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Hotels that provide inadequate training exacerbate staff turnover. This is particularly true for part-time employees who make up 25% of the labor force in the hospitality industry. The purpose of this research is to study the effects of training and select employee motivators including incentives and benefits on part-time hotel employees’ job satisfaction and overall job commitment. Data were collected using survey methodology from part-time employees at four different properties in Northeast Ohio. Data was analyzed to determine connections between training and job commitment. Results can help hotel managers design effective training programs and offer incentives that part-time employees value most in order to reduce turnover.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Training and development is a crucial activity in hospitality organizations because of the high costs associated with employee turnover. Unfortunately, companies do not tend to put forth much effort into implementing effective training techniques. Training in the hospitality industry has a reputation for lackluster techniques and using cheap substitutes and non-trained employees to help develop the new hires (Poulston, 2008). Specifically, management in hotels is usually reluctant to invest in proper training for their employees and in programs to train the trainer. Because of management’s lack of willingness to invest in these types of programs, a cycle is being created in this industry where poor training of employees and the consequential lack of motivation and poor commitment of employees is never-ending (Chow, Haddad, & Singh, 2007).

It is known that larger firms tend to spend more money on training recruiters, planning recruitment efforts, relying on qualifications, and using proper selection procedures when hiring (Chow et al., 2007). Because hotels range in size from a very few number of rooms to thousands of rooms, it is hard to create an industry standard for training (Chow et al., 2007). Also, the hotel industry is made up of both full-time and part-time employees, making it imperative for human resource managers across the industry to think about how to properly train both part-time and full-time employees. Part-time employees make up 25% of the hospitality industry’s workforce (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). Demographics of the hotel industry are very broad, which makes training employees even more of a challenge. Age range, gender, job qualifications, and
previous work experience fall across the board with hotel employees. Because there can be very few similarities among hotel industry employees and job positions, trainers tend to find ways to make the training generic (Choi & Dickson, 2010).

Positions held by part-time hotel employees include everything from front desk, housekeeping, cooks, servers, and maintenance, and even some management and accounting positions (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). With a whole host of positions being held, the company must employ trainers to develop training programs for each of these positions. Doing so may cost the company more time and money (Chow et al., 2007) as they may find themselves holding a training session for a very small number of employees (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010).

Lack of training in the hotel industry has been linked previously to turnover (in management staff). The hotel industry has a complete disconnection between what they believe the problem is with turnover, and what the actual problem is that creates high turnover rates (Choi & Dickson 2010). The study done by Choi and Dickson (2010) has linked turnover problems in the hotel industry with poor training, but mainly only with full-time employees.

Training is not the only cause of employee turnover in the hotel industry. There are many reasons why employees choose to leave an organization, and a few have been repeatedly looked at as a possibly precursor to turnover. Choi and Dickson (2010), Johanson and Cho (2009), and Poulston (2008) have researched employee motivation, employee benefits, and training methods for part-time employees; however, these researchers did not make connections between these factors and job satisfaction and job
commitment. Johanson (2008) and Chow et al., (2010) researched what part-time employees feel, lack in their current job positions in hotels and problems they have with management, but have not connected what employees lack, to a feeling of being dissatisfied in their current positions.

The purpose of this research was to study the effects of type and length of training on satisfaction with training and the impact of training satisfaction and benefits and incentives received on hotel part-time employees’ job satisfaction, as well as overall job commitment. A quantitative study was used to survey part-time employees working in various hotel departments from four different properties in the northeast Ohio region. The research draws comparisons to the motivator-hygiene theory and the conservation of resource theory to identify why employees may be dissatisfied.

Results of this research study could help hotel managers prevent possible problems that stem from employee dissatisfaction. Managers can implement training methods that employees favor, and offer benefits and incentives that employees are more likely to value and hence remain loyal to the company. In the next chapter, previous research related to poor training and lack of benefits and incentives among full-time hotel employees will be discussed. Challenges experienced while employing part-time employees will also be discussed. In addition, theories and previous studies are discussed to show the possible link of poor job commitment and satisfaction to issues with training, and lack of benefits and incentives. Chapter three discusses data collection methods, survey development procedures, and analyses methods used. Results of data analyses are discussed in Chapter four. Finally, Chapter five discusses research results and
managerial implications of research results, points out the study’s limitations, and puts forth ideas for future research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There are many factors that can affect how satisfied an employee is with their job, as well as if they wish to leave their job. This section will provide literature on the conservation of resource theory (COR) as well as the motivator-hygiene theory, the foundational theories for this research. Following the theoretical underpinnings is a presentation of past research related to training, benefits, employee motivation, job satisfaction, and job commitment in the hospitality industry and particularly the lodging industry. This section will end with a presentation of the conceptual model and research propositions.

Theoretical Underpinnings

Motivator Hygiene Theory

Frederick Herzberg created the motivator-hygiene theory in 1959 to study job attitudes. Herzberg (1959) concluded that fourteen factors can be associated with how an employee feels about their job. These factors include: recognition, achievement, possibility of growth, advancement, salary, interpersonal relations, supervision-technical, responsibility, company policy and administration, working conditions, the work itself, factors in personal life, status, and job security (Herzberg, 1959). The factors that Herzberg’s (1959) research resulted in are widely prevalent in the job satisfaction literature. Herzberg (1959) used these factors to relate full-time employees and their attitudes towards their job. He stated that if an employee feels unhappy with one or more of them, their attitude towards their job would be negative.
Chuang, Yin, and Dellmann-Jenkins (2008) related the motivator-hygiene theory to the hospitality industry, stating that understanding the motivation of employees will help promote job fit and increase productivity throughout the organization. These researchers concluded that factors that lead to job satisfaction will also lead to organizational trust. Chuang et al., (2008) also discussed that employees who seem to be more dissatisfied with their job will likely have more stress and overall be less productive.

Another factor in the motivator-hygiene theory that Herzberg (1959) discussed is turnover resulting from job dissatisfaction. The motivator-hygiene theory states that employees who have strong feelings of job achievement, job recognition, job responsibility, room for advancement, and increases in salary were less likely to leave the job. Even though the motivator-hygiene theory was proposed decades ago, managers need to take these factors into consideration. Managers also need to intervene with employees who have already taken the steps towards quitting (Herzberg, 1959).

Poulston (2009) applied the motivator-hygiene theory to research how employees in hotels are motivated by the possibility of advancement in the workplace. In the study, the researcher uses the “hygiene” factors described by Herzberg to relate them to employee motivations (Poulston, 2009). The research found that employees are unmotivated due to lack of advancement in the company, which in turn makes them less satisfied. The link between dissatisfied employees and the lack of career advancement, or motivators, was very strong (Poulson, 2009).

Lundberg, Gudmundson, and Andersson (2009) applied Herzberg’s
motivator-hygiene theory to their research pertaining to the motivations of seasonal workers in the hospitality industry (as a whole). The researchers used Herzberg’s constructs of salary, interpersonal relationships, and reward systems to measure overall motivations of employees. This research supported Herzberg’s theory of employee motivations, and showed that the motivator-hygiene theory is still valid (Lundberg et al., 2009). The researchers show that work motivation is based on the employee’s needs based on their self-fulfillment.

Part-time Workforce in the Lodging Industry

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2006, there were approximately 62,000 overnight accommodations available in the United States. Two million workers were employed within these organizations, and 25% of those employees were considered part-time. There is no universal definition for a part-time employee; however, for the purpose of this paper and research, a part-time employee is an individual who works less than 35 hours per week (Johanson & Cho, 2009). To go along with that, a full-time employee, is a person who works 40 or more hours in one week and receives some type of benefit package (Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004). The reasons that people choose, or not choose, to work part-time are varied; however, according to Doerpinghaus and Feldman (1993), many part-time employees are students, have spouses that work full-time, or some even have another full-time job themselves. These are considered voluntary part-time employees. Involuntary part-time employees are those who wish to move up and work full-time, but are not given that opportunity.
Doeringhaus and Feldman (1993) also stated that some people choose to work part-time because of health reasons or children.

Cunningham and Mahoney (2004) and Chew and Chan (2008) found four different constructs led to employees being unmotivated or dissatisfied with their current job. These include: poor training or lack of quality training, employee benefits, employee motivators (what drives these employees to do better), and employee incentives and initiative programs. All of these factors have been linked in some way to job commitment or high turnover rates in full-time employees in the hospitality industry, but never with part-time employees in this industry.

Because there is such a high demand for hospitality employees to run such areas as the front desk or maintenance, sometimes management will choose under-qualified or inexperienced staff to work in these areas (Poulson, 2008). If management chooses to use these employees in unfamiliar areas, they must spend money on the correct training and development programs. However, investment is not made in these activities; instead companies are trying to find ways around long and expensive training sessions to save money (Poulston, 2008). The current research will try to connect poor staff training and high staff turnover factors to high part-time employee intent to leave in the hotel industry.

Poulston (2008) categorized typical problems associated with employing part-time employees in the hospitality industry. These include:

- employees’ subservient status
- understaffing and high staff turnover
- poor training
high employee theft
possibility of unfair dismissals
sexual harassment issues
food hygiene issues

In comparison to the problems Poulston (2008) associated with part-time employees, Johanson and Cho (2009) found some misconceptions and negative connotations that are associated with part-time employees. Most employers feel that part-time employees are substandard to the rest of the workforce, are usually less concerned with quality of work and cleanliness, tend to have higher rates of absenteeism, and are likely to quit because they feel unappreciated. Johanson and Cho (2009) found that these are actually not always true. In a study done in four upscale hotels, they determined that part-time employees actually have greater job satisfaction, have a higher level of organizational commitment, perform more action behaviors (such as going above and beyond what is asked of them), and tend to engage in more quality work performance. The researchers did state that very little research has been done comparing full-time and part-time employees, and some studies have not supported the above findings. They do reiterate that employers should not judge part-time employees, and most negativity associated with this workforce is untrue and unfounded.

**Employee Motivators**

Cunningham and Mahoney (2004) found several employee motivators: personal orientation and training, conscientiousness of job knowledge, perceptions of fairness based on biases towards different groups of employees, employee’s self-efficacy
(satisfying the needs and wants of the consumer first and foremost), job involvement, career exploration and planning, and overall work environment. Even though their research was actually conducted in a Division I athletic department, the constructs that are discussed have been supported by other findings from Poulston (2009) and Johansson and Cho (2009).

Specifically, Cunningham and Mahoney (2004) described that career exploration is very important to employees that are under the age of 30. This group of employees includes individuals who have recently graduated or are still attending some level of schooling who are still in the process of determining their future career paths. Eighteen to 30-year olds feel that if they have the support from their organization to explore either promotions within the current company, or moving laterally to different branches, that they will tend to stay with the company longer. Companies that provide career planning for their young employees are actually creating motivation for them to work towards a goal, as well as providing an incentive to retain these employees for a very long time.

Maroudas, Kyriakidou, and Vacharis (2008) researched the effects of incentives on their employees in the luxury hotel setting of Athens, Greece. The participants were given a questionnaire that asked hotel identity, biographical data, and motivators used. The questions that were asked pertained to a list of incentives that were offered to the employees which included, but was not limited to: gifts, bonuses, paid expenses to seminars, meals, transfers, events, and insurance (Maroudas et al., 2008). This research enhanced previous research done which stated that there is a link to employee motivators (such as incentives) and an overall employee’s performance. The study also recommends
future research on the effects of training programs on employee morale (Maroudas et al., 2008).

Curtis, Upchurch, and Severt (2009) researched the effects of employee motivators on tipped (hourly) employees in the restaurant industry. Questions related to loyalty to employees and supervisors, job security, organizational involvement, and career development was posed to tipped employees in a restaurant setting (Curtis et al., 2009). The conclusion of the study was that employee motivators are crucial to create and sustain a successful organization (Curtis et al., 2009). The researchers also pointed out that lack of employee motivation could result in lack of morale, productivity, and problems with turnover.

Benefits and Employee Incentives

Because there are many factors that can contribute to what motivates an employee, the current research will only focus on the role of employee benefits and incentive offered (or not offered) on job satisfaction.

By providing all employees with incentives or benefits for doing their job well, most employers can expect a level of respect from their employees (Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004). Unfortunately, it is well known in the hospitality industry that most part-time employees do not receive many, if any, benefits, and incentives are very sparse (Cunningham & Mahoney, 2004). Moncarz, Zhao and Kay (2008) studied how incentives and benefits affect overall job performance of part-time employees. Usually employee recognition, rewards, and compensation were used mainly for full-time employees, but the authors pointed out that using these incentives on non-managerial and
part-time employees could have a huge positive effect on work performance. The study showed that part-time employees who receive these benefits or initiatives tend to assume greater responsibilities in the workplace; management tends to be more likely to use selective hiring techniques; employers also tend to use competitive pay grades more; and team-oriented work environments are used more often.

Most part-time employees do not receive full benefit packages for the work they do, and some receive no additional compensation besides salary. Doepinghaus and Feldman (1993) studied the top 25 benefits that part-time hospitality industry workers receive at their current job and found that out of 945 participants, no significant benefits, such as health care or insurance, were reported. The top five benefits included in a part-time employee’s compensation were free parking, vacation leave, merchandise discounts, sick leave, and retirement contributions. The authors also stated that most of these benefits were not an enticement to attract employees to a job or to retain these employees; instead they were just considered an added bonus.

Bardoel, Morgan, and Santos (2007) researched part-time hospitality employees in Australia, and what constitutes as “quality” work for these employees. They discussed how most research past indicated that part-time employees receive lower pay and do not have access to most benefits. They also discussed how most employers have a notion that part-time employees are less committed, less competent, and less willing to work hard. However, Bardoel et al., (2007), concluded that by making sure these employees have “quality” work to do, they are actually the complete opposite of what previous human resource (HR) departments have described them as. The purpose of Bardoel’s et
al., (2007) research is to describe what signifies as quality work, and how to integrate it into all part-time employees’ positions.

Bardoel et al., (2007) describe job-related values that need to be addressed for these part-time employees. Such values include: wages comparable to full-time employees, employment benefits, employment security, access to training and career progression, an employee voice, and high skill and task autonomy of job. Research results show that having quality part-time work involving job values, can result in part-time workers being present in high level positions, receiving competitive pay, adding to their skills, and being considered as non-replaceable employees. Eighteen managers who oversee part-time hospitality staff were studied and the findings did suggest that human resource department managers must engage in thinking about part-time work, as well as using flexible work arrangements, and developing part-time employees’ skills (Bardoel et al., 2007). Another factor that HR managers need to take into consideration is an employee’s career management, and providing them with additional training and access to promotions (Bardoel et al., 2007).

Most employees need to know that they are working for something, or towards a certain goal. This helps with overall morale, work performance and the level of customer service provided. Also, when employees are involved in making decisions, or are included in teamwork activities, productivity tends to be higher, and the employees are more apt to respect the company that they work for. They also feel a sense of empowerment and job ownership knowing that they have a voice in the company.
Overall, companies that provide incentive plans to employees (full-time and part-time) see lower turnover rates each year (Moncarz et al., 2008).

Moncarz et al., (2008) also found that providing incentives and initiatives to employees helped boost overall employee morale. Moncarz et al., (2008) described initiatives as: hires and promotions, customer centeredness, employee recognition and rewards, employee performance and assessment, and organizational goals and missions. The authors found that these employee initiatives boosted self-confidence in their jobs and created a connection between the employees and the company. By designing an organizational mission for the employees, they feel:

- they have something to work for
- they have guidelines to follow to do their work well
- there is open communication between part-time and upper management employees
- management will use selective hiring and promotions from within the company
- they receive employee recognition programs
- there is effective employee assessments
- leadership and partnership through the HR department

The authors also pointed out that effective employee assessments could include a sit-down meeting between the employee and their supervisor to discuss tasks that the employee did well, tasks that the employee struggled with, areas of improvement, as well as comments that the employee wants to discuss with their supervisor. Moncarz et al.,
(2008) related these initiatives to strong employee job satisfaction in their current position.

Chow et al., (2007) discussed several human resource management (HRM) practices that have an effect (negative or positive) on employee morale. Managers from 140 top hotels in the San Diego, California area were mailed a questionnaire. The questionnaire focused on the areas of job analysis, staffing, training and development, career planning, performance appraisal, pay-for-performance, an employee voice, job security, and dispute resolution. What the researchers found was that having an employee voice is the most significant HRM practice that is being used. On the other hand, pay-for-performance was perceived as being a very negative HRM practice. This was described as being negative because the research was conducted on managerial positions, and managers felt that their demands of the job should be rewarded on a daily basis, instead of how they perform. The researchers point out that this is a technique that was effective among the managers’ subordinates, or the part-time employees of the hotels. Based on the research performed by Chow et al., (2007), pay-for-performance will be investigated in the current research for part-time employees.

**Training in the Hospitality Industry**

Training has a poor reputation in the hospitality industry, and companies need to find a training program that not only works for them, but also enhances the quality of employees they produce. Retention in the hospitality industry is only a lowly 25% per year (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). The reasons for poor training are mainly because of management issues in-house. Management is very reluctant to invest in training of
part-time employees because they feel that they just are constantly being replaced, and management tends to have a “what’s the point” attitude (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). The HR Department’s time is usually occupied with recruiting and selecting these employees, and once hired, they are pushed aside. Also, if an employee makes a mistake at work they tend to feel very embarrassed or demeaned in front of their customers or co-workers; hence poor training is affecting their overall performance at work (Poulson, 2008). Overall, it is agreed that hotels which provide inadequate training exacerbate staff turnover (Poulston, 2008).

Training Methods

Poulston (2008) stated that training programs can have the biggest impact on reducing employee turnover in the hotel industry. Every company has to conduct training and also has to find the methods that work best for them. Employees that are not trained correctly cost the company more money in the long run (Poulston, 2008). If the company would put money into the training programs that they create, they can actually save more money over time (Poulson, 2008).

Poulston (2008) pointed out that most workplace problems are a direct result of poor training. The author also stated that many organizations tend to substitute cheaper versions of training to get the employees in and out quicker. Some methods that the hospitality industry uses when training their employees include: employment tests, on-the-job training, lectures, skills tests, shadowing, scenarios, and one-on-one orientations. These are some of the most common methods used, however most companies tend to combine techniques. On-the-job training is one of the most popular
tools when training new employees in this industry, however most companies do not use a quality trained trainer for these programs, or they use a “show as you go” version which Poulston (2008) stated is just a cheap substitution.

Poulston (2008) also discussed using exit interviews as a training method. When most part-time employees leave they do not get a formal exit interview with their direct supervisor. Instead the supervisor may ask for a reason that the employee is leaving, and then let the employee leave, since the notion is that part-time employees are easily replaceable. However, it was shown by Cunningham and Mahoney (2004) that conducting exit interviews for all employees can provide valuable information about what that employee thought worked well, what did not work so well, what lacked in their training, what incentives could have made them more motivated to conduct their job, and what the employer could change to make the job more appealing. Most companies that do use exit interviews learn information that they can apply back to their training and development programs (Poulston, 2008).

High-performance working practices are a fairly new technique being used in the hospitality industry. These practices include empowering the employee with higher task autonomy, reducing job titles or management, implementing extensive training programs, encouraging information-sharing programs and performance-based pay (Cheng-Hua, Shyh-Jer, & Shih-Chien, 2009). Usually, an outside organization is hired to train and evaluate performance of the employees and organization, which will then have the results measured. Under this system, employees who are performing at high standards will be rewarded or compensated based on what management has put into place (Cheng-Hua et
al., 2009). This is becoming an effective tool because bias is not present during the evaluation process.

According to Poulston (2008), training and development programs can reduce stress that employees feel when they are not trained properly; affect the commitment an employee has to an organization, and overall staff retention. Poulston’s (2008) sample included full-time hotel employees. Although the effects of properly structured training and development programs have not been documented for part-time employees, it may be reasonable to hypothesize that proper training techniques affect the above mentioned for part-time employees as well.

Human Resource Management Best Practices

Chow et al., (2007) are quick to point out that even though there are positive reports linking HR best practices, such as employee development and careful selection of employees, with lower turnover, the number of hotels that actually implement these ideas are relatively small. The researchers did explain that it is more likely that larger hotel companies will implement these best practices ideas, and spend the time and money on training needed for their employees. These large firms will train recruiters, plan a recruitment effort, rely on objective qualifications, and use selective hiring. Because it is more difficult to treat employees fairly as a firm grows, the company needs to make sure they have these guidelines in place to handle the situation before it becomes a problem. Chow et al., (2007) suggest that formal systems are more efficient when there are large numbers of employees being recruited, hired, and trained. Also, these larger companies have more resources to implement these best practices.
Chow et al., (2007) also concluded that the adoption of HRM best practices affect employees’ job satisfaction, morale and positive feelings towards the company. Proper HRM can also affect the likelihood that employees will not quit, and these positive attitudes will have a significant effect on overall turnover.

HR managers are starting to implement their best practices into organizations that focus on cost-reduction (or high-road strategies) and quality and service (or low-road strategies) (Cheng-Hua et al., 2009). Companies are told to focus on three areas, however the most useful for this research are cost-based strategies, which are defined as labor is essentially a commodity, and work is as routine as possible. Training focuses on company policies and correcting skills deficiencies instead of elaborate sessions. Standardization is promoted to improve efficiency.

Choi and Dickson (2010) also conducted a case study in 2000 on New Castle Hotels and their training and development program. The researchers restructured the training program to observe impact on overall retention. The researchers created a training program that consisted of a complete open door policy between upper management and line level employees; developed a peer review program; distributed regular opinion surveys to all employees; put in place a promotion policy that stated that the company will try to promote within before searching for new employees outside the company; and overall, enhanced the skills of the managers and their leadership. The authors put this new program into place and after one year it was obvious that the new training had in fact positively affected overall retention. Managerial turnover was reduced by ten percent after one year, and overall employee turnover was cut down by
almost half. This case study is a key source documenting the effect of poor training on high turnover rates.

Chew and Chan (2008) discussed a list of human resource management best practices that could lead to organizational improvements. The person-organization fit is set to make sure that the new hire is actually a fit for the company and the job. The reason for this concept is to hopefully end the idea of hiring a “body” and instead hiring someone on for the long run. Chew and Chan (2008) describe this as being one of the first steps to pre-training, and getting the person that will want to invest their time in the training, as well as the job, and hopefully for a long time.

Chew and Chan (2008) point out that most large companies have the capital to develop and provide to their employees are the ones who spend the most money on training. When companies are willing to provide benefits and other incentives, companies will spend the time to point out any deficiencies in job performance, and also spend the time to train and correct any problems they see in employee development. Chew and Chan’s (2008) research has pointed out (in non-hospitality related fields) that the organizations that were able to fulfill their employees’ career aspirations were able to create long-term employee commitment.

Furunes (2005) stated that there are four steps associated with effective training. These included identifying training needs, establishing learning objectives, deciding on training methods, and creating an effective evaluation of the training. She stated that training needs to be aimed at desired results and changing someone’s overall behavior.
The goal of training should be to master knowledge and an understanding of how to do the job correctly, and the trainers need to emphasize how to apply these to their day-to-day behavior while they do their job.

Furunes (2005) collected data from hospitality managers in Norwegian hotels, and concluded that one-on-one training was by far the most used training method, as well as the one that was perceived as most effective across all sites surveyed. One-on-one training scored extremely high in her pre-research of being effective. Lectures came in second on most widely used training tools; however, it scored a very low score in her pre-research. Furunes (2005) also pointed out that the reason different training methods may have scored higher is because they are used to supplement another training method, which is very common across the hospitality industry. Furunes (2005) concluded that a paradox that is happening with training in the hospitality industry was that and what may be widely used, is not always the most effective.

Kathman and Kathman (2000) researched training student employees, many of whom are part-time employees in the hospitality industry, and the best practices when dealing with this population. The authors discussed methods that work when training this population, many of which can be extended to training all employees, but especially part-time employees. When starting out with these students, the researchers stated that there needs to be an orientation to the job, with a clearly written job description and performance measures. Starting out with such a clear method leaves no reason for the employee (whether it be student, part-time, or upper management) to question what the actual job is. Kathman and Kathman (2000) also stated that there needs to be follow-up
training after the first few weeks, to measure what else the employee still may need to work on. Finally, the authors discuss the importance of an effective evaluation of training, much like Furunes (2005) also suggested. By evaluating training effectiveness the employer can alter certain aspects of the training program to make the experience more effective.

**Employee Commitment**

Choi and Dickson (2010) studied effects of retaining quality employees. When these quality employees were retained, overall company productivity increased, there was an increase in hotel profits, increase in employee satisfaction levels, and a lesser loss of knowledge capital. Also, the cost associated with training went down significantly.

Chow, Haddad, and Singh (2007) researched how the effect of HRM practices relates to overall job satisfaction in hotel management. The researchers stated that effective deployment of known HRM best practices would help companies reach higher levels of customer and employee satisfaction. This research also added that in 1993, the United States Department of Labor came to the conclusion that human resource practices do improve overall business practices. Studies conducted by the Department of Labor Statistics show that higher grossing companies do tend to have higher flexibility with rewards systems. This will lead to higher growth in profits, sales, and overall earnings. The research also points out a correlation between low levels of employee turnover and higher levels of productivity.

De Vos and Meganck (2009) stated that the HR department has a hard time retaining employees because they tend to map out and create their own career path. This
problem creates voluntary turnover, which management is struggling to reduce. De Vos and Meganck (2009) describe an employee’s psychological contract, which refers to an employee’s perceptions of the organization, and what the rewards for being committed to the organization will be. The researchers discuss that this is important because if an employee does not value the organization they are a part of, the company will never be able to retain employees. However, Cheng-Hua et al., (2009) stated that voluntary turnover is typically the result because there is a desirability to move between jobs. The researchers also state that if an employee moves between jobs, it must be equated with a lack of job satisfaction. Both De Vos and Meganck (2009) and Cheng-Hua et al. (2009) have shown that because there is a lack of commitment on management’s part to fill the void of job satisfaction, and create the opportunity for employees to move throughout the company, they are instead leaving the job. If the companies would open doors for them, and help them move either laterally or upward in their own company, they would retain the employee for a much longer time.

Part-time employees do not receive the same benefits and motivators that full-time employees get (De Vos & Meganck, 2009), so management needs to help this sector of employees realize that they are just as important as the other employees. Retention practices need to be put in place to help employees feel valued, important, and motivated. Such retention factors include financial rewards, employee benefits, career perspectives, training development opportunities, and a supportive work environment (De Vos & Meganck, 2009). Most organizations focus these retention practices solely on full-time employees, when they need to be focusing the most on part-time employees,
who make up a quarter of their workforce (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). Knowing that part-time employees feel underappreciated (De Vos & Meganck, 2009), companies need to provide the same options for them as they would for a full-time employee.

The psychological contract that employees feel exists between them and the company is something that needs to be honored. De Vos and Meganck (2009) refer to the psychological contract as an individual’s belief regarding the conditions of an exchanged agreement between the company and themselves. When the employees feel that they are not receiving enough contribution in return for their work, they feel as if the contract has been breached. When they feel the contract has been breached, they start to have reduced feelings of disconnect with their employer, which in turn reduces their job commitment and willingness to stay (De Vos & Meganck, 2009). It is important for companies to consider the psychological contract, even though it is not a formal document. Management typically does not honor such commitments because they are not formal agreements.

Hausknecht, Rodda, and Howard (2009) described retention factors that they used when studying an employee’s reason for staying at a position. They listed eleven factors that they felt could somehow describe any reason an employee may have for staying, or leaving if it was negative, a certain job. The factors that they listed overlapped ones that Choi and Dickson, (2010) and Poulston (2008) also listed in their previous research. Factors that Hausknecht et al., (2009) described were advancement opportunities, the degree of attachment an individual had to an organization, the amount of pay and benefits, flexible work arrangements, investments, job satisfaction, lack of job
alternatives, location, non-work influences, organizational commitment, organizational justice, and organizational prestige. The researchers also discuss the desirability employees have to be able to move laterally across jobs within the organization (Hausknecht et al., 2009). Employees who are highly regarded in the field, and also have very significant skill sets are more likely to leave, due to the fact that competitors want that advantage over everyone else, and will pay for it either with salary, benefits, or other capital.

Hausknecht et al., (2009) also discussed how hourly workers leave their current positions due to factors other than those that apply to full-time employees, in most cases. Hourly employees are more likely to place emphasis on flexible work arrangements, pay, and benefits as their main reasons for staying with a job. This matches Cunningham and Mahoney’s (2004) research about why employees choose to stay in their current job position. De Vos and Meganck’s (2009) research showed that there were two reasons why turnover is so common in hotels. Financial rewards and lack of career opportunities were cited as being the tops reasons for employee turnover. On the other hand, the reasons why employees decided to stay were social atmosphere and relationship with coworkers, job content, career opportunities, and financial rewards. Coincidentally, the reasons why people are leaving are the same reasons for people staying, depending on where their current job is. With all of these studies, however, it is proven that rewards given to employees will entice them to stay, and the lack of rewards will be reason for them to leave.
What Hausknecht et al., (2009) eventually found out from their research that high performing employees were more likely to stay with a company for longer because of the advancement opportunities that are available to them. Their research also proved that there is a difference between the part-time positions and the full-time positions, and what they need to want to stay with a job. Most hourly employees stated they want transactional contracts, with more concrete incentives. Most full-time employees were happy with a more relational contract, or one that related prestige of the company, organizational commitment, and relationships that will be created.

Buonocore (2009) discussed how social exchange theory relates to contingent workers, or seasonal, and how this can possibly be applied to other employees throughout all industries. Contingent workers were found to have a less profitable exchange relationship with their firms when compared to full-time workers because greater benefits were being given to them. This relates back to what Doepinghaus and Feldman (1993) stated about what motivates part-time employees, and how if they were given the same opportunities as full-time employees, they would have more commitment to the company. Buonocore (2009) also pointed out that the support that contingent workers receive from the organization also affects how committed they are to the organization.

Buonocore (2009) also discussed how organizational commitment and identification are important concepts when addressing employee retention. Identification refers to the association that an employee feels to the organization and the other employees, and how they are psychologically bonded to a job or goal. Individuals may need to define themselves in this way to help them feel a link to the organization. The
author also discusses how social identity literature directly links that organizational identification to activities pertaining in intergroup relationships, and how this is important for the employees to feel a connection. Identification is a precursor to commitment, and if one feels that they can identify with a job, they will more likely be committed to the job.

Retention factors are an important piece when HR managers are analyzing their employees. In the study done by De Vos and Meganck (2009), retention factors were discussed and ranked based on what HR managers believed to be the most important, as well as what employees perceived to be the most important. HR managers felt that training, career perspective, financial rewards, performance management, and communication are the top five factors that if done well, will keep employees in the company. However, the employees felt that career development opportunities, social atmosphere, job content, financial rewards, and work-life balance were the most important factors (De Vos & Meganck, 2009). This study shows that HR managers are giving support to their employees; it is just in areas that employees do not feel they need it.

Davidson, Timo, and Wang (2010) discussed another factor as to why employees are more likely to leave now than before. Generation Y (people born in the United States and Canada from the early 1980s to the late 1990s) employees are gradually starting to enter the workforce, especially into the hospitality sector, and their views of a job differ radically from how previous employees, and Generation X (people born in the United States and Canada from the early 1960s to the late 1970s) employees worked. Davidson
et al., (2010) described the Generation Y employees as often disagreeing with the view of the employers, as well as the reality of the industry. To overcome these issues, the researchers discussed how HR managers need to be actively involved in the recruiting process, training, induction, skill development, and representing a direct and quality cost to the department.

Davidson et al., (2009) also discussed negatives associated with the high turnover rates and hidden costs that are associated with the problem. By shedding light on the high costs, hopefully HR departments will take the time to spend money on proper hiring and training techniques. The authors broke this down into five categories based on the problems associated with high turnover in the US lodging industry. These consisted of pre-departure, recruitment, selection, orientation and training, and lost productivity. The authors also suggested that businesses need to consider actual reasons as to why an employee is leaving, and what may have made them stay. In this particular study, these factors were not researched, but instead suggested as a future research area.

**Training and Employee Commitment**

Choi and Dickson (2010) have shown that employees who feel they were well trained stayed with the company longer (for managerial and supervisory roles). It is also proven that companies that provide position expansion, (promotions within the company) which are built within company policy help with overall employee commitment. Furunes (2005) found this to be true as well and stated that training employees early on will most likely decrease employee turnover rates. Because recruiting employees from competitors increases a businesses skill level, HR chooses not to train employees to keep them from
leaving for the same position at a different company. This will directly affect the costs associated with training and retention; however, what Furunes (2005) did not discuss was that employees, who felt they were properly trained, were more likely to stay with the company.

Chew and Chan (2008) support Choi and Dickson’s (2010) idea that the ability to provide effective training does relate to the organizational commitment of the employee. However, they do point out that certain research has shown that effective training cannot be reached due to constraints such as time, money, personnel, and senior management attitudes.

As Choi and Dickson (2010) and Poulston (2008) have shown, there are certain links between the reasons why employees commit themselves to a company and why they choose to leave. Companies need to create a link starting with the recruitment process to ensure that they are trying to get the best fit for the positions that needed to be filled.

**Conceptual Framework and Research Propositions**

This research will investigate the influence of employees’ satisfaction of training received and motivators (incentives and benefits) on job satisfaction and job commitment. The conceptual framework that focuses on training is available in Figure 1. The conceptual framework that focuses on job satisfaction and job commitment is available in Figure 2.
Figure 1
Conceptual Framework on Training

Figure 2
Conceptual Framework on Job Satisfaction and Job Commitment
Research Propositions

The following research propositions are derived from the conceptual framework shown above.

R1. Demographic factors including age, gender, education level, and past related work experience will impact commitment levels of part-time employees in the lodging industry.

R2. The type of training received will impact satisfaction positively with training for part-time employees in the lodging industry.

R3. The length of training will positively impact satisfaction with training for part-time employees in the lodging industry.

R4. Employees who received follow-up training will be more satisfied with training than those who do not receive follow-up training for part-time employees in the lodging industry.

R5. Satisfaction with training received will have a positive effect on job satisfaction for part-time employees in the lodging industry.

R6. A positive relationship exists between incentives received and job satisfaction for part-time employees in the lodging industry.

R7. A positive relationship exists between benefits received and job satisfaction for part-time employees in the lodging industry.

R8. A positive relationship exists between job satisfaction and job commitment for part-time employees in the lodging industry.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses sample selection, instrument design, pilot study, data collection, and data analysis methods employed in this study. In addition, the use of human subjects in research is also discussed.

Approval for use of Human Subjects in Research

The researcher involved in this study has completed human subjects research training at Kent State University. Kent State University reviewed the research methodology and all data collection materials used in the study. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) ruled that no human rights were violated in the study. All participants were given a cover letter describing the reason for the study (Appendix A).

Sample Selection

The study involved four northeast Ohio hotel properties. Three properties were part of nationally recognized chain hotels, and one was independently owned. While one was a limited service, three others were full-service properties. The first full-service hotel had 291 rooms, the second had 240 guest rooms, while the third property had 116 rooms. The last property which had 40 rooms was limited service. Questionnaires were distributed to all employees who fit this study’s definition of part-time (employees who work less than 35 hours per week). The survey participants were employed in several departments of the hotel, including but not limited to catering, front desk, maintenance, and housekeeping.
**Instrument Development**

The survey instrument contained six sections with a total of thirty-one questions, based upon the eight constructs of the study. Part one contained demographic questions including gender, age, education level, past related work experience, and length of training period. Part two measured the level of satisfaction with the types of training used. Part three measured the use of follow-up training and training satisfaction. Part four measured the employee’s level of satisfaction of benefits offered. Part five measured employee’s satisfaction with incentives received at their current job. Part six measured employees’ overall job satisfaction and job commitment (Appendix B).

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they agree or disagree with each statement using a five-point Likert-type scale in parts 2-6. Responses for these questions ranged from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither disagree/agree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree, and in some instances NA=not applicable. With respect to age, gender, education level, length of training and previous work experience, multiple choice or fill in questions were asked.

Following is a discussion related to instrument design.

**Demographics**

The demographic questions included in this study were age, level of schooling, gender, and years at the job. The decision to include these questions was made after reviewing several related past studies including Poulston (2008), Maroudas et al., (2008), and Chow et al., (2007).
Job Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Chew and Chan (2008) were consulted to adapt questions used to measure the job commitment and job satisfaction constructs. The Cronbach Alpha for job satisfaction and job commitment were 0.76 and 0.89 respectively in Chew and Chan (2008).

Training Methods, Training Satisfaction, and Length of Training

One question related to training method was asked. The choices to be provided were determined after consulting Cunningham and Mahoney (2004) and Poulston (2008). Each of these articles describes types of training that are effective or not effective, for hospitality employees.

The survey instrument used by Chew and Chan (2008) served as a guide for developing questions pertaining to training satisfaction and follow-up training. Kathman and Kathman (2000) were also consulted for questions pertaining to job orientation and job training.

Motivators and Incentives

Chew and Chan (2008) was consulted to frame questions related to employee career development, employee recognition methods, and incentives that part-time employees desire a company to provide.

Pilot Study

Students in a Hospitality Management undergraduate program at a large northeast Ohio University, who worked part-time in the industry, were used in the pilot study for this research. The questionnaire was distributed to the 24 students in a sophomore level introductory class. Participants were asked to fill out the questionnaire and provide any
feedback they felt was necessary regarding question clarity. Overall, questions were perceived to be clear and applicable to the study’s goals; only one minor revision was made to the question asking about level of education, based on feedback received. Academic researchers in the lodging management area and hotel managers also reviewed the questionnaire for content and clarity.

**Data Collection**

Fifteen properties were contacted to participate in the study. Only four properties agreed to participate. Human resource directors (or in some cases the general manager, when an HR director was not available) were contacted by phone or email. Surveys were dropped off in person by the researcher to each property that participated. Surveys were given to the Human Resource (HR) director at each hotel from May 2011 to December 2011. The HR directors were given one month to distribute and collect the surveys from their staff members (Appendix C). Each HR director was also given directions on how to distribute the surveys, a lock box, the surveys and cover letters, a uniquely identified envelope, as well as researcher’s contact information for any additional questions. Surveys were distributed to all part-time employees at the four properties. Respondents also received an informed consent letter along with the survey that described research objectives and provided directions for survey completion. The voluntary nature of responses, confidentiality and anonymity of responses regarding completion of the survey were also stated. The survey and letter were placed in an envelope with the logo of the educational institution that the researcher belonged to. Respondents were directed to place the completed survey in the envelope and seal it, so as to ensure confidentiality of
their responses. Given the sensitive nature of responses, the sealed envelopes were placed in a locked box that could only be opened by the researcher. No identifiers were associated with the surveys.

Four properties participated in the study, and each property received sufficient surveys to distribute to each part-time employee, based on previous conversations with the HR director. When completed, surveys were collected and the HR director notified the researcher.

**Data Analysis**

The eight research questions were analyzed using the following statistical procedures: (1) An independent $t$ Test was used to determine if there was a difference in commitment levels between males and females, as well as if there was a connection to education level and commitment. An independent $t$ test was also used to determine connections between past related work experience and job commitment. A Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between age and commitment, and to determine if duration of employment at the current job was related to commitment. (2) Multiple regressions were run to test the relationship between types of training received and an employee’s training satisfaction. (3) A Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between an employee’s length of training and their training satisfaction. (4) A Pearson correlation was also used to determine the relationship between follow up training and training satisfaction. (5) Simple Linear Regression was used to study the relationship between an employee’s training satisfaction and their overall job satisfaction. (6) Multiple regression was used to determine if incentives that may or may not have
been received by an employee affected their job satisfaction. (7) Multiple regression was used to determine the relationship between benefits received and job satisfaction as well. (8) Simple linear regression was used to determine the relationship between an employee’s overall job satisfaction and their overall job commitment. A total of 91 surveys were received out of a total of 150 surveys passed out, which gave a 60.67% response rate.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study was designed to determine how training, benefits, and incentives that part-time hotel employees receive impact their job satisfaction and job commitment. Questions related to the type of training, length of training, and status of follow-up training were asked to see how it affects an employee’s overall training satisfaction. Questions related to training satisfaction, incentives received, and benefits received were also asked to determine if they impacted the overall training satisfaction. Finally, appropriate analysis was done to determine whether job satisfaction impact an employee’s overall commitment to the job. Surveys were administered to 150 part-time hotel employees; 91 completed surveys were returned for a response rate of 60.67%.

Demographic Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics

Descriptives were examined for the current sample. The age of employees surveyed ranged from 20 to 50, and the mean was 28 ($SD = 7.01$). Majority of employees surveyed were under the age of 30. The education level of employees was also asked; 27 (29.7% of people surveyed) had completed high school or their GED, and 64 (70.3%) have finished their bachelor or another advanced degree. A summary of job titles and breakdown of gender and education level is available in Table 1. The amount of time spent at their current job ranged from one month to nine years; the mean was 2.23 ($SD = 2.11$). Eleven (12.1%) employees had worked a similar job in another hotel and 80 (87.9%) had not. For the training satisfaction items, the internal consistency was nearing $.70 (\alpha = .674)$. Cortina (1993) describes an alpha between .50 and .70 as an average item
intercorrelation. An alpha below .70 was due to the small number of items used in the scale. Using an alpha under .70 can still be effective and is acceptable based on Cronbach’s precision table (Cortina, 1993). The number of items in a scale has a profound effect on alpha. The scale used in this study for training satisfaction is a unidimensional scale, and unidimensional scales average intercorrelation with alpha of .50. Because the alpha is approaching .70, this alpha is acceptable for use in this study. For job commitment the internal consistency was closer to .70 ($\alpha = .701$).

**Demographics and Training Satisfaction**

The purpose of the first research question was to examine how specific demographic variables were related to commitment levels of part-time employees in lodging (i.e., gender, age, education level, past related work experience). An Independent $t$ Test was performed to examine the differences between males ($n = 36$) and females ($n = 54$). The male sample mean for commitment was 6.78 ($SD = .898$) and the female sample mean was 6.24 ($SD = 1.63$). According to Levene’s Test, the Homogeneity of Variance (HOV) assumption was not satisfied ($p = .006$). The Independent $t$ Test indicated that the means were statistically different ($t = 2.012$, $df = 85.514$, $p = .047$) for commitment. The results indicated that males had higher levels of commitment to their jobs compared to females.

Pearson Correlation was used to examine the relationship between age and commitment. There was a weak to moderate (i.e., according to Cohen’s (1988) guidelines) positive correlation between the two variables ($r = .231$, $p = .028$). This indicates that as age increased, the employee’s commitment level also increased.
An Independent $t$ Test was performed to examine if level of education impacted commitment. The sample mean for commitment level for respondents whose highest level of education was a high school/GED was 5.67 ($n = 27$, $SD = 1.92$), and 6.79 ($n = 63$, $SD = .94$) for those whose highest level of education was a bachelor’s degree/advanced degree. Because the number of employees who had completed graduate degrees was very small in the sample, the decision was made to combine respondents who had a bachelor’s degree or higher for analysis purposes. According to Levene’s Test, the HOV assumption was not upheld ($p = .000$). The Independent $t$ Test indicated that the differences between the means were statistically significant ($t = -2.903$, $df = 31.402$, $p = .007$). The results indicated that the higher the level of education completed the more committed the employee was.

A Pearson Correlation was used to examine the relationship between length of time the employee was at their current job and their level of commitment. The relationship between the two variables was however, not statistically significant ($r = .102$, $p = .342$). This indicates that the length of time spent on the job was not related to commitment. An Independent $t$ Test was performed to determine whether previous experience at another hotel affected the employee’s commitment level to their current place of employment. Only 11 employees had previous experience at another hotel and their sample mean for commitment was 5.64 ($SD = 2.38$); for the “no previous experience” group, the sample mean for level of commitment was 6.57 ($SD = 1.18$). According to Levene’s Test, the HOV assumption was not upheld ($p = .000$). The Independent $t$ Test indicated that the means were not statistically different ($t = -1.280$, $df = 30.593$, $p = .211$).
The results indicated that previous work experience did not have an effect on an employee’s job commitment level. Since the HOV assumption was not upheld, the values from equal variances not assumed were reported.

**Impact of Type of Training on Training Satisfaction**

The second research questions examined the impact of different types of training on training satisfaction with part-time employees. A Multiple Regression with Free Entry was used to examine the relationship between types of training: lecture style, shadowing, on-the-job (learn as you go), scenarios, employment tests, and skills tests, and an employee’s overall satisfaction with their training. The means and SD are presented in Table 2 for the independent variables (IV). The mean sample for the dependent variable (DV) was 3.39 (SD = .68). Scale ranged from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither disagree/agree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree, and in some instances NA=not applicable.

The results indicated that the omnibus test (i.e., the overall regression equation) was not significant (\( p = .346 \)), and none of the predictors were significant either (\( p > .05 \)). Thus, there was no relationship between any types of training and training satisfaction. Since the predictors were not significant, the values from equal variances not assumed were reported. Table 3 shows the correlation matrices between the independent and dependent variables. As noted in the table there was significance at both .01 and .05.

**Relationship Between Length of Training and Training Satisfaction**

The purpose of the third research question was to determine if there was a relationship between length of training and training satisfaction. A Pearson Correlation
was used to examine the relationship between the IV, length of training in hours (sample mean 36.73 \([SD = 21.04]\)) and length of training in months (sample mean 1.41 \([SD = .76]\)), and the DV, training satisfaction. Scale ranged from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither disagree/agree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree, and in some instances NA=not applicable.

The Pearson correlation between length of training in hours and months and satisfaction with the employee’s overall training was not significant \((p > .05)\). Results indicate that the length of training (i.e., in terms of total hours or months) had no relationship with an employee’s satisfaction with their training. Since the HOV assumption was not upheld, the values from equal variances not assumed were reported.

**Relationship Between Follow-up Training and Training Satisfaction**

The purpose of this research question was to determine if there was a relationship between whether an employee received follow-up training and their overall training satisfaction. A Pearson Correlation was used to examine the relationship between follow-up training (IV), and the training satisfaction (DV). Results indicated that the relationship between whether an employee received follow-up training and their satisfaction of their overall training was not statistically significant \((p > .05)\); i.e., whether an employee received follow-up training or not had no relationship with their satisfaction with training received. Since the HOV assumption was not upheld, the values from equal variances not assumed were reported.
Impact of Training Satisfaction on Job Satisfaction

The fifth research question’s purpose was to determine if there was a positive relationship between training satisfaction and job satisfaction. Simple Linear Regression was used with the IV, training satisfaction (sample mean of 3.35 \( SD = .75 \)) and the DV, job satisfaction (sample mean of 3.44 \( SD = .70 \)). Scale ranged from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither disagree/agree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree, and in some instances NA=not applicable. The results indicated that the omnibus test was significant \( (F = 11.297, df = 1, 89, p = .001) \). Training satisfaction was a significant predictor of job satisfaction \( (\beta = .336, R^2 = .113, p = .001) \). Training satisfaction accounted for 11.3% of the variance in job satisfaction. As training satisfaction increased, so did job satisfaction.

Impact of Incentives Received on Job Satisfaction

A Multiple Regression with Free Entry was used to examine the impact that employee incentives (IVs): job recognition, career exploration, pay for performance, and more responsibility, had on an employee’s overall job satisfaction (DV). The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4 for the IVs. The sample mean for DV, job satisfaction was 3.45 \( (SD = .70) \). The results indicated that the omnibus test (i.e., the overall regression equation) was significant \( (F = 3.078, df = 4, 81, p = .021) \). Pay for performance was the only statistically significant predictor of job satisfaction \( (\beta = .332, R^2 = .132, p = .004) \). Thus, employees who received increased pay for good performance were more satisfied with their job. Table 6 shows the correlation matrices for
independent and the dependent variables regarding research question six. As noted, there was significance at the .01 level and .05 level.

**Impact of Employee Benefits on Job Satisfaction**

All but a handful of employees surveyed answered either “not relevant” or did not answer at all for the question related to employee benefits. Respondents were directed to select “not relevant,” if they did not receive benefits. Only one person responded with “very satisfied” with health insurance; five were very satisfied with paid vacation, and four were very satisfied with paid sick leave. Because of the small number of responses and high number of “not relevant” answers, the data was not used in further analysis.

**Impact of Job Satisfaction on Job Commitment**

The purpose of the last research question is to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and job commitment. Simple Linear Regression was used with the IV, job satisfaction (sample mean of 3.44 [SD = .71]) and the DV, job commitment (sample mean of 6.46 [SD = 1.40]). Scale ranged from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither disagree/agree, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree, and in some instances NA=not applicable. The results indicated that the omnibus test was significant ($F = 22.727, df = 1, 88, p = .000$). Job satisfaction was a significant predictor of job commitment ($\beta = .453, R^2 = .205, p = .000$) meaning that a satisfied employee will remain committed to the organization.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The overarching objective of this study was to determine factors that affected job satisfaction and job commitment among part-time employees, particularly related to training, benefits, and incentives received. Companies are reluctant to spend money on training part-time employees especially because they feel that these employees are not committed to their organization (Chow, Haddad, & Singh, 2007). Knowledge of training methods, incentives, and benefits that are perceived as being most valuable for part-time employees can help lodging properties make effective resource allocation decisions.

The only study that was referenced which used part-time hospitality employees was Poulston (2008). In this study, 60% of the population studied was female, compared to 56% in Poulston (2008). The average age of respondents in this study was 28 compared to 24 in Poulston (2008). Only 19% of respondents in Poulston (2008) had completed a bachelor’s degree (or anything more advanced than that) in contrast to 70% who had completed a bachelor’s degree in this study. Average length of job in this study was a little over two years while Poulston (2008) found that 65% of the sample had been employed for less than 5 years.

Choi and Dickson (2010) was one of many studies conducted using full-time employees, linking turnover problems in the hotel industry to poor training. Very few problems that have been linked to high turnover have been thoroughly studied in the hotel industry (full-time or part-time) (Cunningham and Mahoney, 2004). While past research focused on part-time employees pertained to motivation, benefits, and training methods
(Choi & Dickson, 2010, Johanson & Cho, 2009, and Poulston, 2008), these variables were never connected to job satisfaction and job commitment.

Results of this study showed that as training satisfaction increased so did job satisfaction. If employees feel they are properly trained to do their job they are more confident overall (Poulston, 2008). According to Poulston (2008), training and development programs can reduce stress that employees feel when they are not trained properly, and this affects their overall job commitment and retention rate. Choi and Dickson (2010) have also shown that employees who feel they were well trained stayed with the company longer. Poulston (2008) and Choi and Dickson (2010) reached their conclusions using full-time hospitality employees only; this study reached a similar conclusion for part-time employees.

Moncarz, et al (2008) studied how incentives and benefits affect overall job performance of part-time employees. Employee recognition, rewards, and compensation were used mainly for full-time employees, but their study showed that part-time employees who receive selected benefits or incentives tended to assume greater responsibilities in the workplace, and employers also tend to use competitive pay grades more. In the current research study, pay for performance was the only employee incentive that impacted job satisfaction. A possible explanation for this could be the small number of employees that indicated they received any incentives at all in this study. Another reason for limited (if any) benefits being offered to part-time employees could be high costs associated with offering benefits such as health care and retirement to employees who may only work a small number of hours a week. With rising costs of
health care and retirement, employers may not want to invest in an employee who may work only a few hours a week.

Doepinghaus and Feldman (1993) studied the top 25 benefits that part-time hospitality industry workers could receive at their current job, and found that employees did not report receiving significant benefits; similar to the conclusion reached in this study. It is possible that employers do not invest in benefits for part-time employees given high turnover rates; however, benefits could curb the turnover rate (Cunningham and Mahoney, 2004).

Another conclusion reached by this study was if an employee was satisfied with their job, they would be more committed overall. De Vos and Meganck (2009) and Cheng-Hua et al. (2009) have both shown in previous studies with full-time employees that lack of job satisfaction affects commitment to the organization. Based on the results of this study it can be concluded that job satisfaction impacts job commitment for both full- and part-time employees.

Research results of this study found that the higher the level of education completed by a part-time employee, the more their commitment. Doerpingshaus and Feldman (1993) stated that many part-time employees are students, and are at their job to get related experience, or because they are in need of short term work. This conclusion can help hotel managers decide appropriate benefits for part-time employees. For example, Bardoel et al., (2007) found that part-time employees valued access to training and career progression. If employees had these incentives available, they were more likely to stay at their current job (Bardoel et al., 2007).
Limitations

This study had the following limitations:

1. A major limitation in this study stemmed from hotels’ unwillingness to participate in the study. Many human resources managers did not want to take the time to distribute surveys to employees. While initial contacts were made with several hotels, only few agreed to participate. A possible reason for hotels’ reluctance to participate in this research could be the sensitive nature of questions in the survey related to employees’ satisfaction with training received and their job, and their overall commitment level.

2. Only hotels in the northeast Ohio area were contacted given time and financial constraints. Hence, results cannot be generalized beyond this geographic region.

3. Some of the non-significant results could be attributed to the small sample size used for data analysis.

4. As is the case with all self-administered surveys, respondent bias is possible (Dey, 1997).

Managerial Applications

Most respondents in this study indicated that they did not receive benefits. Unfortunately, this is common practice in the hospitality industry (Doepinghaus & Feldman, 1993). Bardoel, Morgan, and Santos (2007) also found in a study conducted with part-time hospitality employees in Australia that they received lower pay and benefits were not offered. Offering benefits for part-time employees could positively
impact job satisfaction and overall commitment to the job. Several employers outside of the hospitality industry do so; Lowe’s Hardware is one such. On their day of hire, part-time employees are offered limited-benefit health plans, as well as term life insurance. Lowe’s has also started putting part-time employees in managerial positions and have increased their training programs to focus more on customer service. This has helped make part-time employees lifelong employees, instead of short-term staff (Merrifield, 2003).

Another company that has shown great growth in part-time employee commitment rates is United Parcel Service of America, Inc. (UPS) Employees are eligible for bonuses (part-time and full-time) at the end of their first year; health benefits are offered, and part-time employees can even take advantage of their tuition assistance program. Also, formal leadership and training programs are offered for all employees to help better their career. With all of these implementations, UPS has seen a five-year retention rate of 92.3% (Bloomberg, 2006).

Pay for performance significantly impacted an employee’s job satisfaction in this study. Cheng-Hua et al., 2009, discussed an evaluation method for measuring employee performance and rewarding them based on results. The researchers stated that an outside organization should be hired to evaluate performance of the employees. After results of performance measurement are presented to management, higher pay can then be awarded to those employees who have been noted as high performers. Managers can use this to make sure that there is no bias when awarding these incentives.
Chiang, Back and Canter (2005) discussed the impact of training on job satisfaction of hotel managers. The researchers found that if an employee stated that their satisfaction level was low with training, their overall intent to stay decreased, similar to the conclusion reached in the current study. If managers follow a model like Choi and Dickson (2010), who implemented a completely new training model that tailored to the employees in the New Castle Hotels, they could see an improvement on training satisfaction (which could lead to job commitment).

Gurbuz (2007) found in a study involving four- and five-star hotels that when a company takes the time to increase their employee’s education level, that employee will become more committed. The author concluded that more educated employees were able to perceive their work responsibilities more clearly. If employers take the time to invest in their employees, they will be a better fit for the organization (Bardoel et al., 2007).

**Future Research**

Results of this study indicated that men were more committed to the employer than women. In addition, commitment also increased with age and education level. While it was not the intent of this study, it would be interesting to determine why men were more committed to their employer than women. It may be possible that due to the nature of jobs held, men and women received different types of training. Future research could focus on reasons for differences in commitment levels among part-time employees based on gender.

Due to the exploratory nature of research related to part-time employees in the lodging industry, there is scope for studying factors that affect this group’s job
commitment in a larger geographic scale. It is possible that employee responses could vary based on geographic location, particularly in countries outside of the US. While the focus of this research was to study the role of training, incentives, and benefits received by part-time hotel employees on job commitment, it is possible that other factors including relationship with supervisors, availability of mentors, job enrichment opportunities, and opportunities to meet social needs of employees could particularly impact commitment among part-time employees, which all describe Management by Objective (Thomsen, 1998). Given the frustration with hotels’ unwillingness to participate in research, future research involving part-time employees could adopt a qualitative approach such as the use of focus groups, to gain an in-depth understanding of benefits and incentives that would be most desirable for this group and the reasons for the choices made.

Research results of this study indicated that little to no benefits were offered in hotels for part-time employees. A possible reason for this may be the timing of data collection; the hotel segment is still recovering from a recession. However, as the lodging industry continues to recover with higher occupancy rates and average daily rates, an empirical research study could be designed to determine hotels’ reasons for not offering incentives and benefits for part-time employees (Cho, 2010).
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KSU INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL FORM

Dear Hotel Employee,

I am conducting research to better understand the impact of employee training, employee incentives, and employee benefits on job satisfaction and commitment. The data that you provide can help hotel managers schedule more effective training programs and determine incentives and benefits that motivate you the most.

This research has been approved by your human resource manager. You are requested to fill out the attached questionnaire by February 15, 2011. Completing the survey should take approximately 5-10 minutes.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and anonymous. Please circle your answers with pen or pencil, and fill in the necessary responses. Once completed, the surveys can be folded and stuffed into the attached envelope and sealed with the provided sticker. Please deposit the envelope with the completed survey in the locked box provided. Once all surveys have been returned, the box will be returned to Kent State University. Your answers will not be reviewed by anyone but the researcher at the University. envelopes will only be opened by the researcher, and will be kept completely confidential. No identifiers will be connected to the survey, and employers will not be made aware of any one employee's individual answers. Your response is essential for the success of this study and will provide important information for hotel training purposes.

If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at 740.391.4299, or Swathi Ravichandran at 330.672.7314. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University’s rules for research, please call Division of Research and Sponsored Programs at 330.672.7204.

Thank you for your time and assistance, it is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Christin Jaworski
Graduate Student
Hospitality and Tourism Management
Kent State University
740.391.4299
cjaworski@kent.edu

Swathi Ravichandran, MBA, PhD
Assistant Professor
Hospitality Management
Kent State University
330.672.7314
sravichandran@kent.edu

Kent State Research and Sponsored Programs:
Cabantoga Hall
P.O. Box 5190
Kent, Ohio 44242-0001
330.672.7204
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THE EFFECT OF TRAINING, EMPLOYEE BENEFITS, AND INCENTIVES ON JOB SATISFACTION AND COMMITMENT IN PART-TIME HOTEL EMPLOYEES

Please circle the answer that best suits you. Answer based on your current job.

Gender:
Male  Female

How old are you? __________________________

Schooling Completed:
High School/GED  Bachelor Degree  Graduate School  Other: __________________________

How long have you worked in your current job position? __________________________

What is your job title? __________________________

Have you worked in any other hotel doing a similar job?
Yes  No

Overall, how many hours of training did you receive in your current job? __________________________

Overall, how many months of training occurred at your current job? __________________________

The following set of questions relate to the type of training you may have received. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following training methods. If you did not receive a particular type of training indicated below, please circle not relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Method</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied/Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group training in classroom setting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(following supervisor around)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(learn as you go)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(demonstrating real life examples with a manager/employee what would you do scenarios)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasting Personality/ Integrity tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Tests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(testing skills performed during job. Examples: making bed, taking customer’s order in restaurant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have received follow-up training within the first year of my current job.</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received a proper orientation for my current job.</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel employees are properly trained to do their job.</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently satisfied with the training I received for my current job.</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following set of questions relate to the type of benefits you may have received. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following benefits. If you did not receive a particular benefit indicated below, please circle *not relevant*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied/Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Vacation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Sick Leave</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement contributions by employee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement contributions by employer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker’s compensation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others (Please list):______________________________

The following set of questions relate to the type of incentives you may have received. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following incentives. If you did not receive a particular incentive indicated below, please circle *not relevant*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied/Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Recognition (reward systems, employee of the month programs)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Exploration (opportunities for new jobs, career training, internal job fairs)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay-for-performance (merit pay based on performance)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Job Responsibility (employer supervision, added job tasks and duties)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others (Please list):______________________________

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements related to your job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am currently satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is little to gain by sticking with this organization.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to stay at my current job position for as long as possible.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INSTRUCTION LETTER TO HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGER/GENERAL MANAGER

Hello,

My name is Caitlin Jaworski and I am a graduate student at Kent State University studying Hospitality and Tourism Management. I am currently working on my master's thesis which has a focus on training and job satisfaction in part-time hotel employees.

I am wondering if it would be possible to allow your part-time employees to participate in a short, three minute survey about their training and job satisfaction. The purpose of the survey is to collect information about training, benefits, and incentives part-time employees receive, and also their levels of job satisfaction and job commitment. I would be more than happy to share the overall results of the study with you when it is completed as well.

I am looking to use properties in Northeast Ohio, and your property would be one of about ten in the study. I am looking to collect my data in the next few weeks. I have included twenty surveys in this packet for you, if you wish for your employees to take part in the study.

I would love to discuss the details more with you or answer any questions you may have. If you would like to help me out and have your employees fill out the questionnaires, please pass out surveys to part-time employees (all positions), and have them read the cover letter for instructions. Instructions are also printed at the bottom of this letter. I will be available to pick up any completed surveys at your convenience. Please contact me by email at cjaworski@kent.edu or phone at 740.391.4299 if you have questions or completed surveys.

Feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns you may have. I look forward to hearing from you, and I appreciate any help towards the completion of my data collection.

Sincerely,

Caitlin Jaworski
Graduate Student
Hospitality and Tourism Management
Kent State University
740.391.4299
cjaworski@kent.edu

Instructions for participants in study:

Participation in this study is voluntary and anonymous. Please circle your answers with pen or pencil, and fill in the necessary responses. Once completed, the surveys can be folded and stuffed into the attached envelope and sealed. Please deposit the envelopes with the completed survey in the large envelope provided. Once all surveys have been returned, the envelope will be returned to Kent State University.
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Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Part-Time Hotel Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s/Graduate</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Desk</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquets</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Mean and Standard Deviation for Satisfaction Related to Different Types of Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadowing</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Tests</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Tests</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n=91

Responses for items ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree
Table 3

*Pearson Correlations for Types of Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Satisfaction (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture (2)</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow (3)</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job (4)</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario (5)</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Tests (6)</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.032**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Tests (7)</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)*

**Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)**

n=91

*Types of Training (IV)*

*Training Satisfaction (DV)*
Table 4

*Mean and Standard Deviation for Satisfaction Related to Different Employee Incentives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Recognition</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Exploration</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for Performance</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Responsibility</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $n=91$

Responses for items ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction (1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Recognition (2)</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Exploration (3)</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.030**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for Performance (4)</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>.008*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Responsibility (5)</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.032**</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)