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ABSTRACT

A Study of Relationships Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment Among Restaurant Employees

by

David Anthony Vondrasek

Dr. Andrew Hale Feinstein, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Hotel Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment within two locations of a national restaurant chain in Clark County, Nevada. This research attempts to uncover the basic characteristics and attitudes of food and beverage employees. Through a survey instrument, this study will reveal some of the homogeneous traits these employees exhibit.

Methodology: Through the research, two questions were addressed. The first research questions was: Are there any demographic traits of these restaurant employees that significantly affect their job satisfaction? The second research question addressed was: Do restaurant employee’s levels of job satisfaction significantly affect their organizational commitment? The surveys consist of demographics, job-satisfaction, and organizational commitment components that are based on the validated Minnesota Job
Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The demographics collected consisted of employee characteristics such as age, tenure, educational level, marital status, position, years in foodservice, and hours per week. The first question was answered through several unbalanced factorial ANOVAs. The second research question was analyzed using several first order multiple regression analyses.

Findings and Conclusions: Tenure was found to have a significant effect on several of the component scores for satisfaction. These components include satisfaction with social status, supervisor’s human relations moral values, co-workers, and recognition. The demographic variable, location, had a significant affect on the level of satisfaction with policies and level of education significantly effected satisfaction with recognition.

Four components of job satisfaction were found to have an effect on the level of organizational commitment. These components were satisfaction with policies, compensation, work conditions, and advancement. In the final regression equation, advancement was found insignificant in predicting organizational commitment. This study was found to be significant to those managers of the two units studied for identifying components of satisfaction that enhance commitment among employees.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ................................................................................................................................. iii

LIST OF FIGURES ..................................................................................................................... v

LIST OF TABLES ....................................................................................................................... vi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ................................................................................................................. viii

CHAPTER I  THE PROBLEM AND ITS PURPOSE

Introduction ............................................................................................................................... 1
Problem Statement ................................................................................................................... 6
Purpose ..................................................................................................................................... 6
Research Questions .................................................................................................................. 7
Significance of Study ................................................................................................................ 7
Definitions ............................................................................................................................... 7
Limitations ............................................................................................................................... 8
Delimitations ........................................................................................................................... 9
Organization of Thesis .......................................................................................................... 9

CHAPTER II  REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction ............................................................................................................................ 11
Job Satisfaction ....................................................................................................................... 11
   Background of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire .................................................. 15
Turnover ................................................................................................................................. 17
Work Role Centrality ............................................................................................................. 19
Organizational Commitment ............................................................................................... 19
   Background of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire .................................... 23
Summary ............................................................................................................................... 24

CHAPTER III  METHODOLOGY

Introduction ............................................................................................................................. 25
Purpose .................................................................................................................................. 25
Research Questions ............................................................................................................... 26
Kind of Research ................................................................................................................... 26
Kind of Design ....................................................................................................................... 26
Sample and Population ......................................................................................................... 29
   Procedures ......................................................................................................................... 29
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Theoretical Construct of Research Showing the Direction of the Investigation from Demographic Variables to JS and Components ...............34
Figure 2 General Linear Model Used for Research Question 1 ...................................................35
Figure 3 Regression Model Used for Research Question 2 ......................................................36
Figure 4 Regression Model Used for Research Question 3 ......................................................38
Figure 5 Level of General Job Satisfaction by Degree of Tenure ........................................49
Figure 6 Level of Extrinsic Satisfaction by Location and Years in Foodservice ....................57
Figure 7 Level of Extrinsic Satisfaction by Degree of Years in Foodservice ..........................58
Figure 8 Satisfaction with Social Status by Level of Tenure .....................................................60
Figure 9 Satisfaction with Supervisor's Human Relations by Degree of Tenure .....................63
Figure 10 Satisfaction with Moral Values by Degree of Tenure ..............................................66
Figure 11 Satisfaction with Co-workers by Degree of Tenure ...............................................71
Figure 12 Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Education ..........................................74
Figure 13 Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Tenure ...............................................77
Figure 14 Level of Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Compensation .............88
Figure 15 Level of Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Work Conditions ..........92
Figure 16 Level of Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Policies ........................96
Figure 17 Level of Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Advancement ...............100

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1  Facets of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire in their Respective Categories ................................................................. 28
Table 2  Analysis of Variance for General Satisfaction Score by Demographic Variables ........................................................................ 45
Table 3  Collapsed Analysis of Variance for General Satisfaction Score by Store Location, Years in Foodservice and Tenure ................. 46
Table 4  One-way Analysis of Variance for General Satisfaction by Tenure ..... 48
Table 5  Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for General Satisfaction by Degree of Tenure .................................................. 49
Table 6  Analysis of Variance for Intrinsic Satisfaction by Demographic Variables .................................................................................... 51
Table 7  Collapsed Analysis of Variance for Intrinsic Satisfaction by Tenure and Years in Foodservice ................................................... 52
Table 8  Analysis of Variance for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Demographic Variables .................................................................................... 54
Table 9  Collapsed Analysis of Variance for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Years in Foodservice, Store Location with a Test for Interaction Between the Two Variables ......................................................... 55
Table 10 One-way Analysis of Variance for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Years in Foodservice ........................................................................ 56
Table 11 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Degree of Years in Foodservice ........................... 57
Table 12 One-way Analysis of Variance for Social Status Satisfaction by Tenure ............................................................................................ 59
Table 13 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Social Status Satisfaction by Level of Tenure ...................................................... 60
Table 14 One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Supervisor’s Human Relations with Tenure ..................................................... 62
Table 15 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Supervisor’s Human Relations by Degree of Tenure ................ 63
Table 16 One-way analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Moral Values by Tenure ................................................................................ 65
Table 17 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Moral Values by Degree of Tenure ........................................... 66
Table 18 One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Policies by Store Location ........................................................................ 68
Table 19 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Policies by Store Location ....................................................... 69
Table 20 One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Co-workers by Tenure .................................................................................. 70
Table 21 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Co-workers by Degree of Tenure ................................................................. 71
Table 22 One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Education ................................................................. 73
Table 23 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Education ........................................ 74
Table 24 One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Recognition by Tenure ......................................................................................... 76
Table 25 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Tenure ........................................ 77
Table 26 Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction with Moderating Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment ........................................ 79
Table 27 Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment .................. 82
Table 28 One-way Analysis of Variance for Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Compensation ................................................. 86
Table 29 Tukey’s Pairwise Comparison of Levels of Satisfaction Showing Levels that are Significantly Different ........................................ 87
Table 30 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Compensation ........................................................................................................... 88
Table 31 One-way Analysis of Variance for Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Work Conditions ........................................... 90
Table 32 Tukey’s Pairwise Comparisons of Levels of Satisfaction Showing Levels that are Significantly Different ........................................... 91
Table 33 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Work Conditions ........................................................................................................... 92
Table 34 One-way Analysis of Variance for Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Policies ........................................... 94
Table 35 Tukey’s Pairwise Comparisons of Levels of Satisfaction Showing Levels that are Significantly Different ........................................... 95
Table 36 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Policies ........................................................................................................... 96
Table 37 One-way Analysis of Variance for Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Advancement ......................................... 98
Table 38 Tukey’s Pairwise Comparisons of Levels of Satisfaction with Advancement Showing Levels that are Significantly Different ........................................................................................................... 99
Table 39 Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Advancement ........................................... 100
Table 40 Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Policies, Compensation, and Work Conditions Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment ........................................................................................................... 102
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank God for helping me get through this degree process, especially this thesis. My prayers late at night in front of the computer were obviously heard.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my parents Bill and Nancy Vondrasek who never thought twice about the sacrifices they made to help me through my entire education. Their encouragement, wisdom, and sense of humor will always be remembered.

Special appreciation is expressed to the rest of my family who were always there to offer their support.

Thank you to my committee chair, Andrew Feinstein, for his constant guidance, insight, and recommendations. His patience, understanding, and strive for excellence brought out my best.

I would also like to thank the rest of my committee for their encouragement and suggestions. Their attention to detail and professionalism greatly enhanced my academic experience.

Special appreciation is expressed to those individuals whom I cannot name. Without their time and energy, this project would not have been possible.
CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS PURPOSE

Introduction

It is in the interest of an organization to retain quality employees. However, many times employers have a different idea of what will satisfy their employees. The manager's efforts towards employee satisfaction can actually create more dissonance than cohesion between employees and management. The dissonance created could lead to employee turnover when management fails to create cohesion.

Within the field of hospitality, occurrence of high employee turnover continues to be a focus of research (Cranny, 1992; Kovach, 1977; Rose, 1991). Due to the high cost of training new employees, the cost of turnover in the food and beverage industry remains high. Because the food and beverage outlets are labor-intensive (National Restaurant Association, 2000), service that customers expect cannot be automated as a remedy for decreasing costs. In order to reduce the cost of training, occurrences of avoidable turnover must be decreased.

This study focuses on employees who stay with a company for reasons of affective organizational commitment. Affective organizational commitment includes reasons of wanting to be with that company and possessing similar values to those of the company. The counterpart to affective organizational commitment is continuance organizational commitment and is made up of the idea that individuals do not leave a company for fear
of losing their benefits, taking a pay cut, and not being able to find another job (Murray, Grégoire, & Downey, 1991).

Job satisfaction has been defined as a state of pleasure from the feeling of achievement and facilitating achievement of one's values from a job (Locke, 1969). Although job satisfaction has been recognized as a component of organizational commitment (Kovach, 1977), a high level of organizational commitment within an organization does not always suggest high levels of job satisfaction. This is especially so when considering two types of organizational commitment -- affective and continuance. Perhaps the level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the employees is not what upper management assumes it to be. Affective organizational commitment exists if the employees possess attitudes of wanting to be with that organization (Allen, 1990). In accordance with Herzberg's two-factor theory, the factors of pay, benefits, and bonuses that cost companies millions of dollars do not create job satisfaction, they merely head off job dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1959).

Unfortunately, satisfaction does not come from the same aspects of a job for everyone. People are all driven and satisfied by different types of motivators and rewards. Several theories have been developed to describe the psychology behind career choices that lead to satisfaction and organizational commitment. Schein (1992) suggests that career anchors are intrinsic traits people have that create identification with a certain type of job. This would suggest those people possess traits that could predict the type of career path that would make them most satisfied. Ross (1995) suggests that predictors of career choice may include locus of control and the Protestant work ethic.
With the ideas of career anchors and predictor variables working inside people, it is no wonder that tests have been compiled to help individuals determine a career path. Some of these tests include the Birkman Method Career Style Summary (http://www.re VIEW.COM/birkman), and the Career Leader (http://www.careerdiscovery.com). However, many times the results of these tests contrast the successes people experience later in life. The other problem with a test of this nature exists with these tests continuously becoming outdated with the constant revolution in job specificity and only a general career path can be charted. Therefore, it may be natural for people to gravitate toward the type of work that makes them satisfied.

Some research regarding work centrality suggests that job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment are related (Mannheim, 1997). However, it has been difficult to decipher whether job satisfaction or work centrality are antecedents of organizational commitment. Since the attachment of a particular type of work has been researched in many ways, many of these descriptions relate back to job satisfaction. Perhaps people seek satisfaction from a specific type of work. Graduates of a hospitality program who remain in the industry were researched with a degree of inconclusiveness while some experts have determined that various personal characteristics -- no matter what industry -- lead to star performance and motivation (Goleman, 1998). According to Herzberg’s two-factor theory, motivation comes from the achievement of the higher level needs after the hygiene needs have been met.

Regarding this topic, there is little known about the people who work in food and beverage units; however, there exists a need to understand those who have demonstrated dedication to the company. With this heightened understanding of those who make up
the bottom line, more focused attention could be paid to the continued retention and promotion of these individuals.

With the cost of turnover in the management category of a company consistently being an issue for large corporations, it is important the dedicated managers are not the minority of those with the company. Mobley (1982) suggests turnover is a severing of membership in an organization by one who has received monetary compensation from that organization. This definition describes the focus of most turnover research (Rose, 1991). Employee turnover has been viewed as two types, voluntary and involuntary (Mobley 1982; Price, 1977; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1980). Involuntary turnover includes dismissal, layoff, retirement, disability, and death; voluntary turnover is due to the employee severing the relationship (Rose, 1991).

Wasmuth and Davis (1983) estimated the average cost of an hourly hotel employee leaving was $1,500 and $3,000 for salaried employees per incident (Rose, 1991). Their statistics did not decipher between various hotel departments such as food and beverage, room attendants, or front desk. However, Dalton and Todor (1982) suggest these costs also need to be viewed for their positive results. They say some turnover is necessary and even beneficial when poor performers and other negative individuals choose to leave.

Possible negative consequences of turnover include: a rise in recruiting, hiring, assimilation, training, and closing paperwork; the disruption of communication, productivity loss, loss of productive employees, and decreased satisfaction among employees who stay (Mobley, 1982). Greater problems are created with store manager turnover.
With management turnover, there may be the possibility of reduced line-level employee morale. If managers do not stay with the company, what message is sent to the employees working for that manager? Since all managers have their own style, there is a chance the employees will face instances of role ambiguity, lack of job satisfaction, and comfort with their position. As individuals, managers stress different conditions at work that creates another source of confusion for employees working through a management turn.

This study is important because there is not enough understanding of the reasons employees stay with the company. However, Price (1977) found that job satisfaction and turnover have an inverse relationship. With higher satisfaction, lower turnover results (Rose, 1991). Since the restaurant employees deal with very specific tasks on a daily basis, there may be a link between their personality traits, behavioral characteristics, and their demographics that contribute to their job satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a particular type of work. Perhaps knowledge of these similarities can aid further research, pinpoint better strategies for recruiting, promotion, and training of future store managers, as well as reduce the amount of turnover in management.

In researching job satisfaction, the attention lies with the cognitive processes rather than hygienic needs (Spector, 1997). Herzberg (1959, p.113) states these hygiene factors as "supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies & administrative practices, benefits, and job security."

Job dissatisfaction ensues when these factors fall below the acceptable level (Herzberg, 1959). Spector (1997, p.2) states that job satisfaction "can be considered as a global feeling about the job or as a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects..."
or facets of the job." Job satisfaction has been correlated with turnover but not to the extent that a predictive value can be placed on satisfaction in determining a turn (Kraut, 1975: Mobley, 1979).

Problem Statement

More awareness by managers is needed regarding the relationship between the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This study attempts to identify and assess the levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and demographic traits of food and beverage employees.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment within two locations of a national restaurant chain in Clark County, Nevada. The average check of these restaurants is $20.00 with 450 to 500 covers per day. This research attempts to uncover the basic characteristics and attitudes of food and beverage employees. Through a survey instrument, this study will reveal some of the homogeneous traits these employees exhibit. With an awareness of the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment experiences by the employees, managers will be in a better position to know the opportunities in enhancing their commitment. This research will allow managers to understand areas of high job satisfaction and organizational commitment along with existing challenges. The study will also take into consideration demographic traits of employees in order to cite components of high satisfaction for specific groups. This
study will utilize the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982) to collect the data.

Research Questions

1. Are there any demographic traits of these restaurant employees that significantly affect their job satisfaction?

2. Do restaurant employee's levels of job satisfaction significantly affect their organizational commitment?

Significance of Study

This study will be of significant value to those managers who are dedicated to retaining their employees in food and beverage operations. It is intended to become a tool to help management learn where adjustments need to be made in order to keep people working for their organization. The current study focuses upon whether a relationship exists between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The findings will be instrumental to management in determining a path to creating more affective organizational commitment and subsequent reduction in turnover.

Definitions

Turnover – Severing membership in an organization by one who has received monetary compensation from that organization (Mobley, 1982). This definition describes the focus of most turnover research (Rose, 1991).
Job Satisfaction – A state of pleasure from the feeling of achievement and facilitating achievement of one’s values from a job (Locke, 1969).

Organizational Commitment – “The relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982, p.27).

Limitations

The subjects who volunteer to participate limit the study. Since the study was conducted on a volunteer basis, similar attitudes might be characteristic of those willing to participate. Therefore, a non-response bias might exist by those who reacted to their dissatisfaction by not responding to the survey. A manager of one of the locations was able to reduce this possibility by keeping track of those who had not participated and allowing them the time to answer the questionnaire before their shift. The study is also limited in the length of time the researcher had to collect data.

The questionnaires were completed while the employees were at work. It is possible they were influenced by recent occurrences at work, such as a customer complaint, resulting in negativity on the questionnaire. The employees in the restaurants cover a wide range of age, education level, and experiences. Because of these deficiencies, some employees may not thoroughly understand their own levels of satisfaction as they are stated on the questionnaire. If this is an employee’s first job, he/she has no means of comparison to their current job from other employers they have worked for.

The direction of causal influence also remains a question. The literature suggests that job satisfaction influences the level of organizational commitment. However, it is
possible that organizational commitment is a predictor of job satisfaction. The research methods do not consider the use of post hoc statistical measures to determine which element predicts the other.

For the respondents answering the questionnaire, the Hawthorn effect may also materialize. This means the subjects exaggerate areas of dissatisfaction with the idea that it will better motivate management to take measures to increase satisfaction for that facet.

Delimitations

The current research is surveying employees of two locations of a national chain restaurant in Clark County, Nevada. This condition allows for the maximum amount of consistency among 150 possible respondents. Both of these restaurants are subject to all the controls of the parent company since they are not franchised units. The results are not generalizable to the rest of the units or any other hospitality operation. They are only a reflection of how all responding employees feel about working in these two restaurants.

Some of the variables interact with each other. The age of the respondents also has an effect on their possible tenure. With age comes the possibility of more time working with the current employer. Those who have not been able to work until recently have less of a chance to gain greater tenure. Not all possible interactions of the variables will be explored.

Organization of Thesis

This study is written in a five-chapter format. In Chapter I, the problem and purpose of the study are discussed. Chapter II will review the literature related to the subject
matter. Chapter II discusses the literature related to job satisfaction, turnover, organizational commitment, and related topics that were investigated. A detailed explanation of the study treatment and the assessment methodology are provided in Chapter III. Chapter IV displays and interprets the results of the study. Chapter V summarizes the results and provides conclusions, offers implications of the thesis, and suggests future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

When researching the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, understanding past and current studies becomes necessary. In dealing with these topics, literature regarding job satisfaction and organizational commitment leads to the related topic of turnover. One researcher suggests when organizational commitment is high, turnover is most likely to be low (Allen, 1990). While many researchers study organizational commitment (why people stay with a company), many others study turnover (why people leave a company). The relationship job satisfaction with both of these phenomena was researched several times as well (Steers & Porter, 1975; Mowday, 1982; Mannheim, 1997; Rose, 1991; Carsten & Spector, 1987; Price, 1977). In the following discussion of job satisfaction, it should be noted that much of the current research focuses upon satisfaction as a cognitive process or attitude as opposed to the fulfillment of needs (Spector, 1997). This study will focus on satisfaction in this context as well.

Job Satisfaction

While many researchers continue to look at job satisfaction as an attitude, the perspective that it is linked to extrinsic personal needs fulfillment exists as well (Kovach, 1977, 25). Herzberg (1959,) states, “...among the factors of hygiene we have included
supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies and administrative practices, benefits, and job security. When these factors deteriorate to a level below which the employee considers acceptable, job dissatisfaction ensues" (p.113). It is believed this satisfaction “results from the correspondence between the individual’s need set and the organization’s reinforcer system and has its major impact on individual decisions to remain with or withdraw from the organization” (Steers & Porter, 1975, p.228-229). This idea of the organization’s reward system affecting the decision to stay suggests the external factors of the workplace has an effect upon job satisfaction. It is also suggested the level of job satisfaction is affected by the number of years at the same job. Educators with more years at the same university were significant in determining satisfaction. The literature suggests that job satisfaction consists of several facets, creating a global feeling of satisfaction. As a group, these facets are a related constellation of attitudes about various aspects of the job (Spector, 1997).

Studies relating to satisfaction levels with pay and the differences between men and women’s intent to leave show no significant differences (Oshagbemi, 2000a). In an investigation of satisfaction with pay among university educators, the findings suggested those studied were dissatisfied with their pay (Oshagbemi, 2000a). The amount of pay among these educators was correlated with the level of job dissatisfaction instead of a contributor to satisfaction. Some studies continue to find that age is linked to the level of pay (Markiewicz, 2000; Oshagbemi, 2000a). Markiewicz’s study also determined there is a relationship between job satisfaction and friendship quality factors with colleagues (Markiewicz, 2000). A predicting element of satisfaction was the maintenance difficulty with the closest male colleague (Markiewicz, 2000).
Locke (1969, p.41) defines job satisfaction as the “pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values”. A slightly more focused outlook states that intrinsic job satisfaction “accrues from accomplishment, from the expression of his own abilities, from the exercise of his own decisions” (Steers & Porter, 1975, p.271). This intrinsic job satisfaction may also be linked to other personal needs fulfillment. One group of intrinsic needs was named career anchors. Schein discusses career anchors as one’s self-concept which effects whether they remain with or leave a company (Schein, 1992). These anchors are: “security, autonomy, technical/functional competence, management competence, entrepreneurial creativity, sense of service, pure challenge and lifestyle” (Schein, 1992).

In researching job satisfaction, authors have looked to cognitive processes as well as hygienic needs (Spector, 1997). Herzberg (1959) states these hygiene factors as “supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies & administrative practices, benefits, and job security.” Job dissatisfaction ensues when these factors fall below the acceptable level (Herzberg, 1959). Job satisfaction has been correlated with turnover but not to the extent that a predictive value can be placed on satisfaction in determining an individual instance of employment turnover (Kraut, 1975; Mobley, 1979).

The importance of measuring job satisfaction presents itself in many studies which point to it as a predictor element for turnover, organizational commitment, customer focus, and degree of absenteeism (Dienhart & Gregoire, 1993; Mannheim, 1997; Mowday, 1982; Steers & Porter, 1975). The literature reviewed suggests the absence of
organizational commitment leads to turnover. Typically, organizational commitment is
looked at as a causal factor of organizational commitment (Rose, 1991). Whether job
satisfaction affects turnover or organizational commitment would be a redundant
question. Fewer turnovers come with greater organizational commitment. However,
Carsten & Spector (1987) found job satisfaction and turnover are less correlated during
times of high national unemployment and strongly correlated during times of low
unemployment. Along with the availability of work, “numerous studies have shown that
the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover is moderated by the alternatives
people perceive in the work world” (Carsten & Spector, 1987, p.63).

In determining job satisfaction, the literature suggests people will be satisfied with
their job when it allows them a chance to use their abilities, fulfills their self-image,
personality traits, and interests (Super, 1953). It is suggested that career choice is related
to the variables; Protestant work ethic and locus of control (Ross, 1995). As a predictive
variable itself, there are several instances where job satisfaction was studied to determine
a predictive value.

One researcher believed the measured level of job satisfaction was influenced by
interpersonal comparison. This theory states “people compare themselves to others in
assessing their own feeling of job satisfaction” (Munchinsky, 1987, p.400). However,
another early theory of job satisfaction suggests that satisfaction is a central nervous
system response and while the job remains constant, the level of satisfaction will
fluctuate due to various factors (Landy, 1978; Muchinsky, 1987). “Each person brings to
a job a set of aspirations and expectations that are influenced by his prior successes or
failures and that define his sense of achievement. Behavior on the job is a function of these influences" (Peskin, 1973, p.129).

One relationship job satisfaction has on turnover is when job satisfaction rates high, turnover is down and vice versa (Price, 1977). Many researchers found that job satisfaction can consistently be correlated with turnover (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979). However, some of these same researchers have also found this relationship to be weak, thus compromising its predictive quality (Kraut, 1975; Mobley, 1979; Rose, 1991). In the studies conducted by Dienhart, Gregoire & Downey (1990), job satisfaction was looked at with job involvement and job security to help predict levels of customer focus. In this study of predicting customer focus, the authors suggest that as the levels of job satisfaction, job involvement, and job security increase, the level of customer focus will also increase.

Many studies use different facets of satisfaction to predict employee attributes such as performance, organizational commitment, and service quality (Dienhart & Gregoire, 1993; Oshagbemi, 2000b; Yousef, 1998). In a study of job security as a predictor of commitment, a significant positive correlation was found to exist (Yousef, 1998). Also, in a later study by Yousef (2000), leadership behavior was affected by commitment, which was affected by job satisfaction and job performance. Another study found satisfaction with company vision significantly predicted 33% of the variance in job satisfaction (Testa, 1999).

**Background of Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire**

In 1945, the University of Minnesota opened its Industrial Relations Center (IRC) for the purpose of training people for manager and labor relations leadership positions (IRC).
By 1948, they began in-depth surveys of employer-employee relationships. The three variables they sought to evaluate and connect were human resource policies, economic characteristics of a firm, and employee satisfaction. From its studies in vocational rehabilitation, a theory of work adjustment along with several measurement instruments was created. Currently, the IRC defines industrial relations as the study and practice of the employment relationship. The five areas of study in the IRC include "collective bargaining; compensation and reward theory and administration; the economics of human resources; organizational theory and administration; and staff, training, and development" (IRC website, 2000).

"The theory of work adjustment is based on the concept of correspondence between individual and environment" (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984, p.54). The following statements can summarize this theory: (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984, p.9-10).

- Work is conceptualized as an interaction between an individual and a work environment.

- The work environment requires that certain tasks be performed, and the individual brings skills to perform the tasks.

- In exchange, the individual requires compensation for work performance and certain preferred conditions, such as a safe and comfortable place to work.

- The environment and the individual must continue to meet each other's requirements for the interaction to be maintained. The degree to which the requirements of both are met may be called correspondence.

- Work adjustment is the process of achieving and maintaining correspondence.
Work adjustment is indicated by the satisfaction of the individual with the work environment and by the satisfaction of the work environment with the individual, by the individual's satisfactoriness.

Satisfaction and satisfactoriness result in tenure, the principal indicator of work adjustment. Tenure can be predicted from the correspondence of an individual's work personality with the work environment.

Work personalities and work environments can be described in terms of structure and style variables that are measured on the same dimensions.

The initial measures of satisfaction used by the IRC consisted of the Hoppock Job Satisfaction Blank (short-form), which was an employee attitude scale. Eventually, items that measured intrinsic reinforcement factors were added, since the previous scales only measured satisfaction with environmental or extrinsic reinforcement factors. The short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was followed once the original questionnaire was validated. The 20 items on the short-form were developed by choosing one item from each of the 20 scales that correlated highest with their respective scale. The short-form MSQ "can be scored on three scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction and general satisfaction" (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

Turnover

In discussing turnover, Mobley's (1982) definition suits the basis of most turnover literature. Turnover is severing one's membership in an organization by one who has received monetary compensation from that organization. Since the cost of turnover runs
high (Steers & Porter, 1975), a great deal of research took place to help find reasons for turnover and absenteeism. Turnover has been characterized as the “most costly and least understood of all phenomena working against productivity, efficiency, and ultimate profits” (Peskin, 1973, p.68).

A major factor researchers have found that links to turnover and absenteeism is the degree of job satisfaction experienced by employees (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson & Capwell, 1957; Vroom, 1964). Some of the consequences of turnover include recruiting costs, selection costs, assimilating, training and processing, communication disruption throughout the organization, productivity decreases, loss of key employees, and decreased satisfaction among leftover employees (Mobley, 1982). In 1983, Wasmuth and Davis estimated that turnover costs an organization $1,500 for hourly employees and $3,000 for salaried employees per incident. However, knowledge of these turnover costs was deemed by some to be meaningless if the potential benefits are not calculated (Dalton & Todor, 1982). These benefits include increased motivation if people are better able to move up, decrease poor performers, and help bring new ideas and attitudes into an organization.

Employee turnover has been separated into two categories, voluntary and involuntary turnover (Mobley, 1982; Price, 1977; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1980). Voluntary turnover is the turnover resulting from an employee severing the work relationship with the employer while involuntary turnover takes place with dismissal, layoff, retirement, disability, and death (Rose, 1991). According to Ingham (1967), turnover rates will be based upon the level of job satisfaction. “As the size of an organization increases, worker’s attachment to the organization, as measured by absenteeism, decreases; overall
job satisfaction and its corollary, turnover are unaffected” (Kovach, 1977, p.1). Kovach 
(1977) suggested that the quality of job satisfaction will make the difference between 
attachment to the organization and turnover.

Work Role Centrality

The topic of work role centrality presents itself in relation to job satisfaction and 
organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was linked as an outcome to 
job satisfaction and work role centrality (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1985; Mannheim, 1984). 
Work role is stated as a personal sub-identity in which a person vested mental energy 
relating it to one’s self-esteem (Mannheim, 1975; Mortimer & Lorence, 1989).

Work role is also related to the attachment a person has to the employing 
organization. This attachment includes affective and continuance components (Griffin & 
These components will be further discussed with organizational commitment.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been defined as the “relative strength of an 
individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday, 
Porter, & Steers, 1982, p.27). It was suggested this commitment takes a greater period of 
time to develop and is more stable than levels of job satisfaction (Porter, 1974). 
Research indicates there are different types of organizational commitment – affective, 
Affective organizational commitment is explained as remaining with a company for reasons that include job satisfaction, and wanting to be there (Gregoire & Downey, 1991). Continuance organizational commitment means not severing the work relationship due to reasons of fear of losing benefits, pay reduction, and fear of making a change (Gregoire & Downey, 1991). Because organizational commitment takes longer to develop, some researchers determined that measuring it within the first year of employment may result in inconclusive data (Werbel & Gould, 1984; Williams & Hazer, 1986).

Along with affective and continuance commitment, Allen (1990) suggests a third measurable type of commitment. This component, called the normative component, refers to the employee’s sensed obligation to the company. Using Wiener’s (1982, p.471) definition, commitment is “the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests.” Some of these behaviors exist because employees want to do the moral or right thing (Wiener, 1982). This moral obligation, also called personal norms (Schwartz & Tessler, 1972) are contributors to the decisions of staying or leaving an organization (Prestholdt, 1987).

Organizational commitment can be further broken down to three characteristics (Mowday, 1982). These characteristics include: (1) “a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (Mowday, 1982, 27). However, several definitions for organizational commitment exist. Mowday sites 10 different ones to demonstrate some lack of agreement on the subject (p.20).
the research done by Mowday, et al., (1982). Therefore, their definition seems most appropriate.

The three characteristics of organizational commitment suggest this phenomenon is quite complex. In order to explain or measure a belief, willingness, or desire, researchers had to try to find relationships between commitment and other potential links, such as job satisfaction. "When discussing commitment in terms of when the identity of the person [is linked] to the organization or when the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent, we are in effect focusing on employee attitudes toward the organization (Mowday, et al., p.26).” In fact, the terms attitudinal commitment and organizational commitment are used interchangeably in Mowday’s book, Employee Organizational Linkages (Mowday, et al., 1982).

As an attitude, differences between commitment and job satisfaction are seen in several ways (Mowday, et al., 1982). First of all, commitment is a more global response to an organization (Mowday, et al., 1982). Job satisfaction is more of a response to a specific job or various facets of the job (Mowday, et al., 1982). Wiener (1982) states job satisfaction is an attitude toward work-related conditions, facets, or aspects of the job. Therefore, commitment suggests more of an attachment to the employing organization as opposed to specific tasks, environmental factors, and where the duties are performed (Mowday, et al., 1982). When discussed on these terms, commitment should be more consistent than job satisfaction over time (Mowday, et al., 1982). “Although day-to-day events in the work place may affect an employee’s level of job satisfaction, such transitory events should not cause an employee to reevaluate seriously his or her attachment to the overall organization” (Mowday, 1982, p.28).
While searching for antecedents to organizational commitment, various researchers created categories containing several characteristics (Wiener, 1982). Wiener (1982, p.419) suggests one category “includes job characteristics and work experiences such as job challenge, feedback, opportunity for social interaction, task identity, group attitudes, and organizational dependability.” As antecedents to organizational commitment, these characteristics are identified as correlates to job satisfaction as well (Stone & Porter, 1975). It is then possible the relationship job characteristics has with organizational commitment is linked by job satisfaction as an intervening variable (Wiener, 1982).

Regarding how job satisfaction and organizational commitment relate to one another, mixed findings are reported. Some research suggests job satisfaction is not necessarily an antecedent to commitment (Bateman & Strasser, 1984) while Curry, Wakefield, Price, and Mueller (1986) report no linkage between satisfaction and commitment. However, some researchers reported the two variables are highly correlated and in some cases, job satisfaction is linked to commitment as an antecedent (Lincoln & Kalleberg, 1985; Mathieu & Hamel, 1989; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Steers and Porter (1975) suggest people who stay with a job experience their expectations, while job expectations of those who leave were not met. This may be due to the level of education of the employees.

Education was found to have an inverse relationship with organizational commitment (Angle & Perry, 1981; Morris & Sherman, 1981; Morris & Steers, 1980; Steers, 1977a). However, the results of these research findings were not completely consistent (Lee, 1971; Steers & Spencer, 1977). Many studies examined the effects age, tenure, level of education, gender, race, and other factors have on organizational commitment (Mowday,

Other research of organizational commitment suggests various organizational practices as builders of commitment. The early experiences an employee has in workplace relationships influence how committed he/she will be (Buchanan, 1974; Louis, 1980). Several researchers believe that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors have an influence on commitment (Caldwell, O’Reilly & Morris, 1983).

From the literature, there is some indication that organizational commitment may be independent from other variables. In some cases, satisfaction appears to influence commitment during certain periods while commitment seems to influence satisfaction at other times (Farkas & Tetrick, 1989). In determining whether or not to leave an organization, researchers concluded job satisfaction is one major factor. Level of organizational commitment was identified as another major factor (Price, 1991).

Background of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

The thrust of the research of employee organizational linkages began with the Office of Naval Research awarding Professors Lyman W. Porter and Robert Dubin a research contract at the University of California, Irvine (Mowday, et al., 1982). The research in this field quickly expanded to the University of Oregon, Purdue University, and the University of Nebraska, Lincoln (Mowday, et al., 1982).

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was developed since little evidence can support the stability, consistency, or predictive powers of other instruments. Porter and Smith (1970) began with identifying 15 items that correlate with the three
parts of the definition created of organizational commitment. The OCQ is used to create a general commitment score. Though the creators of this questionnaire define organizational commitment in three parts, the questions address a global attitude toward the organization. The popularity of the OCQ has also been noted as one of the most widely used measures of commitment (Rose, 1991).

Summary

Chapter II discussed job satisfaction and some of the possible relationships existing between it and other variables such as turnover and organizational commitment. Depending on the external conditions of employment rates, turnover was identified as having a relationship with organizational commitment. Organizational commitment was viewed as an effect of low turnover and high job satisfaction and as an independent phenomenon caused by several factors. The background of the questionnaires was added to increase understanding of the research leading to these instruments.

In Chapter III, the methodology was broken down into the discussions of purpose of the study and research questions. The kind of research and the design will reiterate why the research is being done. Then the instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis will show how the study is carried out.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Previously, the topic of job satisfaction was defined and discussed in terms of an attitude toward job characteristics. Job satisfaction was also explained in terms of its predictive value in determining levels of organizational commitment. In contrast, the action of labor turnover has been described as a function of low organizational commitment and job satisfaction. This action is often taken when employees experience low levels of either of these two attitudes. In order to address voluntary turnover reduction, this study looks at the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment moderated by several demographic variables. This study takes a proactive approach to understanding turnover reduction through increasing the level of organizational commitment.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment within two locations of a national restaurant chain in Clark County, Nevada. This research attempts to uncover the basic characteristics and attitudes food and beverage employees. Through a survey instrument, this study will reveal some of the homogeneous traits these employees, as a group, exhibit. With an awareness of the levels of job satisfaction and organizational
commitment experiences by the employees, managers will be in a better position to know
the opportunities in enhancing commitment. This research will allow managers to
understand areas of high job satisfaction and organizational commitment along with
existing challenges. The study will also take into consideration demographic traits of
employees in order to cite components of high satisfaction for specific groups. This
study will utilize the Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Organizational
Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982) to collect the data.

Research Questions

1. Are there any demographic traits of these restaurant employees that significantly
affect their job satisfaction?

2. Do restaurant employee's levels of job satisfaction significantly affect their
organizational commitment?

Kind of Research

The methods used will consist of inferential methods. These inferential methods will
help determine whether a relationship between the demographic variables and the levels
of general satisfaction exists. Then the study will continue to seek the existence of a
relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and level of organizational
commitment.

Kind of Design

This study's design is intended to measure and identify levels of job satisfaction and
organizational commitment among employees of two locations of a national restaurant chain in Clark County, Nevada. In question 1, the independent variables are age, education level, tenure, position, marital status, years in foodservice, and hours per week in relation to the dependant variable, level of general JS.

In researching the second question, intrinsic JS and extrinsic JS, and demographic variables will be compared to levels of organizational commitment. For part of the analysis of the second question the facets of co-workers and work conditions will be excluded so the focus is upon intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction only. These analyses will move onto the entire set of components of job satisfaction.

In analyzing the second question, these levels of job satisfaction with the variables age, education level, tenure, position, marital status, years in foodservice, and hours worked per week are the independent variables. Organizational commitment is used as the dependent variable.

The indicators for both intrinsic and extrinsic JS are weighed equally. General satisfaction adds two more facets containing questions equally weighed. These additional two facets are satisfaction with co-workers and working conditions. This method of Thurstone Scaling, with all items weighted equally, also applies to the OCQ, which will yield one mean score for the level of commitment. Table 1 categorizes the components of the MSQ into their respective scales.
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Sample and Population

The population for this study consists of a national chain restaurant with two locations in Clark County, Nevada. The participation of all the employees in these two restaurant locations was sought. Each location has approximately 72 employees creating a population of 144. Therefore, the sample in this study equals the population.

Procedures

In reviewing the literature, the researcher found other studies utilizing the MSQ and the OCQ. Once these were determined to be the ideal form for collecting data, permission was sought for the use of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The researcher also spoke with one of the authors of the OCQ who stated that this instrument was not copyrighted in order to allow people to use and benefit from their research. The necessary steps were then taken to obtain permission for the use of the MSQ. The University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Department granted permission for this with an inquiry for the data from the MSQ for the continued development of the MSQ (see Appendix A).

The researcher then contacted the general manager of one of the participating restaurants to ask if they will allow this study to be conducted. The manager was very interested and, by request, discussed the matter with the general manager of the second location. After receiving permission from these two managers, the researcher set up a time to meet with them to cover the details of the study.

At this point, the researcher sought the protocol review for research involving human subjects from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (see Appendix B). During this time the research methodology was presented to the rest of the thesis committee for their
approval. Upon making any corrections and changes to the methodology, the survey instruments were distributed to the two restaurants.

Each restaurant was given 75 questionnaires and one collection box. Should questions arise, the managers were given the details of the survey. Each survey consisted of the MSQ, OCQ, a demographics questionnaire, and an informed consent form with a signature blank. The consent form gave explicit instructions for the respondents to sign the form, separate it from the rest of the questionnaire, deposit it into the collection box, fill out the questionnaire, put the questionnaire in an envelope, seal it, and deposit that into the same collection box.

The questionnaires were left in the restaurants with the collection boxes from Tuesday, March 28, 2000 until Wednesday, April 5, 2000. During this time, the researcher made a follow-up visit to each of the units bringing Krispy Kreme Doughnuts for the employees. The majority of the finished questionnaires were completed at these times. However, these visits helped to increase the managerial support of the survey insuring a 70% participation rate. The managers discussed with the researcher that this time would allow for maximum participation at the greatest ease. On the eighth day, the researcher collected the boxes containing the finished questionnaires to begin the data entry.

Instrumentation

This study utilized the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short-form) to measure intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction among foodservice employees. The MSQ (short-form) was developed from the 100-question long-form
using 20 of the original questions (Weiss, 1967). Each question of the short-form represents one facet of job satisfaction, which can be grouped as an indicator of intrinsic JS or extrinsic JS. The questions chosen for the short-form are considered the strongest measure for their respective facet (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). The study will also collect data regarding organizational commitment using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire as outlined by Mowday, et al., (1982). The data from this questionnaire will give a general score for the level of organizational commitment.

Limitations

The subjects who volunteer to participate limit the study. Since the study will be conducted on a volunteer basis, similar attitudes might be characteristic of those willing to participate. Therefore, a non-response bias might exist by those who react to their dissatisfaction by not responding to the survey. A manager of one of the locations was able to reduce this possibility by keeping track of those who had not participated and allowing them the time to answer the questionnaire before their shift. The study is also limited in the length of time the researcher had to collect data.

The questionnaires were completed while the employees were at work. It is possible they were influenced by recent occurrences at work, such as a customer complaint, that could result in negativity on the questionnaire. The employees in the restaurants cover a wide range of age, education level, and experiences. Because of these deficiencies, some employees may not thoroughly understand their own levels of satisfaction as they are
stated on the questionnaire. If this is an employee's first job, he/she has no means of comparison to this current job from other employers they have worked for.

The direction of causal influence also remains a question. The literature suggests that job satisfaction influences the level of organizational commitment. However, it is possible that organizational commitment is a predictor of job satisfaction. The research methods do not consider the use of post hoc statistical measures to determine which element predicts the other.

For the respondents answering the questionnaire, the Hawthorn Effect may also materialize. This means the subjects exaggerate areas of dissatisfaction with the idea that it will better motivate management to take measures to increase satisfaction for that facet.

**Delimitations**

The current research is surveying employees of two locations of a national chain restaurant in Clark County, Nevada. This condition allows for the maximum amount of consistency among 150 possible respondents. Both of these restaurants are subject to all the controls of the parent company since they are not franchised units. The results are not generalizable to the rest of the units or any other hospitality operation. They are only a reflection of how all responding employees feel about working in these two restaurants.

Some of the variables interact with each other. The age of the respondents also has an effect on their possible tenure. With age comes the possibility of more time working with the current employer. Those who have not been able to work until recently have less of a chance to gain greater tenure. Not all possible interactions of the variables will be explored.
Statistical Analysis

Analysis was broken down into two parts. Figure 1 shows the theoretical construct of the direction of the investigation from demographic variables to job satisfaction and job satisfaction to commitment. The first part was used to determine if any of the demographic variables significantly affected general job satisfaction. This was accomplished by analyzing the data using an unbalanced factorial ANOVA at the significance level \( \alpha = 0.05 \) (Figure 2). Any variables that were found to be significant were further analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance. The second part was used to determine whether the intrinsic or extrinsic JS factors significantly affected organizational commitment.

Furthermore, part two explored whether any of the demographic variables predicted levels of employees' commitment. This was done through a first order multiple regression model. Figure 3 shows the model for the first regression using intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. For the demographic variables, a system of dummy variables was used. The groups for the age, tenure, and years in foodservice variables use the original five-point scale. The groups for education level, position, marital status, and hours per week were collapsed in order to create equality in each group's size.

A second regression was then used to determine which individual components of job satisfaction have an effect on commitment. Figure 4 shows the model for this regression analysis. The second regression used the same dummy variables as the first regression. Any components that the regression found significant were further analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance.
Figure 1. Theoretical construct of research showing the direction of the investigation from demographic variables to JS and components of JS with demographic variables to OC.
\[
Y_{ijklmnop} = \mu + \text{Age}_j + \text{Education}_k + \text{Tenure}_l + \text{Position}_m + \text{Marital}_n + \text{Yrs}_o + \text{Hrs}_p + \text{Store}_a + \varepsilon
\]

Where:

\[
Y_{ijklmnop} = \text{Response for } ijklnop - \text{th individual}
\]

\[
\mu = \text{overall mean}
\]

\[
\text{Age}_j = \text{fixed effect, } j = 0,1,2,3,4 (<20, \geq 20 - <25, \geq 25 - <30, \geq 30 - <35, \geq 35)
\]

\[
\text{Education}_k = \text{fixed effect, } k = 0,1,2,3,4,5 (>\text{grade school, some HS, HS grad., college, 2yr college, 4yr college, Master's degree})
\]

\[
\text{Tenure}_l = \text{fixed effect, } l = 0,1,2,3,4 (<6mo., \geq 6mo. - <1yr., \geq 1yr. - <2yr., \geq 2yr. - <3yr., \geq 3yr.)
\]

\[
\text{Position}_m = \text{fixed effect, } m = 0,1,2,3,4,5,6 (\text{hostess, cook, busser, dishwasher, server, bartender, management})
\]

\[
\text{Marital}_n = \text{fixed effect, } n = 0,1,2,3 (\text{single, divorced, married, widowed})
\]

\[
\text{Yrs}_o = \text{fixed effect, } o = 0,1,2,3,4 (<6mo., \geq 6mo. - <1yr., \geq 1yr. - <2yr., \geq 2yr. - <3yr., \geq 3yr.)
\]

\[
\text{Hrs}_p = \text{fixed effect, } p = 0,1,2,3,4 (<15, \geq 15 - <20, \geq 20 - <25, \geq 25 - <30, \geq 30)
\]

\[
\text{Store}_a = \text{fixed effect, } P=0,1 (\text{store}_0, \text{store}_1)
\]

\[
\varepsilon = \text{Error Term = All two-way and higher interactions}
\]

**Figure 2.** Unbalanced Factorial ANOVA used for Research Question 1.
\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Intrinsic}_{i1} + \beta_2 \text{Extrinsic}_{i2} + \beta_3 \text{Age}_{A_{i3}} + \beta_4 \text{Age}_{B_{i4}} + \beta_5 \text{Age}_{C_{i5}} + \beta_6 \text{Age}_{D_{i6}} + \beta_7 \text{Education}_{A_{i7}} + \beta_8 \text{Tenure}_{A_{i8}} + \beta_9 \text{Tenure}_{B_{i9}} + \beta_{10} \text{Tenure}_{C_{i10}} + \beta_{11} \text{Tenure}_{D_{i11}} + \beta_{12} \text{position}_{A_{i12}} + \beta_{13} \text{Marital}_{A_{i13}} + \beta_{14} \text{Yrs}_{A_{i14}} + \beta_{15} \text{Yrs}_{B_{i15}} + \beta_{16} \text{Yrs}_{C_{i16}} + \beta_{17} \text{Yrs}_{D_{i17}} + \beta_{18} \text{Hrs}_{A_{i18}} + \text{Store}_{A_{i19}} + \epsilon \]

Where:

- \( Y_i \) = response in the i-th trial
- \( \beta_0 \) = Constant
- \( \text{Intrinsic}_{i1} \) = satisfaction response value in the i-th trial
- \( \text{Extrinsic}_{i2} \) = satisfaction response value in the i-th trial
- \( \text{Age}_{A_{i3}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for age <20
- \( \text{Age}_{B_{i4}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for age \( \geq 20 \) - <25
- \( \text{Age}_{C_{i5}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for age \( \geq 25 \) - <30
- \( \text{Age}_{D_{i6}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for age \( \geq 30 \) - <35
- \( \text{Education}_{A_{i7}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for no college degree
- \( \text{Tenure}_{A_{i8}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for tenure <6mo
- \( \text{Tenure}_{B_{i9}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for tenure \( \geq 6mo \) - <1yr
- \( \text{Tenure}_{C_{i10}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for tenure \( \geq 1yr \) - <2yrs
- \( \text{Tenure}_{D_{i11}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for tenure \( \geq 2yrs \) - <3yrs
- \( \text{Job position}_{A_{i12}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for back of house
- \( \text{Marital}_{A_{i13}} \) = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for not married

(figure continues)
$Y_{\text{rsA}_{14}}$ = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years <6mo

$Y_{\text{rsB}_{15}}$ = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years ≥6mo - <1yr

$Y_{\text{rsC}_{16}}$ = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years ≥1yr - <2yrs

$Y_{\text{rsD}_{17}}$ = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years ≥2yrs - <3yrs

$H_{\text{rsA}_{18}}$ = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for hours <30

$S_{\text{torA}_{19}}$ = dummy variable response in the i-th trial for Store 0

$\varepsilon$ = Error Term = All two-way and higher interactions

**Figure 3.** First Order Multiple Regression Model for Research Question 2.
\[ Y_{ijkmnop} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Ability}_{i1} + \beta_2 \text{Achievement}_{i2} + \beta_3 \text{Authority}_{i3} + \]
\[ \beta_4 \text{Independence}_{i4} + \beta_5 \text{Values}_{i5} + \beta_6 \text{Responsibility}_{i6} + \beta_7 \text{Security}_{i7} + \]
\[ + \beta_8 \text{Social}_{i8} + \beta_9 \text{Status}_{i9} + \beta_{10} \text{Variety}_{i10} + \beta_{11} \text{Advancement}_{i11} + \]
\[ \beta_{12} \text{Policies}_{i12} + \beta_{13} \text{Compensation}_{i13} + \beta_{14} \text{Recognition}_{i14} + \beta_{15} \text{HR}_{i15} + \]
\[ + \beta_{16} \text{TC}_{i16} + \beta_{17} \text{Conditions}_{i17} + \beta_{18} \text{Co-workers}_{i18} + \beta_{19} \text{Activity}_{i19} + \]
\[ \beta_{20} \text{Creativity}_{i20} + \beta_{21} \text{Age}_{i21} + \beta_{22} \text{AgeB}_{i22} + \beta_{23} \text{AgeC}_{i23} + \]
\[ \beta_{24} \text{EducationA}_{i24} + \beta_{25} \text{EducationB}_{i25} + \beta_{26} \text{TenureA}_{i26} + \]
\[ \beta_{27} \text{TenureB}_{i27} + \beta_{28} \text{TenureC}_{i28} + \beta_{29} \text{TenureD}_{i29} + \beta_{30} \text{positionA}_{i30} + \]
\[ + \beta_{31} \text{MaritalA}_{i31} + \beta_{32} \text{YrsA}_{i32} + \beta_{33} \text{YrsB}_{i33} + \beta_{34} \text{YrsC}_{i34} + \]
\[ \beta_{35} \text{YrsD}_{i35} + \beta_{36} \text{HrsA}_{i36} + \text{StoreA}_{i37} + \epsilon \]

Where:

\[ Y_i = \text{Response in the i-th trial} \]
\[ \beta_0 = \text{Constant} \]
\[ \text{Ability}_{i1} = \text{satisfaction response value in the i-th trial} \]
\[ \text{Achievement}_{i2} = \text{satisfaction response value in the i-th trial} \]
\[ \text{Authority}_{i3} = \text{satisfaction response value in the i-th trial} \]
\[ \text{Independence}_{i4} = \text{satisfaction response value in the i-th trial} \]
\[ \text{Values}_{i5} = \text{satisfaction response value in the i-th trial} \]
\[ \text{Responsibility}_{i6} = \text{satisfaction response value in the i-th trial} \]
\[ \text{Security}_{i7} = \text{satisfaction response value in the i-th trial} \]

(figure continues)
Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,

Social, Status, Variety, Advancement, Policies, Compensation, Recognition, HR, TC, Conditions, Co-workers, Activity, Creativity, AgeA, AgeB, AgeC, AgeD, EducationA, TenureA, TenureB, TenureC,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TenureD_{i,29}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for tenure $\geq$ 2 yrs - &lt;3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job positionA_{i,30}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for back of house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaritalA_{i,31}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for not married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsA_{i,32}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years &lt; 6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsB_{i,33}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years $\geq$ 6 mo - &lt;1 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsC_{i,34}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years $\geq$ 1 yr - &lt;2 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrsD_{i,35}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for years $\geq$ 2 yrs - &lt;3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HrsA_{i,36}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for hours &lt; 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StoreA_{i,37}</td>
<td>dummy variable response in the i-th trial for Store 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>Error Term = All two-way and higher interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.** First Order Multiple Regression Model 2 for Research Question 2.

**Summary**

In Chapter III, the research methodology, population and sample, and instrumentation were presented. Chapter V presents the findings from the instruments using the procedures that have been outlined.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study investigated the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among the employees of two units of a national chain restaurant with two locations in Clark County, Nevada. Two research questions were identified to address this inquiry. The data analysis begins with an investigation into which demographic variables were significant to the stated levels of job satisfaction. In this investigation, the attitude of job satisfaction was broken down by general, intrinsic, and extrinsic JS scores. The researcher used unbalanced factorial ANOVA model for this analysis. Those variables that were significant in the full model and the collapsed unbalanced factorial ANOVA model were used for further investigation. The 20 components of job satisfaction are then further analyzed using the satisfaction component as the dependent variable and the demographic traits as the independent variables. To determine the significance of the demographic traits on individual satisfaction components, the researcher used a series of one-way ANOVAs.

In the analysis of the second research question, the levels of intrinsic and extrinsic JS were analyzed to determine whether they significantly effect organizational commitment using a first order multiple regression model. Organizational commitment was further analyzed by regressing each component of job satisfaction and a set of
demographic variables. A collapsed first order multiple regression model was used to
determine which components of job satisfaction are significant as predictors of
organizational commitment.

Participation

Among the two locations of this restaurant, there were 144 employees as of April 1, 2000. The surveys and collection boxes remained in the restaurants from March 28, 2000 until April 6, 2000. The extra time was needed to obtain the desired response rate of 70% or greater. Out of the 144 employees, three were on their first week of employment at one location and four were on their first week at the second location. This left a total of 137 potential responses for the survey of which 102 responded. The response rate created was 74.5%.

Formal Hypothesis Testing

The two research questions described in Chapter 1 were converted into two research hypotheses:

1. Are there any demographic traits of these restaurant employees that significantly affect their job satisfaction?

   \( H_0: \) The demographic variables assessed have no significant effect on the level of job satisfaction of the employees.

   \( H_a: \) The demographic variables assessed have a significant effect on the level of job satisfaction of the employees.

2. Do restaurant employee’s levels of job satisfaction significantly affect their organizational commitment?
\( H_0: \) There are no differences in levels of job satisfaction between groups of employees as identified by their demographic traits.

\( H_a: \) There are differences in levels of job satisfaction between groups of employees as identified by their demographic traits.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in two phases. All of the analysis was done using the Minitab computer software package, release 12.2 (Minitab Inc., 1998). Phase one analyzed the data using an unbalanced factorial ANOVA from the general linear model in the statistics menu in Minitab. Phase two analyzed the data using a series of first order multiple regressions. The first order multiple regressions with demographic variables used a dummy variable model to convert categorical data into metric data.

The general assumptions for using linear models were addressed. First, it is identified that the sample equaled the population. Second, the assumption that the dependent variable is interval ratio data was also met. Third, the researcher was able to confirm that the population is normally distributed through use of the normal probability plots and residuals versus fits plots. Fourth, the assumption that the observations are independent of each other has also been met. Each individual taking the survey could do so without other employees having access to their answers. Finally, the variances of the populations are also similar. In some of these analyses, however, the ratio of the greatest standard deviation to the smallest standard deviation for levels of satisfaction comes very close to equaling two. Any of the ratios of standard deviations among levels of satisfaction equaling two or more are noted in the discussion.
Analysis Phase One

The first phase of the analysis addressed the first hypothesis. The procedure used to test this hypothesis was described in Chapter III.

Each of the scores for each question was placed into a table. From the table scores for general satisfaction, intrinsic JS, extrinsic JS, and organizational commitment were tabulated. A general linear model was employed using general job satisfaction as the dependent variable and age, educational level, tenure, position, marital status, years in food service, hours per week, and store location as independent variables.

It was hypothesized that the demographic variables have an impact on the level of job satisfaction experienced by the employees of these two restaurants. A 67.1% usable response rate was calculated with 10 respondents not answering the demographic questionnaire. Using a factorial ANOVA, all the demographic traits were used as independent variables with general job satisfaction as the dependent variable. The results (Tables 2 and 3) seem to support the alternative hypothesis with three demographic variables showing a significant relationship with general job satisfaction at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Table 2 shows the full model and Table 3 shows a collapsed model using only the variables that showed significance. These variables that showed significance were store location ($F = 4.58, p = .036$), years in foodservice ($F = 3.35, p = .015$), and tenure with the current company ($F = 2.87, p = .030$) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. The collapsed model used these three variables and tested for interactions among them. Using Pearson's test for collinearity, years in foodservice by tenure was thrown out due to collinearity. In the collapsed model, tenure was the only variable showing significance ($F = 2.65, p = 0.039$) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level.
Table 2

Factorial Analysis of Variance for General Satisfaction Score by Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Seq SS</th>
<th>Adj SS</th>
<th>Adj MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4462</td>
<td>1.6847</td>
<td>0.4212</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8702</td>
<td>4.311</td>
<td>0.7185</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3982</td>
<td>3.9177</td>
<td>0.9794</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2889</td>
<td>1.1078</td>
<td>0.1846</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8914</td>
<td>1.9926</td>
<td>0.9963</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7144</td>
<td>4.5655</td>
<td>1.1414</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5738</td>
<td>0.2885</td>
<td>0.0721</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5611</td>
<td>1.5611</td>
<td>1.5611</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.4554</td>
<td>20.4554</td>
<td>0.3409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38.1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Collapsed Factorial Analysis of Variance for General Satisfaction Score by Store Location, Years in Foodservice and Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Seq SS</th>
<th>Adj SS</th>
<th>Adj MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7573</td>
<td>3.7809</td>
<td>0.9452</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3822</td>
<td>3.3398</td>
<td>0.8349</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2653</td>
<td>0.2653</td>
<td>0.2653</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29.9698</td>
<td>29.9698</td>
<td>0.3568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The one-way ANOVA for job satisfaction with tenure (Table 4) shows tenure to be significant ($F = 3.15, p = 0.018$). Tukey's pairwise comparisons were then utilized. It was found that significant differences exist between less than six months of employment and six months to one year of employment at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Table 5 shows the least square means for the levels of tenure and Figure 5 shows the trend of tenure's effect on job satisfaction.
Table 4

One-way Analysis of Variance for General Satisfaction by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.757</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33.617</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for General Satisfaction by Degree of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 6 mo.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>0.7348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 6mo - &lt; 1yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.2977</td>
<td>0.6136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1yr - &lt;2yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.6159</td>
<td>0.4476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2yr - &lt;3yr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8333</td>
<td>0.5447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3yr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5429</td>
<td>0.6797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Level of General Job Satisfaction by Degree of Tenure.
A factorial ANOVA was then executed using the score for intrinsic job satisfaction as the dependent variable instead of general job satisfaction. Table 6 shows tenure ($F = 2.55, p = 0.048$) and years in foodservice ($F = 2.59, p = 0.046$) to be significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. The demographic variables tenure and years in foodservice were again tested for interactions resulting in collinearity and were therefore removed from the model. Within the collapsed model, the independent variables did not show significance (Table 7) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level.
Table 6

Factorial Analysis of Variance for Intrinsic Satisfaction by Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Seq SS</th>
<th>Adj SS</th>
<th>Adj MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4784</td>
<td>1.3932</td>
<td>0.3483</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.3352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7093</td>
<td>4.0836</td>
<td>0.6806</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4117</td>
<td>3.1538</td>
<td>0.7884</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3150</td>
<td>1.8609</td>
<td>0.3102</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4869</td>
<td>1.2201</td>
<td>0.6100</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9321</td>
<td>3.1992</td>
<td>0.7998</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6185</td>
<td>0.3796</td>
<td>0.0949</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2215</td>
<td>1.2215</td>
<td>1.2215</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.5241</td>
<td>18.5241</td>
<td>0.3087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33.6975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Collapsed Analysis of Variance for Intrinsic Satisfaction by Tenure and Years in Foodservice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Seq SS</th>
<th>Adj SS</th>
<th>Adj MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4536</td>
<td>2.9987</td>
<td>0.7497</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6858</td>
<td>1.6858</td>
<td>0.4214</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28.6913</td>
<td>28.6913</td>
<td>0.3375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.8307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A factorial ANOVA was also executed using the score for extrinsic job satisfaction as the dependent variable instead of general satisfaction (Table 8). The demographic variables that showed significance were years in foodservice ($F = 2.73, \ p = 0.037$) and store location ($F = 4.51, \ p = 0.038$) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. When the collapsed model (Table 9) was run using only significant variables with a test for interactions, years in foodservice remained significant ($F = 4.86, \ p = 0.001$), but store location did not. However, the interaction of years in foodservice and store location ($F = 2.71, \ p = 0.036$) showed significance at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. A hierarchical model was created by using the insignificant term in the model. When the model was collapsed once more (Table 10), years in foodservice was significant ($F = 3.34, \ p = 0.014$) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Table 11 shows the least square means for the levels of years in foodservice. Figure 6 shows the comparison of levels of extrinsic satisfaction with years in foodservice broken down by store location. Figure 7 shows the overall trend of years in foodservice for extrinsic satisfaction. The overall trend in Figure 7 seems to closely resemble the trend in restaurant location 1 from Figure 6. Satisfaction seems to be highest between one and three years. However, after three years the scores drop.
Table 8

Factorial Analysis of Variance for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Seq SS</th>
<th>Adj SS</th>
<th>Adj MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.829</td>
<td>6.2678</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2347</td>
<td>7.9919</td>
<td>1.998</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1623</td>
<td>3.637</td>
<td>0.9093</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1574</td>
<td>6.3158</td>
<td>1.0526</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5052</td>
<td>1.8482</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7747</td>
<td>4.5112</td>
<td>2.2556</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8837</td>
<td>0.3957</td>
<td>0.0989</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3018</td>
<td>3.3018</td>
<td>3.3018</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43.9424</td>
<td>43.9424</td>
<td>0.7324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76.7911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Collapsed Factorial Analysis of Variance for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Years in Foodservice, Store Location with a Test for Interactions Between the Two Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Seq SS</th>
<th>Adj SS</th>
<th>Adj MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0854</td>
<td>13.7066</td>
<td>3.4266</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3809</td>
<td>0.0864</td>
<td>0.0864</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS*STR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6355</td>
<td>7.6355</td>
<td>1.9089</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59.1928</td>
<td>59.1928</td>
<td>0.7047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77.2946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

One-way Analysis of Variance for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Years in Foodservice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.085</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67.209</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77.295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Extrinsic Satisfaction by Degree of Years in Foodservice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6mo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1905</td>
<td>1.0293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥6mo - &lt;1yr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>1.0418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1yr - &lt;2yr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7667</td>
<td>0.6768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2yr - &lt;3yr</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.9048</td>
<td>0.9192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3yr</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.1485</td>
<td>0.8405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Level of Extrinsic Satisfaction by Location and Years in Foodservice.
Figure 7. Level of Extrinsic Satisfaction by Degree of Years in Foodservice.

The factorial ANOVA was executed for each of the 20 components of job satisfaction with the demographics as independent variables. A one-way analysis of variance was run on each significant demographic variable. Each of the components that were significantly affected will be discussed.

The one-way analysis showed that tenure had a significant effect on the social status component of satisfaction (Table 12) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Tenure ($F = 3.84, p = 0.006$) was found to be significant between the initial stage (less than six months) and three or more years of employment using Tukey’s pairwise comparisons. Table 13 shows the least square means for each level of tenure and Figure 8 shows the overall trend that developed from plotting the least square means of the tenure variable. From this plot, satisfaction seems to be high in the initial time of employment. Within a short amount of time, satisfaction dips down but then begins to rise as length of employment increases.
Table 12

One-way Analysis of Variance for Social Status Satisfaction by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96.79</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>113.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Social Status Satisfaction by Level of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6mo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥6mo - &lt;1yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1yr - &lt;2yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2yr - &lt;3yr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.533</td>
<td>1.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3yr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Satisfaction with Social Status by Level of Tenure.
The one-way analysis showed that tenure significantly affected satisfaction with supervisor's human relations (Table 14). Using Tukey's pairwise comparisons, tenure ($F = 3.13, p = 0.019$) was significant between the initial stage (less than six months) and six months to one year of employment at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Table 15 shows the least square means for the levels of tenure and Figure 9 shows the resulting trend from plotting the least square means of the tenure variable. From Figure 9, satisfaction with this component is high during the initial stage of employment but dips down within the next six months. It is not until the two-year level of tenure that satisfaction is as high as it was in the initial stage of employment.
Table 14

One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Supervisor's Human Relations with Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.47</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>109.94</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>125.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Supervisor’s Human Relations by Degree of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6mo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>1.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥6mo - &lt;1yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1yr - &lt;2yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2yr - &lt;3yr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3yr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Satisfaction with Supervisor’s Human Relations by Degree of Tenure.
The one-way analysis showed tenure significantly affected satisfaction with moral values (Table 16) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Tukey’s pairwise comparison shows tenure ($F = 3.63, p = 0.009$) to be significant between less than six months and six months to one year of employment. Significance was also found between one year and less than two years of employment. The least square means for the tenure levels in Table 17. Figure 10 shows the trend in satisfaction level from plotting the least square means of the tenure variable. Once again, satisfaction is high during the initial stages of employment and dips down at the six months to one-year point. Between one and two years, satisfaction rises close to the point it held during the first six months and becomes more stable.
Table 16

One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Moral Values by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.023</td>
<td>2.256</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55.285</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>64.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Moral Values by Degree of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6mo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4643</td>
<td>0.6929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥6mo - &lt;1yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.6818</td>
<td>0.9946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1yr - &lt;2yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3636</td>
<td>0.7267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2yr - &lt;3yr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.5071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3yr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Satisfaction with Moral Values by Level of Tenure.
The one-way analysis showed store location significantly affected satisfaction with how policies are carried out (Table 18). The store location variable was found to be significant ($F = 6.77, p = 0.011$) in regard to the way policies are carried out at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Table 19 shows the difference in the least square means from these two locations. Using Tukey's pairwise comparisons, the difference in satisfaction by store location was significantly different.
Table 18

One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Policies by Store Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>129.81</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>138.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Policies by Store Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store 1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store 2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.737</td>
<td>1.288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one-way analysis showed tenure ($F = 2.72, p = 0.034$) significantly affected employee's satisfaction with their co-workers (Table 20) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. However, Tukey's pairwise comparison was not able to determine which levels were significantly different. Table 21 shows the least square means for tenure. Figure 11 shows the trend from a plot of the least square means. During the initial stage of employment satisfaction is high but dips down by the one-year mark. After two-years it rises before it heads down again at the three-year mark.
Table 20

One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Co-workers by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>122.46</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>137.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Co-workers by Degree of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6mo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.964</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥6mo - &lt;1yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.227</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1yr - &lt;2yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2yr - &lt;3yr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3yr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>1.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Satisfaction with Co-workers by Degree of Tenure.
The one-way analysis showed education level ($F = 2.94, p = 0.012$) significantly affected satisfaction with the perceived level of recognition (Table 22) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Tukey’s pairwise comparison shows the level of education is significant between those employees with some high school and those with some college. This analysis breaks the assumption of homoscedasticity with the ratio of the largest deviation to the smallest deviation of satisfaction levels being greater than 2. This is due to the unequal grouping of people by education level. Table 23 shows the least square means by level of education.

Figure 12 shows as the level of education increases, the level of satisfaction with recognition decreases until the four-year degree point. Satisfaction begins to rise at this point. However, there may be an interaction with the status of those employees with four-year degrees. The researcher has noted that out of the 11 participants with a four-year degree, 10 have a managerial position.
Table 22

One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.13</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>123.86</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>148.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some HS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>1.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS graduate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.261</td>
<td>1.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2yr degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4yr degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td>1.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Level of Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Education.
The one-way analysis also showed tenure significantly affected satisfaction with the perceived level of recognition (Table 24) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. Tenure ($F = 3.22, p = 0.016$) was significant between less than six months and six months to less than one year being significantly different according to Tukey’s pairwise comparison. Table 25 shows the least square means by level of tenure. The plot of the least square means shows the trend in satisfaction level with length of employment (Figure 13). During the initial stages of employment, the level of satisfaction is high until tenure reaches past six-months. At the two-year mark, satisfaction rises until tenure reaches the three-year mark.
Table 24

One-way Analysis of Variance for Satisfaction with Recognition by Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>130.16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>148.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;6mo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>1.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥6mo - &lt;1yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.545</td>
<td>0.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥1yr - &lt;2yr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥2yr - &lt;3yr</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥3yr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>1.254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13. Satisfaction with Recognition by Degree of Tenure.
Analysis Phase II

The second phase of the analysis addressed hypothesis two. The procedures used are discussed in Chapter III.

For each respondent, a general organizational commitment score was tabulated and used as the dependent variable for the analysis of the second research question. In phase two, the variables were analyzed using a first order regression model. The model employed the scores for intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction and demographic variables using a binary dummy variable grouping. The purpose of the dummy variables was to convert non-metric data into variables that can be used in regression. These dummy variables appear in lower case in the regression table. A second regression was executed using the scores for all 20 components of the satisfaction questionnaire with the same moderating variables. The third regression is the collapsed model using only the scores that were initially found significant. From each of the variables that were found significant in the third regression, one-way analysis of variance was run to further understand the results. Upon determining what components of satisfaction significantly effect commitment, a final regression will be run to show the resulting predictability.

It was hypothesized that the levels of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction would have an effect on the level of organizational commitment. The analysis could only use 92 observations because 10 were thrown out due to missing values. This resulted in a 67.1% usable response rate. The results of the regression are shown in Table 26. The two scores that were found to be significant were the extrinsic satisfaction variable \( p = 0.000 \) and store location \( p = 0.046 \) at the \( \alpha = 0.05 \) significance level. The second
Table 26

Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction with Moderating Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.7843</td>
<td>0.6387</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJS</td>
<td>0.2186</td>
<td>0.1996</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTJS</td>
<td>0.7041</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageA</td>
<td>0.1275</td>
<td>0.4457</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageB</td>
<td>-0.0127</td>
<td>0.3703</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageC</td>
<td>0.3181</td>
<td>0.3564</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageD</td>
<td>0.4641</td>
<td>0.4002</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eduA</td>
<td>-0.0166</td>
<td>0.2125</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenA</td>
<td>-0.490</td>
<td>0.3956</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenB</td>
<td>-0.4485</td>
<td>0.3852</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenC</td>
<td>-0.6181</td>
<td>0.3894</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenD</td>
<td>-0.3312</td>
<td>0.3941</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posA</td>
<td>-0.2984</td>
<td>0.2933</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marA</td>
<td>0.2970</td>
<td>0.2403</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsA</td>
<td>0.5169</td>
<td>0.4541</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsB</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.4103</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsC</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.3322</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsD</td>
<td>0.1937</td>
<td>0.2838</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 26

**Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Intrinsic and Extrinsic Satisfaction with Moderating Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hrsA</td>
<td>0.0443</td>
<td>0.2163</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strA</td>
<td>-0.4033</td>
<td>0.1988</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R² = 58.9%, adj. R² = 48.0%.*
regression using all 20 components of general satisfaction and the following one-way analysis was more complete in explaining extrinsic satisfaction's significance.

Another first order regression (Table 27) used each response to the satisfaction questionnaire as independent variables along with each of the demographic dummy variables. The regression found six of the variables to be significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level. These variables were satisfaction with level of activity ($p = 0.006$), satisfaction with policies ($p = 0.028$), satisfaction with compensation ($p = 0.001$), satisfaction with advancement ($p = 0.030$), satisfaction with work conditions ($p = 0.009$), and marital status ($p = 0.010$). A collapsed model was executed finding four components of satisfaction significant. The usable response rate for the analysis not using the demographic variables is 99.0%.
Table 27

Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.1063</td>
<td>0.7363</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIV</td>
<td>-0.4324</td>
<td>0.1499</td>
<td>-2.88</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>-0.0494</td>
<td>0.1045</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIT</td>
<td>0.2483</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTAT</td>
<td>-0.0524</td>
<td>0.1026</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPHR</td>
<td>-0.0521</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPTC</td>
<td>0.0355</td>
<td>0.1287</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRALV</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.1411</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECUR</td>
<td>0.2317</td>
<td>0.1667</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVS</td>
<td>-0.0701</td>
<td>0.1366</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHT</td>
<td>0.1106</td>
<td>0.1031</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVLTY</td>
<td>-0.1436</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLCY</td>
<td>0.2646</td>
<td>0.1171</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSN</td>
<td>0.32125</td>
<td>0.08975</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVST</td>
<td>0.2483</td>
<td>0.1111</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSPBL</td>
<td>-0.2188</td>
<td>0.1386</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREAT</td>
<td>0.0887</td>
<td>0.1174</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDI</td>
<td>0.3469</td>
<td>0.1277</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 27

Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COWKS</td>
<td>0.15572</td>
<td>0.09206</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOG</td>
<td>-0.2174</td>
<td>0.1096</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHMT</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageA</td>
<td>0.3512</td>
<td>0.4487</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageB</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
<td>0.3619</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageC</td>
<td>0.2075</td>
<td>0.3381</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ageD</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eduA</td>
<td>0.2481</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenA</td>
<td>-0.3641</td>
<td>0.4189</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenB</td>
<td>-0.7442</td>
<td>0.4198</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenC</td>
<td>-0.723</td>
<td>0.3928</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenD</td>
<td>-0.0086</td>
<td>0.4469</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posA</td>
<td>-0.0126</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marA</td>
<td>0.6607</td>
<td>0.2473</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsA</td>
<td>-0.1544</td>
<td>0.4921</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsB</td>
<td>0.4733</td>
<td>0.4058</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsC</td>
<td>0.0186</td>
<td>0.3244</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrsD</td>
<td>0.0932</td>
<td>0.2856</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
### Table 27

**Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HrsA</td>
<td>-0.3221</td>
<td>0.2205</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StrA</td>
<td>-0.3812</td>
<td>0.1992</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $R^2 = 77.7\%$, adj. $R^2 = 62.4\%$.
From the second regression, those seven variables that were shown to be significant were used as the independent variables in a series of one-way ANOVA's that were used to determine whether any of these components could be eliminated. Those components that were found significant from the one-way analysis will be discussed in greater detail.

The one-way ANOVA for the compensation variable was significant ($F = 17.37, p = 0.000$). Using Tukey’s pairwise comparison (Table 28), several areas that were significant are shown with an asterisk next to them (Table 29). The results suggest that as satisfaction with the compensation increases, the level of organizational commitment also increases. The plot of the least square means from Table 30 shows the trend of satisfaction level with commitment level (Figure 14).
Table 28

One-way Analysis of Variance for Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMPSN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46.943</td>
<td>11.736</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>64.855</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29

Tukey's Pairwise Comparisons of Levels of Satisfaction Showing Levels that are Significantly Different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>-1.2812</td>
<td>0.3675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>*-1.7442</td>
<td>-1.2471</td>
<td>-0.0724</td>
<td>0.3441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>*-2.2321</td>
<td>*-1.7275</td>
<td>-1.2903</td>
<td>0.0659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>*-2.9666</td>
<td>*-2.47</td>
<td>*-2.0303</td>
<td>-1.2912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** An asterisk indicates those levels that are significantly different from each other.
Table 30

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Levels of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7000</td>
<td>0.6214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1569</td>
<td>0.9528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6083</td>
<td>0.8627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.2205</td>
<td>0.9001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.8178</td>
<td>0.4902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Level of Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Compensation.
The one-way analysis for the work conditions variable was also significant ($F = 21.55$, $p = 0.000$) at several levels of Tukey's pairwise comparison (Table 31). The levels that were significantly different from each other are shown with an asterisk next to them in Table 32. The results suggest that as level of satisfaction increases, the level of commitment also increases. Table 33 shows the least square means for the degrees of satisfaction. The plot of the least square means show the trend of satisfaction level with commitment level (Figure 15).
Table 31

One-way Analysis of Variance for Organizational Commitment by Satisfaction with Work Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONDI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.894</td>
<td>13.224</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>58.904</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32

Tukey's Pairwise Comparisons of Levels of Satisfaction Showing Levels that are Significantly Different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>-3.3595</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>*-3.6774</td>
<td>-1.2266</td>
<td>0.4338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>*-4.1589</td>
<td>*-1.672</td>
<td>-1.0798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0156</td>
<td>-0.1558</td>
<td>0.0448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>*-5.3277</td>
<td>*-2.8831</td>
<td>*-2.3162</td>
<td>*-1.7072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2.099</td>
<td>-1.1969</td>
<td>-0.9711</td>
<td>-0.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. An asterisk indicates those levels that are significantly different from each other.
Table 33

**Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Work Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2667</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9400</td>
<td>1.0306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3364</td>
<td>0.7919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.8539</td>
<td>0.8479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.9800</td>
<td>0.4041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 15.** Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Work Conditions.
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The one-way analysis for the policy variable (Table 34) was also significant ($F = 11.82, \ p = 0.000$) at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance. Table 35 shows the levels from Tukey's pairwise comparisons that were significantly different. Each of the levels that are significant are shown with an asterisk next to them. The least square means for the levels of satisfaction with policies are shown in Table 36. Figure 16 shows the trend for the effect the level of satisfaction has on the level of commitment. As satisfaction increases, commitment also increases.
Table 34

One-way Analysis of Variance for Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLCY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.902</td>
<td>9.225</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>74.896</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35

Tukey's Pairwise Comparisons of Levels of Satisfaction Showing Levels that are Significantly Different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervals for (column level mean) – (row level mean)</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>-1.1621</td>
<td>0.6481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-1.4067</td>
<td>-1.0356</td>
<td>0.3289</td>
<td>0.4719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>*-2.0132</td>
<td>*-1.6335</td>
<td>*-1.3022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.3823</td>
<td>-0.248</td>
<td>-0.0155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>*-3.2212</td>
<td>*-2.8751</td>
<td>*-2.5594</td>
<td>*-1.8534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0565</td>
<td>-0.8886</td>
<td>-0.6406</td>
<td>-0.0289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. An asterisk indicates those levels that are significantly different from each other.
Table 36

**Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0167</td>
<td>1.3123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.2737</td>
<td>0.7493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.5556</td>
<td>0.8185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.2144</td>
<td>0.8858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1556</td>
<td>0.5228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Satisfaction level vs. Commitment level graph]

**Figure 16.** Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Policy.
The one-way analysis for the advancement variable (Table 37) was also significant \((F = 9.99, p = 0.000)\) at the \(\alpha = 0.05\) level of significance. Table 38 shows the levels from Tukey's pairwise comparisons that were significantly different. Each of the levels that are significant are shown with an asterisk next to them. The least square means for the levels of satisfaction with policies are shown in Table 39. Figure 17 shows the trend for the effect the level of satisfaction has on the level of commitment. As satisfaction increases, commitment also increases.
**Table 37**

**One-way Analysis of Variance for Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Advancement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.85</td>
<td>8.212</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>78.949</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38

Tukey’s Pairwise Comparisons of Levels of Satisfaction with Advancement

Showing Levels that are Significantly Different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>-1.1276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-1.6258</td>
<td>-1.4297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3948</td>
<td>0.2201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>-1.970</td>
<td>*-1.7722</td>
<td>-1.0139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0355</td>
<td>-0.1408</td>
<td>0.3105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>*-2.753</td>
<td>*2.5647</td>
<td>*-1.818</td>
<td>*-1.4557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.6589</td>
<td>-0.8257</td>
<td>-0.363</td>
<td>-0.0217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. An asterisk indicates those levels that are significantly different from each other.
Table 39

Least Square Means and Standard Deviations for Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>StDev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0083</td>
<td>1.2651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.019</td>
<td>1.0146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.6238</td>
<td>0.8041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.9756</td>
<td>0.9466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.7143</td>
<td>0.7388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17. Level of Organizational Commitment by Degree of Satisfaction with Advancement.
The four components of satisfaction were used as independent variables for a first order regression model to determine their significance in predicting organizational commitment. However, the variable of satisfaction with advancement was insignificant. Using the variables of satisfaction with policies, compensation, and work conditions as independent variables, the first order regression was executed. Table 40 shows the final regression results.
Table 40

Summary of Simultaneous First Order Multiple Regression Analysis for Policies.

Compensation, and Work Conditions Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>StDev</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.6189</td>
<td>0.2081</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLCY</td>
<td>0.17719</td>
<td>0.06869</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSN</td>
<td>0.30034</td>
<td>0.06342</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDI</td>
<td>0.42459</td>
<td>0.08564</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = 59.9\%$; adj. $R^2 = 58.6\%$. 
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Summary of the Findings

Two hypotheses were tested to determine whether demographic traits have an effect on the level of job satisfaction and whether those levels of job satisfaction have an effect on the level of organizational commitment. Hypothesis one focused on the levels of job satisfaction as general, intrinsic, and extrinsic. The null hypothesis is rejected because the degree of tenure was found to have a significant effect on the level of general satisfaction. Years in foodservice had a significant effect on the level of extrinsic satisfaction and its interaction with store location was found to be significant as well.

Upon further analysis, tenure was found to have a significant effect on several of the component scores for satisfaction. These components of satisfaction include satisfaction with social status (F = 3.84, p = 0.006), supervisor’s human relations (F = 3.13, p = 0.19), moral values (F = 3.63, p = 0.009), co-workers (F = 2.72, p = 0.034), and recognition (F = 3.22, p = 0.016). The store location was found to have a significant effect on the degree of satisfaction with policies (F = 6.77, p = 0.011). Satisfaction with recognition was significantly effected by level of education (F = 2.94, p = 0.012).

These components that were found to have a significant relationship with a demographic variable should be looked at within its category of satisfaction (intrinsic or extrinsic). The satisfaction components of social status and moral values fall into the intrinsic satisfaction scale. The satisfaction components of supervisor’s human relations, policies, and recognition fall into the extrinsic satisfaction scale and co-workers falls into the scale for measuring general satisfaction. These component descriptions of intrinsic and extrinsic are important for simplifying the understanding of the types of job satisfaction.
Through the analysis of hypothesis two, four components of job satisfaction were found to significantly effect the level of organizational commitment. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected because the level of satisfaction was found to have a significant effect on the level of commitment. These components of satisfaction that were significant include satisfaction with compensation ($F = 17.37, p = 0.000$), work conditions ($F = 21.55, p = 0.000$), policies ($F = 11.82, p = 0.000$), and advancement ($F = 9.99, p = 0.000$). The components of satisfaction with compensation, policies and advancement are part of the measure for extrinsic satisfaction and the component of satisfaction with work conditions is part of the general measure. It should be noted that none of the components of intrinsic satisfaction were found to affect commitment. The most important finding was that three components of job satisfaction predict 59% of the variance in commitment giving managers specific areas to focus on to increase commitment.

Chapter IV introduced the results from the survey for the two hypotheses. Chapter V will discuss the conclusions, implications, and recommendations from these results.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The level of organizational commitment among hospitality employees needs to be addressed in order to focus on ways to enhance it. Though reasons for turnover are discussed in the literature, the focus of this study is the reason for commitment. Management needs to broaden their understanding of the conditions that influence an employee’s level of satisfaction and commitment.

This study focused upon the satisfaction levels and organizational commitment levels of employees of two national chain restaurant locations in Clark County, Nevada. The results are only generalizable to these two locations and not any locations outside Clark County or other restaurants. In the interest of researching what demographic traits are characteristic of higher satisfaction levels, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was administered with questions relating to the participant’s demographic traits. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was also administered in order to determine whether these components of satisfaction have an effect on the level of commitment.
Summary of Key Findings

In examining phase one of the analysis, the scores for satisfaction were calculated to determine a general, intrinsic, and extrinsic score. The general score was analyzed with the demographic traits as independent variables. Tenure was the variable that was found to have a significant effect on the level of general satisfaction ($F = 3.15, p = 0.018$). The scores for intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction were each used to determine whether they were significantly affected by any of the demographic variables. None of the demographic variables had a significant effect on the intrinsic satisfaction score. The number of years in foodservice and the interaction of the years in foodservice with the store location significantly affected the level of extrinsic satisfaction. However, the store location variable was found insignificant upon final analyses.

It seems that those with less experience in foodservice are less extrinsically satisfied in location 1 during the initial stage of employment than those at location 2. However, with greater foodservice experience, the results are the opposite. Those with greater foodservice experience had higher levels of extrinsic satisfaction in location 1 than those employees in location 2. However, the groups with less experience in foodservice only made up a small part of the population while the majority of the population had more than two years of experience in foodservice. This could explain why satisfaction levels vary so much as Figure 6 demonstrates.

This phenomenon could also be the result of the employee’s perception of managerial treatment. Perhaps management in one location favors those with greater experience. This could also be interpreted from the employee’s perspective. Those with greater
experience may have different perceptions of how the restaurant should run than those with less experience. The level of these results on extrinsic satisfaction become clearer since the analysis found that this category of satisfaction includes two out of the four components that were found to have a significant relationship with the level of organizational commitment.

Upon further analysis of the components of satisfaction, all the one-way ANOVAs which show a significant relationship with one of the independent variables are discussed. The tenure variable was shown to have a relationship with more of the components of satisfaction than any other variable. For the components that tenure had an effect upon, a similar trend is noticed with the degree of tenure among several satisfaction variables. In most cases, the level of satisfaction with a specific component was initially high. Within a relatively short amount of time, this satisfaction level dropped. In most cases, the results indicate a slight rise and leveling off.

In the case of the level of satisfaction with co-workers, the tenure variable had a slightly different effect. Satisfaction was initially high, decreased quickly, and after a slight rise at the 2-3 years point, satisfaction level plummets once again. Perhaps this is a symptom of turnover. With tenure, there is the increased instance of having to train new employees as the other more experienced employees move on.

In the case of satisfaction by recognition, both levels of education and tenure were found to be significant. With greater education, the level of satisfaction decreased. At the point of a 4-year degree, the level of satisfaction increased, but this may be due to the status of the employee being different from the other employees. Most of the non-
managerial employees do not have the 4-year degree. In order to maintain confidentiality, no further identification shall be noted. However, it would be interesting to further investigate whether satisfaction increases past the 4-year degree point. Those with higher education may have found what makes them satisfied though this choice may not be consistent with their educational focus.

The second phase of the analysis pinpointed the components of satisfaction that had a significant effect on the level of commitment. Through a series of one-way ANOVAs with those components that were identified as significant in the first order multiple regression analyses, the researcher was able to narrow down these components to four variables and analyze them using one-way ANOVAs. These variables were satisfaction with compensation ($F = 17.37$, $p = 0.000$), working conditions ($F = 21.55$, $p = 0.000$), policies ($F = 11.82$, $p = 0.000$), and advancement ($F = 9.99$, $p = 0.000$). Each of these components show themselves to be significantly different on several levels on Tukey's pairwise comparisons.

For each of these four components of satisfaction that had a significant relationship with the level of commitment, the effect satisfaction had been relatively the same. As satisfaction increased, the level of commitment also increased. In the prediction of commitment, three of these components of satisfaction were found to be significant. These three variables explained 59% ($R^2$) of the commitment variance. Managers could use this information to focus more effort to enhancing these levels of satisfaction in order to raise the level of commitment and reduce turnover. Perhaps with more studies of this nature, a model that is generalizable to other restaurants could be created.
Conclusions

This study was conducted to help identify any demographic variables that significantly affect the level of job satisfaction. Some demographic traits were found to significantly affect the level of several components of job satisfaction while many of the demographic variables had no effect. There may be other demographic variables that this study did not address that have an effect on the level of job satisfaction.

This study also sought to identify whether job satisfaction had an effect on the level of organizational commitment. In the final analyses, four components of satisfaction were identified as having an effect on the level of commitment. Of these four components, advancement became insignificant upon further analysis in the collapsed model. The remaining components of satisfaction were compensation, working conditions, and policies. Of these three components, satisfaction with policies was the only component that was also affected by a demographic variable. This study did not identify any other demographic variables from previous analysis that affect a predictor component of commitment.

The level of satisfaction with policies was significantly affected by the degree of tenure employees had with the company. Though no other demographic variables had a significant effect upon a predictor of commitment, there may be other demographic variables that have greater effects on level of satisfaction. From the findings, it is suggested that management can increase the level of commitment by increasing satisfaction with compensation, policies, and the work conditions. This could be accomplished through increasing the interactions with employees or the number of staff
meeting to discuss topics related to these issues. Management could also address these components through discussions with employees focusing on how satisfactorily they perceive these components.

This study also contributes the theoretical construct utilized showing the direction the research had taken. Future studies can use the same construct to formulate the type of analyses to be used. After the analyses have been done, this figure creates the full picture of all the relationships that exist with the assessed demographic variables, satisfaction components, and level of organizational commitment.

With low satisfaction in those categories that predict commitment, employees may look to other aspects of the job for satisfaction. While satisfaction with advancement shows a significant relationship with commitment, its use as a predictor is insignificant. Perhaps employees will seek out satisfaction with this component when there is dissatisfaction with the other components. In those cases where employees were dissatisfied with the intrinsic satisfaction components, their commitment may be the result of areas of satisfaction. However, if the components that predict commitment show dissatisfaction, employees may look toward other aspects of the job for satisfaction or leave.

Implications of the Study

This study was undertaken because of the investigator's belief that job satisfaction and organizational commitment have a relationship. The investigator also believed that certain demographic traits are characteristic of various levels of job satisfaction. Further,
its was believed that managers needed a more in-depth understanding of the relationships these variables have with each other. Although this thesis is limited in its generalizability to the hospitality industry, it suggests that certain demographic traits have a relationship to satisfaction levels and certain satisfaction levels have a relationship to the level of organizational commitment. However, more demographic traits need to be identified which have an effect on the satisfaction components that effect organizational commitment.

The components of job satisfaction also need to be re-evaluated. In determining which components of satisfaction effect commitment, new components need to be added to accommodate for changes in society since the survey was created in 1967. Perhaps a better questionnaire exists for the purpose of determining commitment that utilizes components of satisfaction. With more identifiable components, survey participants are less likely to exaggerate their dissatisfaction with part of the job in response to a specific question not asked. Instead, employees should be able to feel that their responses indicated how they really feel about all aspects of the job. A survey with this format could help managers diagnose weaknesses in commitment as deficiencies in specific satisfaction components. This study is significant because it can be used by the managers of these two restaurant locations to increase commitment among employees.

With the understanding of how these three variables affect commitment, management has a focal point for concentrating their efforts to increase commitment. The extra time management spends on increasing satisfaction can reduce costs associated with turnover. By helping employees learn why the policies are important, employees can pride
themselves on their high standards in the workplace. Some restaurants give employees an opportunity to help make some of the policies, creating ownership.

To increase satisfaction with compensation, management can teach employees how to raise the check average through suggestive selling of wine and desserts. Many restaurants use incentive programs to help motivate employees to up sell. However, competition may lower self-esteem in employees who have not won anything. The rise in tip averages in employees who up-sell may allow for more winners.

With regular discussion regarding the work conditions, employees can aid in creating a safer restaurant. Employees can also learn better ways of dealing with stressful interactions among each other. By lowering these negative stressors, employees will be able to focus more on the customer needs creating higher satisfaction among guests as well. Open discussion also allows employees to get to know each other outside the busiest hours of the restaurant. With a greater familiarity among employees, a better team-working environment is possible.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. Further demographics should be gathered to identify more traits that have an effect on the level of job satisfaction. These variables could include type of degree earned in college (for those with a degree), family income level, reason for working, etc.

2. This study should be replicated using several different types of restaurants within different regional locations to determine heterogeneity of restaurant employees (using the MSQ long-form when possible).
3. A study could be conducted focusing on the components of satisfaction that significantly affected organizational commitment. More work could be done to understand what working conditions are significant. Working conditions could be compared to working environments to determine significance of components of either of these issues is indicators of commitment.

4. This study could also be replicated in other fields within the hospitality industry as well as fields outside of the hospitality industry.

5. A study that measures job satisfaction and organizational commitment among graduates of a masters or doctoral program within and outside of the hospitality industry to provide insight into how these individuals are affected in their careers by their graduate degree.
March 10, 2000

David Vondrasek
6952 Wood Bark Dr
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Dear David Vondrasek:

We are pleased to grant you permission to use the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire 1977 short version for use in your research.

Vocational Psychology Research is currently in the process of revising the MSQ manual and it is very important that we receive copies of your research study results in order to construct new norm tables. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your results including 1) demographic data of respondents, including age, education level, occupation and job tenure; and 2) response statistics including scale means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and standard errors of measurement. If your tests are scored by us, we will already have the information detailed in item #2.

Your providing this information will be an important and valuable contribution to the new MSQ manual. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to call us at 612-625-1367.

Sincerely,

Dr. David J. Weiss, Director
Vocational Psychology Research
March 28, 2000

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is David Vondrasek and I am currently a graduate student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas College of Hotel Administration.

At this time I am working on a study of job satisfaction's relationship to organizational commitment among food and beverage employees. A study of this nature would be a great benefit to all managers in there strives to maintain job satisfaction and commitment throughout all areas of the restaurant. Thank you once again for your permission to use the employees of your restaurants as the population sample for my study.

To properly execute a study of this magnitude I will require your interest and enthusiasm. In order for me to statistically test the results for significance I will need to use a sample of at least one hundred employees. With the greatest number of respondents, I can eliminate any bias.

To survey the employees I will be asking for about 12 minutes of their time. I will also perform the study in a manner insuring anonymity. Upon completion, the research results will be furnished to you with the analysis of the findings and a full written copy of the thesis. I feel comfortable working with you in conducting this study and I would like to discuss any necessary parameters you need me to add. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

David Vondrasek
DATE: March 27, 2000

TO: David Vondrasek
    Hotel Administration
    M/S 6022

FROM: Dr. William E. Schulze, Director
    Office of Sponsored Programs (x1357)

RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol Entitled:
    "Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Restaurant Employees"
    OSP # 603s0300-261

This memorandum is official notification that the protocol for the project referenced above has been approved by the Office of Sponsored Programs. The approval is for a period of one year from the date of this notification and work on the project may proceed.

If the use of human subjects described in this protocol continues beyond a year from the date of this notification, it will be necessary to request an extension.

If you have any questions or require assistance, please contact the Office of Sponsored Programs at 895-1357.

cc: OSP File
Dear Participant,

We are conducting research relating to organizational commitment in the restaurant industry. Many researchers have determined that people stay with their jobs due to the personal satisfaction they get out of it. Through researching what you enjoy about your job, we hope to create a more enjoyable work environment.

We invite you to participate in this research. Total participation should not exceed 12 minutes and participation will include the completion of two questionnaires: the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (20 questions) and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (23 questions).

We want to assure you that all of the information you provide will be kept confidential. We will not identify you or the restaurant in any way.

Procedure:
1) Sign this form
2) Remove this form from the questionnaire and deposit in the box marked SURVEYS
3) Complete all 3 sides of the questionnaire
4) Place questionnaire in envelope and seal
5) Deposit questionnaire in the box marked SURVEYS

Participation in this study is voluntary and may be discontinued at any time. If you have any questions specifically regarding the rights of research subjects, please contact UNLV’s Office of Sponsored Programs at (702) 895-1357.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,

David Vondracek, Research Coordinator

I agree to participate in the research project described above.

_________________________     ______________
Signature                           Date
APPENDIX E

DEMONOGRAPHICS SURVEY INSTRUMENT

16. Your age in years
   □ Under 20  □ 20 or older but less than 25  □ 25 or older but less than 30
   □ 30 or older but less than 35  □ 35 or older

17. What is your highest level of education? {check only one}
   □ Finished Grade School  □ 2- Year College degree
   □ Some High School  □ 4- Year College degree
   □ High School Graduate  □ Master’s degree
   □ Some College

18. How long have you been employed at this restaurant company?
   □ Less than 6 months
   □ 6 months or more but less than 1 year
   □ 1 year or more but less than 2 years
   □ 2 years or more but less than 3 years
   □ 3 or more years

19. What is your title? (circle only one)
   □ host  □ cook  □ busser  □ dishwasher  □ server  □ bartender  □ management

20. Marital Status
   □ Single  □ Divorced  □ Married  □ Widowed

21. How long have you worked in the foodservice industry?
   □ Less than 6 months
   □ 6 months or more but less than 1 year
   □ 1 year or more but less than 2 years
   □ 2 years or more but less than 3 years
   □ 3 or more years

22. On average, how many hours do you work each week?
   □ Less than 15  □ 15 or more but less than 20  □ 20 or more but less than 25
   □ 25 or more but less than 30  □ 30 or more

End of Questionnaire

(Please, enclose this questionnaire in the attached envelope, seal it, and drop it in the box)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND HELP
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