

ANALYSIS OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE HOSPITALITY WORKFORCE AND JOB-SATISFACTION FACTORS ACCORDING TO AGE, GENDER, NATIVE LANGUAGE, AND RACIAL-ETHNICITY

Chang Lee

*College of Communication and Education
California State University, Chico
USA*

Jungwon Lee

*Dept. of Global Tourism Management
Hanbuk University
Korea*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationships between the hospitality workforce and certain job satisfaction factors. It also addresses what aspects of a position an employee believes to be valued and important. A total of 17 attributes were collected and used from each member of 24 properties. Factor analyses were used to determine the subsets of employee job satisfaction and satisfaction with workforce diversity. MANOVA was performed to determine the differences between job-satisfaction factors, overall job satisfaction, and retention according to workers' age, gender, native language, and racial-ethnicity. A relationship between satisfaction with workforce diversity and overall satisfaction was investigated using simple regression analysis. The findings revealed that women are more attached to their work than men are. Tenured workers consider their employment important in terms of belonging to the society and the community. Workforce diversity plays a more important role among those in management positions than it does for subordinate employees. Employees who are a part of the major racial-ethnic group in the workplace tend to have a more sensitive attitude toward workforce diversity.

Keywords: *Job Satisfaction, Retention, Workforce Diversity, Language, Characteristics*

INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry consists of various components, such as lodging, food service, attractions, transportation, etc. Among these hospitality components, lodging has played an important role in travel and tourism (Biederman, 2008). The quality of a hotel's products relies heavily on its employees so improving service quality has become a prominent factor in the hospitality industry (Augustyn & Ho, 1998). Quality employees are an organization's foundation, and it is critical for employers to retain their valuable employees, though attracting and retaining a skilled workforce can be challenging (Branham, 2005). The hotel industry has long been plagued by high turnover rates which are higher than most industries who rely on their employees and compete to attract new ones (Jones, 2008). As employees have become the most valuable asset of hotels, a company's success depends greatly on a work environment that attracts workers and exceeds their expectations.

How employees feel about their work environments may vary because of individual characteristics. These differences may determine the level of satisfaction with work environments and workers' intentions of remaining at a given hotel (Franek & Vecera, 2008). Nonetheless, an appropriate understanding of employees' expectations of their work environments is a critical component in hoteliers' being able to retain their valued employees (Hinkin & Tracey, 2000; Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar, & Brymer, 2000).

Identifying job satisfaction factors helps hoteliers make meaningful decisions regarding employees' satisfaction at work (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Efraty and Sirgy (1990) describe job satisfaction as one's effective appraisal of various job dimensions, including the work itself, supervision, pay, promotion policies, and coworkers. Glisson and Durick (1988) considered the worker and the nature of the work itself as two important factors affecting job satisfaction. Porter and Lawler (1968) divided influences on job satisfaction into satisfactory factors related to work itself, such as recognition or awards from working environment, relationships with co-workers, management, and compensations, and factors not directly related to the work itself, such as independence,

achievement, own supervision, self-esteem, and similar feelings obtained from work. Variables selected to measure job satisfaction need to represent all aspects of the work environment: human relations, the job itself, personal feelings, and a feeling of membership within the organization (Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999).

Carbery, Garavan, O'Brien, & McDonnell (2003) state that a combination of demographic, human-capital, and psychological attributes contributed to employees' job satisfaction and retention. Franek and Vecera (2008) indicate employee satisfaction becomes diversified when one group of people starts to desire differently from what another group wants. Changes in workforce demographics have played a major role with fueling interests on diversity in the hotel industry (Woods & King, 2002). Just knowing employees personally within the organization may not be enough for hoteliers to appropriately manage them. Understanding factors that play important roles in work environments are needed to foster diversity in hotel organizations.

The hospitality industry offers a wide range of jobs with diverse human capital requirements (Szivas, Riley, & Airey, 2003). Diversity may cause confusion among people with various backgrounds, and it is unavoidable in the hotel industry. Understanding the diversity of the workforce is necessary for building positive mutual relationships between employees and employers, as well as between employees and their coworkers (Iverson, 2000). Identifying job-satisfaction factors and worker's attitudes toward other coworkers are vital in measuring a worker's level of satisfaction with the work environment. The hotel industry must take new steps in managing diverse employees, a process which requires showing people how to work with those from different backgrounds (Borchgrevink, Ninemeier, & Mykletun, 2000); 2000; Lee & Moreo, 2007; Lee & Way, 2010).

Although there has been much empirical research on job satisfaction, few studies have highlighted factors which focus on individual characteristics (Ellickson, 2002). A study by Simons and Enz (1995) suggested that individual differences should be

considered when designing workforce motivational programs. Little research focuses on the impact of personal language familiarity (English vs. non-English) and racial-ethnicity on individual job satisfaction within the hotel industry.

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to investigate the relationships between job-satisfaction factors, overall job satisfaction, and workers' intentions to remain at their current hotels. The relationship between workforce diversity and overall job satisfaction according to gender, age, native language, and racial-ethnicity is then uncovered.

In accordance with the purposes of this study, two hypotheses are investigated:

1. There is no significant relationship between job-satisfaction factors, overall job satisfaction, and an intention to remain at the current hotel according to age, gender, native language, and racial-ethnicity.
2. There is no significant relationship between overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with workforce diversity according to age, gender, native language, and racial-ethnicity.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Understanding what employees feel about work environments is one of the most important issues for the hotel industry. Hoteliers need to retain employees longer, not only because of the cost of hiring and training new employees, but also because longer tenured employees tend to be more effective at their jobs (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992). High turnover rate is one critical issue in the hospitality industry which ultimately produces higher overhead costs and lower quality customer service (Kuruuzum, Çetin, & Irmak, 2009). Retaining quality employees would be the ideal method for sustaining a reputation and building loyal customer relationships (Ford & Heaton, 2001).

Studies centering on employee satisfaction with the work environment state job satisfaction has a strong relationship with customer satisfaction, especially in areas where there is a heavy

emphasis on service-oriented businesses (McNeese-Smith, 1997; Heskett, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1997; Spinelli & Canavos, 2000; Matzler & Renzl, 2007; Arnett, Laverie, & McLane, 2002). Job satisfaction has been also shown to have a significant relationship with organizational commitment and employee turnover (Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1994; Barrow, 1990; Deery, 2008; Schlesinger & Zornitsky, 1991; Testa, 2001).

The organizations tend to experience less turnover, absenteeism, and poor work performance when employees are happy with their work environment (Kuslivan & Kuslivan, 2000; Bai, Brewer, Sammons, & Swerdlow, 2006). Consequently, identifying which demographic factors have the greatest impact on satisfaction level is worthwhile and necessary for both employee selection and performance (Testa & Muller, 2009). This is especially true in an industry heavily based on human interactions (Spinelli & Canavos, 2000).

Different conceptual definitions of job satisfaction have led to it being measured in a number of ways (Wanous & Lawler, 1972) including: preference of one's own work (Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992); the relationship between employee expectations and actual perceptions (Locke, 1969); an incidental issue to job performance (Fitzgerald, 1972); and how one feels about the job in general (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1975). Lester (1987) indicates that researchers conduct different studies on job satisfaction because employees have different attitudes and values regarding the various aspects of their work. Researchers have also approached job satisfaction from the perspective of need-fulfillment by asking whether the job meets the employees' physical and psychological needs (Wolf, 1970). This study used the job satisfaction definition of: an emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job which is the most referenced and generally accepted description of it (Morgan, McDonagh, & Ryan-Morgan, 1995).

While job satisfaction may be just one part of the equation in employee retention, it is important to explore/understand key factors and individual characteristics that differentiate workers' levels of satisfaction, making the subject widely studied (Franek & Vecera,

2008; Deery, 2008). Different studies find different relationships with job satisfaction factors. Hancer and George (2003) used job satisfaction factors, such as compensation, supervision, social status, and promotion. Lam, Baum, and Pine (2001) identified three job dimensions, such as work environment, the job itself, and rewards, as ones having a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Spinellis and Canavos (2000) also identified factors such as pay, level of challenging tasks, degree of decision making, training, benefits, promotions, and supervision as ones having a positive relationship with job satisfaction.

Various job-satisfaction studies have also identified the role of demographic characteristics, such as gender (Wharton, Rotolo, & Bird, 2000; Frye & Mount, 2007), age (Eskildsen, Kristensen, & Westlund, 2003; Jung, Moon, & Hahm, 2007), education level (Verhofstadt & Omey, 2007), income (Clark, Kristensen, & Westergård-Nielsen, 2009; Tang, 2007), and tenure (Kalleberg & Mastekaasa, 2001; Oshagbemi, 2000). However, limited studies have explored language and racial-ethnicity in measuring satisfaction with work environments in the hotel industry.

Service organizations will need to identify and address needs of an increasingly diverse workforce (Testa & Mueller, 2009). Diversity issues in the work place affect almost every organization (Mindell, 1995) and nation, including the U.S. (Berta, 2000; Griggs & Louw, 1995; Higley, 2000). The labor force in the hotel industry has become and will continue to become more diverse in age, gender, and racial-ethnicity (Littlefield & Sarabakhsh, 1997). Matters of workplace diversity have become one of the leading contemporary organizational concerns. It is clear that organizations must familiarize themselves with different employee attitudes and deal with a differing workforce whether they like it or not (Pitts, 2009; Woods & King, 2002). Factors such as native language and racial-ethnic backgrounds have taken on greater importance in equating employee satisfaction with their work environment (Iverson, 2000; Woods & King, 2002).

Hewitt (1993) states that individuals bring their own identities—including values, traditions, customs, language, and

beliefs—to the workplace. As a result, geographic origins, ethnic heritage, and cultural traditions of today’s immigrants affect the entry-level workforce in the hotel industry. They tend to use these native identities to define their needs and establish social groups among their fellow employees within the organization (Littlefield & Sarabakhsh, 1997). The increasing number of hotel workers with different backgrounds thus require more attention than it currently receives in many places when building teamwork and employee satisfaction in diversified workplace (Lee & Moreo, 2007; Mok, 2002; Lee & Way, 2010).

The character of job satisfaction is necessary in order to facilitate matching the right person to the right job. Inherent in identifying the character of job satisfaction is maximizing job satisfaction and ultimately improving our understanding of organizational effectiveness. Immigrant and minority workers are becoming important assets in serving the needs of multicultural consumers, as well as society as a whole. Identifying the specific character of job satisfaction for each group is important and leads to the need for more insight on the subject. As Resnick and Bond (2001) indicate regarding measurements of job satisfaction, the creation of a new job-satisfaction scale would be the logical step in determining employees’ job satisfaction and its relationship to various topics like language not brought up in previous studies.

METHODOLOGY

This research initially investigated relationships between job-satisfaction factors, overall job satisfaction, and retention at the current hotel according to identified demographic characteristics: age, gender, native language, and racial-ethnicity. The study then explored a relationship between workforce diversity and overall job satisfaction as it relates to identified demographic characteristics.

Along with using items from previous studies (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Loftquist, 1967; Spector, 1997; Lee & Moreo, 2007; Lee & Way, 2010), initial attributes related to job satisfaction were identified through a focus group. The focus group identified seventeen attributes: location of the hotel, communication in

English, work accomplishment, department, level of opportunity to supervise others, level of different work duties, level of importance in the hotel, supervisor (personal), supervisor (technical), benefit package, pay, workload, working condition, working shift, training for daily tasks, career advancement, and job security.

Survey instruments were written in English and Spanish to accommodate Hispanic workers who may have limited English proficiency. The English version of the instrument was translated into Spanish by two Spanish and English bilingual workers and then translated back into English by two English and Spanish bilingual college students to make certain that meanings were the same in both languages.

The pilot test was performed to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire, using 65 workers from three hotels that participated in the focus group. Their suggestions regarding clarity, readability, format, and appropriateness of items were considered for incorporation into the final survey instrument. The data from the pilot test identified a wide perception of employee expectations regarding satisfaction within the workplace environment. Reliability of each factor was assessed by employing Cronbach's alpha-coefficient ranging from 0.83 to 0.91 for the individual factors of satisfaction and a coefficient of 0.96 for the total survey.

Questionnaires were initially distributed to all employees who were eligible to get paychecks from selected hotels, ranging from a 52 room roadside hotel to a 264-room resort. All survey participants were instructed to return their completed surveys in a provided envelope to a collection box located on each property. All collection boxes were then directly mailed to the researchers, and all questionnaires were coded and manually compiled into the computer system.

The intention to remain at their current hotel was measured by asking respondents how long they planned to work at their current place of employment. Responses were divided into four categories: less than one year, one to three years, three to five years,

and more than five years. Overall job satisfaction was measured by asking participants' level of satisfaction with their current job. To quantify the level of job satisfaction, responses gained from the questionnaire were measured by associating a quantitative value with the six-point Likert scale (1 = *Least Satisfied* to 6 = *Most Satisfied*). In order to quantify the level of intention to remain at the current hotel and the level of satisfaction, data was interpreted on a scale such that the selection of a higher number represented a higher level of intention to remain or job satisfaction, and the selection of a lower number indicated the opposite.

DATA ANALYSIS

The answers were evaluated and analyzed in relation to all subjects involved and the questions asked. Descriptive statistics were used to determine frequency distribution for age, gender, native language, and racial-ethnicity. Factor analyses were used to determine the independent subsets of highly correlated statements (Kym & Muller, 1978) that reflect the underlying dimensions of employee job satisfaction and satisfaction with workforce diversity.

The areas of *Work Environment*, *Work Itself*, *Supervision*, *Compensation*, and *Personal Status* were extracted from 17 job satisfaction attributes. The *Workforce Diversity* factor was extracted from four attributes. Multivariate analysis of variance, along with a multiple range test (LSD) as the post-hoc procedure, were performed to determine the differences between job-satisfaction factors, overall job satisfaction, and intention to remain at the hotel according to hotel workers' age, gender, native language, and racial-ethnicity. A significance of satisfaction with workforce diversity on job satisfaction was investigated using simple regression analysis.

RESULTS

The questionnaires yielded a 24.1% (359) response rate after eliminating 7 partially completed responses from 366 returned questionnaires. As Table 1 indicates, there were 109 male respondents (30.4%) and 242 female respondents (67.4%). Age was distributed among the ranges of 18–25 (82, 22.8%), 26–35 (92,

25.6%), 36–45 (90, 25.1%), 46–55 (59, 16.4%), and 56 or older (28, 7.8%). The respondents’ racial breakdown was 146 Caucasians (40.7%), 114 African-Americans (31.8%), 75 Hispanics (20.9%), and 18 that fit into the *other* category (5.0%). As for language, 281 respondents (78.3%) listed English as their native language.

Table 1: Demographics Information

		Frequency	%
Gender	Male	109	30.4
	Female	242	67.4
	Missing	8	2.2
	Total	359	100.0
Age	18-25	82	22.8
	26-35	92	25.6
	36-45	90	25.1
	46-55	59	16.4
	56 or older	28	7.8
	Missing	8	2.2
	Total	359	100.0**
Native English Language	English	281	78.3
	Non-English	62	17.3
	Missing	16	4.5
	Total	359	100.0**
Ethnicity	Caucasian	146	40.7
	African American	114	31.8
	Hispanic	75	20.9
	Others*	18	5.0
	Missing	6	1.7
	Total	359	100.0**

* American Indian and Asian/Pacific Islander

** A total may not equal 100 due to rounding

Several job-satisfaction variables loaded heavily on one factor, in a confirmation that there was minimal overlap among the factors and that all factors were independently structured. Through factor analysis, five job-satisfaction factors were extracted: *Work Environment*, *Work Itself*, *Supervision*, *Compensation*, and *Personal Status*, from 17 attributes. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was conducted yielding a significant chi-square value to test the significance of the correlation matrix (approx. chi-square = 2948.447, sig. = .000). As shown in Table 2, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistic was calculated as 0.906, which indicated that the

variables were interrelated and shared common factors (Kaiser, 1974).

The five identified factors for job satisfaction resulted in a relatively workable and meaningful number of composite dimensions. The reliability coefficients ranged from 0.680 (*Compensation*) to 0.878 (*Supervision*), which are considered acceptable ranges as an indication of reliability (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Succeeding with the reliability and the validity of the factor analysis, a principal-component analysis with an orthogonal rotation was implemented to determine the underlying dimensions of the job-satisfaction attributes and workforce diversity. Because of the sample size of 359 in this study, items with loadings of 0.50 or greater on a single factor were used to interpret these factors.

The total variance and eigenvalues for each of the five job satisfaction characteristics are as follows: *Work Environment* explained 15.901% of the total variance, with an eigenvalue of 2.703 and an alpha coefficient of 0.811; *Work Itself* accounted for 15.322% of the total variance, with an eigenvalue of 2.605 and an alpha coefficient of 0.840; *Supervision* represented 13.616% of the total variance, with an eigenvalue of 2.315 and an alpha coefficient of 0.878; *Compensation* accounted for 12.226% of the total variance, with an eigenvalue of 2.078 and an alpha coefficient of 0.680; and *Personal Feeling* explained 11.822% of the total variance, with an eigenvalue of 2.010 and an alpha coefficient of 0.716. The analysis designated five stable factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, explaining 68.89% of the variance.

Table 2: Factors for Satisfaction with the Work Environment & Workforce Diversity

Attributes		Factor Loading	EV	% of Variance	α
	Satisfaction with location of the hotel	.816			
Work Environment	Satisfaction with communication in English	.793	2.703	15.901	.811
	Satisfaction with the work accomplishment	.674			

	Satisfaction with the department	.572			
Work Itself	Satisfaction with working condition	.670			
	Satisfaction with working shift	.648			
	Satisfaction with training for daily tasks	.632	2.605	15.322	.840
	Satisfaction with career advancement & development	.578			
	Satisfaction with job security	.514			
Supervision	Satisfaction with supervisor (personal)	.880	2.315	13.616	.878
	Satisfaction with supervisor (technical)	.803			
Compensation	Satisfaction with benefit package	.761	2.078	12.226	.680
	Satisfaction with pay	.674			
	Satisfaction with workload	.627			
Personal Status	Satisfaction with level of opportunity to supervise others	.798			
	Satisfaction with level of different work duty	.623	2.010	11.822	.716
	Satisfaction with my importance in the hotel	.617			

Cumulative Variance Explained = 68.89%

KMO: .906

Bartlett test: Chi-square = 2948.48 at p=0.000

As shown in Table 3, the *Workforce Diversity* factor explained 75.36% of the total variance, with an eigenvalue of 3.014 and a reliability coefficient (0.887) that was acceptable as an indication of reliability for a basic study. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistic was calculated as 0.702.

Table 3: Factors for Satisfaction with the Workforce Diversity

	Attributes	Factor Loading	EV	% of Variance	α
Workforce Diversity	different cultural backgrounds	.816			
	different ethnic backgrounds	.793	3.014	75.361	.887
	own cultural practices	.674			
	own ethnicity background	.572			

Cumulative Variance Explained=75.36%

KMO: .702

Bartlett test: Chi-square = 1249.778 at p=0.000

Table 4 shows that the level of the variable *Personal Status* was significantly different, with an F-value of 6.807, according to the respondent's gender. Male respondents (4.57) appeared to have a higher satisfaction with *Personal Status* than did female respondents (4.12); however, female respondents (3.46) scored higher than male respondents (3.28) in the level of intention to remain at their current hotel, with the F-value of 0.532 at $p = .01$.

The level of intention to remain at the current hotel varied significantly by age. The F-value was 3.395 at $p = .01$. An LSD multiple comparison test indicated that respondents in the 46-or-older age group (3.98) had a higher mean score compared with the 18–25 age group (2.84).

Differences were found in measuring the level of satisfaction with *Work Environment* ($F = 11.152$ at $p = .001$), *Work Itself* ($F = 16.453$ at $p = .00$), *Supervision* ($F = 13.507$ at $p = .00$), *Compensation* ($F = 7.792$, at $p = .006$), and *Personal Status* ($F = 18.942$ at $p = .000$) according to native language. Employing this distinction, significant differences were also found in measuring the level of overall job satisfaction ($F = 4.699$ at $p = .031$) and the level of *Intention to Remain at the Current Hotel* ($F = 10.661$ at $p = .001$). The respondents whose native language was English (5.194) tended to be satisfied with their *Work Environment* compared to ones whose native language was not English (4.686). Native English speakers tended to score higher in *Work Itself* (4.423), *Supervision* (5.018), *Compensation* (3.969), *Personal Status* (4.443), and overall job satisfaction (5.063) compared to non- native English speakers. However, the level of *Intention to Remain at the Current Hotel* for native English speakers (3.389) was lower than for non-native English speakers (3.708).

Significant mean differences were discovered among all job-satisfaction factors and *Intention to Remain at the Current Hotel* according to respondents' racial-ethnicity. The F-values for *Work Environment* (2.598, $p = .001$), *Work Itself* (4.436, $p = .000$), *Supervision* (4.532, $p = .004$), *Compensation* (3.137, $p = .026$), *Personal Status* (7.541, $p = .000$), and *Intention to Remain at the Current Hotel* (3.854, $p = .010$) were identified. An LSD multiple

comparison test indicated that Caucasians demonstrated a higher level of satisfaction with *Work Environment* (5.197), *Work Itself* (4.520), *Supervision* (5.115), and *Compensation* (4.003) than Hispanics did. African-Americans demonstrated a higher level of satisfaction with *Personal Status* (4.244) and *Intention to Remain at the Current Hotel* (3.708) than Hispanics did.

Table 4: Differences between Job Satisfaction Factors, Overall Job Satisfaction & Employee Retention by Gender, Age, Native Language, and Racial-Ethnicity

Dependent Variables	Work Environment	Work Itself	Super-vision	Compe-nsation	Personal Status	Overall Satisfaction w/Work Environment	Intention to Remain	
Independent Variable	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
Gender								
a)Male (n=67)	5.075	4.239	4.962	4.025	4.572	4.876	3.283	
b)Female (n=170)	5.057	4.267	4.788	3.774	4.123	5.022	3.464	
F	.015	.028	.836	1.999	6.807	.802	.532	
P value	.903	.867	.361	.159	.010	.371	.010	
Statistical Difference							a>b	b>a
Wilk's Lambda=.916, F=2.989, df=7.000, sig.=.005								
Age								
a)18-25(n=51)	5.142	4.349	4.951	3.830	4.085	4.986	2.843	
b)26-35 (n=59)	5.127	4.342	5.067	3.706	4.423	5.158	3.254	
c)36-45 (n=64)	5.003	4.184	4.726	3.974	4.260	4.869	3.468	
d)46 or older (n=63)	5.238	4.606	4.933	3.822	4.325	4.918	3.977	
F	.385	.878	.967	.424	.573	.594	3.395	
P value	.819	.478	.427	.792	.683	.667	.010 ³	
Statistical Difference							a<d	
Wilk's Lambda=.841, F=1.438, df=28.000, sog.=.067								
Native Language								
a)English (n=185)	5.194	4.423	5.018	3.969	4.443	5.063	3.389	
b)Non-English	4.686	3.693	4.255	3.425	3.624	4.666	3.708	

Dependent Variables	Work Environment	Work Itself	Super -vision	Compe- nsation	Personal Status	Overall Satisfaction w/Work Environment	Intention to Remain
Independent Variable	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
(n=47)							
F	11.152	16.453	13.507	7.792	18.942	4.699	10.661
P value	.001	.000	.000	.006	.000	.031	.001
Statistical Difference	a>b	a>b	a>b	a>b	a>b	a>b	a<b
Wilk's Lambda=.879, F=4.407, df=7.000, sig.=.000							
Ethnicity							
a)Caucasian (n=95)	5.197	4.520	5.115	4.003	4.526	5.189	3.389
b)African-American (n=79)	5.069	4.301	4.930	3.907	4.244	4.886	3.708
c)Hispanic (n=52)	4.783	3.750	4.326	3.391	3.653	4.711	2.826
d)Other (n=12)	5.437	4.000	4.541	4.000	4.888	5.250	4.250
F	2.598	5.436	4.532	3.137	7.541	2.591	3.854
P value	.001	.000	.004	.026	.000	.054	.010
Statistical Difference	a>c	a>c	a>c	a>c	b>c		b>c
Wilk's Lambda=.808, F=2.408, df=21.000, sig.=.000							

The probability of a hotel worker's overall job satisfaction changed according to his or her satisfaction with workforce diversity. Table 5 shows the levels of association between a hotel worker's overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with workforce diversity for male respondents ($\beta = .497$) and for female respondents ($\beta = .382$). The age group 36–45 ($\beta = .552$) indicates a stronger association in overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with workforce diversity in comparison with other age groups. As age advanced, the level of association grows stronger until the age group reaches 46 or older ($\beta = .473$). The level of satisfaction with workforce diversity had a statistically significant impact on overall job satisfaction for both native English speakers ($\beta = .431$) and non-native English speakers ($\beta = .318$). Satisfaction with workforce diversity also indicates an association with overall job satisfaction for Caucasians ($\beta = .500$), African-Americans ($\beta = .379$), and Hispanics ($\beta = .377$).

Table 5: Relationships between Work Environment and Workforce Diversity

Dependent Variable	B	β	T	Sig.
Satisfaction w/ Work Environment R ² = .173, F =74.612	.952	.416	8.638	.000
Gender				
Male R ² = .247, F = 35.149	1.075	.497	5.929	.000
Female R ² = .146, F = 41.051	.877	.382	6.407	.000
Age				
18-25 R ² = .057F = 4.486	.513	.239	2.201	.031
26-35 R ² = .138, F = 14.396	.860	.371	3.794	.000
36-45 R ² = .305, F = 38.617	1.242	.552	6.214	.000
46 or older R ² = .224, F = 16.407	1.128	.473	4.051	.000
English Articulation				
English R ² = .186, F = 63.754	.917	.431	7.985	.000
Non-English R ² = .101F = 6.758	.876	.318	2.600	.012
Ethnicity				
Caucasian R ² = .250, F = 47.958	.982	.500	6.925	.000
African-American R ² = .144, F = 18.779	.926	.379	4.333	.000
Hispanic R ² = .142, F = 12.101	.994	.377	3.478	.001

Independent Variable: Satisfaction w/ Workforce Diversity

DISCUSSION

The study finds some significant relationships between job-satisfaction factors, overall job satisfaction, and an intention to remain at the current hotel with regard to age, gender, native language, and racial-ethnicity. Relationships are also found between overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with workforce diversity. This study gives hoteliers a better understanding of the importance of customized support and needs, as well as of social training.

The hotel industry provides a unique work environment that allows people to easily join and leave the workforce. As the industry's workforce becomes increasingly diversified, this change may cause new workers to become more sensitive to their work environments. Hoteliers need to redesign workplaces with customized work environments which allow people to work effectively with coworkers from different backgrounds. For instance, people who are new to the geographic area of a workplace may have different perceptions of their work, compared to workers who have lived in the area for a longer period.

The findings indicate gaps still remain between male and female workers in accepting social status and work roles. People care about their social status and their involvement within the workplace and local area. For example, instead of just teaching English for non-native English speakers, a company may need to help with introducing workers to the local culture or may need to provide social counseling and assimilation services according to each group's characteristics. This study shows that women are more attached to their work than men are, regardless of their satisfaction with the work environment. Men appear to more easily accept workplace social status (such as opportunity to supervise others), a variety of work duties, and the feeling of their own importance at work.

Both female and male workers weigh workforce diversity as an important factor influencing their overall job satisfaction. Female workers highly value belonging to the organization, an attitude which helps maintain workplace stability; however, they also perceive fewer opportunities for supervising others, experience a wider variety of work duties than men do, and develop their own sense of importance at work. Managers need to enhance female workers' positive feelings about their work environment and provide them with more opportunities to sharpen their abilities.

Aged employees express a higher level of intention to remain with their current employers compared to younger employees. This finding indicates younger workers might be looking for jobs which compensate them better and allow them to move to different

locations; on the other hand aged workers may have settled into the area where they work and consider their employment as important in terms of belonging to the society and the community. They may consider it more than a job. The results indicate workers between 36 and 45 are more likely to be in management positions with years of experience; their responsibilities in managing diversified workers lead them to be more sensitive to workforce diversity compared to ones in other age groups. It indicates that ones in supervisory level positions must have training which can help collaborating workers with different backgrounds. Workforce diversity plays a more important role among those in management positions than for line employees, and aged workers see workforce diversity more sensitively than younger workers do.

Non-native English speakers tend to remain at their current workplace regardless of their satisfaction level with the current work environment. One partial explanation is that job security is their prime consideration. As native English speakers are probably more familiar with U.S. culture, they tend to be more sensitive to workforce diversity compared with non-native English speakers. Non-native English speakers may not be familiar with U.S. work environments or have difficulty adapting to new environments because of their English ability.

Job security is a primary consideration for non-native English speakers, who tend to be new to the area in which they work and have some difficulties communicating with coworkers and customers. Miscommunication may generate customer complaints, which might create conflicts that could lead to an uncomfortable work environment for non-native English speakers. Employers can minimize a lack of familiarity with new work environments and language by assuring these non-native English speakers of sustainable job opportunities and ensuring that they have access to consistent language training and the opportunity to participate in organizational and community activities.

Employees who are a part of the major racial-ethnic group in the workplace might have a more sensitive attitude toward workforce diversity. Since acceptance of workforce diversity is

associated with satisfaction with the work environment, it is important that hoteliers implement a variety of customized programs which can assist each group of people who share similar backgrounds. The greater the levels of acceptance of workforce diversity, the more likely individuals will be able to accept individual differences and foster the integration of diversity into the workforce.

As Iverson and Roy (1994) indicate, when workers have stable employment and opportunities for career development, the level of satisfaction with the work environment increases. It is important for hoteliers to become aware that increasing diversity requires a greater need to ensure all employees believe they have equal access to opportunities for advancement, feel empowered to be more creative in providing service, and believe their efforts will be recognized. Hoteliers also must be aware workers feel differently about these and other matters based on their backgrounds. Furthermore, managers must strive to set levels of expectations that are seen as fair, motivational, and in line with the strategies of the organization.

Managers need to understand what employees tend to expect from their work (Rafaeli, 1989), even as the level of interaction with service products varies from person to person. They must create more opportunities for workers to interact with coworkers. As Lee and Moreo (2007) and Lee and Way (2010) suggested, employers need to consider letting workers maintain positive interactions with peers who have different backgrounds, as a retention tool. Workers with more opportunities to interact with others tend to increase employee loyalty and may in turn help to increase the retention of quality workers.

The impact of workforce diversity on the respondent's satisfaction with work environment was significant for all respondents, regardless of gender, age, native language, and racial-ethnicity. This study suggests to effectively utilize increasing workforce diversity, hoteliers need to create a workplace that can provide customized services not only for customers, but also for employees. Since employee expectations about work environments

differ by individual characteristics, hoteliers need to understand that a training mentality of *one size fits all*, may not work in the hotel industry because of the diversity of its employees. Providing services with customized trainings for workers may make them feel recognized, not only in the organization but also in the community.

One suggestion would be to use higher public education to provide necessary training at a reasonable cost with meaningful results. Many educational facilities and public offices also offer courses for newcomers to an area. It may be beneficial for both hoteliers and employees if all workers are required to participate in diversity-related training and workshops, rather than just making these activities optional. This is because simply saying a hotel provides a workplace without offering some customized assistance to employees may not be able to ensure the hotel will attract qualified employees.

Since the current study used limited attributes and measured only the acceptance of workforce diversity, further research needs to implicate an instrument with detailed individual characteristics. Research regarding the direct influence of individual experiences, and their influence on the acceptance of workforce diversity, might provide theoretical and practical suggestions for managing diversified hotel workers. Even if the present findings demonstrate the relationships between workers, one type of measurement is not adequate to measure all workers. The scale that was used in this study may need further modifications and testing to fit in future research. More research is needed to apply the results to different types of workers at various levels in the hotel industry.

REFERENCES

- Agho, A.O., Price, J.L., & Mueller, C.W. (1992). Discriminate validity of measures of job satisfaction, positive affectivity and negative affectivity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 65, 185-196.
- Arnett, D.B., Laverie, D.A., & McLane, C. (2002). Using job satisfaction and pride as internal-marketing tools, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 87-96.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace and Co.
- Augustyn, M., & Ho, S. K. (1998). Service quality and tourism. *Journal of Travel and Research*, 37(1), 71-75.
- Bai, B., Brewer, K., Sammons, G., Swerdlow, S. (2006). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and internal service quality. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 5(2), 37-54.
- Barrow, C.W. (1990). Employee turnover: Implications for hotel managers. *FIU Hospitality Review*, 8(1), 24-31.
- Bedeian, A., Ferris, G., & Kacmar, K. (1992). Age, tenure, and job satisfaction: A tale of two perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 40, 33-48.
- Berta, D. (2000, October 16). Diversifying your workforce should be business as usual. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 82.
- Biederman, P.S. (2008). *Travel and Tourism*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Borchgrevink, C.P., Ninemeier, J.D., & Mykletun, R.J. (2000). Silent (non-language) training videos: Cross-cultural hospitality applications. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 13(3), 41-44.

- Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 Hidden Reasons Employees Leave: How to Recognize the Subtle Signs and Act Before It's Too Late*. New York: AMACOM.
- Carbery, R., Garavan, T., O'Brien, F., & McDonnell, J. (2003). Predicting hotel managers' turnover cognitions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(7), 649-679.
- Clark, A.E., Kristensen, N., & Westergård-Nielsen, N. (2009). Job satisfaction and co-worker wages: Staus or signal?. *The Economic Journal*, 119(536), 430.
- Cranny, C., Smith, P. & Stone, E. (Ed.). (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Deery, M. (2008). Talent management, work-life balance and retention strategies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(7), 792-806.
- Ellickson, M.C. (2002). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 31(3), 343-358.
- Efraty, D., & Sirgy, M.J. (1990). The effect of quality of working life (QWL) on employee behavioral responses. *Social Indicators Research*, 22, 31-47.
- Eskildsen, J.K., Kristensen, K., & Westlund, A.H. (2003). Work motivation and job satisfaction in the Nordic countries. *Employee Relations*, 26(2), 122-136.
- Fitzgerald, S.M. (1972). *A career development study of elementary school teachers*. Doctoral dissertation (3452A), Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Ford, R.C., & Heaton, C.P. (2001). Lessons from hospitality that can serve anyone. *Organizational Dynamics*, 30(1), 30-48.

- Franek, M., & Vecera, J. (2008). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction. *E+M Ekonomie A Management*, 4, 63-75.
- Frye, W.D., & Mount, D.J. (2007). An examination of job satisfaction of general managers based on hotel size and service type. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 2(2), 109-134.
- Glisson, C.V., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Quarterly*, 33(1), 61-68.
- Griggs, L.B., & Louw, L. (Eds.). (1995). *Valuing diversity*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Heskett, J., Sasser, W.E., & Schlesinger, L.A. (1997). *The service profit chain*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hancer, M., & George, R.T. (2003). Psychological empowerment of non-supervisory employees working in full-service restaurants. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 22(1), 3-16.
- Heskett, J.L., Jones, T.O., Loveman, G.W., Sasser, W.E., & Schlesinger, L.A. (1994). Putting the service-profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72, 164-74.
- Hewitt, W. (1993). Cultural competence: An interview with Warren Hewitt. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 25(1), 5-7.
- Higley, J. (2000). Hospitality leaders promote diversity during conference. *Hotel and Motel Management*.
- Hinkin, T.R., & Tracey, B.J. (2000). Employee turnover does more than reduce service quality and damage employee morale—it hits a hotel's pocketbook. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), 14-21.

- Iverson, R.D., & Roy, P. (1994). A causal model of behavioral commitment: Evidence from a study of Australian blue-collar employees. *Journal of Management*, 2(1), 15-41.
- Iverson, K. (2000). Managing for effective workforce diversity: Identifying issues that are of concern to employees. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(31), 31-38.
- Jones, J. (2008). A Unique Formula for Success. *Lodging Hospitality*, 64(15), 60-64.
- Jung, K., Moon, M.J., & Hahm, S.D. (2007). Do age, gender, and sector affect job satisfaction? Results from the Korean labor and income panel data. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(2), 125-146.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- Kalleberg, A.L., & Mastekaasa, A. (2001). Satisfied movers, committed stayers: The impact of job mobility on work attitudes in Norway. *Work and Occupations*, 28, 183-209.
- Kuruuzum, A., Çetin, E., & Imak, S. (2009). Path analysis of organizational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction in Turkish hospitality industry. *Tourism Review*, 64(1), 4-16.
- Kusluvan, S., & Kusluvan, Z. (2000). Perceptions and attitudes of undergraduate tourism students towards working in the tourism industry in Turkey. *Tourism Management* 21(3), 251-269.
- Kym, J.O., & Mueller, C.W. (1978). *Introduction to Factor Analysis: What it is and how to do it*. California: Sage Publications.

- Lam, T., Baum, T., & Pine, R. (2001). Study of managerial job satisfaction in Hong Kong Chinese restaurants. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(1), 35-42.
- Lee, C., & Moreo, P.J. (2007). What do seasonal lodging operators need to know about seasonal workers?. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(1),148-160.
- Lee, C., & Way, K. (2010). Individual employment characteristics of hotel employees that play a role in employee satisfaction and work retention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(3), 344-353.
- Lester, P.E. (1987). Development and factor analysis of the teacher job satisfaction questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47, 223-233.
- Littlefield, R.S. & Sarabakhsh, M. (1997). Enhancing multicultural education training for the hospitality management students. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 9(2), 53-55.
- Locke, E.A. (1969). What is job satisfaction?. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 309-336.
- Matzler, K., & Renzl, B. (2007). Assessing asymmetric effects in the formation of employee satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1093–1103.
- McNeese-Smith, D. (1997). The influence of manager behavior on nurses' job satisfaction, productivity, and commitment. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 27(9), 47-55.
- Mindell, A. (1995). *Sitting in the Fire*. Portland, Oregon: Lao Tse Press.

- Mok, C. (2002). *Managing diversity in hospitality organization*. In D'Annunzio-Green, N., Maxwell, G.A., & Watson, A. (Eds.). *Human Resources Management*, 212-223. London, UK: Continuum.
- Morgan, R., McDonagh, P., & Ryan-Morgan, T. (1995). Employee job satisfaction: An empirical assessment of marketing managers as an occupationally homogenous group. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 10, 10–17
- Oshagbemi, T. (2000). Is length of service related to the level of job satisfaction?. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27, 213-216.
- Pitts, D. (2009). Diversity management, job satisfaction, and performance: Evidence from U.S. federal agencies. *Public Administration Review*, 69, 328–338.
- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin Dorsey.
- Rafaeli, A. (1989). When cashier meet customers: An analysis of the role of supermarket cashiers. *Academy of Journal of Management*, 30, 245-273.
- Resnick, S.G., & Bond, G. (2001). The Indiana job satisfaction scale: Job satisfaction in vocational rehabilitation for people with severe mental illness. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 25(1), 12-19.
- Schlesinger, L.A., & Zornitsky, J. (1991). Job satisfaction, service capability, and customer satisfaction: An examination of linkages and management implications. *Human Resource Planning*, 14, 141-150.
- Simons, T., Enz, C.A. (1995). "Motivating hotel employees". *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 20-7.

- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C.L. (1975). *Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction*. London, U.K.: Sage Publications.
- Spinelli, M.A., & Canavos, G.C. (2000). Investigating the relationship between employee satisfaction and guest satisfaction. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(6), 29-33.
- Susskind A.M., Borchgrevink C.P., Kacmar K.M., & Brymer R.A. (2000). Customer service employees' behavioral intentions and attitudes: An examination of construct validity and a path model, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 19(1), 53-77.
- Syptak, J.M., Marsland, D.W., & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice, *Family Practice Management*, 6(9). 26-26.
- Szivas, E. Riley, M., & Airey, D. (2003). Labor mobility into tourism: attraction and satisfaction, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 64-76.
- Tang, T. L. P. (2007). Income and quality of life: does the love of money make a difference?, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 72(4), 375.
- Testa, M.R. (2001). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and effort in the service environment, *Journal of Psychology*, 135(2), 226-236.
- Testa, M.R. & Muller, S. (2009). Demographic and cultural predictors of international service worker job satisfaction, *Managing Service Quality*, 19(2), 195-210.

- Verhofstadt, E. & Omey, E. (2007). Higher educated worker: better but less satisfied?, *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(2), 135-151.
- Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Loftquist, L.H. (1967). Manual of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, 22(45).
- Wharton, A.S., Rotolo, T., & Bird, S.R. (2000). Social context at work: a multilevel analysis of job satisfaction, *Sociological Forum*, 15(1), 65-90.
- Wanous, J.P. & Lawler, E.E. (1972). Measurement and meaning of job satisfaction, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 56(2), 95–105.
- Wolf, M.G. (1970). Need gratification theory: A theoretical reformulation of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and job motivation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54. 87-94.
- Woods, R.H. & King, J.Z. (2002). *Leadership and Management in the Hospitality Industry*, American Hotel & Lodging Association, Lansing, Michigan: Educational Institute.