based on the demographic criterion national cultural origin (upbringing) that produces a distinctive value system. This study concentrates on the “different effects” of cultural diversity (Levi, 2001), based on the dimension of individualism/collectivism (I/C). Triandis’ (1995) typology of individualism and collectivism (I/C) based on the four types of self: vertical I (independent/different), horizontal I (independent/same), vertical C (interdependent/different), and horizontal C (interdependent/same) will help the present study differentiate between different cultural nuances of respondents. Hofstede’s (1980b) individualism-collectivism (IND) cultural dimension, will be used for its detailed description of the differences between I as a society in which “everybody is supposed to take care of himself/herself and his/her immediate family” (p. 48), versus C where “people are born into extended families or clans who protected them in exchange for loyalty” (p. 48).

Humane National Culture

The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) is a research program used to provide basis for conceptualizing worldwide leadership differences. Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque, and House (2005) used a hypothetical case of an American executive in charge of four similar teams (Brazil, France, Egypt, and China) in order to provide an action-oriented and context-specific advice congruent with GLOBE’s findings, for successful interaction with employees from different cultures. Their study informed the purpose of the present study with a description of GLOBE’s classification of national cultures in terms of humane orientation (a dimension new to cross-cultural studies). This dimension includes the extent to which individuals are encouraged “for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring, and kind to others” (p. 69). Thus, the proposed research will consider GLOBE’s information on the humane orientation of cultures (Javidan et al., 2005) for exploring participants’ perceptions about the meaning of a humane organization, as well as for the existence of any connection between the humane orientation of cultures and the individualism-collectivism cultural dimension of Triandis (1995) and Hofstede (1980a).

Purpose of Literature Review

The literature review section of this qualitative study intends to inform the reader about the existing empirical and theoretical studies in the fields of the two chosen constructs (meaningful work and individualistic/collectivistic national culture). The hospitality industry will be the research context and as such it brings to the stage its own specific business characteristics that relate to the above two constructs in a unique way. The purpose of this case study will be to explore the way hospitality management employees from different national cultures (individualistic or collectivistic) perceive the meaningful workplace, as well as the way they define a humane organization.

Organization of Literature Review

Literature Review Sections

The study will organize the existing relevant literature in three major themes: meaning of work, the individualistic/collectivistic (I/C) dimension of national culture, and hospitality industry. The meaning of work section includes mainly some sociological and psychological perspectives about work and the workplace. The theme about cultural differences is based on the second construct - national culture. The presence of a third theme in the literature review (the hospitality business) is due to the specific professional background on which the research will be conducted that may influence the interpretation of the relationship between a humane organization/meaningful workplace and national culture. Only relevant empirical studies will be reviewed in this section.

Literature Review Sources

Books, articles, conference papers, and dissertations were used for the purposes of this literature review. Most books were sources recommended by department professors. Some of the articles were obtained directly from professors and authors (Chalofsky, 2003, 2004), as well as from the references of these authors' basic works. Most of the empirical studies in relation to hospitality organizations were obtained through Internet database search for the period 1985-2005 (this time frame was assumed to address more relevant and contemporary issues for the industry), as well as some sources on culture and motivation were included for the period 1970-2003. Multiple databases were selected and the search results originated from the following: ProQuest, Emerald, Lexis-Nexis, and ScienceDirect. The search key words and combinations include: humane organization(s) and culture, humane organization and hospitality (organization), humanness and hospitality, meaningful work (workplace) and hospitality, work and leisure, meaningful workplace and national culture, national culture (culture) and hospitality/tourism, individualistic culture and hospitality, diversity and hospitality, job satisfaction and hospitality, work-life balance and hospitality organizations, employee-friendly organizations and hospitality, employee friendly organizations and culture, quality of work/life and organizations, human resources development and hospitality (organizations), human resources management and hospitality/tourism. In addition, other combinations with the same key words and word roots were attempted. Google.com was also utilized for search on individualism and collectivism.

Literature Review Themes

Meaning of Work

The search in the sphere of meaning of work started with the work of Chalofsky (2003, 2004) that inspired searching for predecessors in the fields of sociology and social psychology. Thus, the main works considered in this literature review, as also reflected in the Theoretical Framework section of the study, are the theoretical stances of Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) flow concept of meaning, as well as Chalofsky's (2003) meaning of work and humane workplace concepts. In addition, a search in the Dissertation Abstracts produced a couple of empirical studies on the concept of meaningful work (Gayle 1997; Turner, 2006).

Cultural Differences

The search in the field of national cultural differences led to the awareness that researchers have distinguished between different cultural values based on nationality. Most cited in that respect was Hofstede's work (1980a, 1980b, 1997) with his five cultural dimensions (individualism, power distance, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation), among which that of IND differentiating between individualistic and collectivistic (I/C) national values. However, a simple Gogle.com search performed on November 3, 2006 with key words "individualism and collectivism" revealed Harry Trinadis' work (1993, 1995a, 1995b, 1998, 2001) as pioneering and specializing particularly in the I/C dimension.

Hospitality Industry

Studies taking place in the service industry (Schneider & Bowen, 1993), and more specifically in the hospitality, (Brownell, 1998; D'Annunzio-Green, 2002), engaging the reader's attention with embodiments and revelations of the meaningful workplace like: work-life balance, culturally appropriate management styles, and employee satisfaction with the workplace. Brownell (1998) touched on the diversity of the hospitality workforce (cultural diversity included) and how the different needs of that diverse employee base would shape the work environment provided by employers to include a better life-style and work-life balance. D'Annunzio-Green (2002) was more specific in comparing the East and West models of management represented by the Russian and United States cultures. Schneider and Bowen (1993) tied it all back to the necessity of creating a good workplace for employees in the service industries because of their very nature's demands of direct correlation between employee and customer satisfaction.

Methodology

Introduction

The present explorative study will use a socially constructed knowledge claim (Creswell, 2003) that relies heavily on participants' perceptions and their interpretation based on the epistemology of constructionism. The methodology of the study will thus take the ideographic approach using qualitative techniques (Burrell & Morgan, 1979) in the attempt to understand different employees' perceptions of a humane workplace, through the lens of their individualistic (I) or collectivistic (C) cultural values.

Research Design

Yin (2003), Merriam (1998), Creswell (2003), and Stake (1995) talked about what constitutes a case study: the process, the unit of study (with its special characteristics), the bounded context, as well as the end product. A working definition for this research will be that a case study is an empirical study of a real-life contemporary phenomenon that occurs in a context with obvious boundaries. The proposed study will engage in a single embedded case study (Yin, 2002) of managers' perceptions (sub-units) on the Humane Organization (and the meaningful workplace) in a single hospitality organization (Marriott International). It could also be classified as: a particularistic case study (Merriam, 1998) of the above-mentioned construct raised from

practice, or an instrumental case study that attempts to answer a “puzzlement” (Stake, 1995, p. 3) other than just understanding the case of investigation.

Data Collection

Data Collection Methods

For achieving the purpose of the study, this case design will seek several sources of data evidence such as: 1) interviews featuring perceptions, opinions, and experiences of participants (executives, organization policy makers, and other management level employees); 2) complete observation, where the researcher’s primary and only role is to observe (Merriam, 1998) participants, their social and physical work environment; 3) documentation analysis (internal company policies, departmental memorandums, and correspondence; external sources of literature such as Fortune magazine, Diversity Inc. magazine, and the Great Place to Work Institute publications; as well as Internet documentation search).

Research Site

The proposed study has selected and will address Marriott International as the background hospitality organization based on pre-determined criteria (Merriam, 1998) such as: 1) to be recognized as one of the “100 Best Companies to Work For” by Fortune Magazine and the Great Place to Work Institute, as well as 2) to be one of the “Top 50 Companies for Diversity”, according to DiversityInc magazine’s classification.

Population and Sample Size

The population that will be targeted will be executives and other management level employees at Marriott International Head Quarters. The interviewees will be between 6 and 12 in number (Yin, 2002) as a result of a purposeful convenience sampling (Merriam, 1998) of those individuals who volunteer and are recommended to the researcher’s specific purpose of study based on some predetermined criteria. The selection criteria for interview participants are: management employees of Marriott International HQ and representatives of I and C national cultures. Six to 12 managers will be approached to self-administer the instrument presented below (SINDCOL) in order to determine levels of I and C. More participants will be solicited to take the survey if the results of the first 6-12 individuals do not reveal representatives of both I and C cultural values.

Measurement of I and C

For the purpose of evaluating the influence of individualistic and collectivistic cultural values on participants’ perceptions of the meaningful workplace, the construct of national cultural differences needs to be properly measured. An already developed instrument (Triandis & Singelis et al., in press as illustrated in Triandis, 1995) will be used to determine the types of national culture that each participant belongs to. The instrument is appropriate for the proposed study because it is designed for adults and accounts for the same categories of individualistic and collectivistic national cultures developed by Triandis (1995): VI (vertical), HI (horizontal), VC, and HC. Triandis and Singelis et al. (in press), as cited in Triandis (1995), called this instrument SINDCOL (Subjective Individualism and Collectivism). The authors are still testing the validity

and reliability of this measurement, which aims at combining the benefits of numerous other instruments (Triandis, 1995) and thus become “best method of measurement”. The authors recommended using Instrument 1 and 2 at the individual (versus the cultural) level of measurement. Instrument 1 consists of 32 value and attitude statements plus 31 multiple-choice scenarios that people should express agreement or disagreement with on a 1 to 9 (never or definitely NO - always or definitely YES) scale. Instrument 2 consists of 24 questions in which, after having received an overview of the cultural values’ main characteristics, participants will self-evaluate their belonging to either I or C using a 0 to 10 score behind each of the latter.

Interview Guide

The study will use semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 1998), lasting between 1 and 2 hours each, consisting of open-ended questions classified in different sections of obtaining people’s perceptions on: the meaningful workplace, the humane organization, cultural differences, the hospitality business, and participants’ own organization. The categories of the main interview sections were determined based on the research questions and the results of the preliminary literature review. The study will use the type of questions suggested by Merriam (1998): ideal position questions (e.g., Please describe your ideal workplace.) and hypothetical questions (If you were to design your own workplace, how would it look like?) to obtain the direct answers concerning participants’ perceptions. Interpretive questions (What does it mean to you to work in a learning environment?), as well as devil’s advocate questions (How would you describe a bad workplace?) will be used as follow up or probe questions to clarify, contrast, and complete the already shared insights.

Data Collection and Data Management Process

The organization will be addressed with an official proposal to conduct the study explaining its purposes, benefits, and potential risks for participants. Once access is obtained and the purposeful sampling is completed, one-on-one interviews will be requested for scheduling with 6-12 of the total number of surveyed managers. Participants will be addressed with letters explaining the purpose of the study, the researcher’s motivation, as well as participant rights and confidentiality measures. Commitment for participation will be obtained in a written form through Informed Consents. The interviews will be conducted at times and places convenient for participants. Communication with participants before and after the interviews will happen through follow up telephone conversations and e-mails as agreed by them. Interview protocols, observation diaries, transcribed data, and all other documentation will be securely stored in the researcher’s home office.

Data Analysis

Interviews will be transcribed verbatim and analytic memos (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) will be used throughout the data collection. Transcripts will be coded using open and theoretical codes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Codes will be synthesized into categories and subcategories based on the researcher’s perspectives (etic voice) and participants’ views (imic voice). Thus, the proposed study will use Content Analysis (theoretically determined data categories), Constant-Comparative Analysis that will consider participants’ input throughout the process of data

collection, as well as Cross- (sub)Case Analysis (as a result of the constant-comparative method) to link emerging themes among participants (Merriam, 1998).

Trustworthiness of Study

In this study, trustworthiness will be sought through: 1) triangulation of data sources (presented in the data collection section); 2) member check during which participants will be consulted to verify data narratives; 3) audit trail (a complete record of the research process, the correspondence with participants and organization, all sampling, data collection, and data analysis tools); 4) as well as reflective memos representing the researcher's bias statement of different types of I-s involved in the research process (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2002).

Ethical Considerations

Participants' confidentiality will be handled with utmost care, especially as far as their personal demographic information is concerned. Their real names will be substituted by pseudonyms. Information revealing their specific national belonging (as relevant to national culture) will be rephrased or used in collective sense only, unless permission is granted by participants.

Statement of Potential Significance

This case study intends to expand the understanding of the phenomenon of the Humane Organization through understanding of what a Meaningful Workplace is in a hospitality organization. Furthermore, a culturally informed model of the Meaningful Workplace may be created, not only for hospitality organizations but for other industries as well. As a result, professionals could revisit existing organizational beliefs, policies, and practices regarding the climate in which employees from different national cultures work. The benefits from this study will extend to theory, knowledge, practice, policy, as well as future research.

References

- Alderfer, C. P. (1981). *Creating the corporate future: Be planned or be planned for*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Bond, E. (2005). Hospitality: Nibbling at the ownership pie. *Network Journal*, 12(3), 14.
- Bronwell, J. (1998). Striking a balance: The future of work and family issues in the hospitality industry. *Marriage and Family Review*, 28(1/2), 109-123.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Chalofsky, N. (2003, December). Meaningful work. *Training Development Magazine*, 52-58.
- Chalofsky, N. (2004, January). Religion, spirituality, and meaning. *Spirit at Work*, 10.
- Chalofsky, N., Brooks, A., Hatcher, T., Kuchinke, P., Lee, M., McLagan, P., & Vaill, P. (2003, March). *Exploring the concept of the humane workplace*. Paper presented at the

- International Research Conference of the Academy of Human Resources Development, Minneapolis, MN.
- Chung, B. (1998). Accounting for changing times: Aligning human resources practices to employees' nonwork lives. *Marriage and Family Review*, 28(1/2), 143.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cseh, M. (2006, Spring). *Global HRD*. Presentation at the George Washington University.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Cushing, K. (2004, June). Concerns raised over UK long-hours culture [Electronic version]. *Caterer & Hotelkeeper*, 193(4327), 14.
- D'Annunzio-Green, N., Maxwell, G., & Watson, S. (2002). *Human resources management: International perspectives in hospitality and tourism*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Fox, M. (1994). *The reinvention of work: A new vision of livelihood for our time*. New York, NY: Harper-Collins.
- Freeman, M. (2004, April). *Hospitality execs told to think diversity in attracting clients*. Lakeland Ledger Publishing Corp. Retrieved February 28, 2005, from LexisNexis.
- Gayle, S. (1997). Workplace purpose and meaning as perceived by information technology professionals: A phenomenological study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, (UMI No. 9731486)
- Gibbons, P. (1999). Spirituality at work: Definitions, measures, assumptions, and validity claims.
- Goodale, T., & Godbey, G. (1988). *The evolution of leisure*. State College, PA: venture Publishing.
- Hofstede, G. (1980a). *Culture's Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980b, Summer). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 42-63.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Jovidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., Sully de Luque, M., House, R.J. (2005, February). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 67-90.
- Kelly, J., & Kelly, J. (1994). Multiple dimensions of meaning in the domains of work, family, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(3), 250.
- Kriegl, U. (2000). International hospitality management. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(2), 64-71.
- Levering, R. (1988). *A great place to work: What makes some employers so good (and most so bad)*. New York, NY: Random House Inc.
- Levi, D. (2001). *Group dynamics for teams*. London, UK: Sage Publications Inc.

- Marquardt, M., Berger, N., & Loan, P. (2004). *HRD in the age of globalization: A practical guide to workplace learning in the third millennium*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J., Clark, R., & Lowell, E. (1953). *The achievement motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- McClelland, D. C. (1966). That urge to achieve. In Boone, L.E., & Bowen, D. D. (Eds.), *The Great writings in management and organizational behavior* (pp. 384-394). NY: Random House Inc.
- McGregor, D. M. (1957). The human side of enterprise. In L.E. Boone & D.D. Bowen (Eds.), *The great writings in management and organizational behavior* (pp. 126-136). NY: Random House Inc.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Maxwell, G. A., & Quail, S. (2002). Human resource strategy and development for quality service in the international hotel sector. In N. D'Annunzio-Green, G. Maxwell, & S. Watson, (Eds.) *Human Resources Management: International perspectives in hospitality and tourism* (pp. 90-103). London, UK: Continuum.
- Neulinger, J. (1974). *The psychology of leisure*. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.
- Oakley, M. A. (2004, July). The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act: New rules or new headaches for the hospitality industry. *Business and Management Practices*. Retrieved February 28, 2005, from LexisNexis.
- Pauchant, T. C. (Ed.). (2002). *Ethics and spirituality at work: Breakthroughs and pitfalls of the search for meaning in organizations*. Westport, NY: Quorum Books.
- Peshkin, A. (1991). *The color of strangers: The color of friends*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Schneider, B. & Bowen, D. (1993). The service organization: Human resources management is crucial. *Organizational Dynamics*, 21, 39-52.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tossi, M. (2002). A century of change: The US labor force, 1950-2050. *Monthly Labor Review*, 125(5), 15-28
- Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Bolder, CO, Westview.
- Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Bolder, CO: Westview.
- Turner, L. (2006). Patterns of learning in the lives of people who experience meaningful work. *Dissertation Abstracts International*. (UMI No. 3161602).
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Yin R. K. (2002). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. (2003). The role of theory in doing case studies. In R. K. Yin (2nd ed.), *Applications of case study research* (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.