



THESIS

This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG TOURISM BASED SERVICE WORKERS: A STUDY OF NONSUPERVISORY RESORT EMPLOYEES

presented by

Joseph Michael La Lopa

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in PRTR

Sonald 3

Major professor

Date June 8, 1995

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

0-12771

LIBRARY Michigan State University

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
MN 2 2.00		
UN 0.9 1058		
JAN 0 7 2003		
<u>کې</u> دي		

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record. TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

1

=

MSU Is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG TOURISM BASED SERVICE WORKERS: A STUDY OF NONSUPERVISORY RESORT EMPLOYEES

By

Joseph Michael La Lopa

À DISSERTATION

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Park, Recreation, and Tourism Resources

ABSTRACT

ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG TOURISM BASED SERVICE WORKERS: A STUDY OF NONSUPERVISORY RESORT EMPLOYEES

By

Joseph Michael La Lopa

The service industry has been depicted in the mass media as providing only dead-end, low wage, "hamburgerflipping jobs." Yet, millions of people work in service jobs. The purpose of this study was to test the following central hypotheses: 1) people may have five types of personal reasons for working in tourism based service jobs (e.g., pursue a bona fide career, supplement income or free time, enjoy a lifestyle provided by tourism based service jobs, make a career transition, or secure a convenient source of employment), and 2) knowing the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs would increase the predictability of organizational commitment and two behavioral outcomes - job performance and functional turnover.

Self-reported data were collected from 300 nonsupervisory resort employees working in rural Michigan. In addition, supervisors completed performance appraisals for respondent employees and turnover questionnaires for respondent employees who voluntarily quit their jobs during a one year period.

Contrary to the widespread belief that the service sector only offers dead-end jobs, it was found (as

hypothesized) that respondent employees were working in tourism based service jobs to pursue a bona fide career. Respondent employees were also found to be working in tourism based service jobs due to a prior personal awareness of the organization as a good place to work. These two reasons significantly increased the predictability of organizational commitment when added independently (via a forced regression analysis) to the following antecedent variables: attitude toward job, job satisfaction, job enrichment, age, gender, marital status, and dealing with customers. These antecedent variables were also independent significant predictors of organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment was found to be a significant predictor of job performance but not functional turnover. The voluntary turnover of respondent employees was dysfunctional since more than half of those who left their jobs were better than average performers. Taken as a whole, however, those who left their jobs had significantly lower organizational commitment than those who did not. Copyright by

Joseph Michael La Lopa

This dissertation is dedicated first to my beautiful wife Paula, and to my daughters Veronica, Erica, and Julia. Paula showed real strength and character by putting up with the countless hours I spent working toward this degree (as I was a "little difficult" to live with at times) while nurturing our young daughters as they struggled to become human beings in our complex physical and spiritual world.

I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my father and mother. My father has always been there for me when I needed him most at times in my life. He offered his financial and moral support six years ago that allowed me to embark on a journey that led me here to complete the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Michigan State University. I want to thank my mother for telling me, when I was a child, that I could do whatever I wanted to do in this lifetime as she inspired me to make my dreams come true.

Lastly, my sense of family and tradition compels me to dedicate this dissertation to two families of immigrants, one Italian and one Polish, who came to this country a mere two generations ago to find a better life in America. This academic achievement is one I am certain they would have been proud to know was accomplished on behalf of both families. I hope my achievement inspires future generations to pursue dreams beyond any I could have imagined possible.

V

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not even be in position to write an acknowledgements page were it not for my guidance committee. Each has contributed the right expertise at the right time to help guide me through the different stages of this dissertation process. I will forever be in their debt for they have helped me to achieve my dream of becoming a Ph.D.

Dr. Holecek is acknowledged for allowing me to think and behave freely while under his tutelage here at Michigan State. His non-authoritarian leadership style has allowed me to both flourish academically and mature into a budding scholar as I work under him at the Tourism Center. Finally, he is acknowledged for the amount of time and effort he put into helping shape this dissertation into a respectable document.

I want to acknowledge Dr. Fridgen for his enthusiasm in this research. His expertise in the field of psychology, and personal interest in my well being, has made him an invaluable member of my committee.

Dr. Hollenbeck is acknowledged for his breadth and depth of knowledge pertaining to the subject of organizational behavior. Dr. Hollenbeck willingly shared

vi

his time and his remarkable expertise many times to overcome various challenges that arose while conducting this research.

Dr. Kossek is acknowledged for contributing her expertise in the social sciences, particularly the quality of life issues that were touched upon in this dissertation. Dr. Kossek was particularly helpful in the proposal phase of this dissertation by calling my attention to much of the relevant literature pertaining to the subjects covered in this study.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to the managers who allowed me to conduct a survey at their resorts. Without their support there would have been no data with which to write a dissertation. I am forever in their debt. I would be remiss if I did not also thank the following people who helped me to conduct the survey at the resorts: Sharlene, Mac, Tracy, Barbara, and Billy Joe.

vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	xi xiv
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
Problem Statement	4
Purpose of the Study	· 4
Study Objectives	5
Importance of Study	5
Definitions of Terms Relevant to the Study	6
Overview of the Dissertation	9
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Introduction	10
Theory in the Context of this Study	11
General Overview of	
Organizational Commitment Theory	12
Theories of Organizational Commitment	17
Exchange Theories of Organizational Commitment Psychological Theories of Organizational	18
Commitment	25
Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational	
Commitment	31
Introduction	31
Antecedents of Organizational Commitment	34
Job Involvement	34
Job Satisfaction	37
Job Design	41
Biodata	44
Outcomes of Organizational Commitment	48
Job Performance	48
General Voluntary Turnover Theory	51
Functional Turnover	54
Work Values Theory	56
Introduction	56
Values	57
Work Values	58
Five Types of Personal Reasons People May Have	
for Working in Tourism Based Service Jobs	62

Chapter

Page

	Taxonomy of Types of Personal Reasons for Working	
	in Tourism Based Service Jobs	72
	The Bona Fide Career Type	72
	The Supplemental Type	72
	The Lifestvle Type	73
	The Transition Type	73
	The Convenience Type	73
		75
	Study Hypotheses	74
	Hypothesis 1	75
	Hypothesis 2	76
	Hypothesis 3	77
	Hypothesis 4	78
	Hypothesis 5	78
	Hypothesis 5	70
	Nypochesis of the second s	00
	Hypothesis /	01
	hypotnesis 8	81
	NEWLOD C	~~
111.	METHODS	82
	Tabas du shi sa	~~
		82
		82
	Materials	83
	Procedures	95
	Procedure for Tracking Turnover	
	at the Resorts	101
	Data Analysis	102
	Pretest of Survey Instruments	108
	Procedures	108
	Pretest Results	109
	Discussion of Pretest Results	113
_		
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	126
	Introduction	126
	General Survey Results	126
	Results of Hypotheses Testing	143
	Result of Hypothesis 1	143
	Results of Hypotheses 2, 3,	
	4, 5, and 9	146
	Results of Hypothesis 6, 7, and 8	151
	Discussion	153
	Hypothesis 1	154
	Hypothesis 2.	161
	Hynothesis 3	162
	Hypothesis A	162
	Hypothesis 5 Hypothesis 5	164
	nypullesis J	104
		100
		100
	Hypothesis 8	169

Chapter

Page

	Hypothesis 9	169
v.	LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	171
	Introduction. Study Limitations Conclusions Managerial Implications Research Implications Recommendations for Future Research	171 171 175 175 179 181
LIST	OF REFERENCES	189
APPEN	DICES	
	 A. Pretest Survey Booklet B. Employee Performance Appraisal Form C. Employee Turnover Questionnaire D. Supervisor Waiver Form E. Cover Letter F. Breakdown of Resort Jobs G. Job Titles of Leavers By Department H. Second Jobs Held by Employees 	202 217 218 219 220 221 223 224

LIST OF TABLES

TablePage		
3.1	Five scales developed for measuring and testing the five types of personal reasons for working in tourism based service jobs 89	
3.2	Initial mean scores, standard deviations, standardized alpha, and standard errors of measurement (SEM) for each scale resulting from the pretest	
3.3	Communality estimates, eigenvalues, and percentage of variance by factor for the scales developed to measure and test the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs (except items J3, S9, and S11) without iteration - initial statistics 116	
3.4	Final four factors produced by varimax rotation of items from the five scales developed to measure and test the types of personal reasons people may have for working in service jobs (except J3, S9, and S11) after rotation with Kaiser Normalization 118	
3.5	Revised scales for measuring the four types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs as a result of the pretest	
4.1.	Mean score, standard deviation (SD), standardized alpha, and standard error of measurement (SEM) for study scales 128	
4.2.	Pairwise correlation matrix of Bona Fide Career Scale items with those from the following scales: Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, Supplemental Employment Scale, and Convenient Source of Employment Scale 137	

Table

	4.3.	Pairwise correlation matrix of Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale items with those from the following scales: Supplemental Employment Scale, Convenient Source of Employment Scale, and Bona Fide Career Scale	139
	4.4.	Pairwise correlation matrix of Supplemental Employment Scale items with those from the following scales: Convenient Source of Employment Scale, Bona Fide Career Scale, and Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale	140
	4.5.	Pairwise correlation matrix of Convenient Source of Employment Scale items with those from the following scales: Bona Fide Career Scale, Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, and Supplemental Employment Scale	141
	4.6.	Comparison of correlations between antecedents and outcomes in previous studies that have used the OCQ to measure commitment with those observed in this study	144
	4.7.	Pairwise correlation matrix of antecedent variables to organizational commitment	147
	4.8.	F-test, adjusted R ² , and change in R ² , resulting from forced regression analysis of antecedent variables on organizational commitment	148
	4.9.	Pairwise correlation matrix of antecedent variables to the outcome variables of job performance and functional turnover	152
4.	.10.	F-test, adjusted R^2 , and change in R^2 , resulting from forced regression analysis of organizational commitment (OCQ) on job performance (JP) and functional turnover (ETO)	152
		catholet (DIX)	172

Table

4.11.	F-test and adjusted R ² resulting from the forced regression analysis of the Bona Fide Career Scale, Personal Awareness Scale, Proximity to Job Scale, and items from the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale (items T7 through T12), Supplemental Employment Scale (items S13 through S17), and Convenient Source of Employment Scale (items C19 and C20) on Organizational Commitment (OCQ)	159
A1.	Breakdown of jobs by department for all resorts in study	221
B1.	Job titles of leavers by department	223
С1.	Second jobs held by employees	224

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Pac	
1.	Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment
2.	Age distribution of the study sample 130
3.	Distribution of highest level of education completed by the sample
4.	Distribution of tenure in the study sample 132
5.	Number of dependents living at home in the study sample 133
6.	Percentage of total turnover attributed to each department 134
7.	Comparison of job performance Z scores for stayers versus leavers

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The service sector has replaced the goods-producing sector as the predominate employer in the United States. Through the period of 1979-1989, service sector employment grew by 60 percent, while manufacturing declined nearly 10 percent. The service sector is also expected to steadily add more jobs to the economy than the goods-producing sector into the 1990's (Plunkett, 1990). Furthermore, over the last decade goods-producing wages have fallen as service sector pay has increased resulting in service workers earning about the same as their counterparts in the goodsproducing sector (Dupuy & Schweitzer, 1994).

Tourism is a significant part of the service sector. By many estimates, tourism is fast becoming the top American export contributing billions of dollars to the economy. This revenue generation translates into jobs for millions of Americans. Employment in the tourism industry is not only large it is growing. In fact, the travel and tourism industry accounts for 1 in 10 jobs in the United States and compensates its employees well, with average compensation paid being 13.3 percent higher than for all other industries (World, Travel, and Tourism Council, 1993).

The tourism industry is often perceived as being mostly comprised of small independently owned travel agencies, motels, restaurants, amusement areas, souvenir, gift and other retail establishments. When viewed in its entirety, however, the tourism industry added some \$43 billion to U.S GNP in 1990. It represents one of the three largest employers in more than 30 states, generating about six million jobs and estimated payrolls of some \$70 billion (Edgell, 1990). In Michigan, the direct expenditure of \$6.74 billion by domestic visitors in 1994 was instrumental in the creation of 114,500 jobs (Tourism Industry Coalition of Michigan, 1994).

On the other hand, defining the tourism industry as part of the service sector does have negative ramifications as a certain stigma has been attached to the quality of jobs the service sector provides. The most widely held stigma is that the service sector only provides minimum wage, deadend, low prestige jobs to the economy (Roberts, 1992). This stigma has led to the belief that the growth of services in the United States is somehow a threat to the creation of high wage factory jobs (Heskett, 1986).

As is the case with many service businesses, Pizam (1982) characterized the nature of the business cycle in the tourism industry as seasonal - especially in places such as Michigan, which has distinct winter, spring, summer and fall seasons. Much like the retail industry, this forces tourism

businesses to cater to the change of seasons, offering products and services targeted to the seasonal preferences of their customers. The seasonal nature of tourism also tends to make it unattractive to potential employees and others (Pizam, 1982).

Barrett (1987) examined the nature of tourism employment in Montana using data drawn from the 1980 Census of Population. Adding to the negative stigma already enjoyed by the tourism industry as being part of the service sector, Barrett (1987) concluded that tourism employment was substantially inferior to other forms of employment throughout Montana's economy for a variety of reasons. One reason noted is that the benefits tend to go to the person holding the job and not to the public at large. Barrett (1987) also concluded that tourism jobs do not only fall far short of most Montanan's aspirations, the state will also lose its skilled labor to other states while attracting low skilled labor from other states wanting to work in them. As a result, tourism is not believed capable of providing economic stability to the state.

In summary, despite the impact tourist dollars have on the economy, the tourism industry has failed to become recognized as a vital part of the economy. The problem may stem from the tourism industry representing a significant part of service sector, thus being unfairly characterized as offering lesser skilled and lower paid jobs than those in

the somehow superior goods-producing sector (Heskett, 1986). As a result, people fail to have a good understanding of the quality of jobs the industry generates. In many respects, it almost seems as if society not only looks down on the tourism industry but also those people who work in the jobs the industry has to offer.

Problem statement

What types of personal reasons could people have for working in tourism based service jobs, particularly when they have often been depicted as being inferior to those in the goods-producing sector? Specifically, what factors influence an individual to not only decide to work in a tourism based service job but also develop organizational commitment, become recognized by management as one of the top performers, and accrue long tenure with the organization.

Purpose of Study

- To substantiate the belief that there are five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs.
- 2. Determine if these five types of personal reasons will significantly increase the predictability of

organizational commitment and two behavioral outcomes, job performance and functional turnover.

Study Objectives

- Gain a basic understanding of organizational commitment through a review of the relevant literature.
- 2. Identify and test key antecedent (independent) variables that may be used to predict organizational commitment across tourism based service workers.
- 3. Identify and test key outcome (dependent) variables that may be predicted by organizational commitment across tourism based service workers.
- 4. Propose, measure, and test a taxonomy of five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs.
- 5. Determine whether knowing the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs will increase the predictability of organizational commitment and two behavioral outcomes, job performance and functional turnover.

Importance of the Study

This study is important because the majority of the jobs in this economy are in the service sector. This is not

expected to change much in the future as service jobs will continue to grow as manufacturing jobs continue to decline. Understanding antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment for those in service jobs grows in importance everyday as more and more service jobs replace manufacturing jobs.

Definitions of Terms Relevant to the Study

Definitions of selected key terms used in this document are provided below:

<u>Antecedent Variable</u>--An antecedent variable is another name for an independent or predictor variable.

<u>Attitude</u>--Bem (1970) defines attitudes as "our affinities for and our aversions to situations, objects, persons, groups, or any other identifiable aspects of our environment, including abstract ideas and social policies (p. 14).

<u>Construct</u>--Babbie (1989) defines a construct as "a theoretical creation based on observations but which cannot be observed directly or indirectly" (p. 109). A construct is a term which is quite literally made up to give meaning to a phenomenon that cannot be observed (like an attitude) but is believed to exist as part of the human condition. <u>Organizational Commitment</u>--Steers' (1977) definition of organizational commitment was central to this study. Steers

(1977) defined it according to three factors: "a) strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (p. 46). <u>Outcome Variable</u>--An outcome variable is another name for a criterion or dependent variable.

<u>Psychological Variable</u>--A psychological variable cannot be directly observed and measured (e.g. attitude). <u>Reliability</u>--Kerlinger's (1986) definition of reliability as the "accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument" (p.405) is the most appropriate due to the various summated scales used to gather data for this study. Reliability of a measuring instrument (or summated scale) can range anywhere from 0 (no precision in measurement) to 1.00 (high precision in measurement).

<u>Resort</u>--A resort is a facility specifically defined to support participation in both indoor and outdoor recreation activities, usually during a vacation or pleasure trip (Spotts, 1992). Resorts generally offer amenities such as recreation rental equipment (e.g., skis, boats), swimming facilities, downhill/cross-country ski areas, etc. A resort is distinguished from a hotel/motel by both its on site recreation facilities and natural resources and its use as primarily a vacation oriented versus transient-oriented lodging facility. Meetings are also conducted at resorts so

people can conduct business in a relaxed setting yet enjoy recreation opportunities when not in a working session. Scale--A scale is a measurement tool used in the social sciences whose development is generally attributed to Rensis Likert. According to Spector (1992), scales are widely used "across social sciences to measure not only attitudes, but opinions, personalities, and descriptions of people's lives and environments as well (p. 1). Virtually all of the scales in this study are designed to produce a score classifying them as summated rating scales. Service Sector--According to Dupuy and Schweitzer (1994), the Bureau of Labor Statistic classifies the service sector as a collection of "six major subindustries: 'narrow services' (comprising business services, health services, traditional service positions such as hotel jobs); retail trade; public administration; wholesale trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and transportation and public utilities" (p. 4). The service jobs investigated in this study are classified under the "narrow services" subindustry of the service sector. More specifically, the service jobs that are being targeted in this dissertation are those that belong to the tourism industry.

<u>Structural Variable</u>--A structural variable can be directly observed and measured (e.g. height, weight).

Overview of the Dissertation

The study is divided into five chapters. The first chapter contains the introduction, problem statement, study objectives, importance of study, and definition of terms relevant to the study. The second chapter contains a review of the two main theories of organizational commitment, a review of the research that has been conducted in the service sector involving the antecedent and outcome variables of organizational commitment that were examined in this study, the work values literature, a discussion of the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs, and a presentation of a taxonomy of types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. Research hypotheses are presented at the end of chapter two that are based on the literature review and taxonomy of five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. In the third chapter, the sample, procedures, materials, data analysis techniques, and results of the pretest of the survey instruments are discussed. The fourth chapter contains the general survey results, results of the hypotheses testing, and discussion of the results. Lastly, the fifth chapter includes study limitations, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

It would be impractical to discuss the host of publications that have been collected, reviewed, and/or read pertaining to the constructs explored in this dissertation. Key publications will instead be presented which have helped to shape the body of literature surrounding the constructs of organizational commitment and work values that played a key role in the context of this dissertation.

This chapter will be divided into six sections. In the first section, a brief rationale for applying organizational commitment theory in this study will be presented. In the second section, the construct of organizational commitment will be discussed. This will be followed by a section covering a review of the literature pertaining directly to the antecedent and outcome variables of organizational commitment. The fourth section will consist of a review of the work values literature. The work values literature is important to this study as it serves as a base from which were established the five hypothesized types of personal reasons people may have for working in service jobs. The five types of personal reasons people may have for working

in a tourism based service jobs will be discussed in the fifth section of this chapter. Finally, in the sixth section of the chapter, the antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment are linked to the types of personal reasons people may have for wanting to work in tourism based service jobs to form eight hypotheses that were tested in this study. (Note; a ninth hypothesis was added as a result of the pretest phase of the study).

Rationale for Applying Organizational Commitment Theory in the Context of this Study

The alleged low quality of jobs the tourism industry has to offer the economy was discussed in the introduction section of this dissertation. Because the tourism industry has been viewed as offering low quality jobs the question has arisen as to why people would work in them in the first place. In answer to that question, this study was undertaken to determine whether there are five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs.

However, understanding why an individual may choose to work in a tourism based service job alone would not have provided any insight into whether or not (s)he remained in the job once the decision was made to secure one (especially when considering that tourism businesses tend to experience higher than average turnover rates among their employees). Organizational commitment theory then became central to this study for two reasons: 1) it is an established theory that has been applied successfully in the context of research involving service firms, and 2) it provided the opportunity to validate the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs as antecedent variables of commitment.

General Overview of Organizational Commitment Theory

The question as to whether or not organizational commitment is a separate construct from other types of commitment, such as work commitment, career commitment, professional commitment and others has been raised repeatedly over the years. As a result, a large body of literature has accumulated as researchers attempt to establish a formal definition of the commitment construct. Some of the work commitment constructs (which have led to the development of the organizational commitment construct itself) will be identified and briefly discussed in this general overview.

Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978) conducted a study of 643 managers in federal government agencies to determine if commitment was a function of psychological and/or structural variables. The structural variables they used were tangible

measures such as tenure while their psychological variables were attitudinal measures. The researchers found that the structural, role-related variables (tenure and work overload) were better predictors of organizational commitment than the psychological variables (attitude toward change and job involvement) investigated in this study.

The Stevens et al. (1978) study is important because the researchers point out the difficulty of properly defining and measuring the construct of commitment. Stevens et al. (1978) stated that "terms such as professional commitment, occupational commitment, organizational loyalty, organizational attraction, organizational identification, organizational involvement, role commitment, job involvement, or job commitment have been used interchangeably or with no clear differentiation with regard to related constructs" (p. 393).

Morrow (1983) is regarded as one of the key authors distinguishing organizational commitment from other similar constructs, such as work commitment. The apparent explanation for there being a wide variety of commitment definitions is that researchers have tended to take their own unique approaches to defining and then measuring the construct. This has made it difficult to determine if there is one best singular approach to studying, let alone defining, the construct of organizational commitment.

Morrow (1983) discovered 30 different forms of work commitment from a review of the literature. She then categorized the 30 different forms into five basic approaches, or focal points, from which work commitment has been studied by previous researchers, namely: a value focus, a career focus, a job focus, an organization focus, a union focus, and a general focus. The value focus has been investigated through the use of constructs such as the protestant work ethic, a conventional ethic (based on work values), and a general work ethic. The career focus has been used to study work commitment by examining career commitment, career salience and commitment to a profession. The job focus has been characterized by job involvement, job orientation, job attachment, ego-involvement and work as central life interest. The organization focus included the organizational commitment variable from both a calculative and moral perspective. The union focus included union commitment and various other scales constructed to measure attitudes toward unions. Lastly, the general work commitment focus consisted of job involvement, work values, occupational involvement, willingness to accept annuity, career orientation, involvement, organizational involvement (alienative, calculative, moral dimensions) and organizational identification.

Due to the wide variety of approaches that have been taken by previous researchers, Morrow (1983) concluded that

"all of the measures are marked by some construct contamination (redundancy)" (p. 497). She expressed doubt that a singular definition of the work commitment would be established unless researchers were more willing to take a more rigorous approach to defining and measuring the construct.

Randall and Cote (1991) developed a model of work commitment which was meant to establish multivariate relationships between organizational commitment, career salience (defined as the personalized rank ordering, or appeal, of certain careers over others for individuals making them worth pursuing or not), work group attachment, the protestant work ethic and job involvement. A weak relationship was found between career salience and organizational commitment. Job involvement was significantly related to organizational commitment and career salience. Job involvement was also found to be a function of the strength of one's protestant work ethic and attachment to his/her work group. However, the findings of the Randall and Cote (1991) study were suspect as their model did not behave as expected, possibly due to random measurement error introduced from unreliable measures. Tt was suspected that the observed relationships might be different if the variables were tested with another sample. As a result, Randall and Cote (1991) again cautioned that "faced with an abundance of work commitment constructs and

measures, researchers should begin to prune choices by using valid and reliable measures for all constructs being investigated" (p. 209).

More recently, Wallace (1993) investigated the relationship between professional commitment and organizational commitment by conducting a meta-analysis of studies involving these constructs. Professional commitment was defined as "the relative strength of identification and involvement in one's profession" (Morrow & Wirth, 1989, p.14). Professional commitment has also been referred to as occupational commitment, career commitment and career salience.

The results of the meta-analysis revealed a moderately strong positive relation between professional and organizational commitment. The strength of the relationship between organizational and professional commitment was moderated by the degree of professionalization of the occupation, the measure of professional commitment used, and the employee's position in the organization. Wallace (1993) indicated it might be possible that "individuals may be considerably more committed to their profession than the organization while the association between the two is positive" (p. 346).

In summary, much work needs to be done on distinguishing organizational commitment from other constructs such as work commitment, job involvement and

others. It is hard to say whether future researchers will spend more time empirically defining, measuring, and validating the commitment constructs that have emerged rather than pursuing new ones. Until a singular construct emerges (if indeed there is one), researchers will still have to contend with the construct redundancy issue, raised by Morrow (1983), in studies involving work commitment.

Theories of Organizational Commitment

Since the early 1960s, two central approaches have been taken to conceptualize, define and measure the construct of organizational commitment. These are: 1) primarily an exchange approach, and 2) a psychological approach (Stevens et al., 1978). The exchange approach suggests commitment depends on the balance of inputs versus outcomes, meaning, if an individual gets more from the organization than he/she invests, commitment should ensue (Morris & Sherman, 1981). The psychological approach suggests there is a positive mental attitude or affective link between the individual and the organization which leads to commitment. Both theories, or approaches, are further discussed below. Exchange Theories of Organizational Commitment

In the early 1960s, researchers were attempting to explain why certain individuals settled (or did not settle) into a career field and never changed jobs or careers once they had made an occupational choice. As a result, sociologists at the time developed the "construct of commitment to account for the fact that people engage in consistent lines of activity" (Becker, 1960, p.33). The challenge that remained was to find those variables which consistently explained why certain individuals engaged themselves in a line of activity or became committed to their job or occupation. The challenge to find the variables that significantly predict organizational commitment which can be generalized to the labor pool is still being investigated.

Becker's (1960) side-bet theory holds that people become committed to a particular job or occupation once they make a side-bet. A side-bet is a situation in which the committed individual allows other factors, which were not part of the original decision to take a particular job in a given career field, to become part of the decision to stay employed at a particular organization.

Once a side-bet occurs, people do not necessarily stay with an organization because they want to, but because they are left with no other choice than to stay. Leaving the

organization is thought to be unwise due to the potential immediate or even lasting negative consequences it may have on an individual's career from that point forward. As a result, the individual becomes committed to the job or occupation. Becker (1960) believed the basic side-bets that influence an individual's decision to remain in a particular job/occupation were: generalized cultural expectations, personal bureaucratic arrangements, and individual adjustment to social positions.

Generalized cultural expectations were believed to influence commitment levels because there is a price to pay for those who do not follow them. For example, society may look negatively upon people who change jobs frequently and label them as being unreliable or untrustworthy. Those people who accept this cultural expectation as being true will do all they can to avoid this stigma.

To demonstrate how generalized cultural expectations influence commitment, Becker (1960) used the example of an individual who is in a new job for a short time and receives what might very well be a better job offer with another organization. Although there is temptation to accept the better job offer, the individual will not risk his/her reputation for trustworthiness by leaving the current job until (s)he has been in it for at least one year (as this is what the culture expects). The risk of being labelled as Unreliable or untrustworthy then acts as a side-bet
preventing the individual from accepting the new job. As a result, the individual stays in the current job which gives the impression (s)he is committed to the employing organization.

Impersonal bureaucratic arrangements are exemplified by the potential effect of company policies on commitment. An example of this is the individual who has built up a large pension fund and stands to lose a portion of that fund were (s)he to leave the company before being fully vested. That individual may delay any decision to leave the job due to the "financial side bet the pension fund has placed for him by its rules" (Becker, 1960, p. 36). Once again, what appears to be commitment is in reality a case of an individual who actually desires a career or job change, yet refrains from doing so because of the financial ramifications (or side-bets) that will result.

Lastly, an individual's adjustment to social positions also influences commitment toward an organization. An example of this is those individuals who become so well adapted to one organization that they are now unable, or unwilling, to make the effort to adapt to a new one.

Ritzer and Trice (1969) empirically tested Becker's side-bet theory in a study involving a systematic random sample of 623 personnel managers who were members of the American Society of Personnel Administrators. The researchers examined commitment to an organization versus

commitment to an occupation using the side-bet theory. All of the variables empirically tested in the study were chosen because they were believed to represent side-bets which were related to organizational commitment. Structural antecedent biodata variables such as age, education, marital status, number of dependents, and education level were hypothesized to be correlated with organizational commitment. Mobility rates (measured as rate of inter-company change), rate of job change, and rate of geographical change were also hypothesized to be related to organizational commitment.

Ritzer and Trice (1967) rejected Becker's side-bet theory because the only independent variable which correlated significantly with organizational commitment was a mobility variable, which was the employees's rate of inter-company change. As a result, organizational commitment was believed to be more a psychological process than a structural phenomenon which evolved out of the basic need to have meaning in one's life. It is important to note that even though Ritzer and Trice (1967) found little support for the side-bet theory, it was felt that structural variables might play an important role in fortifying an individual's level of commitment once a psychological bond formed between him/her and the organization.

Alutto, Hrebeniak, and Alonso (1973) took another look at the side-bet theory in a study involving 318 school teachers and 395 nurses. In this study, they examined the

potential of the side-bet theory to explain organizational commitment as they believed Ritzer and Trice (1967) failed to find support for Becker's theory due to measurement error. In this study, organizational and occupational commitment were defined as the willingness to leave a system when offered marginal increases in pay, status, friendliness of co-workers and job freedom.

Alutto et al. (1973) did find evidence to support Becker's theory of commitment. One supporting finding was that the structural antecedent variable of age had a significant positive correlation with organizational commitment. Alutto et al. (1973) believed the correlation between age and organizational commitment was due to older employees (especially those with tenure) having a greater number of side-bets or investments in the job than younger employees. This led to the conclusion that organizational commitment may be more than just a psychological process. This conclusion was based on the significant correlations they found between certain structural variables (e.g. age, tenure, no plans to pursue a higher degree, marital status) and organizational commitment.

Shoemaker, Snizek, and Bryant (1977) failed to demonstrate that structural factors alone were responsible for organizational commitment in a study of 120 park and forest rangers working in Virginia. Support was found for Becker's side-bet theory as structural or side-bet variables

were correlated with age, education, length of service, percentage of income derived from second jobs, age at which the individual became a ranger, length of training, and number of locations assigned as park ranger. Interestingly enough, support was also found for Ritzer and Trice's (1967) theory that psychological processes led to organizational commitment, when measured by two attitudinal variables, job satisfaction and employee solidarity.

Meyer and Allen (1984) reexamined the side-bet theory because they believed Ritzer and Trice (1969) and Hrebeniak and Alutto (1972) used inadequate instruments in their attempt to measure commitment, particularly as Becker conceptualized it. Meyer and Allen (1984) re-examined the side-bet theory, once thought to include anything of value that would be lost were an individual to leave an organization, and replaced it with a construct first developed by Kanter (1968) - continuance commitment. Continuance commitment essentially means an individual has an economic incentive for remaining with the organization. Affective commitment was also offered as a construct for explaining the emotional, or psychological ties, that develop between an individual and an organization.

Meyer and Allen (1984) found evidence that the instruments used previously by Ritzer and Trice (1969) and Hrebeniak and Alutto (1972) may not have been measuring commitment as conceived by Becker. The study suggested the

instruments "used to measure Becker's side-bet theory is saturated with affective commitment, and, as such, does not allow the theory to be tested appropriately" (p. 378).

Finally, Cohen and Lowenberg (1990) performed a metaanalysis of Becker's side-bet theory to examine whether or not it was a viable way in which to explain the formation of organizational commitment. One of the principle objectives of their research was to determine whether there were any significant relationships between side-bet variables and organizational commitment which would support Becker's sidebet theory. An exhaustive search of all studies reporting a Pearson product-moment correlation with side bet variables and organizational commitment was undertaken to perform the meta-analysis. In all they found that there had been 11 side-bet variables investigated in the past (e.g., age, tenure, education, gender, marital status).

Cohen and Lowenberg's (1990) meta-analysis failed to support Becker's side-bet theory. According to the researchers, the "low mean corrected correlations for all of the 11 side-bet variables and,...the large confidence intervals which include zero indicate no meaningful relationships with organizational commitment" (Cohen & Lowenberg, 1990, p. 1028). Not even age and tenure, once thought to be the best indicators of side-bets, supported Becker's side-bet theory. Cohen and Lowenberg concluded that the meta-analysis failed to support Becker's side-bet

theory for the following three reasons: a) no one has successfully measured and tested the side-bet theory; b) biodata variables (e.g., age, tenure, marital status) are inappropriate measures of Becker's theory and employee perceptions of what constitutes a side-bet should be examined in their place; and c) the side-bet theory, as recommended by Ritzer and Trice (1969), should be rejected.

Psychological Theories of Organizational Commitment

Kanter (1968) is generally regarded as a pioneer in the psychological approach to explaining organizational commitment. Kanter (1968) defined commitment as the "process through which individual interests become attached to the carrying out of socially organized patterns of behavior which are seen as fulfilling those interests, as expressing the nature and needs of the person" (p. 499). According to Kanter, there were three types of commitment: continuance, cohesion and control.

Continuance commitment occurs once an individual has profited personally from being associated with an organization which fosters a positive cognitive orientation toward his/her role in the workplace. In other words, the personal profits resulting from working for a particular organization are so great that there is nothing for the individual to do but make a long term commitment to a singular role. Continuance commitment also is a function of sacrifice and investment. Sacrifice means giving up something in exchange for remaining with an organization. Investment is the process by which the individual becomes a stakeholder in the organization to remain in a position to sustain personal profits that result from the role in the workplace.

Cohesion commitment occurs once an individual develops an affective bond with his/her co-workers within the organization. Cohesion commitment is a function of renunciation and communion. Renunciation is a process whereby an individual establishes a personal relationship with the immediate work group and abstains from bonding with other groups. Communion results when the bonds that form between all of the individuals in a group create a situation where the group takes on a greater identity than any one member.

Control commitment is the situation in which an individual has no will of his/her own, so to speak, and becomes comfortable doing the bidding of the group. The individual is willing to do the bidding of the group because there is a sense of power or status that comes from being a member, raising the status of all who belong to the group and thereby increasing commitment. Control commitment is a function of mortification and surrender. Mortification is the process of stripping away individual identity and

convincing the individual that he/she is nothing if not part of the organization. Surrendering to the will of the group only comes to those who have felt great power and meaning in their lives by being affiliated with the group, making it essential for them to remain as a member.

Hall and Schneider (1972) advanced another psychological approach to understanding organizational commitment known as the Identification approach. The Identification approach is conceptualized as a psychological process whereby commitment occurs because the goals and values of the organization and an individual's personal goals and values become one and the same (Kidron, 1978). More specifically, the Identification approach holds that "commitment is viewed as partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of the organization, to one's role in relation to the goals and values, and to the organization for it's own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth" (Buchanan, 1974, p. 533).

Steers (1977) proposed a model which established antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment that were built upon the identification approach. The model explored the potential process whereby individuals begin to identify with an organization. Organizational commitment was defined from the standpoint of being a function of an individual's involvement and identification with an organization. Organizational commitment was then defined

"as: a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and c) a strong desire to maintain membership with the organization" (Steers, 1977, p. 46). Commitment, when defined in this way, becomes more than an affective orientation to the organization, there is also a behavioral component or willingness on the part of the individual to boost organizational effectiveness.

In his model, Steers (1977) proposed three general antecedent categories of organizational commitment, namely: personal characteristics, job characteristics, and work experiences. Personal characteristics are those variables which measure the attributes of an individual (e.g., age, central life interest, education) and similar to Becker's (1960) structural variables, or side-bets. Job characteristics consist of variables such as job satisfaction or feedback from the job. Lastly, work experiences refers to the quality of work life experienced by the individual in the course of accumulating tenure with a particular organization.

Steers (1977) also hypothesized that, if the antecedents were favorable, it should follow then that an individual would make a decision to become committed to the goals and values of the organization. The outcomes of organizational commitment, based on one's desire/intent to remain with the organization, should have an effect on outcome variables such as: attendance, turnover and job performance.

The three antecedent and outcome sets proposed by Steers (1977) were found to be related to organizational commitment in a study involving a sample of 382 hospital employees and 119 scientists and engineers. These findings were important, as they established attitudinal organizational commitment as more than an abstract construct and demonstrated its usefulness in the context of an empirical model aimed ultimately at increasing employee retention and performance. This work has culminated into perhaps one of the most frequently cited works establishing linkages between organizational commitment and turnover published by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982).

Allen and Meyer (1990) proposed that there were three distinct links between the employee and the organization leading to one's attitudinal commitment. The three links were actually based on the structural and cognitive approaches to organizational commitment as developed previously by: a) the work of Kanter (1968), and Mowday and others (1982) in the area of affective commitment; b) the work of Becker (1960), Kanter (1968), Farrell and Rusbult (1981), and Hrebeniak and Alutto (1972) in the area of sidebet or calculative commitment; and, c) the work of Wiener & Vardi (1980), who defined and measured the notion that

people develop commitment because they feel obligated because it is the "right thing to do" from a moral standpoint.

Allen and Meyer (1990) labelled the three links between the employee and the organization as affective, continuance, and normative commitment. What the three links suggest is that "employees with strong affective commitment remain because they want to, those with strong continuance commitment because they need to, and those with strong normative commitment because they feel they ought to do so" (Meyer & Allen, 1990, p. 3).

Affective commitment develops as a result of antecedents such as personal characteristics, work experiences, job characteristics and structural characteristics. Continuance commitment develops from two antecedents which are a lack of alternatives and the extent and/or number of investments the individuals have in the organization. Lastly, normative commitment depends upon the individual's social/psychological condition prior to and after entering an organization and upon the individual's close ties to the organization because it employs family members or significant others.

Allen and Meyer (1990) did find support for the approach to compartmentalizing attitudinal commitment into an affective, continuance, and normative links. Each of the links were also shown to have been developed due to the different work experiences possessed by those sampled in the course of the study. This work has continued with the development of the Affective and Continuance Commitment Scales, which have further helped to establish affective and continuance commitment as two distinct constructs (Meyer et al., 1990; Meyer et al., 1993).

In summary, there have been basically two approaches to explain how organizational commitment develops: an exchange approach and a psychological approach. Although Mowday et al. (1979) have defined and measured the construct of organizational commitment with greater precision than most other researchers, a universal definition has not been established to date. The lack of an empirical, universal definition of organizational commitment may also help to explain why the strength and direction of the observed relationships between various antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment, which will be discussed in the next section, have not been consistent from one study to the next making the study of this construct difficult.

Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment

Introduction

In this section the literature pertaining to the antecedent and outcome variables that played a central role

in this dissertation will be discussed. The antecedent variables which will be discussed are job involvement, job satisfaction, job design (or motivating potential of the job), and biodata (age, gender, education, number of dependents, marital status). The job involvement variable was used mostly as a way to introduce and validate the attitude toward job variable that will be discussed later in this dissertation. The antecedent variables that were part of this study were selected for the following three reasons: a) reliable measures have been established for these variables in previous studies, b) they have been shown to predict organizational commitment in previous studies involving service firms, c) working over 10 years for various service firms has allowed me to observe that these variables have contributed to the tenure of certain coworkers over others. The behavioral outcome variables of organizational commitment that were part of this study are functional turnover and job performance. These variables are important to this study for two reasons: a) they have been shown to be predicted by organizational commitment in previous studies involving service firms, and b) they are an effective way to cross validate self-report data. The relationships between the antecedent variables and the outcome variables of organizational commitment that will be examined in this study and discussed below, are displayed in Figure 1.





Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

According to Salancik (1977), "a committed person is one who says he will stay on the job and work hard for the organization's interests" (p. 3). In the attempt to predict which individual is more likely to become committed to an organization and to be a productive employee, a variety of antecedent variables have been examined over the years.

Antecedent variables of organizational commitment generally fall in the following five categories: personal characteristics, work experiences, job characteristics, organizational factors, and role-related factors (Williams & Hazer, 1986). Antecedent variables from three of the five categories (personal characteristics, work experiences and job characteristics) will be discussed in this section. The antecedent variables related to personal characteristics that will be discussed are job involvement and biodata. Job design will be discussed as an antecedent variable representing job characteristics. Lastly, job satisfaction will be discussed as it is the variable used most often to represent the work experience category.

Job Involvement

Job involvement has been studied as a potential predictor of organizational commitment. Dubin (1961)

established the underlying premise of job involvement as a situation that occurs "when a person internalizes a value, norm, goal or behavior pattern, which become guides for future activity" (p. 51). In order to measure job involvement, Dubin developed a 40-item questionnaire. The scale produced a score that was meant to evaluate the degree of an individual's involvement in his/her job (Saleh & Hosek, 1976).

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the importance of work in his total self image" (p. 25). These researchers advanced previous work on job involvement by developing a reliable attitudinal scale that was based on their definition of job involvement. They found that the score produced by their job involvement scale correlated with other job attitudes from a study involving engineers and nurses. Although Lodahl & Kejner (1965) did not seek to determine if there was a relationship between organizational commitment and job involvement, the study is mentioned because of its influence on subsequent research that examined the relationship between the two constructs.

Wiener and Gechman (1977) were among the first to establish a relationship between job involvement and work commitment as similar constructs for the same job behavior. Work commitment was believed to be a behavioral, as opposed to an attitudinal, phenomenon. Wiener and Gechman (1977)

defined work commitment as "a special class of socially acceptable work behaviors that exceed formal and/or normative expectations relevant to work" (Wiener & Gechman, 1977, p. 47). A behavioral approach to job involvement, defined as work commitment, was associated with job satisfaction in their study.

After it was determined that job involvement and organizational commitment were related, the question was raised as to whether the constructs were related because they were one and the same. As a result, several studies were conducted for the purpose of determining whether or not job involvement was a separate construct from organizational commitment (Brooke, Russell, and Price., 1988; Mathieu & Farr, 1991)

For example, Brooke et al. (1988) sought to establish discriminant validity for job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment measures in a study involving 577 employees working at a Veterans Administration Medical Center. Job involvement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction were confirmed in the study as separate constructs because the subjects were able to "distinguish between the extent to which they like their job (satisfaction), the degree to which they are absorbed in or preoccupied with their job (involvement), and the degree of attachment or loyalty they feel toward their employing organization (commitment)" (Brooke et al., 1988, p. 143).

Blau and Boal (1989) investigated whether job involvement and organizational commitment would interact to predict turnover in a study involving 129 employees from an insurance company. Job involvement was found to be significantly positively correlated with organizational commitment, and both were found to be separate constructs. These findings established job involvement as an independent antecedent variable to organizational commitment.

Lastly, Jans (1989) established job involvement as an antecedent to organizational commitment in a study involving Australian military officers. Self image and personal values, non-work factors (e.g. work-family interaction), career prospects, and other similar antecedent variables were found to influence organizational commitment in this study. Job involvement was also found to have the biggest impact on potential organizational commitment early in an officer's career, usually during the apprenticeship stage.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is generally regarded as a logical candidate for being one of the best indicators of organizational commitment. Unfortunately, no consistent relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction has emerged over the years (Wiener & Vardi, 1980; Witt & Boerkrem, 1991). Job satisfaction remains a

potential antecedent of organizational commitment because a number of methodological problems (e.g., sample bias, measurement error) have deterred a clear relationship from emerging.

Regardless of whether or not a consistent relationship has emerged, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are, at the very least, believed to be two separate constructs. Organizational commitment is seen to represent a more global attitude toward the organization, and job satisfaction represents an affective response to one's job (Morrow, 1983).

Wiener and Vardi (1980) studied the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction among insurance agents and staff professionals. Normative commitment, job commitment, calculative organizational commitment, career commitment, and normative organizational commitment were examined in the context of their relationship to job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Job commitment and calculative organizational commitment were found to contribute to job satisfaction as a result of a multiple regression analyses of the four commitment types on overall job satisfaction and the five facets of satisfaction that are part of the JDI. Although the findings may be method bound, due to the scales used in their study, Wiener and Vardi (1980) concluded that "the only two predictors emerging as contributors of job

satisfaction were calculative organizational commitment and
job commitment"(p. 95).

Koslowsky, Caspy, and Lazar (1991) conducted a study to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and exchange theory of commitment among 63 Israeli police officers. The results of the study did not provide any evidence that a cause-effect relationship existed between job satisfaction and commitment as it was defined, measured, and tested. Overall, the study concluded that there are more antecedents to organizational commitment that should be considered beyond that of job satisfaction alone.

Farkas and Tetrik (1989) conducted a longitudinal study in which the relationship of job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and organizational commitment among Naval personnel was examined. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment were shown to be related because they both represent an affective response to the organization, and therefore, are similar constructs explaining the high correlation between them. It was also determined that turnover intentions stabilize over a six-month to one-yearperiod and satisfaction and commitment levels depend on the final decision to stay or leave the Navy.

Mathieu (1991) examined whether there was a reciprocal relationship between satisfaction and commitment in a study involving 588 ROTC cadets. The results of the study clearly indicated a reciprocal relationship between organizational

commitment and job satisfaction. However, the magnitude of the relationship was found to depend on other variables such as unit cohesion, unit performance standards, achievement motivation, and role strain.

Another study of part-time Army reservists found job satisfaction to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment (Martin & O'Laughlin, 1984). In the study, job satisfaction was found to be actually a better predictor of commitment than other predictor variables such as feedback, group cohesion, communications, biodata and compensation. Job satisfaction was also believed by the authors to play a role with turnover intentions in developing organizational commitment.

The notion of job satisfaction as an antecedent to organizational commitment was also examined by Vandenberg and Lance (1992). They sampled 100 management information systems professionals chosen at random from a total population of 455 employees at a multinational software firm. The authors found job satisfaction to be a precursor to organizational commitment. However, the reliability and validity of the measures used in the study made these findings suspect.

<u>Job Design</u>

Hackman, Oldham, Janson, and Purdy (1975) advanced the theoretical work of Herzberg, who pioneered the construct of job enrichment, and created a tool which successfully put the theory into practice in the workplace. According to Hackman et al. (1975), Herzberg's theory generally states that people will be motivated to enjoy their work if it has personal value or meaning, if they are accountable for the fruits of their labor and whether or not those outcomes are acceptable to the firm and/or the customer. The Hackman et al. (1975) approach to job enrichment is embodied in job design, which is a way to systematically improve jobs to the point that they should consistently improve employee intrinsic motivation and productivity - the rationale being if people are in jobs they like then they will be productive when performing them.

Central to Hackman et al. (1975) job design strategy is: a) Herzberg's theory on how to establish jobs that will increase intrinsic motivation and productivity, b) a formal procedure by which to make job enrichment a reality, and c) a survey instrument to evaluate a job's motivating potential and/or enrichment. The characteristics of jobs that lend themselves directly to enrichment are skill variety (chance to utilize array of skills in the context of the job), task identity (the relationship of the job to the product or

service that is being produced), task significance (degree to which one worker's job impacts employees working in other jobs), personal responsibility (how much freedom or liberty the individual has in the way the work of the day is carried out), and feedback from the job (information relative to how well the job is being performed). The combination of these job characteristics are then a function of the motivating potential of the job.

There is a large body of literature on job enrichment and job design. Although one might suspect job design to be a valid predictor of organizational commitment, very few studies have actually used it as an antecedent variable.

For example, Bateman and Strasser (1984) performed a longitudinal study with 129 nursing department employees to determine if there is a relationship between the motivating potential of a job and organizational commitment. In this study, a motivating potential score was calculated using the five job core dimension scales found in the JDS. There was a significant correlation between the motivating potential of nursing jobs and organizational commitment. Motivating potential, however, turned out to be a better predictor of job satisfaction than it was of organizational commitment. Bateman and Strasser (1984) recommended that managers improve the job itself in order to increase job satisfaction among nurses, but not in order to increase commitment.

Glisson and Durick (1988) explored whether there was a relationship between job design, as measured by the Job Diagnostic Survey, and organizational commitment in a study involving 319 human service workers. Glisson & Durick (1988), however, only examined the job characteristic variables from the Job Diagnostic Survey, including: skill variety, task identity, and task significance. Ordinarily these variables are used in a predetermined formula to establish the motivating potential score of a job (which is an inference of how well the job is designed) which also includes two other variables, these being autonomy and feedback from the job. There was a significant correlation between task identity and task significance with organizational commitment. Job characteristics were not found to be better predictors of organizational commitment than were organizational characteristics such as work group size, organization age, work group age, leadership and residential services.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) performed a meta-analysis of previous studies which tested antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. As it pertains to job design, there were only sufficient previous data for them to analyze the relationship between skill variety, autonomy and organizational commitment. In their meta-analysis, skill variety and organizational commitment were found to have an overall medium positive correlation. On the other hand,

autonomy was found to have had an overall small positive correlation with organizational commitment.

Aryee, Wyatt and Kheng (1991) examined antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment in a study of 245 professional accountants in Singapore. The antecedent variables in their study were job satisfaction, realization of professional expectations, professional commitment, professional-organizational conflict, and skill utilization. Job satisfaction, realization of professional expectations, and professional commitment were three antecedent variables found to be related to organizational commitment. A significant percentage of the variance of organizational commitment was not explained by the antecedent variables tested in the study. However, the researchers recommended that future research examine the motivating potential of jobs as a means by which to find valid antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment.

<u>Biodata</u>

Biodata, or personal characteristics, refers to the personal or socio-demographic qualities of people. These variables have been examined frequently as antecedent variables in both the exchange and psychological approaches to organizational commitment. Biodata variables can range from gender, to education level, to political affiliation.

. As is the case with other antecedent variables, biodata variables have been shown to predict organizational commitment with mixed results (Fukami & Larson, 1984; Gregerson & Black, 1992).

For example, Ferris (1981) investigated the relationship between such biodata variables as age (in years), marital status, level of educational attainment, and social background in a study of professional accountants. No support was found for the proposition that age, marital status, and social background have an influence on the level of organizational commitment (as found in previous studies) among accountants. However, Ferris (1981) did find a significant inverse correlation between the level of educational attainment and organizational commitment levels for senior-level accountants, leading him to conclude that those accountants who only held bachelor's degrees were more tied to the organization than those with graduate degrees (who are believed to have more job opportunities due to some experience and a post graduate degree).

Cohen (1992) performed a meta-analysis to examine potential differences in antecedents of calculative organizational commitment between low status occupations (blue-collar) and higher status occupations (white collar). The study argued, among other things, that those in low status occupations have fewer job opportunities than those in higher status jobs, making commitment more a function of

biodata variables such as age, gender, tenure, marital status, and number of children. Personal antecedents for those in low status occupations with respect to tenure, education, marital status and gender, were found to influence organizational commitment more so than those in higher status jobs (Cohen, 1992). It was believed that higher organizational commitment for those in lower status occupations was a function of fewer employment opportunities than those in higher status jobs, making it too costly to leave the organization. Thus, issues such as tenure, age, marital status, and number of dependents appear to play a larger role in a decision to leave an organization for those in lower status occupations when compared to those in higher status occupations.

Bruning and Snyder (1983) examined whether gender differences had an effect on organizational commitment among 583 employees of federally funded social service organizations in 23 states. Bruning and Snyder (1983) did not find evidence to suggest there were any differences in organizational commitment based on gender. The study also cautioned organizations against acting on the assumption that the commitment process for women was different from men and suggested instituting wage and incentive policies tailored to motivate women.

Biodata were used in a study of nurses to determine antecedents and outcomes for the nursing profession (Brief &

Aldag, 1980). The researchers hypothesized that age and tenure would be positively correlated with organizational commitment and that education level and number of dependents (at the time and/or expected in 12 months) would be significantly negatively correlated to organizational commitment. They found that organizational commitment is positively significantly correlated with age, and that organizational commitment is significantly negatively correlated with education level and number of dependents. Tenure was found to be unrelated to organizational commitment. As a result, Brief and Aldag (1980) suggested that nurses who had earned less than a bachelor's degree in nursing, had no dependents under the age of six at home, and were mature in years, are likely to become committed to the organization and are less likely to leave.

Bar-Hayim and Berman (1992) investigated what affect biodata variables have on passive and active organizational commitment among 1299 employees from 14 Israeli enterprises. Passive commitment was defined as loyalty to the organization, while active commitment referred to the employee's willingness to exert effort on its behalf. Older males who were educated and had been with the organization a long time were found to be actively committed to the organization. Young women with low seniority and little education exhibited passive commitment to the organization. In this case, biodata variables were found to be related to

organizational commitment, but on different scales with respect to the amount of effort one puts into doing his/her job.

Sager (1991) conducted a study of salespeople to determine whether or not certain biodata variables had an effect on organizational commitment and turnover. Sager (1991) examined the relationship of marital status, number of dependents, and age with organizational commitment and turnover. Marital status was not found to be correlated with organizational commitment or turnover. The number of children was found to be significantly negatively related to organizational commitment and unrelated to turnover. In the final analogy, however, Sager (1991) believed that an employee's age, marital status, and number of children did not effect commitment and turnover levels of salespeople. These findings conflicted with commonly held assumptions that older salespeople with families should be more stable than their young, single counterparts.

Outcomes of Organizational Commitment

Job Performance

Job performance has been studied as an outcome of organizational commitment. Although job performance might seem to be another logical indicator of organizational

.

commitment (because highly committed employees should be more productive or better performers than those with low commitment), interestingly, no clear relationship has emerged between the two in the research literature.

Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin and Jackson (1989) found a relationship between affective commitment, continuance commitment, and job performance. The purpose of their study was to determine whether job performance would be different depending on whether the employee's commitment was affective or continuance. As it turned out, affective and continuance commitment interacted on job performance such that those who intrinsically valued being part of the organization had higher performance levels than those who would leave the organization if they had another job.

Job performance was also measured among a set of specific antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment in a study involving salespeople (Sager & Johnston, 1989). The researchers used the affective definition of organizational commitment established by Mowday et al. (1979) as both a predictor and criterion variable. Sager and Johnston (1989) found that those salespeople who identify with the organization and perceived themselves as being loyal and hard working were not necessarily perceived the same way by their manager. This may be one of the many reasons a consistent relationship

between organizational commitment and job performance has not been found across previous studies.

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) examined job performance in the context of a path analysis of various antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment in a study involving 367 restaurant managers in a single franchise chain. Job performance was evaluated using supervisors' performance ratings and financial results. Supervisors evaluated managers on six dimensions of performance, namely: prioritysetting, work accomplishment, decision-making, openness to influence, people skills, and general performance. Financial measures were based on the three most important costs associated with restaurant management: food cost, labor cost, and liquor cost. These three critical cost barometers were compared to sales and profit before tax to arrive at an organizational effectiveness measure.

The results of the DeCotiis and Summers (1987) study are important because organizational commitment was not found to be strongly associated with subjective measures, such as job performance. On the other hand, organizational commitment was found to be strongly associated with the purely objective measures, such as financial performance.

General Voluntary Turnover Theory

The literature is replete with researchers who have advanced their theories to explain why turnover occurs in organizations (e.g., Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth, 1978; Hom, Caranakis-Walker, Prussia, and Griffeth, 1992). A growing percentage of this literature has begun to examine the viability of organizational commitment as a predictor of voluntary turnover. Although many studies have demonstrated a relationship between turnover and organizational commitment, there is still a lack of certainty as to the strength and direction of this relationship (Randall, 1990). A sampling of these studies will be discussed below.

Angle and Perry (1981) examined the potential relationship between organizational commitment and turnover in a study involving 1244 bus drivers and 96 transit managers. The variables tested in the study were organizational commitment, organizational effectiveness (as indicated by turnover, absenteeism, intent to quit, tardiness, operating expenses and organizational adaptability. In this study, a significant inverse relationship between turnover and organizational commitment was found.

Mowday, Koberg, and McArthur (1984) conducted a study which examined the relationship between organizational commitment in studies involving 267 hospital employees and

302 clerical employees to validate a simplified version of an existing turnover model. Mobley et al. (1978) suggested that the following chain of events occur in employee hospital turnover: a) job satisfaction impacts the decision to leave or stay employed at the hospital; b) thoughts about leaving lead to intention to search for another job; c) the chance of finding an acceptable replacement for the current job leads to the intention to search for a new job; d) the intention to search for a new job then leads to the intention to guit, which ultimately leads to turnover. In order to validate the model, the following study variables were tested: organizational commitment, mobility cognitions (probability of finding a new job and perceived ease of finding a new job) and withdrawal cognitions (intention to stay, intention to search for a new job, and desire to leave).

Mowday et al. (1984) found the turnover model to be correct in a general sense, with intention to stay with the organization being the best predictor of turnover. Whether or not organizational commitment is a direct predictor of turnover was another matter. It was found that, "organizational commitment was significantly related to withdrawal cognitions, but did not significantly increase explained variance when added to the prediction of turnover by withdrawal cognitions" (Mowday et al., 1984, p. 92). Lastly, organizational commitment and job satisfaction were found to be indirectly related to turnover, as had been speculated by Mobley's (1977) previous work on turnover.

Williams and Hazer (1986) performed a path analysis to improve upon the conceptual limitations of prior models aimed at explaining turnover. The data used in the study came from two previous studies; one conducted by Michaels and Spector (1982) and another by Bluedorn (1982). The antecedent variables borrowed from Michaels and Spector's (1982) study and used to predict an employee's intent to quit and their turnover potential were: pre-employment expectations, perceived job characteristics, leadership consideration, age, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The antecedent variables borrowed from Bluedorn's (1982) study and used to predict an employee's intent to leave and turnover potential were: equity, routinization, instrumental information, age, satisfaction, and commitment.

Williams and Hazer (1986) found that the principal antecedents of organizational commitment which have been studied in the past (personal characteristics, work experiences, job characteristics, organizational factors, and role-related factors) only influenced commitment indirectly in their study. Instead, organizational commitment and job satisfaction were found to play important roles as intervening variables in predicting turnover. These findings led Williams and Hazer (1986) to
conclude that "in terms of empirical turnover studies reviewed, the present research suggests that those failing to include both satisfaction and commitment... should be viewed cautiously (p. 230).

Functional Turnover

There is a growing body of literature that suggests voluntary turnover should not be regarded as necessarily negative, especially in those situations where poor performers leave the organization thereby helping to improve organizational effectiveness. To determine whether turnover is good or bad for an organization, it has recently been dichotomized as being either functional or dysfunctional. In turn, a portion of functional and dysfunctional turnover have been categorized as unavoidable or controllable (Dalton & Todor, 1979; Abelson & Baysinger, 1984).

Functional turnover is good for an employer because it means an undesirable employee has left the organization, which presents the opportunity to replace him/her with higher qualified candidates (Dalton, Todor, and Krackhardt, 1982). Dysfunctional turnover is not good for an employer because it means good employees have left the organization. Although dysfunctional turnover may sound as if it is always bad news for the employer, there has been evidence to suggest that dysfunctional turnover represents a small
percent of total voluntary turnover (Dalton et al., 1982).

Blau and Boal (1987) performed a review of the literature to determine how job involvement and organizational commitment interact to influence turnover. A conceptual framework was developed after job involvement and organizational commitment were divided into high and low categories (based on a median split of questionnaire scales). Although these categories were used to examine an effect on high or low absenteeism, the framework was useful as a way of depicting how job involvement and organizational commitment may be combined to predict functional and dysfunctional turnover.

The combination of organizational commitment and job involvement, into high and low categories, produced a matrix of four basic types of employees; an institutionalized star, a lone wolf, a corporate citizen, and an apathetic employee. For example, the institutionalized star is an employee with high job involvement and organizational commitment. The institutionalized star is someone who is dedicated to his/her job and the organization, whose turnover would be dysfunctional to the employer.

The lone wolf is any employee with high job involvement and low organizational commitment. The turnover of the lone wolf would be seen as functional because this individual is

more committed to his/her work than the organization and likely to leave for a better job when one becomes available.

A corporate citizen is an employee who has low job involvement and high organizational commitment. Turnover of the corporate citizen, even though (s)he may be less productive than the other types, would be dysfunctional as this type of employee is a good soldier who carries out the will of the corporation without question.

Lastly, the apathetic employee is someone with low job involvement and organizational commitment. Turnover of the apathetic employee is truly functional for the organization as this type of employee works less than the others and is not committed to the employer.

Work Values Theory

Introduction

Over a decade ago, Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) believed "individuals may come to organizations with certain needs, desires, skills and so forth and expect to find a Work environment where they can use their abilities and satisfy many of their basic needs" (p.20). From this Perspective, organizational commitment becomes a function of whether or not one's needs and desires are satisfied. Even though need satisfaction is generally regarded as an important component of organizational commitment, previous research has failed to produce or establish a taxonomy of the "needs and desires" individuals have when they come to organizations.

The work values literature provided some of the initial insight as to why individuals might come to join certain organizations based on their personal needs and desires. The work values literature is used here as a theoretical underpinning from which to develop a proposed taxonomy of five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. The taxonomy is intended to improve upon previous efforts to predict organizational commitment and its outcomes.

<u>Values</u>

Rokeach (1973) defined a value as an "enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence" (p.5). In other words, people differ in the way they choose to accomplish certain goals or pursue objects of material worth.

Locke (1976) also defined a value as something conducive to an individual's welfare in that values serve as a reference point from which alternative modes of behavior are selected and acted upon again to achieve a material

outcome(s). Locke also suggests that people act out their lives in such a way as to acquire those things that are of value to the them personally.

One might have thought the values literature would have found a quick and early application in the area of organizational behavior. However, this was not the case even into the early 1980s. According to Pryor (1982), some work had been done in this area, but there had been "few attempts on either the conceptual or empirical level to integrate values, preferences, needs, work ethics, and orientations to work" (p. 40).

Work Values

Zytkowski (1970) has offered a global definition of work values as a "set of concepts which mediate between the person's affective orientation and classes of external objects offering similar satisfactions" (p. 176). Even with such a global definition, it was still thought possible to establish a taxonomy of work values unique to certain occupations. If a taxonomy could be developed, organizations would then hire individuals who matched the values of the occupation being filled.

Actually establishing a taxonomy of work values, unique to certain occupations, has been difficult for at least two reasons. First of all, there is a growing source of work

value inventories (e.g., Super's Work Values Inventory, the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire), that have been offered up in the literature. Secondly, being able to associate the plethora of work values with all of the current and future occupations, makes the challenge of establishing a taxonomy exceedingly difficult. Nonetheless, Zytkowski (1970) proposed that there may be as many as 12 to 15 values, or as little as three to six values, for any given occupation.

Kalleberg (1977) attempted to determine: a) if job satisfaction was a function of work values and job rewards and b) the mechanism by which job rewards are obtained by individuals. Work values were seen as a reflection of an individual's awareness of a particular condition sought from the work situation which regulates the behavior used to pursue that condition. In his analysis, five dimensions of work were examined for their relationship to job satisfaction: a) an intrinsic dimension (enriched or not); b) convenience (live nearby to work, good hours, pleasant work environment); c) relationship with co-workers (social dimensions); d) opportunity for job to provide a career; and e) resource adequacy (access to equipment and materials necessary to do a job properly).

Kalleberg (1977) found variation in work values to be a function of: a) life experiences preceding one's entry into the workplace, b) non-work related social obligations arising indirectly from the job itself, and c) the need to

obtain paid benefits (e.g., to support a growing family) and nonpaid benefits (e.g. meaningful work). Further research was also recommended to determine the relationship of job characteristics, job rewards, and job satisfaction to occupational categories and/or ranking systems such as prestige and socioeconomic status. Such an understanding might even explain how satisfaction with an occupation arises and leads one to excel in his/her career path.

Pryor (1980) conducted a study to examine the stability of work values in a sample of 165 Australian students. Scores on The Work Values List (Super, 1970) were subjected to a variety of statistical analysis techniques (e.g. canonical correlation and principal components factor analysis) in the hope of evaluating the potential stability of a psychological attribute such as that of work values. The assessment of the stability of work values was found to be a more complex undertaking than originally expected. As a result, Pryor (1980) suggested future research be done "to refine and at the same time broaden the concept of stability in work values" (p. 157).

Elizur (1984) conducted a study which involved a content analysis of the work values literature. An important finding from this study was the confirmation of two basic facets of work values, namely: "modality of outcome and the relation to task performance" (Elizur, 1984, p. 380). Modality of outcome refers to the notion that

outcomes can be both social/psychological or instrumental/material. Material benefits refer to tangible rewards made available to employees in the way of pay or benefits. Social/psychological benefits are intangible rewards, such as achievement or independence. Relation to task performance refers to the material or psychological/sociological incentives which management puts into place as a means to motivate people to come to work and contribute to organizational effectiveness. Elizur's study (1984) contributed to the literature as it established a "modality of outcome - material, social and psychological and type of outcome - performance relations (reward, resource)" (p. 379).

Judge and Bretz (1992) examined whether work values had an influence on job choice decisions in a pilot study involving students. The study examined whether accepting a job offer was influenced by the organization's prioritization of the following values: concern for others, achievement, honesty, and fairness. Judge and Bretz (1992) concluded that the values of an organization have an influence on whether or not an individual accepts a job offer, particularly when (s)he learns of the organization's value system ahead of time. Although the conclusions in this study are confined to a short list of potential work values (e.g., concern for others, honesty, achievement, and fairness), the researchers did find strong evidence to

support the belief that "individuals were more likely to choose jobs whose value content was similar to their own orientation" (Judge & Bretz, 1992, p. 261).

Five Types of Personal Reasons People May Have for Working in Tourism Based Service Jobs

Allen and Meyer (1990) recommended future research be taken to "identify 'commitment profiles' that differentiate employees who are likely to remain with the organization and contribute positively to its effectiveness from those who are likely to remain but contribute little" (p. 15). Additionally, Mottaz (1988) suggested that individuals take a job with a given employer to achieve certain objectives or work values. Commitment to a particular social setting, such as the work place, may be a function of whether or not the setting is perceived as consistent with the individual's values and identity (Brown, 1969; Santee & Jackson, 1979).

Building particularly on the original work of Kalleberg (1977), it is believed that there are five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. It may be the case that people work in tourism based service jobs only to: 1) pursue a bona fide career, 2) supplement income or free time, 3) enjoy a lifestyle directly or indirectly provided by tourism based service jobs, 4) make a transition from one occupation into another,

or 5) secure a convenient source of employment or entry into the job market. The nature of each of these five types of personal reasons will be discussed below.

Before discussing the bona fide career reason for working in a tourism based service job, it is important to point out that no attempt will be made here to support or refute the career theory literature (e.g. Hall, 1976; Schein, 1978; Rhodes & Doering, 1983; Mihal, Sorce, Comte, 1984; Holland, 1985; Dawes, 1991). By and large, the bona fide career reason takes into consideration the existence of some formal or informal evolutionary process that shapes the self image and work values of certain individuals in the labor pool which predisposes them to a career in the tourism based service sector (Hall & Schneider, 1972).

The bona fide career reason for working in tourism based service jobs is believed to have arisen because certain people have developed a personal need or an interest in working in that sector. The list of potential ways in which people actually develop an interest in pursuing a career in tourism based service jobs is in all likelihood endless. For example, the orientation toward working in tourism based service jobs may be the result of the child who is exposed, but not limited to, parents who worked in tourism based service jobs. The child's exposure to relatives or friends may spark an early interest in a career in the tourism based service sector (Ross, 1993). The early

interest then acts as a reference point which orients the individual to pursue a career in tourism based service jobs when (s)he is older (Becker & Carper, 1956).

Alternately, a bona fide career interest may not only arise from being exposed to the tourism based service sector at an early age. A career interest in tourism based service jobs may develop among teenagers working in a fast food outlet that is located on their high school's premises to serve students during school hours (Bloodworth, 1994). The location of the fast food outlet is advantageous to the students (who benefit personally by earning a wage), the high school (which need's to cut costs and offset growing budget declines), and the food-service outlet (which needs a ready supply of workers and customers). The students who work in the food-service job may, by design, learn every aspect of the business while they earn their high school diploma. As a result, some of these high school students leave high school with a deeper understanding of the foodservice industry, later turning it into a career.

A bona fide career interest may evolve from those high school or college students who take on their first part-time job in tourism based service jobs. Not only do students gain practical work experience by working part-time in a tourism based service job, they also earn money which can be spent on their leisure pursuits or school expenses. These teenagers may enter into tourism based service jobs

initially to offset expenses or leisure time and then discover that they have a talent for working with people. This talent may turn into a real love for the tourism based service occupation that prompts the teenager to pursue a career in it.

Although all tourism based service jobs do not require frequent and intense customer contact, it is an important aspect of tourism based service jobs which generally differentiates them from, for example, manufacturing or agriculture. Those people who are unable to handle the challenges of dealing with customers on a daily basis may abandon a tourism based services career altogether. As mentioned, those people who enjoy constant contact with customers are potentially more likely to pursue a career in tourism based service jobs.

In many respects, having actually worked in a tourism based service job for some period of time may serve to spark an interest in pursuing it as a career path. The combination of early exposure to tourism based service jobs and actual hands-on experience in a tourism based service job for a given period of time probably combine to influence the conscious decision to pursue it as a viable career path.

The supplementary reason for working in a tourism based service job arises when an already employed individual needs to supplement his/her personal income by taking on a second job. These individuals are often referred to as

"moonlighters" (Davidson, 1983). These people may be principal wage earners looking to support the low wages offered in their present full-time job (Dempster-McClain & Moen, 1989). They may only be interested in part-time work as they have another full-time job in a different or similar occupation. Or, they may be retirees who want to supplement surplus free time and perceive an opportunity to do so by working in a tourism based service job.

The lifestyle reason for working in a tourism based service job may also be based on an individual's attraction to the secondary benefits a tourism based service organization provides to individuals, such as the quality of life offered those living and working in a particular geographic location. In effect, the geographic location of an employer can make the jobs it has to offer attractive to some people in the labor pool. For example, some tourism based service jobs provide employees the opportunity to live and work in picturesque lake-side, resort based communities. For example, sayings such as "half the pay for a view of the bay," are common in parts of the Northern Lower Peninsula of Michigan. In fact, faced with the recent advent of a military base closing in Michigan's Upper Peninsula, some residents have voiced the concern that they do not want to leave their homes and jobs in the area because they enjoy the "slow pace and outdoor life" ("U.P. group works," 1993).

More evidence of there being a lifestyle reason for working in a tourism based service job which enables one to live in a particular geographic location of the world may be found most recently in Hawaii. The "Aloha State," long known for its outstanding natural beauty, has seen unemployment rise dramatically in the face of a prolonged recession. This downturn in the economy, due to a dramatic decline in Hawaii's tourism industry, prompted many residents to flee for the continental United States in search of different career opportunities. However, there are still plenty of people living in Hawaii who share the outlook of one person quoted as saying: "I don't think there's anyone who doesn't think of leaving, but most of us stay because it's just so darn beautiful" (Ybarra, 1994). This quote epitomizes the perspective of the person who seeks a tourism based service job because of the lifestyle it provides, which in this case means maintaining residence in Hawaii.

Additional lifestyle reasons for working in tourism based service jobs may be the case of those who want access to the indirect benefits a service firm employer has to offer employees. For example, my qualitative research of tourism based service employees (especially resort employees in Colorado) over the years has led me to discover individuals who report they work in a tourism based service job primarily to engage in their favorite recreation

pursuits. I have spoken to resort employees who pursue their love of downhill skiing by working for a ski resort in the winter seasons; they are typically characterized (in industry jargon) as "ski-bums or ski-bunnies." These individuals tend to be the bartender, lift operator, or better still, the ski instructor at a resort who is permitted to ski for free (or at greatly reduced prices), when they are not on the clock. These individuals are attracted to their jobs because they get to have unlimited skiing opportunities as a consequence of their employment.

In the general service sector, I am also aware of the avid bodybuilder who lives to (again in industry jargon) "pump iron" and works his/her job as a weight trainer at a local gym because it provides him/her with an opportunity to work out for free when off the clock or even during working hours demonstrating weight training for the clientele. I have also conducted occasional interviews with retail employees. They claim to truly enjoy wearing the latest fashions when they go out in public, so they work for a clothing retailer because they are able to purchase clothes at a significant discount.

The transition reason for working in a tourism based service job is believed to be due in part to the result of declining industries, such as in automotive, steel, logging, and other "smokestack" industries. In 1994 alone, seven million American workers over the age of 25 were forced into

making a career change due to technology and corporatedownsizing (Bleakley, 1994). Many of these displaced workers may decide to work in tourism based service jobs because they do not like the idea of sitting idle and collecting unemployment. These people probably never considered working in the tourism based service sector until after they were abruptly put out of their jobs and forced into a career change.

Displaced workers who are in a career transition could very well possess a high level of knowledge, skills, and abilities that do not transfer naturally to jobs available in the tourism based service sector. For example, the Defense Department cut an average of 11,000 military and civilian jobs a month in 1994, and many of these newly unemployed workers are now unable to find jobs to which they had been accustomed (e.g., driving tanks, firing mortars, building missiles) and are working in the tourism based service sector as salespeople, stockbrokers and shift managers in fast food restaurants (Ricks, 1994).

There are also plenty of former auto workers adapting to tourism based service jobs which force them to not only take a significant cut in pay and fringe benefits but to adapt to a facet of service jobs they did not have to deal with on the assembly line, that being direct contact with the customer. Lacking the skills or desire to work directly with the public, these former auto workers and military

personnel would most likely return to their former jobs were they to be recalled and/or given the opportunity to work in similar jobs for new, or even former employers.

The transition reason for working in a tourism based service job may also include the purpose of changing careers voluntarily. Such individuals may have gone to college or been apprentices preparing for a particular occupation after leaving high school. After working in the job awhile, they may decide they no longer want to pursue the career they selected in their teenage years, and decide to try their hand at another line of work. Examples might include the bank manager who decides to leave banking and go into the restaurant business, or the manufacturing manager who takes an early retirement and works out of his/her home as a real estate agent.

The convenient reason for working in a tourism based service job is believed to be the result of those people in the labor pool who may live close to a variety of tourism based service employment opportunities. These individuals may seek a job with a tourism based service organization(s) due to the close proximity of the employer to their place of residence. Afterall, with the rapid technological advancements of the 1990s and the coming of the information superhighway, it is increasingly possible for tourism based service providers to locate their businesses anywhere in the country (providing there is good phone service) and become

the only employer in a small rural communities (Toffler, 1980).

Other convenience reasons for someone needing a job include: a) good working hours that fit with an unusual personal schedule, b) frequent job openings requiring no previous experience, c) an opportunity to spend more time with friends or relatives, d) few responsibilities, e) little stress from the job, and possibly f) a chance to really enjoy a job for its own sake.

It is important to point out that the type of reason for seeking a tourism based service job may change over the course of one's lifetime due to psychological, social or economic situations. As mentioned earlier, teenagers may seek employment in a tourism based service job because it is convenient to do so and turn it into a bona fide career because they really enjoy doing the work.

Finally, it may certainly be possible that an individual has multiple personal reasons for wanting to work in a tourism based service job. Even though it is believed that an individual has one basic reason for working in a tourism based service job, there may be a combination of personal reasons. For instance, an individual may decide to work in a tourism based service job because it is a great way to pursue a career and live in his/her favorite geographic location of the country. Working in tourism based service jobs also help retirees supplement their finances or reduce surplus free time while residing in a resort community in Florida.

Taxonomy of Types of Personal Reasons for Working in Tourism Based Service Jobs

The preceding discussion, as to the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs, may be aggregated into a taxonomy of five "types." These types will now be defined below.

The Bona Fide Career Type. The bona fide career type consists of those people who decide to work in tourism based service jobs because they find these jobs desirable. Those who possess a career interest in tourism based service jobs like the nature of the work (perhaps because it involves working with people) and may not be able to see themselves working in any other occupation (e.g., manufacturing, agriculture).

The Supplemental Type. The supplemental type works in tourism based service jobs because (s)he needs to augment personal or household income. These individuals may already have a full- or part-time job but still be unable to meet their expenses. The supplemental type may also include those individuals who find themselves with plenty of free time and the desire to spend some of it in an enjoyable yet constructive manner.

The Lifestyle Type. People may also work in tourism based service jobs because they find these jobs desirable as means to an end. The tourism based service job provides them with an opportunity to enjoy the secondary benefits of working for a tourism based service firm, such as residing in a particular geographic location of the country. Lifestyle types may also work in tourism based service jobs because they wish to satisfy their craving for certain recreational pursuits.

The Transition Type. These people find tourism based service jobs desirable only after working happily in another career field until a change is forced upon them by special circumstances outside of their control (e.g. economic recession, natural disaster). As a result, tourism based service jobs suddenly become attractive to these people, who would not have worked in them otherwise. This type may also include people who have made a conscious decision to make a career change at some point in their life.

The Convenience Type. Convenience types work in tourism based service jobs because they encounter few barriers to securing a job with a particular tourism based service organization. For this type of tourism based service sector employee, convenience may include: good hours, light duties and minimal responsibilities, familiar or friendly coworkers and customers, easy accessibility by public transportation (e.g., on the bus line), limited experience requirements, or even low stress. All, or only a few, of these factors may make working in tourism based service jobs attractive to certain individuals in the labor pool.

Study Hypotheses

In the research literature it is evident that previous attempts to establish specific reliable and valid antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment has been met with mixed success. The rationale for there being potentially five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs, with support from the work values literature, has also been discussed.

Seven of the following eight hypotheses suggest a relationship between specific antecedents (job involvement, job satisfaction, job design, and biodata) and outcomes (job performance, functional turnover) of organizational commitment. Also, the first seven study hypotheses suggest that knowing the type of personal reason an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will significantly increase the predictability of organizational

commitment and its outcomes. The eighth hypothesis suggests that there is a difference in the level of commitment between those who remain with the organization versus those who leave voluntarily.

<u>Hypothesis 1</u>

There are five basic types of personal reasons people may have for wanting to work in tourism based service jobs. The types of reasons are a: 1) bona fide career type; 2) supplemental type; 3) a lifestyle type; 4) a transition type; and a 5) convenience type.

This hypothesis has been established because it would be valuable to identify those job candidates who were not only predisposed to a career in tourism based service jobs, but because it may lead to developing valid antecedents of organizational commitment (Pierce & Dunham, 1987). Indeed, there are some researchers who suspect there is a no commitment-type of individual (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987). Finding evidence to the contrary in this study would be valuable to those trying to improve organizational effectiveness and reduce turnover levels of good employees (O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1981).

Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis is that:

- a. An individual's attitude toward his/her job is a significant predictor of organizational commitment.
- b. Knowing the type of reason (e.g., bona fide career) an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will increase the predictability of organizational commitment, when attitude toward the job is controlled.

The second hypothesis is intended to extend previous efforts to establish job involvement as an antecedent variable of organizational commitment. Job involvement has been defined as the psychological attachment individuals have for their work (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). I believe that this construct is a precursor to another antecedent of organizational commitment which is the positive or negative attitude an employee develops toward his/her job once (s)he has worked in it for awhile.

Building again on the work values perspective, it is conceivable that an individual could develop an attitude toward his/her job based on whether it coincides with his/her values, making it meaningful to the individual. Kalleberg (1977) put it best by saying "work has no inherent meaning but, rather individuals impute such meanings to their work activity" (p. 127) Basically, the nature of this

hypothesis is that when an individual has a favorable attitude toward his/her tourism based service job, it should lead to relatively high organizational commitment. Conversely, an unfavorable or negative attitude toward one's job should result in relatively low organizational commitment.

<u>Hypothesis 3</u>

The third hypothesis is that:

- a. Job design is a significant predictor of organizational commitment.
- b. Knowing the type of reason (e.g. bona fide career) an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will increase the predictability of organizational commitment, when job design is controlled.

The most tangible relationship an employee has to the organization is through his/her job. The nature of this hypothesis is that employees working in jobs that are enriched, suggesting high motivating potential, may be prone to develop relatively high levels of organizational commitment. Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis is that:

- a. Job satisfaction is a significant predictor of organizational commitment.
- Knowing the type of reason (e.g., bona fide career) an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will increase the predictability of organizational commitment, when job satisfaction is controlled.

Job satisfaction should occur when an employee is satisfied with the performance of paid/nonpaid benefits that are important, or have value, to that individual. This is an important consideration as there is evidence that commitment is greater for those employees who work in jobs that are satisfying (Meyer & Allen, 1987).

<u>Hypothesis 5</u>

The fifth hypothesis is that:

- a. Biodata variables, including: age, tenure, education
 level, number of dependents, gender, and marital status
 are significant predictors of organizational
 commitment.
- b. Knowing the type of reason (e.g., bona fide career) an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will increase the predictability of organizational

commitment, when each of the biodata variables are controlled.

Because biodata variables have been shown to predict organizational commitment in the past, they will be examined in this study as well. They are important variables to consider in the context of any study designed to predict organizational commitment because they are more easily observed than cognitive variables and are more reliable measures. If biodata variables are shown to predict organizational commitment, they can be easily accessed from an individual's job application and used to improve the recruitment and selection process used by an organization.

<u>Hypothesis 6</u>

The sixth hypothesis is that:

- a. Organizational commitment is a significant predictor of job performance.
- b. Knowing the type of reason (e.g., bona fide career) an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will increase the predictability of job performance, when organizational commitment is controlled.

Organizational commitment has been found to be a predictor of job performance. It is important to include a hypothesis with job performance in this study because it is an observed behavior that might cross validate an employee's self reported level of commitment.

<u>Hypothesis 7</u>

The seventh hypothesis is that:

- a. Organizational commitment is a significant predictor of functional turnover.
- b. Knowing the type of reason (e.g.. bona fide career) an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will increase the predictability of functional turnover, when organizational commitment is controlled.
 Organizational commitment has been examined in terms of

being a predictor variable of voluntary turnover (e.g. general turnover, functional turnover). Functional turnover is an important consideration for employers, especially from the standpoint of learning how to avoid losing good employees to other organizations. Functional turnover is an important variable to measure because it is another observed behavior (like job performance) which may be associated with the construct of organizational commitment. Hypothesis 8

The eighth hypothesis is that:

a. Employees who stay with an organization will have a higher degree of commitment than those employees who leave voluntarily.

Organizational commitment has been studied in the context of it being a predictor of voluntary employee turnover, regardless of whether it was functional or dysfunctional, and must be included in this study because it provides another opportunity to establish behavioral outcomes of organizational commitment. Turnover is also important to include in this study as Porter and others (1974) found that "commitment to the organization was clearly the most important variable in differentiating between stayers and leavers" (p. 606).

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

In the beginning of this chapter the sample, procedures and materials for the study will be discussed. The sample, procedures, and results for the pretest of the survey instruments will be discussed at the end of the chapter. It should also be noted at this point that many of the data collected from the resort that was utilized to pretest the survey instruments (referred to as Resort D) were ultimately combined with the data collected from the other three resorts (referred to as Resorts A, B, and C) that participated in the study. That is why Resort D will not be discussed to a great extent in the initial procedures section of this chapter but will be dealt with in the section concerning the pretest.

<u>Sample</u>

The sample for this study was drawn from four out of seven resorts that were asked to participate in the study. Three of the participating resorts are located in Michigan's northwest lower peninsula, and one is located in western

Michigan. The sample included all nonsupervisory permanent full- and part-time employees working at the resorts. Those employees with a job title of supervisor were included in the sample if they did not have the authority to hire, fire, or evaluate the performance of other employees in their department or work-unit. The resort employees included in the study generally held jobs in the following departments: a) general property maintenance, b) food and beverage service, c) guest service-sales-safety, and d) administration.

<u>Materials</u>

In all cases, self administered questionnaires were chosen as the data collection method for this study as the potential sample size made the time and cost of personal interviews prohibitive. The scales, demographic variables, and UCRIHS waiver form for nonsupervisory employees were compiled into a booklet to make it easier for employees to respond to the survey. A copy of the survey booklet is contained in Appendix A.

It is being assumed in this study that regardless of how "involved" employees are with their jobs, working in tourism based service jobs has varied affects on people in regards to the attitudes that they develop as a consequence of working in the jobs the industry has to offer. Miller's

(1934) Attitude Toward Any Occupation Scale was modified slightly and renamed the Attitude Toward Job Scale in this study to measure and test the potential range of affects that working in tourism based service jobs may have on employees attitudes. The slight modifications that were made to the scale basically involved updating the terminology used in the scale (as it is over 60 years old) and changing the word "occupation" to "job" in many of the items. The Attitude Toward Job Scale is contained in Section I of the survey booklet.

Miller's (1934) scale has parallel Forms A and B, both with 45 items. Form A was modified for use in the study. Item weights range from 0.6 (for strongly negatively stated items) to 10.4 (for strongly positively stated items) in form A. Reliability coefficients for the scale reportedly range from .71 to .92. The scale is thought to have content validity as it was developed by subject matter experts.

The Thurstone method of equal-appearing intervals was used to develop the Attitude Toward Any Occupation Scale (Shaw & Wright, 1976). The Thurstone method relies on a panel of judges to follow a formalized procedure aimed at developing a scale to reliably measure a particular attitude or construct. The Thurstone method starts with a large pool of items that reflect, in this case, a range of potential attitudes people could have for a particular occupation. The judges take the pool of items and first sort them into 11 piles. The judges then assign a weight to each of the items based on their median position in each of the 11 piles. Ultimately a scale is produced that consists of a sampling of items (from extremely negative to extremely positive) to account for the variance in the population on the attitude being measured.

The attitude toward job scores were calculated for resort employees by summing the weights for each of the items that they placed an X before, which was an indication that they agreed with the statement made by the item in reference to their resort job. A high score on the scale means that the employee reports (s)he has a favorable attitude toward his/her job.

It is important to note that Miller's scale (1934) contained items that appear to be similar to some of those used in scales designed to research the construct of job involvement by Lohdahl & Kejner (1965) and Kanungo (1982). This is of concern because any findings concerning the attitude toward job variable might be contaminated as the scale could potentially measure job involvement. Because employees were not required to respond to each of the 45 items on the Attitude Toward Job Scale it is doubtful that they would respond to only those items used in the job involvement scale. For this reason, the scale is assumed to measure only the employees attitudes toward their jobs.

Section I and II of Hackman & Oldham's Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) were used to measure job design. The JDS is a way to examine whether the job itself (as opposed to pay or benefits) has the capacity to motivate employees to be productive while they are at work. Those jobs which have the capacity to motivate employees, in and of themselves, are said to be enriched. Hackman & Oldham (1976) developed the JDS for use as a diagnostic tool to evaluate jobs prior to any redesign efforts and as a way to evaluate jobs once a redesign has been completed to determine if the jobs were enriched. Section I and II of the JDS are reproduced in section II and III of the survey booklet included in Appendix A.

Job design (enrichment) was inferred using the motivating potential score (MPS) which was calculated from scores obtained for the five job core dimension scales that comprise section I and II of the JDS. The five core job dimensions are skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Each of the job core dimension scales consist of a three-item, seven-point Likert scale, making it possible to calculate the MPS. The internal consistency reliability coefficients for each of the five job core dimension scales has ranged from .59 to .71 (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

The MPS can range from 1 (low motivating potential) to 343 (high motivating potential). When the scale was

originally developed, the mean MPS was 128.31 with a standard deviation of 72.73. The MPS of a job is calculated using the raw mean scores from the five job core dimensions in accordance with the following formula:

According to Hackman and Oldham (1975), a good base score for any job is an MPS of 125. To get an MPS of 125, the job would have to be rated with all fives on the sevenpoint Likert items making up the scales measuring the five core job dimensions. Hackman and Oldham (1975) maintain that a job that has an MPS between 200 to 343 indicates a job that is well designed.

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to measure and test the employee's level of organizational commitment (Mowday et al., 1979). The OCQ was initially tested across 2563 employees employed by a variety of organizations. Internal consistency reliability coefficients for the OCQ have ranged from .82 to .93. The OCQ has received high marks in the past as a respected empirical measure of affective (cognitive) organizational commitment, particularly in previous studies designed to evaluate its psychometric properties (Ferris & Aranya, 1983). The fifteen item OCQ is found in section IV of the survey booklet which is contained in Appendix A.

No existing scales were identified that could have been modified slightly to measure and test the five hypothesized types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. The process of developing a Bona Fide Career Scale, Convenient Source of Employment Scale, Job Transition Scale, and Lifestyle Choice Scale for use in this study were guided by the works of Anastasi (1979), Miner and Miner, (1979), Gatewood and Field (1992), and Spector (1993). The Supplemental Employment Scale was developed from items used in previous scales developed to investigate supplemental employment (Perrella, 1970; Jamal & Crawford, 1981; Jamal, 1986; Stinson, 1986).

All scale items were written a priori (except the Supplemental Employment Scale) and designed to measure the contents of the definitions coinciding with the taxonomy of types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs that were discussed at the end of Chapter II. The scale items were weighted using a Likert Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree with the statement) to 7 (strongly agree with the statement). The five scales are presented in Table 3.1. Prior to the pretest, the items from each of the five scales were listed at random (using a random numbers table) in Section V of the survey booklet as illustrated in Appendix A.

Table 3.1. Five scales developed for measuring and testing the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs.

Bona Fide Career Scale

- B1. I want a career for myself working in the resort/tourism business.
- B2. I really enjoy this kind of work.

Job Transition Scale

- J3. I was layed off by another employer.
- J4. I am getting experience in this job in order to start a business of my own someday.
- J5. I decided to work here until I find a more interesting job.

Convenient Source of Employment Scale

- C6. This resort was willing to provide me with my first job.
- C7. This resort is a convenient place for me to work.
- C8. I am a student, this job allows me the opportunity to earn extra income.

Supplemental Employment Scale

- S9. I have to pay off debts I owe.
- S10. I need something to do to occupy my free time.
- S11. I am trying to save money for the future.
- S12. I need additional money to meet current living expenses for myself, or family.
- S13. I just wanted to try my hand at a different line of work.

Lifestyle Choice Scale

- L14. I am only here to take advantage of the recreational activities the resort has to offer when I get off of work.
- L15. I am working here in order to live in this part of Michigan.
A Service Job Satisfaction Scale was also developed to test the level of job satisfaction among employees working in tourism based service jobs and presented in section VI of the survey booklet. Job satisfaction is not a measure of how satisfied an employee is with his/her "job," per se. It is more a measure of how satisfied an employee is with the benefits that result from doing the job. The Service Job Satisfaction Scale developed for this study does incorporate items from scales used in prior studies discussed below.

Items were borrowed from a study designed by Sheridan, Slocum, and Richards (1974) to test expectancy theory and job behavior among nurses to test their valence (attractiveness) for different items from a list of potential outcomes (benefits). Because the scale was used to establish the valence a list of outcomes had for the nurses, the researchers did not attempt to establish reliability. The list of benefits generated by Sheridan and others (1974) were still helpful in this study in developing the Service Job Satisfaction Scale.

Items for developing the Service Job Satisfaction Scale were also borrowed from a scale used to test the occupational preferences of senior psychology majors (Muchinsky & Taylor, 1976). The reliability of the scale used by Muchinsky and Taylor (1976) was not reported. Items from the Muchinsky and Taylor (1976) scale were added to the items borrowed from the Sheridan and others (1974) study to

complete a fixed list of potential benefits for the Service Job Satisfaction Scale.

The problem with generating a fixed list of benefits for the Service Job Satisfaction Scale was considered. First of all, there was the risk of excluding benefits the employee believes to be an important consequence resulting from the work performed for a given tourism based service employer. In this case, the scale would be deficient as it did not include all of the potential benefits from working in a tourism based service job. The scale would naturally produce an unreliable score because tourism based service job satisfaction was inadequately measured. There was also the potential problem of having employees evaluate their satisfaction with benefits that are important to them but not offered by their current employer. In this regard, the scale would have been contaminated because there would be benefits listed that might be evaluated by employees even though they are not currently being offered by their employer. The score produced by such a scale would also be an unreliable measure of tourism based service job satisfaction.

In view of these considerations, a fixed list of paid/nonpaid benefits was established. The principal advantage of a fixed list of benefits was that it made it easier to calculate a job satisfaction score for employees because each one is presented with the same list of items

from which to choose. An open-ended format would have made it exceedingly difficult to reliably code and analyze the data in order to accurately measure tourism based service job satisfaction for the large sample size used in this study. To safeguard the exclusion of a benefit from the Service Job Satisfaction Scale that may be particularly important to tourism based service workers, an open-ended item was included during the pretest of the survey instruments.

The instructions for the Service Job Satisfaction Scale required employees to first read through the list of 20 paid/nonpaid benefits and then place an X before only those benefits that were important to them. They were then asked to rate how satisfied they were with only those benefits that were important to them using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 7 (extremely dissatisfied). A mean job satisfaction score was calculated for each employee by dividing the number of benefits that were checked as important into the sum of the item weights.

The procedure of having employees rate their satisfaction with paid/nonpaid benefits, important only to them, was another important consideration when developing this scale for the study. This course of action was taken because job satisfaction scales, such as the Job Diagnostic Index (Smith et al., 1969), typically require subjects to sort or evaluate how satisfied they are with all of the

items in the scale. It was therefore assumed (with general support from the work values literature), that it is illogical to have employees indicate their level of satisfaction with all of the benefits listed on a job satisfaction scale since not all of the items may be important to the individual.

Dillman's (1986) strategy for maximizing response rates to personal (biodata) items was implemented which explains why these variables are found at the end of the survey booklet. Dillman (1986) has found that respondents tend to complete personal items when they are placed at the end of a questionnaire because they have already spent their time completing the early pages. Not responding to the final items may mean their questionnaire will not be counted and their time will have been wasted. The biodata variables contained in Section VII are: age, marital status, level of education, tenure, and number of dependents. Employees were also asked to indicate their name, job title, department, employment status (full-time or part-time permanent), whether they had a second job, the title of the second job, and the employment status of their second job.

The Employee Performance Appraisal used in this study was developed using two other scales as guides. A copy of the performance appraisal form used in the pretest is found in Appendix B. The top portion of the appraisal form (Section I) was based on items borrowed from a behaviorally

anchored rating scale (Eichel & Bender, 1984). The primary reason for including a behaviorally anchored rating scale in the appraisal form was to reduce some of the subjectivity of employee ratings by their supervisors to make the scores more reliable. The bottom section of the appraisal (Section II) consists of Likert scale items from another previously used performance appraisal form (Olson, 1981). The reliability of the scale had to be determined during the pretest of the survey instruments.

Dalton, Todor, and Krackhardt's (1982) three-item scale was used to test the functionality of voluntary turnover. The scale is referred to as the Employee Turnover Questionnaire in this study. A copy of the ETQ is contained in Appendix C. Campion (1991) recently found internal consistency reliability of the three-item scale to be .88. The advantages of the scale are that it is easy to use and "considers factors that are highly relevant and visible to the supervisor (e.g., job performance and ease of replacement)" (Campion, 1991, p. 210). The disadvantage of the scale is that it is a subjective measure of functional turnover. The ETQ was coded such that higher scores indicate dysfunctional turnover.

Procedures

The resorts that participated in the study were not selected at random from a sampling frame of all possible resorts in Michigan. It would have been better to select the resorts at random for this study but factors such as time and money did not permit that option. As a result, the study was based on a convenience sample which means it will be difficult to generalize the findings beyond those resorts that were sampled.

Seven resorts were asked to participate in this study. Out of the seven resorts that were contacted, four agreed to take part in the study and referred to as Resorts A, B, C, and D for purposes of anonymity. It should be noted again that Resort D doubled as a pretest site in this study.

The survey (including the pretest of the instruments) took place at the resorts between early June and late August, 1993. General managers were offered an executive report highlighting the findings concerning their property as compared to the other three resorts (without knowing the names of the other resorts) as an incentive to participate in the study. However, managers were informed that the information provided by employees was to be kept confidential and their names would not to appear in the contents of the report.

st sa Hu ir er Th du fu ev pe re opj or deg suj Wa th Ap WC er a Pe Vc

Employees indicated that their participation in the study was voluntary by signing a waiver form that was sanctioned by the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS). As mentioned, the form was included in the survey booklet. The information provided by employees was treated as confidential rather than anonymous. The reason employees could not participate anonymously was due to the study design which included a job performance and functional turnover variable. These two variables were evaluated by having the employee's supervisor complete a performance appraisal and turnover questionnaire. As a result, supervisors had to have the names of employees (as opposed to randomly assigned identification numbers) in order to evaluate the employees properly.

As indicated, the supervisors in each of the functional departments played an important role in the study. Resort supervisors were also required to sign a waiver form that was sanctioned by UCRIHS to indicate their participation in the study was voluntary. The form can be referred to in Appendix D. Without the voluntary help from supervisors it would not have been possible to evaluate the performance of employees or the functionality of their voluntary turnover.

Resort employees were all given a packet consisting of a cover letter, a survey booklet, and a copy of the employee performance appraisal and told their participation was voluntary. The cover letter provided basic information on

the dates the survey was to take place (specific to each resort) and instructions as to where the employees were to return their completed booklets. The cover letter also instructed employees to fill out only the top portion of the their performance appraisal (which was inserted loosely in the survey booklet) and give it to their supervisors to complete (granted the supervisor volunteered to participate in the study).

There were incentives put into place to increase voluntary participation of employees and supervisors in the survey. The incentives were put into place based on one of the principles of Homan's exchange theory, which states that people "are likely to perform an activity, the more valuable they perceive the reward to be" (Babbie, 1989, p.49). Employees were offered a cash incentive to properly complete their survey booklets should they elect to participate in the survey. Supervisors all received a Michigan State University (MSU) pen and pencil set for volunteering to take the time to complete performance appraisals for those employees who elected to participate in the survey.

Although there were subtle differences involved in the procedures for surveying employees at each of the resorts, they were all similar in one respect. The basic similarity in the procedures was the aspect of having a single contact person at each of the resorts who was responsible for helping place survey packets in the hands of resort

e:
st
a
C
p:
tl
be
iı
n
tł
nc
٥٧
Pa
al
ar
re
th
it
ac
Þo
th
đn
Ve
ļ

employees. The contact people were also invaluable to the study because they helped return completed survey booklets and performance appraisals to MSU after the survey had been conducted at their respective resorts.

As mentioned, there were subtle differences in the procedures used to deliver survey packets into the hands of the employees working at Resorts A, B, C, and D (which will be discussed in the section dealing with the pretest later in this chapter). These differences should be discussed in more detail because they may have influenced the findings in this study.

Resort A provided a contact person who gave advance notice to all employees that a survey was being conducted over a three day period and that they were allowed to participate if they wished to do so. The employees were allowed to obtain survey packets in their designated break area. The break room set-up was advantageous for several reasons: a) it provided an opportunity to answer questions that arose as employees completed their survey booklets, b) it was the only time during the study that employees were actually observed completing survey booklets, and c) it was possible to time how long it took respondents to complete their booklets (which averaged 25 minutes).

Those employees who could not complete their questionnaires during their allotted time for break or lunch were allowed to finish them at home. Those employees who

19 iz รบ aŗ p] SU ar to We in re pa Се en su apj the Pad di Re A1 ap an rarely made it to the break area were given packets by their immediate supervisors. Regardless of how employees acquired survey packets, completed survey booklets and performance appraisals were returned to the employee break area and placed into a box that was made available to employees and supervisors over the three day period of the survey.

The general manager of Resort B sanctioned the survey and asked for the full cooperation of each department head to assist MSU in its research. The employees at Resort B were also given a three-day period in which to participate in the survey. The contact person at Resort B took full responsibility for coordinating the delivery of the survey packets to eligible employees. Two boxes were placed at central locations at the resort to make it convenient for employees to return their completed questionnaires and/or supervisors to return their completed performance appraisals.

The area manager of Resort C agreed to participate in the study and personally assisted in distributing the survey packets to employees. The manager also had department heads distribute the packets to their employees. The employees of Resort C were given five days to participate in the survey. All of the completed questionnaires and performance appraisals were collected by the general manager's assistant and mailed back to MSU.

The procedures for distributing survey packets to employees created at least two additional limitations to the study. The first limitation is that few employees or supervisors were actually observed while completing survey booklets or performance appraisals. Not being able to observe the conditions in which the survey instruments were completed introduces the possibility of response error in the results of the study. For example, it will never be known if those employees who took booklets home were the same one's who filled them out, or if there were performance appraisals completed by the employees themselves and not their supervisors.

The second limitation associated with the procedures of handing out the survey packets is that all resort employees were not required to participate in the study. The fewer employees that volunteered to participate in the survey, the higher the potential for nonresponse error (Tull & Hawkins, 1990). Not having every employee participate in the survey does not automatically mean that there will be nonresponse error. However, it will not be possible to correlate the scores of nonrespondents with respondents to determine if there was nonresponse error because employees could only be surveyed during the initial time granted by resort managers.

Finally, the survey booklets and performance appraisals that were not completed while the survey took place at each of the resorts were collected during the remainder of the

summer. This was accomplished by forwarding a list of employees, alphabetized by department, to the contact person at each resort. The alphabetized list provided information for each employee as to whether or not there was a completed questionnaire but no matching performance appraisal, and vice-versa. The contact people were truly invaluable to this study as they helped to reconcile the discrepancies between missing survey booklets and/or performance appraisals.

Procedure for Tracking Turnover at the Resorts

The voluntary turnover of those employees who participated in the survey was tracked from early summer through to the end of March, 1994. One of the more consistent procedures in this study was the tracking of turnover for those employees who participated in this study.

The payroll clerks at resorts A, B, and, C were each given an alphabetical listing of employees by department who had participated in the study. When employees voluntarily either of the resorts, payroll would send their immediate supervisor a turnover questionnaire and an envelope stamped and addressed to MSU. All the supervisor was required to do was to fill out the turnover questionnaire and mail it back to MSU in the postage-paid envelope provided by the payroll department. This procedure worked remarkably well as supervisors were very good about promptly completing turnover questionnaires and placing them in the mail.

Tracking turnover at Resort D (which was initially used to pretest the survey instruments), was accomplished with help from the office manager who was mailed an alphabetical listing of those employees who had participated in the survey. The office manager was then contacted once a month to determine if any employees had left the resort who had participated in the survey. When it was determined that an employee had voluntarily left the resort, an MSU representative contacted his/her immediate supervisor by phone. The supervisors then completed a turnover questionnaires over the phone in reference to the recently departed employee.

<u>Data Analysis</u>

All of the statistical procedures necessary to analyze the data in this study were performed using the SPSS/PC+ software (Norusis, 1988). Descriptive statistics were run first for all biodata variables and summated scales to examine the basic integrity of the data set (e.g. missing data, response sets) resulting from the pretest of the survey instruments at Resort D and the subsequent employee survey at Resorts A, B, and C.

All summated scales used in the study were examined for their reliability, mean score, standard deviation, and standard error of measurement. The statistic used to report reliability for all of the scales (except the Attitude Toward Job Scale which had dichotomous items) was the widely used Cronbach's Alpha. The standardized alpha coefficient was the preferred statistic for reporting alpha because it is the value that would be obtained if all of the scale items were standardized to have a variance of 1 and tends to be a more conservative estimate of reliability (Norusis, 1988). Those scales with standardized reliability coefficients of .60 or greater were considered to be acceptable for this study. Some researchers suggest reliability estimates should range between .70 to .80 to be considered reliable measures for most research (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1982). Because this study was not designed to make critical decisions regarding someone's future (e.g. institutionalize, perform major surgery) scales with reliability coefficients of .60 or higher were acceptable.

To depict how the reliability coefficient effects the accuracy of the observed scores produced by the scales in this study, the standard error of measurement (SEM) was also reported because it "gives...an idea of the error to be expected in a particular individuals's score on the measure" (Gatewood, 1990, p.190). For example, if an individual's attitude toward job score was 50, and the SEM of the scale

happened to be 3.5, there is a good chance that the employee's "true" score lies somewhere between 36.5 and 53.5.

No standardized alpha was reported for the Attitude Toward Job Scale or Service Job Satisfaction Scale. It would not have been practical to establish reliability for the Service Job Satisfaction Scale as it is a checklist requiring employees to pick only those benefits that are important to them prior to rating how satisfied they are with the paid/nonpaid benefits they selected. The Guttman split-half reliability coefficient was reported for the Attitude Toward Job scale due to the dichotomous nature of the scale items.

Two techniques were used in the event that any, or all, of the study scales were found to be unreliable. The first technique used to increase the reliability of the study scales was a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation. The varimax rotation is advantageous because it minimizes the number of variables with high loadings on a given factor to make it easier to interpret the factors that result in the final factor matrix. The final factors were then examined to determine if the reliability coefficients were increased as a result of the factor analysis.

The second technique used to increase the reliability of the study scales was a two-step procedure recommended by

Hunter (1993). The two-step procedure is performed after an inter-item correlation matrix is produced using all of the items from the unreliable scales. In the first step of Hunter's (1993) procedure, each scale is examined internally for items that are significantly inter-correlated. Those items that are inter-correlated are combined to determine if the reliability coefficient for the scale had been In the second step, each scale is examined to increased. find items in the correlation matrix from other scales, that are both significantly correlated and qualitatively similar to items of its own, so that they can measure the intended construct with greater precision. The new combination of items are then examined to determine if there was any increase in the reliability coefficient. The two-step procedure may result in: a) scales that reliably measure the intended construct with a different (e.g. more, fewer) number of items, b) a new combination of items that reliably measure new or unique constructs undetected prior to conducting the study, or c) no improvement in the reliability of the scales.

A forced regression analysis was used to test those hypotheses that stated an antecedent variable (e.g. job design) would significantly predict a particular dependent variable (e.g. organizational commitment). The forced regression technique was used as variables are subjectively selected and entered one at a time into an equation to examine their effect on the explained variance of the dependent variable in accordance with the hypotheses formulated for this study. Moreover, this statistical procedure was advantageous as an F test could be performed to determine whether there was a significant increase in the explained variance of the dependent variable each time an independent variable was added to the multiple regression equation (Shavelson, 1988). The formula used to generate the F statistic, to determine whether there was a significant difference in the predictability of the dependent variable, was:

$$F_{obs} = (R^{2}_{Y,1,2,...,k1} - R^{2}_{Y,1,2,...,k2}) / k_{1} - k_{2})$$

$$(1-R^{2}_{Y,1,2,...,k1}) / (N-k_{1}-1)$$

with $df_1 = (k_1 - k_2)$, $df_2 = (N - k_1 - 1)$, and where:

df = degrees of freedom
k₁ = number of independent variables in the larger set
 of independent variables
k₂ = number of independent variables in the smaller set
 of independent variables
N = number of cases

Prior to testing the study hypotheses, the antecedent variables were checked for multicollinearity problems prior to regressing them on the outcome variable specified in each hypothesis. This precaution was taken to provide some degree of certainty that when each independent variable was added to a given regression equation it offered something unique in the way of its effect on the explained variance of the dependent variable prescribed by the hypothesis.

The option of regressing each antecedent variable on all other antecedent variables to determine whether the coefficient of determination (R^2) for any of the regressions approached 1.00, therefore indicating multicollinearity problems, was ruled out for two reasons. First, while it may be a more rigorous approach it is not a fail safe method for detecting problems of multicollinearity (Berry & Feldman, 1985). Second, at no time are more than two antecedent variables regressed on the outcome variable of organizational commitment.

Potential multicollinearity problems were examined instead using a pairwise correlation matrix of all of the antecedent variables to organizational commitment. A predetermined conservative cutoff of a significant correlation of .60 between any of the antecedent variables and organizational commitment was used to identify potential multicollinearity problems (Barry & Feldman, 1985).

Lastly, an independent t-test was performed to test hypothesis 8, which stated that the mean scores on the OCQ would be higher for those who stayed with the resorts (stayers) versus those who voluntarily left (leavers).

Pretest of Survey Instruments

Procedures

The survey instruments were pretested at a resort in western Michigan (referred to as Resort D). The pretest took place over a two day period at the beginning of the summer of 1993. Upon arrival to Resort D it was learned that the food service facilities had been recently licensed to a private concern. The restructuring effectively reduced the pretest sample to roughly 20 full- and part-time permanent employees (down from the usual 50 employed in previous years). To increase the sample size to at least 30 employees, 10 full-time seasonal employees were allowed to participate in the pretest of the survey instruments.

The resort manager and a staff assistant helped to distribute the survey packets to supervisors, who in turn, were responsible for handing them to their employees. The survey packet consisted of a cover letter (see Appendix E), survey booklet, and performance appraisal. The cover letter instructed employees to: a) contact the MSU representative if they had any questions or concerns regarding the survey, b) complete the top portion of their performance appraisal before giving it back to the supervisor, and c) place their completed booklets into the boxes made available to them at the resort. The cover letter also told the employees about

the cash incentives that were in place for those who properly completed their booklets.

Employees were also invited to attend a focus group at the end of the second day of the survey to determine if anyone had problems or concerns pertaining to the survey instruments. Only a few employees attended the focus group session at the resort to discuss the survey. Employees said the instructions were easy to follow, making it easy to complete the survey booklet. One employee said that there were too many questions. According to the employees, it took an average of about 15 minutes to complete the booklet. One employee did remark that the booklet was "interesting."

Employees were also asked if any of the questions were too personal, making it difficult for them to provide honest answers. The employees indicated that this was not the case and that they felt free to answer each of the questions truthfully.

Pretest Results

Twenty-two employees turned in completed survey booklets by the end of the second day of the pretest. The survey was extended two days in order to give the eight remaining employees a chance to voluntarily complete their survey booklets. At the end of the extended two day period three more completed booklets were mailed back to MSU.

Of the 25 nonsupervisory employees who participated in the pretest, 14 were full-time permanent, one was part-time permanent and 10 were full-time seasonal employees. Six of the employees were park rangers, nine were maintenance employees, five were in customer service positions and the remaining five were in the sales department. Four employees indicated that they held second jobs, one was on a full-time basis and the other three were employed on a part-time basis. The part-time jobs held were factory worker, coach operator, and maintenance worker. One employee had a fulltime job as pastor of a church.

The mean age of the sample was 37.72 years, with a standard deviation of 17.58. The sample was comprised of 14 male and 11 female employees. The mean education level was 12.52 years, with a standard deviation of 1.33. The mean tenure at Resort D was 3.56 years, with a standard deviation of 2.24. There were 11 single, and 14 married employees. The mean number of dependents was .96, with a standard deviation of 1.34 (note: the mode was 0 dependents as 14 employees reported having no dependents).

The descriptive statistics and standardized alpha coefficients produced from the pretest of the survey instruments are presented in Table 3.2. The standard error of measurement (SEM) is also presented to show what effect the standardized alpha coefficient has on the accuracy of the score produced by the summated scales.

Scales	# of Items	Mean	std. Dev.	stđ. Alpha	SEM
Attitude Toward Job	45	70.1	36.4	.761	17.8
Job Design (MPS)	!	141.7	68.1	NA	NA
Autonomy	m	5.1	1.2	.82	0.5
Feedback from Job	m	5.1	1.2	.86	0.4
Skill Variety	m	4.6	1.3	. 68	0.7
Task Identity	m	4.9	1.4	.80	0.6
Task Significance	m	5.9	0.9	.51	0.6
Organizational Commitment (OCQ)	15	74.8	12.3	.86	4.6
Bona Fide Career	7	9.6	2.5	.66	1.5
Job Transition	m	7.5	4.2	.60	2.6
Convenient Source of Employment	m	6.9	3.4	.48	2.5
Supplemental Employment	S	19.3	5.3	.22	4.7
Lifestyle Choice	7	3.1	1.9	.47	1.4
Service Job Satisfaction	21	5.1	1.0	NA	NA
Employee Performance Appraisal	13	46.0	5.8	. 88	2.0

Initial mean scores, standard deviations, standardized alpha, and standard errors of measurement (SEM) for each scale resulting from the pretest (N=25). Table 3.2.

Notes; ¹ - Guttman split-half reliability coefficient.

As illustrated in Table 3.2, the standardized alpha reliability coefficients for the scales varied, with both the established and modified scales performing as the most reliable measures in the pretest. The established OCQ had an acceptable standardized alpha of .86, much as it has in all of the previous studies that have used it to test organizational commitment. The five job core dimension scales (e.g. Autonomy) used to calculate the MPS had an average standardized alpha coefficient of .73. The Feedback from Job Scale had the highest alpha coefficients of .86 while the Task Significance Scale had the lowest standardized alpha coefficient of .51. The modified Attitude Toward Job Scale had an acceptable split-half reliability coefficient of .76.

Three of the five scales developed to measure and test the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs had unacceptable reliability coefficients and needed to be reworked before conducting the survey at Resorts A, B, and C. The Bona Fide Career Scale and the Job Transition Scale had acceptable standardized alpha coefficients above .60. However, the Convenient Source of Employment Scale, Supplemental Employment Scale, and the Lifestyle Choice Scale each had standardized alpha coefficients below .60. Several of the nonsupervisory employees at Resort D responded to the open-ended item 16 in Section V of the booklet that asked them to write in other

reasons they may have had for working at a resort. Some of the reasons written by employees were similar to those hypothesized in this study. Nonsupervisory employees wrote that they worked for Resort D for the following reasons: a) "Chance to work with people in preparation for career as a cop"; b) "Going to school and this job was fun and convenient, now will go find accounting job"; c) "I am member who lives here in summer, with inflation and a retired spouse, can use the extra spending money - and this is ideal for it"; d) "I like to work with people"; e) "At first the job was convenient, now I stay because I love the job; and f) "I hoped to improve electric and plumbing skills and little less hassle and not be a puppet."

Discussion of Pretest Results

The pretest of the survey instruments was reasonably successful given the smaller than expected sample size. The modified Attitude Toward Job Scale and established OCQ required no additional work as these exhibited acceptable measurement properties. The following scales had to be reworked before being re-administered to the other three resorts: the scales developed to measure and test the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs, the Service Job Satisfaction Scale, and the Employee Performance Appraisal. Each of these scales will be discussed below.

Hypothesis 1 is central to this study as it predicted that there are five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. Therefore, even though three of the scales developed to measure and test the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs were found to be unreliable, a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to increase the standardized alpha coefficient for all five scales. The factor analysis was used more to guide than unilaterally decide what scales would emerge from the varimax rotation in order to end up with five scales that maintained as many of their original items as possible.

In the factor analysis, factor loadings of 0.4 were chosen in order to preview only those variables with high loadings in the final factor pattern matrix produced by the varimax rotation (Norussis, 1988). The scale items were factor analyzed based on their random order in Section V of the pretest survey booklet (as presented in Appendix A). The first principle components factor analysis was performed using all 15 items from the five scales that were developed to measure and test the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. This first factor analysis (using all 15 scale items)

produced six factors explaining 63.2 percent of the variance. However, two of the six factors were a combination of items that defied any rational attempt to define them in terms meaningful for revealing new types of personal reasons people may have for working tourism based service jobs.

From that point forward, scale items were removed singularly and in combination to explore what effect their removal had on the factors produced by the varimax rotation. The initial statistics for each factor resulting from the removal of items J3, S9, and S11 (which can be viewed in their written form in Table 3.1) is presented in Table 3.3. The total variance explained by each factor is listed in the eigenvalue column (Norusis, 1988). The column next to it on the right contains the percentage of the total variance relating to each factor. There is no relationship between the "Factors" and the "Items" column even though they may be on the same line. The table is set up to illustrate the information about the variables in the first two columns. The last four columns describe the factors.

Focusing on eigenvalues of 1.0 or greater in Table 3.3 shows that removing items J3, S9 and S11 did not completely satisfy the goal of maintaining the five scales originally developed for this study as four factors were produced that explained 67.0 percent of the variance. In effect, removing items J3, S9, and S11, reduced the five scales that were

Table 3.3. Communality estimates, eigenvalues, and percentage of variance by factor for the scales developed to measure and test the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs (except items J3, S9, and S11), without iteration - initial statistics.

Item ¹	Communality	Factor	Eigenvalue	Pct. Var.	Cum. Pct.
B1.	.66327	1	3.02989	25.2	25.2
B2.	.66688	2	2.02639	16.9	42.1
C6.	.55992	3	1.66314	13.9	56.0
С7.	.47265	4	1.32140	11.0	67.0
S10.	.72466	5	.95326	7.9	75.0
S12.	.49566	6	.87862	7.3	82.3
J4.	.66053	7	.65938	5.5	87.8
S13.	.73899	8	.63306	5.3	93.0
C8.	.40213	9	.30966	2.6	95.6
L14.	.48268	10	.25496	2.1	97.7
L15.	.38003	11	.16844	1.4	99.2
J5.	.61934	12	.10179	. 8	100.0

Notes;

Items with "J" are from the initial Job Transition Scale. Items with "L" are from the initial Lifestyle Choice Scale. Items with "B" are from the initial Bona Fide Career Scale. Items with "S" are from the initial Supplemental Employment Scale. Items with "C" are from the initial Convenient Employment Scale. (the initial scales are presented in Table 3.1.

developed to measure and test the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs to four scales as a result of the pretest. The four factors (or scales) that were produced after 7 iterations are shown in Table 3.4. The four scales had average standardized alpha coefficients of .61 with the average standard error of measurement being 1.95.

Factor 1 is a combination of three items which were initially in the Job Transition Scale and the Lifestyle Choice Scale. The combination of the three items on Factor 1 created a new scale which was named the Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale. The resulting three item scale consists of the following two items from the initial Job Transition Scale: a) Item J4 - "I am getting experience in this job in order to start a business of my own someday," and b) Item J5 - "I decided to work here until I find a more interesting job." Item L15, from the initial Lifestyle Choice Scale is also included in the scale - "I am working here in order to live in this part of Michigan." The Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale had an acceptable standardized alpha of .68 with a standard error of measurement of 2.4. The scale suggests people may work in tourism based service jobs to maintain their lifestyle in a preferred geographic location even though they might prefer to be employed in another line of work.

Final four factors produced by the varimax rotation of items from the five scales developed to measure and test the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs (except J3, S9 and S11) after rotation with Kaiser Normalization. Table 3.4.

Item Factor Loadings	r to start a	ssort/tourism .85371 .66729	kind of work97953 ne57720	ny very first job63717 work61983
Items/Factors	<pre>Factor 1 J4. I am getting experience in this job in ordel business of my own someday. J5. I decided to work here until I find a more L15. I am working here in order to live in this Factor 2</pre>	B1. I want a career for myself working in the r business B2. I really enjoy doing this kind of work.	S13. I just wanted to try my hand at a different S10. I need something to do to occupy my free ti	<u>factor 4</u> C6. This resort was willing to provide me with C7. This resort is a convenient place for me to

The two items from the initial Bona Fide Career Scale loaded high on Factor 2. The scale had an acceptable standardized alpha of .66 with a standard error of measurement of 1.4. The two scale items are: a) Item B1 -"I want a career for myself working in the resort/tourism business," and b) Item B2 - "I really enjoy doing this kind of work." As originally intended, this scale suggests that people may have a bona fide career interest in tourism based service jobs.

Two items from the initial Supplemental Employment Scale loaded high on Factor 3. The standardized alpha for the revised Supplemental Employment was acceptable at .64 with the standard error of measurement equal to 2.2. The modified Supplemental Employment Scale consists of the following two items: a) Item S10 - "I need something to do to occupy my free time," and b) Item S13 - "I just wanted to try a different line of work." The scale indicates that some people may work in tourism based service jobs to supplement their free time or primary job with one that they may find to be of interest.

Two of the four items from the initial Convenient Source of Employment Scale loaded high on Factor 4. Although the standardized alpha for the modified two-item Convenient Source of Employment Scale was unacceptable at .47, with a standard error of measurement of 1.9, it was hoped that writing more items would increase the reliability when the scales were re-administered to a much larger sample size. The revised Convenient Source of Employment Scale consists of the following items: a) Item 6 - "This resort was willing to provide me with my very first job," and b) Item 7 - "This resort is a convenient place to work." As initially intended, this scale suggests people work in tourism based service jobs because they are a convenient way to get a first job and earn some income.

To increase the variance and therefore reliability of the four scales, items were written a priori so that each scale would consist of six items. The items belonging to each of the four scales that were revised to measure and test the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs are presented in Table 3.5. The scale items were listed at random (using a random numbers table) in Section V of the survey booklet before being re-administered at Resorts A, B, and C.

The Service Job Satisfaction Scale, contained in Section VI of the pretest booklet, was also modified slightly. Item 1 - "Opportunity to work in my special field of interest," was eliminated from the scale as it was felt to be similar to items that were in the Bona Fide Career Scale which may have contaminated the correlation between the two variables when testing the study hypotheses. A new item was substituted which stated "Chance to demonstrate my true talents and abilities." Item 2 was reworded to read

le	e
peor	
sons	a Tu
rea	res
onal	ୟ ଅ ଅ
pers	SQO
of.	ຍິ
:ypes	servi
our 1	sed a
he f	e Q M
ngt	uris
suri	LO LO
mea	r bui
3 for	VOLKI
cale	LOL
ed s	ave st.
evis	ay n rete
K	E Q
5.	
e 3.	
[ab]	

Bona Fide Career Scale

- B1. I want a career for myself in the resort/tourism business.¹
- B2. I really enjoy this kind of work.¹
- B3. I have no desire to work in any other type of business than resorts.
- B4. I have always been interested in doing this kind of work.
- B5. It is hard for me to imagine working in any other type of job.
- B6. I enjoy working with the public.

Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale

- T7. I am getting experience in order to start a business of my own someday.¹
- T8. I am working here until I can find a job I would like much better.¹
- T9. I am working here in order to live in this part of Michigan.¹
- I like being able to take advantage of recreational opportunities the resort has to offer when I get off of work. **T10.**
- I could not get the job I wanted with a different employer. T11.
- I would rather work here than have to move away from family and friends in T12.
- search of a job in another part of the state/country.

Supplemental Employment Scale

- S13. I need something to do to occupy my free time.¹
- I wanted to try my hand at a different line of work.¹ S14.

Table 3.5 (cont'd).

- S15. I needed an extra source of income to meet living expenses for myself (or family).
- I needed a way to save money for the future. S16.
- S17. The money I earn allows me to pursue my personal interests/hobbies.
- S18. I have unexpected expenses that require me to earn additional income.

Convenient Source of Employment Scale

- C19. This place was willing to provide me with my first job.¹
- C20. This resort is a convenient place for me to work.
- C21. Working at this resort is better than having no job at all.
- I knew people who worked here and they told me I should apply for a job. C22.
- C23. I heard this resort was a good place to work, so I applied for a job.
- C24. This place is located close to where I live, so why not work here?

Notes; 1 - Items from the initial scales that were developed for this study.
"Chance to live comfortably in this part of Michigan," whereas it once stated "Opportunity to live in this part of Michigan." The open-ended item in Section VI was also removed in order to have all forced response items in the scale.

Section II of the Employee Performance Appraisal was modified slightly after the pretest to change those items from a four-item to a five-item Likert scale. This was done to allow supervisors to capture the potential range of employee job performance and account for more of the variance in the sample thereby increasing the reliability of the overall scale.

It was decided to delete the three-item Feedback from Agents Scale from Section II and III from the survey booklet. Even thought the three-item scale is customarily part of Section I and II of the JDS, it is not used in the calculation of the MPS and therefore irrelevant to this study.

The three-item Dealing with Others Scale was not deleted from Section II and III of the survey booklet even though it too is not used in the calculation of the MPS. The Dealing with Others Scale was instead modified into a Dealing with Customers Scale prior to re-administering the survey booklet to Resorts A, B, and C. The purpose of the Dealing with Customers Scale was to measure the level of direct customer contact that is required by those who work

in tourism based service jobs. In order to develop a Dealing with Customers Scale, the three items from the Dealing with Others Scale were modified to give them new meaning. Item 1, in Section II of the pretest survey booklet (see Appendix A), was modified to read: "To what extent does your job require you to <u>work closely with the</u> <u>other customers</u> of the resort." The following items from Section III of the pretest survey booklet (see Appendix A) were also modified to read: Item 2 - "The job requires a lot of direct contact with the customers," and Item 6 - "The job can be done properly without having to talk or deal directly with customers."

Developing the new Dealing with Customers Scale made perfect sense as tourism based service jobs require varying degrees of customer contact. More importantly, this was seen as an opportunity to determine whether the job requirement of dealing with customers could predict organizational commitment as the potential relationship between these two variables has not been previously investigated. In order to examine the potential relationship between the job requirement of dealing with customers and organizational commitment a ninth hypothesis was established.

Hypothesis 9 is that:

a. Dealing with customers is a significant predictor of organizational commitment.

b. Knowing the type of personal reason an individual has for working in a tourism based service job will increase the predictability of organizational commitment, when the dealing with customers variable is controlled. _____

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The data obtained for only the full-time permanent employees from Resort D were combined with those from Resorts A, B, and C to boost the sample to over 300 cases. The data were combined because "the statistics calculated from large samples are more accurate...and give the principle of randomization, or simply randomness, a chance to 'work,' to speak anthramorphically (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 119). The data obtained from the following scales for Resort D were not used as they were reworked after conducting the pretest: the scales for measuring types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs, the Service Job Satisfaction Scale, and Dealing with Customers Scale.

General Survey Results

Three hundred of the 307 completed booklets received from the 590 eligible nonsupervisory employees were found to be useable. This translates into a 50.9 percent response rate for this study. Of these 300 useable survey booklets,

36.7 percent were received from Resort A, 34.0 percent were received from Resort B, 23.0 percent from Resort C, and 6.3 percent from Resort D. By department where respondents are employed, 51.0 percent of the useable booklets were obtained from employees in the property maintenance department, 21.3 percent from food and beverage department employees, 19.0 percent from general service-sales-safety department employees, and 8.7 percent from employees in the administrative department. A breakdown of jobs in the four departments across the resorts is found in Appendix F.

No supervisors declined to complete performance appraisals or turnover questionnaires for employees who participated in the survey, thus no useable survey booklets received from employees had to be eliminated from the database because of required supervisory inputs. One performance appraisal, however, was not useable.

The descriptive statistics and standardized alpha for all of the scales (except the Attitude Toward Job Scale which is based on the Guttman split-half reliability) on the basis of the study sample are presented in Table 4.1. The standard error of measurement (SEM) is provided to show the effect that the standardized alpha has on the accuracy of the scores produced by the scales. Also recall that scales with a standardized alpha of .60 or greater were considered as being acceptable for this study. The mean score,

Scale	∳ Items	N	Mean	SD	std. Alpha	SEM	
Attitude Toward Job	45	300	73.5	37.1	.79 ¹	17.0	1
MPS (Job Design)	ł	298	132.3	73.1	NA	NA	
Autonomy	e	300	4.9	1.3	.71	0.7	
Feedback from Job	e	299	5.0	1.3	.72	0.7	
Skill Variety	e	300	4.2	1.5	.71	0.8	
Task Identity	e	299	5.3	1.3	. 68	0.8	
Task Significance	e	298	5.6	1.2	. 65	0.7	
Dealing with Customers	e	284	4.9	1.9	. 85	0.7	
OCQ (Org. Commitment)	15	297	73.6	16.4	.91	3.7	
Bona Fide Career	9	282	25.3	7.1	.74	3.6	
Job Trans. & Lifestyle Choice	9	282	1		.03	 	
Conv. Source of Employment	9	282	8	8	.47	 	
Supplemental Employment	9	282		8 8 8	.50	1	
Service Job Satisfaction	9	276	5.2	1.2	NA	1	
Performance Appraisal	20	299	51.2	7.6	.92	2.2	
ETQ (Functional Turnover)	e	47	9.1	2.9	. 88	1.0	

Notes; ¹ - Guttman split-half reliability coefficient

standard deviation, and SEM were not calculated for the Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, Convenient Source of Employment Scale, and Supplemental Employment Scale due to their low standardized alpha.

The established and modified scales had the highest standardized alpha, much as they did in the pretest. For example, the standardized alpha for the established scales was: .91 for the OCQ, .88 for the ETQ, and above the acceptable level of .60 for the five job core dimension scales (which are used to calculate the MPS). The standardized alpha for the modified Dealing with Customers Scale was .85. The Guttman split-half reliability for the Attitude Toward Job Scale was acceptable at .79.

All of the scales developed exclusively for this study did not have acceptable standardized alpha coefficients. Although the standardized alpha for the Employee Performance Appraisal was acceptable at .92, three of the four revised scales that were used to measure and test four types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs were unacceptable. The standardized alpha for the Bona Fide Career Scale was acceptable at .74. However, the standardized alpha for the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, Convenient Source of Employment Scale, and Supplemental Employment Scale were all below the acceptable level of .60.

Dillman's (1986) suggested strategy of placing personal (biodata) items at the end of the survey booklet, coupled with offering respondents nominal cash incentives, proved to be effective. There were high response rates for all of the biodata items on the survey booklet.

The mean age of the sample was 33.43, with a standard deviation of 12.75 and a range of 14 to 79 years. The mean age of 33.43 suggests the sample is comprised of middle-aged workers. However, the age distribution of the sample presented in Figure 2 reveals that 64.0 percent of those who participated in the survey were 35 years and younger.



Figure 2. Age distribution of the study sample.

Only two employees did not complete the item asking them for their gender. The 298 employees who reported their gender are equally split between 149 males and females.

The mean level of education completed by the sample was 12.76, with a standard deviation of 2.6. The range was from 6th grade up to one Ph.D. The distribution of education level for the sample is presented in Figure 3. The distribution is negatively skewed with 54.6 percent of the sample having obtained a high school degree or less.



Figure 3. Distribution of highest level of education completed by the sample.

The mean tenure (length of service) was 4.30 years, with a standard deviation of 4.88. The range was from .1 years to 32 years. The distribution of employee tenure is presented in Figure 4. Although the mean was 4.3 years, there were 74.7 percent employees with five years of service or less.





The responses to the item asking for marital status were recoded to reflect that employees were either married or single. There were 157 single and 141 married employees in the sample.

The number of dependents for employees is presented in Figure 5. Almost 52.0 percent of the sample reported having no dependents. Another 31.0 percent have between one and two dependents with the remaining 17.0 percent having greater than two dependents living at home.





The voluntary turnover of employees was lower than expected in this study. Only 47 (15.9%) employees voluntarily left their jobs over a one year period. The percentage of total turnover attributed to each department is presented in Figure 6. Almost half (46.8%) of the 47 employees who left their jobs were from the property maintenance department while only one (2.1%) employee left the administrative department. The job titles of those who left the resorts, by department, is found in Appendix G.



Figure 6. Percentage of total turnover attributed to each department. (N=47)

Only 46 employees (15.34%) reported having second jobs such as factory worker, beauty consultant, professor, and farmer. Of the 46 employees who held second jobs, 11 (24%) indicated their second job was full-time, 33 (71.7%) indicated it was part-time, and two (4.3%) employees did not report their employment status. A complete listing of second jobs worked by employees is found in Appendix H.

The standardized alpha for the revised Bona Fide Career Scale (even though it had an alpha of .74), Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, Supplemental Employment Scale, and Convenient Source of Employment Scale had to be increased to .60 or greater before their scores could be accurate enough to be tested against the study hypotheses. Hunter's (1993) procedure was used to increase the alpha of these scales.

Prior to performing the procedure, a pairwise correlation matrix was produced for each of the four scales using their own items along with those from the other scales. Each scale was then examined internally for items that were significantly inter-correlated. The intercorrelated items for each scale were then subjected to reliability testing to determine if the standardized alpha had been increased to .60 or greater. Each scale was next examined to find items from other scales across the matrix that were both significantly correlated and qualitatively similar to items of its own. When it was judged that an item(s) could be borrowed from one scale and added to a different one, the reliability of the scale(s) with the new item(s) was then checked to see of its standardized alpha was boosted to .60 or greater.

Upon completing Hunter's (1993) two-step procedure only the revised Bona Fide Career Scale remained intact with all of its six original items. Two new scales, however, were created out of the revised Convenient Source of Employment Scale - a Personal Awareness Scale and Proximity to Job Scale. No items were traded between scales in the effort to increase the standardized alpha for any one scale (as recommended in the second step of the procedure) even though they may have been correlated. By and large, items were not traded between scales to boost alpha because none were judged to be qualitatively similar to any other scale but their own. The results of the procedure will be discussed in more detail below.

The pairwise correlation matrix for the revised Bona Fide Career Scale is presented in Table 4.2. The intercorrelation of scale items B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, and B6, produced the highest standardized alpha of .74. Item T8, from the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, was qualitatively similar and had a significant negative correlation with all of the Bona Fide Career Scale items. However, once item T8 was recoded (to establish a significant positive correlation with the scale items) and

Table 4.2. Pairwise correlation matrix of Bona Fide Career Scale items with those from the following scales: Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, Supplemental Employment Scale, and Convenient Source of Employment Scale. (N=282)

		Bon	<u>a Fide Car</u>	eer Scale	Items	
All Items ¹	B1.	B2.	ВЗ.	B4.	B5.	B6.
B1.	1.00					
B2.	.23**	1.00				
B3.	.33**	.28**	1.00			
B4.	.38**	.57**	.37**	1.00		
B5.	.30**	.39**	.57**	.46**	1.00	
B6.	.15*	.33**	.13	.22**	.13	1.00
Т7.	•23**	.05	.01	.12	.01	05
T8. -	•.16*	40**	38**	30**	38**	15*
Т9.	.24**	.07	.11	.10	.09	01
T10.	.17*	.20**	.19**	.20**	.20**	.19**
T11	•.04	23**	02	12	07	15*
T12.	.11	.08	.24**	.02	.19**	.11
S13.	.07	.05	.25**	.10	•25**	.01
S14.	.11	.05	.07	02	08	.10
S15	•.08	.03	03	11	21**	.08
S16.	.16*	.14*	.12	.08	.14	.01
S17.	.12	.19**	.20**	.20**	.26**	.11
S18	.08	02	.06	04	09	01
C19	•.07	08	.08	.02	01	06
C20.	.04	.34**	.18*	.21**	.21**	.22**
C21	.11	17*	22**	17*	22**	01
C22	.01	.06	.17*	04	.14*	.11
C23.	.17*	.17*	.21**	.14	.17*	.26**
C24.	.02	.08	.13	.06	.14*	.12

¹ - Items with "B" are from the revised Bona Fide Career Scale. Items with "L" are from the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale. Items with "S" are from the revised Supplemental Employment Scale. Items with "C" are from the revised Convenient Employment Scale. (see Table 3.5).

1-tailed significance: * - p<.01, ** - p<.001

added to the Bona Fide Career Scale, the standardized alpha coefficient was only raised by .02. As a result, the sixitem Bona Fide Career Scale was left intact after the two step procedure and used to test the study hypotheses.

The standardized alpha of .03 for the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale was not increased using Hunter's procedure. As seen in Table 4.3, items T7, T8, T9, and T11 were inter-correlated but they only produced a standardized alpha of .28. It should be noted that the standardized alpha of the scale was increased to .34 by removing item T9. However, the scale was not given further consideration for use in testing the study hypotheses because it had a standardized alpha that was below .60.

As can be observed in Table 4.4, items S15, S16, and S18, on the revised Supplemental Employment Scale, were significantly inter-correlated. The standardized alpha produced by these three items was .58, as compared to .50 using all six items. Because the revised Supplemental Employment Scale did not have a standardized alpha above .60, it was abandoned because it's score would have been too unreliable to test against the study hypotheses.

The standardized alpha of .47 for the revised Convenient Source of Employment Scale was not increased to .60 or greater using Hunter's two-step procedure. As can be seen in Table 4.5, items C20, C23, and C24 were significantly inter-correlated. The standardized alpha

Table 4.3.Pairwise correlation matrix of Job Transition
and Lifestyle Choice Scale items with those
from the following scales: Supplemental
Employment Scale, Convenient Source of
Employment Scale, and Bona Fide Career Scale.
(N=282)

	<u>Job Trar</u>	nsition and	Lifestyle	<u>Choice It</u>	ems
All Items ¹ T7.	T8.	Τ9.	T10.	T11.	T12.
T7. 1.00					
T815*	1.00				
T909	05	1.00			
T1011	16*	.01	1.00		
T1106	.23**	.03	05	1.00	
T1221**	21**	.15*	.02	11	1.00
S1307	01	.04	.13	.15*	.03
S1415*	.01	.19**	.01	.11	.08
S1502	.11	.07	.11	.04	01
S1620**	04	.12	.18*	.13	.09
S1708	19**	.03	.22**	.06	.16*
S1809	.11	.10	.03	.16*	.01
C1911	.12	01	06	03	01
C2004	24**	.14*	.20**	14*	.26**
C2105	•27**	.06	03	.04	.03
C2203	09	05	.20**	.08	.10
C2304	26**	.16*	.20**	.04	.17*
C2404	03	.14*	.18**	01	.21**
B123**	16*	.24**	.17*	04	.11
B205	40**	.07	.20**	23**	.08
B301	38**	.11	.19**	02	.24**
B412	29**	.10	.20**	12	.02
B501	38**	.09	.20**	07	.19**
B605	15*	01	.19**	15*	.11

¹ - Items with "B" are from the revised Bona Fide Career Scale. Items with "L" are from the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale. Items with "S" are from the revised Supplemental Employment Scale. Items with "C" are from the revised Convenient Employment Scale. (see Table 3.5).

1-tailed significance: * - p<.01, ** - p<.001

Table 4.4. Pairwise correlation matrix of Supplemental Employment Scale items with those from the following scales: Convenient Source of Employment Scale, Bona Fide Career Scale, and Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale. (N=282)

		Suppleme	ental Emplo	oyment Scal	e Items	
All Item	s ¹ S13.	S14.	S15.	S16.	S17.	S18.
813.	1.00					
814.	.13	1.00				
815.	.01	.09	1.00			
816.	.14*	.18**	.23**	1.00		
817.	.21**	.10	09	.25**	1.00	
818.	.06	.17*	.39**	.34**	07	1.00
C19.	02	02	06	.04	.08	01
C20.	.14*	.12	01	.14*	.16*	.03
C21.	02	.01	.11	.06	09	.06
C22.	.13	.11	.14	.32**	.19**	.17*
C23.	.05	.24**	04	.29**	.28**	.14
C24.	.25**	.17*	.12	.17*	.12	.21**
B1.	.07	.11	08	.16*	.12	08
B2.	.05	.05	.03	.14*	.19**	02
B3.	.25**	.07	03	.12	.20**	.06
B4.	.10	02	11	.08	.20**	04
B5.	•25**	08	21**	.14	.26**	09
B6.	.01	.10	.08	.01	.11	01
Т7.	.07	.15*	02	.20**	.08	.09
Т8.	01	.01	.11	04	19**	.11
Т9.	.04	.19**	.07	.12	.03	.10
T10.	.13	.01	.11	.18*	.22**	.03
T11.	.15*	.11	.04	.13	.06	.16*
T12.	.03	.08	01	.09	.16*	.01

¹ - Items with "B" are from the revised Bona Fide Career Scale. Items with "L" are from the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale. Items with "S" are from the revised Supplemental Employment Scale. Items with "C" are from the revised Convenient Employment Scale. (see Table 3.5).

1-tailed significance: * - p<.01, ** - p<.001

Table 4.5. Pairwise correlation matrix of Convenient Source of Employment Scale items with those from the following scales: Bona Fide Career Scale, Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale, and Supplemental Employment Scale. (N=282)

		<u>Convenie</u>	ent Source	of Employm	ent Scale	Items
All Item	s ¹ C19.	C20.	C21.	C22.	C23.	C24.
C19.	1.00					
C20.	.03	1.00				
C21.	.09	03	1.00			
C22.	.01	.04	.05	1.00		
C23.	.05	.16*	.05	.54**	1.00	
C24.	.07	.56**	.13	.04	.13	1.00
B1.	07	.04	11	01	.17*	.02
B2.	08	.34**	17*	.06	.17*	.08
B3.	.08	.18*	22**	.17*	.21**	.13
B4.	.02	.21**	17*	04	.14	.06
B5.	01	.21**	22**	.14*	.17*	.14*
B6.	06	.22**	01	.11	.26**	.13
Т7.	.11	04	.05	03	04	.04
Т8.	.12	24**	•27**	09	26**	03
Т9.	01	.14*	.06	05	.16*	.14*
T10.	06	•20**	03	.20**	.20**	.18**
T11.	03	14*	.04	.08	.04	01
T12.	01	.26**	.03	.10	.17*	.21**
S13.	02	.14*	02	.13	.05	.25**
S14.	02	.12	.01	.11	.24**	.16*
S15.	06	01	.11	.14	04	.12
S16.	.04	.14*	.06	.32**	.29**	.17*
S17.	.08	.16*	09	.19**	.28**	.12
S18.	01	.03	.06	.17*	.14	.21**

 Items with "B" are from the revised Bona Fide Career Scale. Items with "L" are from the revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale. Items with "S" are from the revised Supplemental Employment Scale. Items with "C" are from the revised Convenient Employment Scale. (see Table 3.5).

1-tailed significance: * - p<.01, ** - p<.001

produced by these three items was .54, which was unacceptable for use in this study. However, the revised Convenient Source of Employment Scale was not abandoned entirely because four of its scale items were used to create two new, two-item scales. The two scales were judged to measure new concepts, or types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs.

As can be observed in Table 4.5, the first of the two new scales created from the Convenient Source of Employment Scale is based on the significant correlation of .56 (p <.001) between item C20 ("This resort is a convenient place for me to work.") and item C24 ("This place is located close to where I live, so why not work here?"). The scale may indicate that some employees work in tourism based service jobs due to their geographic proximity or closeness to the resort. This new scale was named the Proximity to Job Scale and had an acceptable standardized alpha of .72 yielding a SEM of 1.78.

The second scale created from the Convenient Source of Employment Scale was based on the significant correlation of .54 (p <.001) between item C22 ("I knew people who worked here and they told me I should apply for a job,") and item C23 ("I heard this resort was a good place to work, so I applied for a job."). The scale suggests that people may work in tourism based service jobs depending upon their prior personal awareness of the reputation of the

organization in terms of being a "good" place to work. The new scale was named the Personal Awareness Scale and had a standardized alpha of .70 and SEM of 2.15.

Results of Hypotheses Testing

The correlation between the antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment established in previous studies using the OCQ (as summarized by Morrow, 1993) compared to those observed in this study are presented in Table 4.6 (Note; each correlation in the "Previous Studies" column represents a separate study). Overall, the correlations observed in this study were within the parameters that have been established by previous studies using the OCQ to measure organizational commitment. It should also be noted that the correlation between the OCQ and ETQ (used to measure functional turnover) would have been negative in this study had the items on the ETQ been reverse coded.

Result of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 initially predicted that there would be five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs, those being: 1) pursue a bona fide career, 2) supplement income or free time, 3) enjoy a lifestyle directly or indirectly provided by tourism based

Table 4.6. Comparison of correlations between antecedents and outcomes in previous studies that have used the OCQ to measure organizational commitment with those observed in this study.

Biodata/Scales	N	Correlations from Previous Studies ¹	Correlations Observed in Study ²
Bona Fide Career	279	Not available	.57**
Personal Awareness	279	Not available	.29**
Proximity to Job	279	Not available	.18*
Attitude Toward Job	297	Not available	.40**
MPS (Job Design)	296	.49	.47**
Job Satisfaction	279	ns; .73	.60*
Age	291	31; ns; .46	.22**
Tenure	290	17; ns; .35	.01
Education	295	19; ns; .16	05
Dependents	284	35; ns; .05	.03
Gender ³	295	27; ns; .18	.13
Marital Status ⁴	295	ns; .14	.16*
Job Performance	296	27; ns; .13	.28**
ETQ ⁵	47	16;28	· 22 ⁶
Deal with Customers	281	Not available	.16*

1	-	All correlations are significant at an unknown	
		probability level, except ns = not significant. Also,	,
		each correlation coefficient or "ns" represents a	
		separate study as summarized by Morrow (1993).	
2	-	All observed correlations are uncorrected.	
3	-	Male coded as 1, female coded as 2.	

- 4 Single coded as 1, married coded as 2.
- ⁵ Used to measure functional turnover.
- The correlation would have been negative had the ETQ scale items been recoded.
- * p <.01.
- ** p <.001.

service jobs, 4) make a transition from one occupation into another, or 5) secure a convenient source of employment or entry into the job market. A scale was developed to measure and test each of these five hypothesized types of personal reasons. Hypothesis 1 was rejected because the bona fide career reason for working in tourism based service jobs was the only reason (of the five) that was reliably measured by its scale known as the Bona Fide Career Scale.

Two new reliable scales did emerge as a result of testing hypothesis 1, a Personal Awareness Scale and Proximity to Job Scale. The Personal Awareness Scale suggests that people may work in tourism based service jobs because they had personal prior awareness of the organization as a good place to work. The Proximity to Job Scale suggests that people may work in tourism based service jobs due to their geographic proximity or closeness to the employer.

Finding only three types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs also had a direct effect on the manner in which hypotheses 2 through 7, and 9 were tested. In effect, these hypotheses were tested using the scores from the Bona Fide Career Scale, Personal Awareness Scale, and the Proximity to Job Scale.

Results of Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9

The results from testing Hypothesis 2 through 5, and 9 will be discussed in this section as they all pertain to antecedents of organizational commitment. The hypotheses which deal with the predicted outcomes (e.g., job performance, functional turnover) of organizational commitment are discussed in the following section.

A pairwise correlation matrix of the antecedent variables (from each hypothesis) was constructed to check for multicollinearity problems prior to testing these hypotheses. The matrix is presented in Table 4.7. No two variables had a correlation above the predetermined cutoff of .60 meaning multicollinearity should not necessarily be a problem when these variables are regressed on the outcome variable, organizational commitment.

The F value, adjusted R^2 , and change in R^2 resulting from each forced regression analysis performed to test hypotheses 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 are presented in Table 4.8. The results of the forced regression analyses reveal partial support for hypotheses 2 through 5 and full support for hypothesis 9. By and large, hypotheses 2 through 5 were partially supported because the proximity to job score increased the amount of explained variance in the OCQ score only when added to two antecedent variables, education

												1
Vari	lables	1	2	m	4	ß	9	7	8	6	10	1
1. 2. 5. 5. 6. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	Career Awareness Proximity Att. Job Job Sat. MPS Age Educ. Tenure Marital Gender				03 03 03 03		 	11 42** 03	0 0	18 05	12.	1
Note 1-te	ss; iiled Signi	lficance	1 •	p<.01,	Ω, #	<.001						T

Pairwise correlation matrix of antecedent variables to organizational commitment (N=265). Table 4.7.

147

Table 4.8.	F-test, adjusted R^2 , and change in R^2 , resulting from forced regression analysis of antecedent variables on organizational commitment
	commitment.

.'

	Hypotheses	F	Sig.F	Adj. R ²	$\frac{Chg}{R^2}$	
2.	Attitude Toward Job (AT	J) 50.99	.0000	.15		
	ATJ + BFC ¹	78.64	.0000	.36	.21*	
	ATJ + PA ²	33.39	.0000	.19	.04*	
	ATJ + PJ ³	26.97	.0000	.16	.01	
3.	MPS (Job Design)	75.73	.0000	.21		
	MPS + BFC	90.77	.0000	.39	.18*	
	MPS + PA	53.50	.0000	.27	.06*	
	MPS + PJ	42.54	.0000	.23	.02	
4.	Job Satisfaction (JS)	155.99	.0000	.36		
	JS + BFC	125.87	.0000	.48	.12*	
	JS + PA	86.74	.0000	.39	.03*	
	JS + PJ	78.26	.0000	.36	.00	
5.	Age	12.59	.0005	.04		
	Age + BFC	67.01	.0000	.33	.29*	
	Age + PA	19.28	.0000	.12	.08*	
	Age + PJ	9.22	.0001	.06	.02	
	Tenure	.03	.8519	004		
	Tenure + BFC	65.91	.0000	.32	.32*	
	Tenure + PA	12.31	.0000	.08	• 08*	
	Tenure + PJ	4.03	.0188	.02	.02	
	Education	1.25	.2645	.001		
	Education + BFC	66.69	.0000	.32	.32*	
	Education + PA	13.05	.0000	.08	• 08*	
	Education + PJ	4.57	.0112	.03	.03*	
	Dependents	.36	.5502	002		
	Dependents + BFC	64.15	.0000	.32	.32*	
	Dependents + PA	14.26	.0000	.09	.09*	
	Dependents + PJ	4.36	.0137	.02	.02	
	Gender	4.34	.0381	.01		
	Gender + BFC	70.60	.0000	.34	.33*	
	Gender + PA	14.03	.0000	.09	.09*	
	Gender + PJ	5.35	.0053	.03	.02	
	Marital Status	7.25	.0075	.02		

Tab	le 4.8 (cont'd.).				
	Marital Status + BFC	70.76	.0000	.34	.32*
	Marital Status + PA	16.65	.0000	.10	.08*
	Marital Status + PJ	7.04	.0010	.04	.02
9.	Dealing w/Customers (DC)	7.99	.0050	.02	
	DC + BFC	70.53	.0000	.33	.31*
	DC + PA	16.27	.0000	.10	.10*
	DC + PJ	8.70	.0002	.05	.03*

Notes; ¹ Bona fide career ² Personal awareness ³ Proximity to job

* 1-tailed sig.: F $_{\text{observed}} > F_{\text{critical (01.1, 200)}} = 6.76$

(which was not found to be a significant predictor of the OCQ score by itself) and dealing with customers.

As stated in hypothesis 2, attitude toward job was a significant predictor of organizational commitment as the attitude toward job score explained 15 percent of the variance of the OCQ score (F = 50.99, p<.001). As stated in hypothesis 3, job design was found to predict organizational commitment as the MPS (which was used to infer job design) explained fully 21 percent of the variance (F = 75.73, p<.001). Service job satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment (as stated in hypothesis 4) because the service job satisfaction score explained fully 36 percent of the variance of the OCQ score (F = 155.99, p<.001). These three hypotheses were partially supported because only the independent addition of the bona fide career score and personal awareness score (to the relevant antecedent variable in each hypothesis) significantly increased the amount of explained variance in the OCQ score an average of .17 and .04, respectively.

Hypothesis 5 was partially supported because age, gender, and marital status were the only biodata variables found to be significant predictors of organizational commitment. Age (measured in years) explained four percent of the variance (F = 12.59, p<.001) in the OCQ score. Marital status (with single coded as 1, and married coded as 2) was also a significant predictor of the OCQ score explaining two percent of the variance (F = 7.25, p<.05). Adding only the bona fide career score and personal awareness score independently to each of these three biodata variables increased the amount of explained variance in the OCQ an average of .31 and .08, respectively.

Hypothesis 9, which stated that customer contact would be a significant predictor of organizational commitment, was fully supported as the dealing with customers score explained two percent of the variance in the OCQ score (F = 7.99, p<.05). The independent addition of the bona fide career score, personal awareness score, and proximity to job score to the dealing with customers score significantly increased the amount of explained variance in the OCQ score by .31, .10, and .03, respectively.

Results of Hypotheses 6, 7, and 8

Potential multicollinearity problems were also tested for by examining a pairwise correlation matrix of the antecedent variables (e.g., commitment) to job performance and functional turnover. The matrix is presented in Table 4.9. No correlations were found which exceeded the predetermined cutoff of .60 which may have led to multicollinearity problems in the regression analysis used to test hypothesis 6 and 7.

The F value, adjusted R^2 , and change in R^2 resulting from each regression analysis for hypothesis 6 and 7 are presented in Table 4.10. There is no apparent change in the adjusted R^2 for hypothesis 6 due to rounding the statistic to two decimals.

As stated in hypothesis 6, organizational commitment was a significant predictor of job performance as the job performance score explained seven percent of the variance of the OCQ score (F = 23.12, p<.001). This hypothesis was only partially supported as the independent addition of the bona fide career score, personal awareness score, or proximity to job score to the OCQ score did not increase the amount of explained variance in the job performance score.

Hypothesis 7, which stated that organizational commitment would predict functional turnover, was rejected because the OCQ score was not a significant predictor of the

Table 4.9.Pairwise correlation matrix of antecedent
variables to the outcome variables of job
performance and functional turnover. (N=279)

Variables		1	2	3	4
1.	Org. Comm. (OCQ)	1.00	<u></u>	······································	
2.	Career	• 58**	1.00		
3.	Aware Job	.29**	.21**	1.00	
4.	Proximity Job	.18*	.24**	.11	1.00

1-tailed Significance: * - p<.01, ** - p<.001

Table 4.10. F-test, adjusted R^2 , and change in R^2 , resulting from forced regression analysis of organizational commitment (OCQ) on job performance (JP) and functional turnover (ETQ).

	Hypotheses	F	Sig.F	Adj. R ²	Chg. R ²
6.	OCQ + Job Perf.(JP)	23.12	.0000	.07	
	$OCQ + JP + BFC^1$	11.84	.0000	.07	
	$OCQ + JP + PA^2$	11.74	.0000	.07	
	$OCQ + JP + PJ^3$	11.69	.0000	.07	
7.	$OCQ + ETQ^4$	2.40	.1289	.03	
	OCQ + ETQ+ BFC	2.07	.1395	.05	.02
	OCQ + ETQ + PA	2.85	.0694	.08	.03
	OCQ + ETQ + PJ	1.20	.3108	.01	02

Notes;

- ¹ Bona fide career
- ² Personal awareness
- ³ Proximity to job
- 4 Used to measure functional turnover

ETQ score (which was used to measure functional turnover in this study). Adding the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs to the OCQ score did not increase the amount of explained variance in the ETQ score.

Finally, hypothesis 8 was fully supported as those who remained with the resorts (stayers) were more committed to the organization than those who voluntarily left them (leavers) over a one year period. The mean OCQ score of 75 for stayers was significantly greater than the mean OCQ score of 68 for leavers based on the results of a one-tail t-test of significance where independent $t_{observed} = (2.97)$ did exceed t emical (05/1, 120) = 1.66.

Discussion

In this study the possibility of there being five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs and that these types of personal reasons effect various antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment was examined. A discussion of the results from testing the study hypotheses follows.

<u>Hypothesis 1</u>

The first hypothesis states that there are five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs, these are: pursue a bona fide career, supplement income or free time, enjoy a lifestyle directly or indirectly provided by tourism based service jobs, make a transition from one occupation into another, or secure a convenient source of employment/entry into the job market. Five scales were initially developed to measure and test each of these five reasons: a Bona Fide Career Scale, Convenient Source of Employment Scale, Supplemental Employment Scale, and Job Transition Scale. As a result of the pretest, the initial five scales were reduced to four scales as the Job Transition Scale and Lifestyle Choice Scale were combined to form a revised Job Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale.

When a two-step procedure for establishing the reliability of the four revised scales was completed, only the Bona Fide Career Scale was found to be reliable for measuring and testing the hypothesized bona fide career type of personal reason people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. However, two additional types of personal reasons for working in tourism based service jobs emerged as a result of performing the two-step procedure to increase the standardized alpha of the revised Convenient

Source of Employment Scale. These are: 1) an individual's personal prior awareness that a particular tourism based service organization is a good place to work (as measured by the Personal Awareness Scale), and 2) the geographic proximity one has to available tourism based service employers (as measured by the Proximity to Job Scale).

Based on the results of testing the study hypotheses, however, the findings suggest only two types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. Only the scores produced by the Bona Fide Career Scale and Personal Awareness Scale significantly increased the amount of explained variance in the OCQ score when added independently to all of the antecedent variables examined in this study. The score produced by the Proximity to Job Scale significantly increased the amount of explained variance in the OCQ score only when added independently to education and the dealing with customers score. Because proximity to job had a limited effect on the antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment, it was not found to be a viable reason study subjects have for working in their tourism based service jobs.

The lack of evidence to support there being five posited types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs may be attributed to two factors. The first factor may be directly related to the process of developing scales to measure and test whether

or not there are five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. The second factor may be due to a limited sampling of those who work in tourism based service jobs because only full- and part-time nonsupervisory resort employees were surveyed.

Scale development is a rigorous and challenging endeavor for any researcher, especially when the scales are to produce scores that play an integral part in testing the study hypotheses. Specific to the first factor, poor scale development may have hampered the attempt to measure and test the five posited types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs.

The development of reliable scales begins with a comprehensive definition of the construct(s) or attribute(s) to be measured (Spector, 1992). The inability to establish reliable scales for measuring and testing the five posited types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs could be due to inadequacies in how each was defined in this study. Scale items were then written to measure possibly deficient definitions. As a result, the scales were found to be unreliable (as indicated by a low standardized alpha) because a large portion of the variance in each scale was not attributable to the general and group factors surrounding each of the five posited types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs (Cortina, 1993).

The second factor which may have contributed to only the bona fide career reason being found to explain why people work in tourism based service jobs, out of the five that were originally hypothesized, may be that full- and part-time permanent employees were surveyed. Over 500 fulland part-time seasonal employees were not surveyed due to the functional turnover variable that was examined in this study. Seasonal employees were not surveyed because they are hired as temporary workers and turnover in these jobs is expected. Seasonal employees should have been surveyed because they may be more prone to work in tourism based service jobs for many of the same reasons that were hypothesized in this study, such as: supplement income or free time, enjoy a lifestyle directly or indirectly provided by tourism based service jobs, make a transition from one occupation into another, or secure a convenient source of employment/entry into the job market. As a result, the Bona Fide Career Scale was found to be reliable simply because those who had a bona fide career reason for working in tourism based service jobs were surveyed.

The three reliable scales that did emerge out of this study (e.g., Bona Fide Career), however, were examined in the context of a forced regression analysis to determine if they were significant independent predictors of organizational commitment, job performance, and functional turnover. The scale items that were part of the revised Job

Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale (items T7 through T12), Supplemental Employment Scale (items S13 through S18), and Convenient Source of Employment Scale (items C19 and C20) and not used to test the study hypotheses were also examined in the context of a forced regression analysis to determine if any were significant independent predictors of organizational commitment, job performance, and functional turnover.

As a result of the forced regression analysis, all three scales (e.g., Bona Fide Career) and nine of the scale items that had been part of the revised scales that were not used to test the study hypotheses were found to be significant predictors of organizational commitment. The three reliable scales and remaining scale items, however, were poor predictors of job performance and turnover.

The F value and adjusted R^2 resulting from the forced regression analysis of the reliable scales and scale items, on organizational commitment, are presented in Table 4.11. Of the three scales, the Bona Fide Career Scale was the most significant predictor of organizational commitment, as it's score explained 33 percent of the variance in the OCQ score (F = 136.68, p<.001). This finding further emphasizes that those people who have a career interest in tourism based service jobs are more likely to develop organizational commitment than those who do not.
Table 4.11.F-test and adjusted R2 resulting from forced
regression analysis of the Bona Fide Career
Scale, Personal Awareness Scale, Proximity to
Job Scale, and items from the revised Job
Transition and Lifestyle Choice Scale (items
T7 through T12), Supplemental Employment
Scale (items S13 through S17), and Convenient
Source of Employment Scale (items C19 and
C20) on Organizational Commitment (OCQ).

Ľ	Sig.F.	R ²
136.68	.0000	.33
25.67	.0000	.08
8.75	.0034	.03
.03	.8613	00
170.90	.0000	.38
1.40	.2382	.00
22.24	.0000	.07
25.81	.0000	.08
22.56	.0000	.07
1.25	.2638	.00
1.10	.2940	.00
4.05	.0451	.01
16.48	.0035	.03
21.65	.0000	.07
8.52	.0038	.03
1.80	.1806	.00
13.69	.0003	.04
	136.68 25.67 8.75 .03 170.90 1.40 22.24 25.81 22.56 1.25 1.10 4.05 16.48 21.65 8.52 1.80 13.69	136.68 .0000 25.67 .0000 8.75 .0034 .03 .8613 170.90 .0000 1.40 .2382 22.24 .0000 25.81 .0000 22.56 .0000 1.25 .2638 1.10 .2940 4.05 .0451 16.48 .0035 21.65 .0000 8.52 .0038 1.80 .1806 13.69 .0003

Notes;

- The scale items can be viewed in their written form by referring to Table 3.5.

There were five items that were found to be significant predictors of organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ). The relevant findings from the forced regression analysis of Items T8, T10, T11, T12, and S17 on the OCQ score will be discussed below.

Item T8 ("I am working here until I can find a job I would like much better") was the item that was the most significant predictor of organizational commitment, as it explained 38 percent of the variance in the OCQ score (F =170.90, P<.001). This finding suggests that employees may develop organizational commitment for reasons other than a bona fide career interest in tourism based service jobs. It could be speculated that employees develop organizational commitment simply because they like their jobs.

There were three qualitatively similar items that significantly predicted organizational commitment as a result of the forced regression analysis: a) Item T10 - "I like being able to take advantage of recreational opportunities the resort has to offer when I get off of work" b), Item T12 - "I would rather work here than have to move away from family and friends in search of a job in another part of the state/country, and c) Item S17 - "The money I earn here allows me to pursue my personal interests/hobbies". Each of the three items explained seven percent of the variance in the OCQ score with and average F of 22.15 (p<.001). The result of the forced regression analysis involving items T10, T12, and S17 does provide evidence that people may have a lifestyle type of reason for working in tourism based service jobs. More importantly, the finding suggests that those people who have a lifestyle type of reason for working in tourism based service jobs are likely to develop organizational commitment.

Finally, Item T11 ("I could not get the job I wanted with a different employer") was a significant predictor of organizational commitment as it explained eight percent of the OCQ score (F = 25.81, p<.001). This finding may support the validity of the Personal Awareness Scale in that people may have a specific employer in mind when they choose to work in a tourism based service job.

<u>Hypothesis 2</u>

The second hypothesis states that an individual's attitude toward his/her job is a significant predictor of organizational commitment. It was also hypothesized that the personal type of reason an individual has for working in tourism based service jobs will increase the predictability of organizational commitment when attitude toward the job is controlled.

Those employees who had a positive attitude toward their jobs were found to be more committed to the organization than those who had a negative attitude.

Furthermore, those employees who had a career interest in tourism based service jobs and worked for their current employer because the firm had a reputation in the community as being a good place to work developed organizational commitment. This is an important finding as it suggests that employees develop an attitude toward tourism based service jobs as a consequence of working in them which, in turn, affects organizational commitment.

<u>Hypothesis 3</u>

The most tangible relationship employees have to any organization is through their job. Therefore, job design was examined in the context of this study to see if it contributed to a tourism based service employee's potential level of organizational commitment. Job design was inferred in this study through the motivating potential score (MPS) of resort jobs.

It was hypothesized that job design can be used to predict organizational commitment. Furthermore, knowing the personal reason someone may have for working in a tourism based service job was also thought to improve the predictability of organizational commitment when the motivating potential of a job is controlled.

In support of Bateman & Strasser's (1984) findings, there is evidence from this study that job design (inferred

through the motivating potential score of an employee's job) may be a valid predictor of organizational commitment. The results of the study also provide evidence that when the individual has a career interest, and/or prior awareness of the organization as a good place to work, the predictability of organizational commitment is increased.

Hypothesis 4

The fourth hypothesis states that job satisfaction would predict organizational commitment because individuals had received paid/nonpaid benefits that were of value to them personally. It was also proposed that the types of personal reasons an individual has for working in a tourism based service job, when combined with job satisfaction, would increase the predictability of organizational commitment.

In support of Vandenberg & Lance's (1992) findings, job satisfaction was found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment in this study. A career interest in tourism based service jobs and prior personal awareness of the organization as good place to work were also shown to significantly increase the predictability of organizational commitment. This evidence suggests that if individuals are satisfied with their jobs (as they are receiving paid/nonpaid benefits that are important to them), have a career interest in tourism based service jobs, and have prior personal awareness that an organization is a good place to work, organizational commitment is increased.

<u>Hypothesis 5</u>

Biodata variables have been shown to have mixed success as predictors of organizational commitment. In this study age, tenure, education level, number of dependents, gender, and marital status were examined as potential predictors of organizational commitment in tourism based service jobs. The types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs were also tested to see whether they would increase the predictability of organizational commitment when the biodata variables were controlled.

In this study, older, married females had stronger organizational commitment than young, single male employees. When these females had a career interest in tourism based services and/or previous knowledge of the organization as a good place to work, there was a greater chance of them being committed to the organization than their male counterparts.

Lastly, evidence that tenure, number of dependents, and level of education, did not independently predict organizational commitment is still noteworthy as it underscores the importance of knowing the types of personal reasons an individual may have for working in a tourism

based service job. For example, when an individual was found to have a career interest in tourism based services and/or personal awareness of an organization as a good place to work, the predictability of organizational commitment was increased when independently added to tenure, number of dependents, and level of education.

Hypothesis 6

Organizational commitment was hypothesized to predict job performance. Job performance was an important variable in this study as it is an effective way to validate an employee's stated level of organizational commitment. In other words, job performance is a behavior that can be observed by a second party and recorded using a performance appraisal. It was also hypothesized the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs would increase the predictability of job performance.

Organizational commitment was found to be a significant predictor of job performance in this study. According to Meyer et al. (1989), there is a relationship between organizational commitment and performance because "employees who intrinsically value their association with the organization are more likely not only to remain with the company but to work toward its success" (p.155). Commitment

may not only be the result of employees feeling trapped in their jobs because they have no other employment opportunities available to them resulting in their being committed to the organization but unproductive employees (Salancik, 1977; Hollenbeck & Williams, 1986).

Finding a relationship between organizational commitment and job performance is important for another reason. This finding supports the postulate that a true relationship exists between commitment and performance and the reason previous researchers may not have consistently found evidence of the relationship may be attributable to measurement error (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987).

A career interest in tourism based service jobs or previous knowledge of the organization as being a good place to work did not increase the predictability of job performance. Although not formally tested in this study, there are other factors which may explain more of the variance in the job performance score of tourism based service workers, such as: a positive attitude toward the job, a well designed job, or job satisfaction.

<u>Hypothesis 7</u>

Functional turnover was hypothesized in this study as another behavioral outcome of organizational commitment among tourism based service workers. It was also

hypothesized that the personal reasons an individual has for working in a tourism based service job adds to the predictability of functional turnover when organizational commitment is controlled. A positive correlation was found between organizational commitment and functional turnover in this study, but it was not statistically significant below the p<.05 level.

Even though organizational commitment was not found to significantly predict functional turnover in this study, the results do support previous literature which suggests that not all of a firm's turnover is necessarily dysfunctional (Dalton et al., 1982). For example, a comparison of the job performance Z scores for both stayers and leavers is presented in Figure 7. A positive Z score indicates an employee is a better than average performer while a negative Z score indicates the employee is a below average performer. Turnover at the resorts appears to be somewhat dysfunctional as 55.3 percent of leavers had positive job performance Z On the other hand, 49.2 percent of stayers had scores. positive Z scores. Unless management corrects the apparent dysfunctional turnover problem, it is reasonable to speculate that the percentage of stayers with positive job performance Z scores will only continue to decline at the resorts.

It would be difficult for any firm to maintain organizational effectiveness when 55.3 percent of voluntary



Figure 7. Comparison of job performance Z scores for stayers versus leavers.

turnover was by employees who were better than average performers. Such might not be the case for the study resorts, however, as only 47 of the 300 employees in the sample left their jobs over a one year period yielding a voluntary turnover rate of just 15.7 percent. Having such a low turnover rate was contrary to Johnson (1986) who reported that turnover is such a problem in the tourism industry that it has become accepted as a fact of life by many employers. In summary, when half of an organization's turnover among full- and part-time permanent employees is dysfunctional, it may not necessarily be a problem for management when the overall turnover rate is low and ready access to a skilled workforce is high.

<u>Hypothesis</u> 8

An alternate approach to evaluating turnover was included in this study. It was simply hypothesized that stayers would have higher organizational commitment than leavers. In this study, it was found that those employees who were committed to the organization were less likely to leave their jobs than those who were not. This finding indicates the importance of determining those factors (e.g., job design, a career interest in tourism based service jobs, customer contact) which lead to organizational commitment among tourism based service workers.

Hypothesis 9

The ninth hypothesis was that dealing with customers had an impact on organizational commitment. A Dealing with Customers Scale was developed to measure and test whether customer contact predicted commitment. It was then hypothesized that one's types of personal reasons for

working in a tourism based service jobs would add to the predictability of organizational commitment when dealing with customers was controlled.

One of the more exciting findings in this study was that dealing with customers was found to be a significant predictor of organizational commitment in tourism based service jobs. Moreover, having a career interest in tourism based service jobs, prior knowledge of the organization's reputation, and geographic proximity to the job, all added significantly to the predictability of organizational commitment beyond that explained by dealing with customers.

Although no previous studies have examined the relationship between dealing with customers and organizational commitment (as measured by the OCQ), there is room to speculate why such a relationship was found in this study. Employees who work in jobs that require continuous interface with the customer represent the critical point at which the goals and values of the organization come into direct contact with the public. Those employees who find they are comfortable representing a tourism based service firm's goals and values, especially those who have constant interface with the external customers (public), may develop organizational commitment as a result. This may be particularly true in the case of those tourism based service employees who believe they work for a firm that is devoted to providing good service to the customers (Whitley, 1991).

CHAPTER V

LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

There were two major purposes for this study. The first was to test the hypothesis that there are five basic types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. The second was to test the hypothesis that knowing the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs would increase the predictability of organizational commitment and two behavioral outcomes, job performance and functional turnover. Some study limitations, conclusions, and recommendations for future research will be discussed in this chapter relative to the findings from this study.

Study Limitations

The findings are based on a convenience sample of fulland part-time permanent employees who were working at the four resorts that agreed to participate in the study. Seasonal employees were not surveyed due to the functional turnover variable that was investigated in this study. The

four resorts were not selected at random due to the shortness of both time and money. This should not diminish the findings of this study, however, for several reasons.

First of all, every full- and part-time permanent resort employee was given an opportunity to participate in the study. Because a census was taken of resort employees, as opposed to a random sample, frame error was minimized. Moreover, with a response rate of over 50 percent the findings are generalizable to the four resorts that participated in the study.

Although the employees participated in the study on a voluntary basis, the self-selection of respondents should not unduly bias the findings. The nominal financial incentives that were offered to employees in exchange for their participation, were attractive enough so that the sample included a wide range of employees with diverse attitudes, representing a substantial cross-section of the unskilled and skilled jobs at the resorts.

The findings are viewed as being generalizable to other large, year-round resorts, which offer golf and skiing that are located primarily in the northern lower peninsula of Michigan (like the three who represent 93.7% of the data collected in this study). In contrast, it appears unlikely that these findings are generalizable to other types of resorts such as coastal resorts or marinas that offer predominately water based recreation activities that are

open to the public in the summer season. The findings may not be generalizable to coastal resorts or marinas because it is not known whether the conditions of employment and/or the nature of these business are different than those who participated in this study.

A second limitation was that only a small percentage of those employees who participated in the survey were actually observed filling out survey booklets. There is always the concern of nonrandom sampling error when the findings are based on self-reported data and the conditions under which the respondents completed the booklets is unknown (e.g., literacy, state of mind). Nonrandom sampling error should not bias the findings in this study for reasons that will be discussed below.

The scales used in this study had items that were positively and negatively stated to make it possible to determine if respondents were simply moving through the survey booklet and circling answers without reading the questions. By and large, employees responded in the appropriate manner when presented with either the positively or negatively stated items.

Each survey booklet was also examined for response sets. That is, survey booklets that were found to have items that were consistently answered as extremely negative or extremely positive, regardless of the scale, would have

been eliminated from the study. No survey booklets were eliminated for response set problems.

As mentioned, there were nominal financial incentives in place to encourage employees to not only participate in the survey but to properly complete their survey booklets. There is evidence that employees took the time to complete their survey booklets through their own initiative, in a conscientious manner, in order to secure their chances of being eligible to receive the financial incentives. The evidence to suggest that employees personally focused their attention on properly completing their survey booklets is that out of the 307 survey booklets that were received by MSU, only seven were not useable because of not being filled out properly.

The cross-sectional design of this study represents the third limitation of the findings. It is not known how stable the scores are that were produced especially by the attitudinal scales (e.g., organizational commitment, attitude toward job) which over time could affect the relationships found between the variables examined in this study from season to season.

For example, the survey was conducted during the early part of the summer golf season, which presents a slower work pace for resort employees compared to the busy winter ski season. As a result, the employees may have better attitudes (e.g., toward their jobs or the organization)

during the summer when the pace of the work is slower. In the winter the resorts become popular ski destinations and play host to thousands of skiers. The pace of the work for all employees is substantially accelerated and could have a negative affect on employee attitudes.

However, the possibility that employees could have different attitudes in the summer versus the winter should not negatively affect the study findings. Although employees were not surveyed in the winter, the study findings can certainly be generalized to the summer season.

Conclusions

Managerial Implications

The study findings suggest that there is a sequence of events that unfold to explain why people may decide to work in tourism based service jobs, develop organizational commitment, become top performers, and accrue long tenure at the firm. This sequence of events will be discussed below.

The findings suggest that people work in tourism based service jobs for two reasons. The first reason is to pursue a bona fide career, particularly among those people who happen to live in the rural areas of Michigan where the study was conducted. Having a career interest is perhaps a precursor to the second reason people have for working in tourism based service jobs, which is a prior awareness of an organization as being a good place to work. The organization's reputation as being a good place to work is communicated to potential recruits via its own employees or through other media sources. This prior awareness influences the decision to seek employment with one organization over another.

This is an important finding for managers. If an organization's employees are informing skilled service career-oriented people that they work for a reputable organization, it could help management hire qualified applicants because "employee referrals have long been touted as a prime recruitment source." (Cascio, 1991, p.256). Conversely, if qualified recruits are being advised not to apply for a job by the organization's own employees, this could make it difficult for management to hire them.

To mitigate the possibility of employees making it difficult for managers to attract and hire qualified recruits, management might examine the quality of work life within the organization. Managers who have made a long term commitment to develop an effective Total Quality Management (TQM) program have not only been able to attract good employees to their organizations but reduce dysfunctional turnover (Branst, 1984; Uttal, 1987).

Once the individual has been hired, the study findings suggest there are several factors that influence his/her

potential level of organizational commitment. Those careeroriented employees who work for a firm based on its favorable reputation may develop organizational commitment because they: a) have a favorable attitude toward their job, b) work in jobs that are well designed, c) have job satisfaction, d) are older, married females, and/or e) have frequent contact with customers.

Organizational commitment also plays a pivotal role within the workforce because it was found to have an affect on two important behavioral outcomes that were examined in this study. First, those who develop organizational commitment tend to be rated by their supervisors as being the top performers in their jobs. Second, the firm may experience some degree of dysfunctional turnover but overall turnover should remain low because employees are less likely to leave their jobs once they develop organizational commitment.

The findings from this study have real value as a potential diagnostic tool for managers of tourism based service organizations who want to promote organizational commitment and job performance while reducing the voluntary turnover of good employees. Managers could use the study scales to conduct a survey in each functional department and examine those variables found to predict organizational commitment (e.g., bona fide career interest, attitude toward job, job design, customer contact), which in turn were found to lead to increased job performance and reduced dysfunctional turnover.

The data from the employee survey could then be analyzed (in-house or by an independent research firm) to examine the level of organizational commitment, job performance, and historical turnover in each of the functional departments. Once the data were analyzed, a strategy could be developed to make improvements that would lead to increased commitment and performance while reducing dysfunctional turnover. For example, if it turned that a low mean motivating potential score (MPS) was found for the jobs in a particular department (e.g., housekeeping), a strategy could be put into place to enrich them. After the jobs were enriched, management could conduct a follow-up survey to determine whether the mean MPS was increased thereby raising the level of organizational commitment and job performance while reducing dysfunctional turnover.

Managers may find the Service Job Satisfaction Scale that was developed for this study to be particularly useful to them for two reasons. The first reason is that a relationship was found between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in this study. The second reason managers might find the Service Job Satisfaction Scale to be useful is that it will allow them to identify benefits that are important to employees at either the departmental or individual level. Knowing the benefits that are valued by

employees will provide managers an opportunity to put together a cafeteria plan that offers paid/nonpaid benefits that are exclusively important to each individual employee or group of employees working in a given department.

Research Implications

The first research implication is that the dealing with customers variable holds great promise as a viable antecedent of organizational commitment in tourism based service organizations. This variable has not been tested in previous organizational commitment studies. It is an important finding because it suggests that those who work in jobs that require them to have constant interface with customers tend to become more committed to the organization as a result.

The second research implication is that the Service Job Satisfaction Scale was also shown to be an effective survey instrument in this study. It was effective because it did not presuppose that all the benefits on the scale were equally important to resort employees. Employees were allowed to choose only those benefits that were important to them and then evaluate how satisfied they were with those benefits. The Service Job Satisfaction Scale will form the basis of a future publication aimed at human resource managers of tourism based service organizations who may want

to: a) identify those paid/unpaid benefits that are important to individual employees or groups of employees working in a particular department(s), and b) tailor wage and incentive programs to meet the individual needs of employees or groups of employees working in a particular department(s).

Finally, the third research implication from this study is that there is a distinct advantage of using established reliable scales that can be used as developed by their authors, or modified slightly to fit unique situations, in research that investigates the relationship between constructs. The established scales that were used without modification (e.g., Employee Turnover Questionnaire, Organizational Commitment), modified slightly (e.g., Attitude Toward Job Scale, Dealing with Customers Scale), or combined into a new scale (e.g., Employee Job Performance Appraisal) were the most reliable measures used in this study. On the other hand, the scales that were developed exclusively for this study to measure and test the five posited types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs were found generally to be unreliable and had to be reworked significantly in the attempt to increase their standardized alpha coefficients. As it turned out, only one of the five scales (the Bona Fide Career Scale) was consistently found to be reliable throughout the course of this study as the other four scales were either abandoned or used as a basis from which to create new scales.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the literature and anecdotal personal observations involving tourism based service workers, there is room to still speculate that people work in tourism based service jobs for reasons other than the two found in this study - a bona fide career and/or personal awareness of an organization as a good place to work. Future researchers should re-examine the scales that were first developed to measure and test the five posited types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. Researchers should first examine the definitions for each of the five constructs that were used to write items for each of the five scales developed exclusively for this study. A qualitative study (e.g., in-depth interview) involving tourism based service workers is recommended as it may provide researchers with a detailed understanding of the five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. More precise definitions could then be used to write new items for the purpose of developing reliable scales to measure the five posited constructs. The revised scales could then be readministered to a larger sample of both full- and part-time

permanent and seasonal employees to determine whether they are capable of detecting the five posited types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs.

It was determined in this study that those who had a career interest in tourism based services were more likely to develop organizational commitment than those who did not. What is not known is how people develop a career interest in tourism based service jobs. Future research aimed at examining how a career interest develops for tourism based service jobs, which in turn may contribute to organizational commitment, should start with a review of some of the identity theory literature (Mead, 1934). Identity theory is comprised essentially of three basic elements: role identity, role behavior, and commitment to a particular role (Hoelter, 1983).

Role identity is perhaps the earliest stage where an individual develops a career interest. Role identity is the establishment of a link between the individual and society and is best defined as being "like a compass helping us steer a course of interaction in the sea of social meaning" (Burke & Reitzes, 1981, p.91). Role identity drives role behavior of individuals as they attempt to behave in ways they perceive to be consistent with the type of person, or role, they are attempting to emulate (Santee & Jackson, 1979).

Commitment to a particular role also depends on its salience to the individual. A high degree of salience increases the probability of the individual spending more time in a particular role. (Stryker & Serpe, 1980). A career interest may be the result as people tend to engage in behaviors that provide outcomes consistent with the salient aspect of their identities driving them to maintain these identities and seek situations which increase the probability they (the behavior) will be invoked (Leary, Wheeler, and Jenkins, 1986; Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

One additional note pertaining to the development and/or pursuit of a career in tourism based service jobs is that managers should not confuse the concept of a career with that of progressing upward in the organization (e.g., being promoted from some entry level position to manager). The notion of a career, as evidenced in this study, may take place in a singular job all the while working in some capacity within the tourism based service sector (e.g., a chef makes a career preparing menus/meals at a resort without any thought to being the food and beverage director).

It was found in this study that people work in tourism based service jobs based on their prior personal awareness of an organization as being a good place to work. What is not known at this point is how potential job recruits become aware of the reputation of an organization as a place to

work, especially in rural areas where the study was conducted. Future researchers should examine how people become aware of the reputation of an organization and how that information influences their decision to seek employment at one firm versus another.

Dealing with customers shows real promise in future research because it was found to predict organizational commitment for individuals working in tourism based service jobs. In order to explain why dealing with customers predicts organizational commitment, it was speculated that those who are comfortable representing the goals and values of the organization (while in full view of the public eye) may become committed to it as a result. However, the nature of the relationship between dealing with customers and organizational commitment should be empirically tested in future research involving tourism based service firms.

With respect to future research involving the relationship between dealing with customers and organizational commitment, it may be possible that there are different personality types possessed by those who work in high customer contact versus low customer contact jobs. Putting the person with the right personality into the right tourism based service job may affect their level of organizational commitment, job performance and turnover.

Future researchers might apply the concept of the extraverted and introverted personality types (as advanced

by Jung and Eysenck) in the context of research designed to examine the relationship between dealing with customers and organizational commitment in the tourism based service industry. The extraverted person "is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to...craves excitement, acts on the spur of the moment, and is generally impulsive" (Diggins & Huber, 1976, p. 28). In a general sense, the extraverted personality type seems indicative of those people who are comfortable working in tourism based service jobs that require high customer contact (e.g., waitress, salesperson). Conversely, the introverted personality type tends to be "quiet, retiring sort, introspective...reserved and distant except to friends...and keeps his feelings under close control" (Diggins & Huber, 1976, p.28). In a general sense, the introverted personality type seems indicative of those people who are comfortable working in tourism based service jobs that require low customer contact (e.g., bookkeeper, maintenance worker). In other words, future researchers could hypothesize that placing people with extraverted personalities into tourism based service jobs that require constant interface with the external customers leads them to develop organizational commitment, demonstrate better than average job performance, and become less likely to voluntarily resign from their jobs.

Organizational commitment was also found to be a significant predictor of job performance in this study. However, knowing the types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs did not increase the predictability of job performance beyond that of organizational commitment alone. Future researchers should investigate if there are variables, that once added to organizational commitment, could significantly increase the amount of explained variance in job performance.

Organizational commitment should also be examined in future research as an antecedent to functional turnover. Organizational commitment was correlated with functional turnover although the correlation was not significant at p<.05 or lower. A significant correlation might have been found in this study were it not for the fewer than expected cases of voluntary turnover across the resorts in this study over the one year study period. Future researchers might find a significant relationship between these two variables given a larger sample size of voluntary turnover data.

In this study, it was hypothesized that there are five types of personal reasons people may have for working in tourism based service jobs. There are no known existing scales that could have been used or modified to measure and test the five hypothesized types of personal reasons for working in tourism based service jobs. As a result, a great deal of time and effort was spent on scale development.

Future researchers are advised to exhaust every effort to find existing reliable scales that can be used whole, in part, or modified slightly, whenever research is conducted that requires the measurement and testing of constructs.

Because this study was cross-sectional, future researchers should conduct a longitudinal study design, especially if the research involves year-round resorts. It would be useful to examine job design longitudinally at resorts, in particular, because many of the employees change job duties and responsibilities depending on the season of the year. For example, it is not unusual for an employee in the property maintenance department to: a) maintain the greens in the summer, b) aerate the fairways in the fall and prepare them for winter, c) be a ski-lift operator in the winter, and d) clear the leaves and debris from the golf course in the spring so it will be in good shape to endure summer play. Future research should examine whether job design fluctuates from one season to the next causing, for example, organizational commitment, job performance, and functional turnover to wax and wane throughout the year.

Finally, it was assumed in this study that job involvement and the employees' attitudes toward their jobs were separate constructs. Job involvement has been found to predict organizational commitment in previous studies and was defined in this study as "the degree to which a person is identified psychologically with his work, or the

importance of work in his total self image" (Lohdahl & Kejner, 1965, p. 25). It was then reasoned that no matter how "involved" employees are with their jobs, working in tourism based service jobs has varied affects on people with respect to the attitudes that they develop as a consequence of working in the jobs the industry has to offer. It was found in this study that the employees' attitudes toward their jobs were a significant predictor of organizational commitment. Future researchers should test the hypothesis that job involvement and the employees' attitudes toward their jobs are separate albeit significant predictors of organizational commitment. Empirical evidence is required before these two constructs can formally be recognized as separate and significant independent predictors of organizational commitment.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abelson, M.A. & Baysinger, B.D. (1984). Optimal and dysfunctional turnover: Toward an organizational level model. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>9</u>, 331-341.
- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment. <u>Journal of Occupational Psychology</u>, <u>63</u>, 1-18.
- Alutto, J.A., Hrebeniak, L.G. & Alonso, R. (1973). On operationalizing the concept of commitment. <u>Social</u> <u>Forces</u>, <u>51</u>, 448-454.
- Anastasi, A. (1976). <u>Psychological testing</u> (4th ed.). New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Angle, H.L. & Perry, J.L. (1981). An empirical assessment of commitment and organizational effectiveness. <u>Administrative Science Ouarterly</u>, <u>26</u>, 1-14.
- Aryee, S., Wyatt, T. & M.M. Kheng (1991). Antecedents of organizational commitment and turnover intentions among professional accountants in different settings in Singapore. <u>The Journal of Social Psychology</u>, <u>131</u>, 545-556.
- Ashforth, B.E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, <u>14</u>, 20-39.
- Babbie, E. (1989). <u>The practice of social research</u> (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bar-Hayim, A. & Berman, G.S. (1992). The dimensions of organizational commitment. <u>Journal of Organizational</u> <u>Behavior</u>, <u>13</u>, 379-387.
- Barrett, R. (1987). Tourism employment in Montana: Quality versus Quantity? <u>Western Wildlands</u>, <u>20</u>, 18-21.
- Bateman, T.S. & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>27</u>, 95-112.
- Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. American Journal of Sociology, <u>66</u>, 32-40.

Bem, D.J. (1970). <u>Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs</u>. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

- Berry, W.D. & Feldman, S. (1985). <u>Multiple regression in</u> <u>practice.</u> Newbury, CA: Sage Publications.
- Blau, G.J. & Boal, K.B. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement will affect organizational commitment and absenteeism. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, <u>12</u>, 288-300.
- Blau, G. & Boal, K. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. <u>Journal of Management</u>, <u>15</u>, 115-127.
- Bloodworth, S. (1994, April). On the job in the class at Traviss. <u>The Ledger</u>, pp. 1E, 3E.
- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. <u>Human Relations</u>, <u>35</u>, 135-153.
- Branst, L. (1984, February). Disneyland A kingdom of service quality. <u>Ouality</u>, 16-18.
- Brief, A.P. & Aldag, R.J. (1980). Antecedents of organizational commitment among hospital nurses. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 7, 210-221.
- Brooke, P.P., Russell, D.W. & Price, J.L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 139-145.
- Brown, M.E. (1969). Identification and some conditions of organizational involvement. <u>Administrative Sciences</u> <u>Ouarterly</u>, <u>14</u>, 346-355.
- Brunig, N.S. & Snyder, R.A. (1983). Sex and position as predictors of organizational commitment. <u>Academy of</u> <u>Management Journal</u>, <u>26</u>, 485-491.
- Buchanan II, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. <u>Administrative Sciences Ouarterly</u>, <u>19</u>, 533-546.
- Burke, P.J. & Reitzes, D.C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. <u>Social Psychology</u> <u>Ouarterly</u>, <u>44</u>, 83-92.
- Burkhart, A.J. & Medlik, S. (1981). <u>Tourism: Past, present</u> <u>and future</u>, 2nd edition. London: Heinemann.

- Campion, M.A. (1991). Meaning and measurement of turnover: Comparison of alternative measures and recommendations for research. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>76</u>, 199-212.
- Cascio, W.F. (1991). <u>Applied pscychology in personnel</u> <u>management</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, A. & Lowenberg, G. (1990). A re-examination of the side-bet theory as applied to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. <u>Human Relations</u>, <u>43</u>, 1015-1033.
- Cohen, A. (1992). Antecedents of organizational commitment across occupational groups: A meta-analysis. <u>Journal</u> <u>of Organizational Behavior</u>, <u>13</u>, 539-558.
- Cortina, J.M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and appliation. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>78</u>, 98-104.
- Dalton, D.R. & Todor, W.D. (1979). Turnover turned over: An expanded and positive perspective. <u>Academy of</u> <u>Management Review</u>, <u>4</u>, 225-235.
- Dalton, D.R., Todor, W. & Krackhardt, D. M. (1982). Turnover overstated: The functional taxonomy. <u>Academy</u> <u>of Management Review</u>, 7, 117-123.
- Davidson, Peter (1983). <u>Moonlighting: A complete guide to</u> <u>over200 exciting part-time jobs</u>. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Dawis, R.E. (1991). Vocational interests, values and preferences. In Dunnette, M.D. & Hough, L.M. (Eds.), <u>Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology:</u> <u>Vol. 2.</u> (pp. 833-871). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- DeCotiis, T.A. & Summers, T.P. (1987). A path analysis of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. <u>Human Relations</u>, <u>40</u>, 445-470.
- Dempster-McClain, Donna & Moen, Phyllis (1989). Moonlighting husbands: A life cycle perspective. <u>Work</u> <u>and Occupations</u>, <u>16</u>, 43-64.
- Diggins, D. & Huber, J. (1976). <u>The human personality</u>. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Dillman, D.A. (1986). <u>Mail and telephone surveys: The</u> <u>total design method</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Dubin, R. (1961). <u>Human relations in administration</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dupuy, M. & Schweitzer, M.E. (1994, February). Are service jobs inferior? <u>Economic Commentary</u>, p.1. Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.
- Edgell, D. L. (1990). <u>Charting a course for international</u> <u>tourism in the nineties: An agenda for managers and</u> <u>executives</u>. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- Eichel, E. & Bender, H.E. (1984). <u>Performance appraisal: A</u> <u>study of current techniques</u>. New York: AMA Research Information Service.
- Elizur, D. (1984). Facets of work values: A structural analysis of work outcomes. <u>Journal of Applied</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>69</u>, 379-389.
- Farkas, A.J. & Tetrick, L.E. (1989). A three-wave longitudinal analysis of the causal ordering of satisfaction and commitment on turnover decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 855-868.
- Farrell, D. & Rusbult, C.E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. <u>Organizational Behavior and Human</u> <u>Performance</u>, <u>27</u>, 78-95.
- Ferris, K.R. (1981). Organizational commitment and performance in a professional accounting firm. <u>Accounting, Organizations and Society, 6</u>, 317-325.
- Ferris, K. & Aranya, N. (1983). A comparison of two organizational commitment scales. <u>Personnel</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>36</u>, 87-98.
- Fukami, C.V. & Larson, E.W. (1984). Commitment to company and union: Parallel models. <u>Journal of Applied</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>69</u>, 367-371.
- Gatewood, R.D. & Feild, H.S. (1990). <u>Human resource</u> <u>selection</u> (2nd ed.). Orlando, FL: Dryden Press.
- Glisson, C. & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. <u>Administrative Sciences</u> <u>Ouarterly</u>, <u>33</u>, 61-81.

- Gregersen, H.B. & Black, S.J. (1992). Antecedents to commitment to a parent company and a foreign company. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>35</u>, 65-90.
- Hall, D.T. & Schneider, B. (1972). Correlates of organizational identification as a function of career pattern and organizational type. <u>Administrative</u> <u>Sciences Quarterly</u>, <u>17</u>, 340-350.
- Hall, D.T. (1976). <u>Careers in organizations</u>. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>60</u>, 159-170.

- Hackman, R. J., Oldham, G., Janson, R. & Purdy, K. (1975). A new strategy for job enrichment. <u>California</u> <u>management review</u>, <u>17</u>, 57-71.
- Hackman, R. J. & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. <u>Organizational</u> <u>Behavior and Human Performance</u>, <u>16</u>, 250-279.
- Heskett, J.L. (1986). <u>Managing in the service economy</u>. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hoelter, J.W. (1983). The effects of role evaluation and commitment on identity salience. <u>Social Psychology</u> <u>Ouarterly</u>, <u>46</u>, 140-147.
- Holland, J.L. (1985). <u>Making vocational choices</u> (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Hollenbeck, J.R. & Williams, C.R. (1986). Turnover functionality versus turnover frequency: A note on work attitudes and organizational effectiveness. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Applied Psychology</u>, <u>71</u>, 606-611.
- Hom, P.W., Caranikas-Walker, F., Prussia, G.E. & Griffeth, Rodger W. (1992). A meta-analytical structural equation analysis of a model of employee turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, <u>77</u>, 890-909.
- Hrebeniak, L.G. & Alutto, J.A. (1972). Personal and rolerelated factors in the development of organizational commitment. <u>Administrative Sciences Quarterly</u>, <u>17</u>, 555-573.

Hunter (1993). Class Handouts

- Jamal, Muhammed & Crawford, Ronald L. (1981). Consequences of extended work hours: A comparison of moonlighters, overtimers, and modal employees. <u>Human Resource</u> <u>Management</u>, <u>23</u>, 18-23.
- Jamal, Muhammed (1986). Moonlighting: Personal, social, and organizational consequences. <u>Human Relations</u>, <u>39</u>, 977-990.
- Jans, N.A. (1989). Organizational commitment, career factors, and career/life stage. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Organizational Behavior</u>, <u>10</u>, 247-266.
- Johnson, K. (1986). Labour turnover in hotels-update. <u>The</u> <u>Services Industries Journal</u>, <u>6</u>, 363-380.

- Judge, T.A. & Bretz, R.D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. <u>Journal of Applied</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>77</u>, 261-271.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. <u>American Sociological</u> <u>Review</u>, <u>42</u>, 124-143.
- Kanter, R.M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, <u>33</u>, 499-517.
- Kanungo (1982). Measurement of job involvement and work involvement. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>67</u>, 341-349.
- Kaplan, R.M. & Sacuzzo, D.P. <u>Psychological testing:</u> <u>Principles, applications, and issues</u>. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publising Company.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. (3rd ed.). Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Kidron, A. (1978). Work values and organizational commitment. <u>Academy of management journal</u>, <u>21</u>, 239-247.
- Koslowsky, M., Caspy, T. & Lazar, M. (1991). Cause and effect explanations of job satisfaction and commitment: The case of exchange commitment. <u>The Journal of</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>125</u>, 153-162.
- Lawler III, E.E. & Hall, D.T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvment, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>54</u>, 305-312.
- Leary, M.R., Wheeler, D.S. & Jenkins, T.B. (1986). Aspects of identity and behavioral preferences: Studies of occupational and recreational choice. <u>Social</u> <u>Psychology Quarterly</u>, <u>46</u>, 11-18.
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunette, M.D. (Ed.), <u>Handbook of</u> <u>Industrial and Organizational Psychology</u> (pp. 1297-1350. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lohdahl, T.M. & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. <u>Journal of Applied</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>49</u>, 24-33.
- Martin, T.N. & O'Laughlin, S.M. (1984). Predictors of organizational commitment: The study of part-time army reservists. Joournal of Vocational Behavior, 25, 270-283.
- Mathieu, J.E. & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and metaanalysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, <u>108</u>, 171-194.
- Mathieu, J.E. & Farr, J.L. (1991). Further evidence for the discriminant validity of measures of organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 127-133.
- Mathieu, J.E. (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>76</u>, 607-618.
- Mead, G.H. (1934). <u>Mind, self and society</u>. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. <u>Journal of Applied</u> <u>Psychology</u>, <u>69</u>, 372-378.

- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1987). A longitudinal analysis of the early development and consequences of organizational commitment. <u>Canadian Journal of</u> <u>Behavioral Science</u>, <u>19</u>, 199-214.
- Meyer, J.P., Paunonen, S.V., Gellatly, I.R., Goffin, R.D. & Jackson, D.N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 152-156.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Gellatly, I.R. (1990). Affective and continuance commiment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 710-720.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Applied Psychology</u>, <u>78</u>, 538-551.
- Michaels, C.E. & Spector, P.E. (1982). Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand and Meglino model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 53-59.
- Mihal, W.L., Sorce, P.A. & Comte, T.E. (1984). A process model of individual decision making. <u>Academy of</u> <u>Management Review</u>, <u>9</u>, 95-103.
- Miller, H.E. (1934). The construction and evaluation of a scale of attitudes toward occupations. <u>Purdue</u> <u>University Studies in Higher Education</u>. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue Research Foundation.
- Miner, M.G. & Miner, J.B. (1979). <u>Employee selection</u> <u>within the law</u>. Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs.
- Mobley, W.H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>62</u>, 237-240.
- Mobley, W., Horner, S., & Hollingsworth, A. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 498-414.
- Morris, J.H. & Sherman, D.J. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. (1981). <u>Academy of</u> <u>Management Journal</u>, <u>24</u>, 512-526.

- Mottaz, C. (1988). Determinants of organizational commitment. <u>Human Relations</u>, <u>41</u>, 467-482.
- Mowday, R.T. & Steers, R.M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. <u>Journal of Vocational</u> <u>Behavior</u>, <u>14</u>, 224-247.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. & Steers, R.M. (1982). <u>Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of</u> <u>commitment, absenteeism and turnover</u>. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R.T., Koberg, C.S. & McArthur, A.W. (1984). The psychology of the withdrawal process: A crossvalidation test of Mobley's intermediate linkages model of turnover in two samples. <u>Academy of Management</u> Journal, <u>27</u>, 79-94.
- Morrow, P.C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. <u>Academy of</u> <u>Management Review</u>, <u>8</u>, 486-500.
- Morrow, P.C. & Wirth, R.E. (1989). Work commitment among salaried professionals. <u>Journal of Vocational</u> <u>Behavior, 34</u>, 40-65.
- Morrow, P.C. (1993). <u>The theory and measurement of work</u> <u>commitment</u>. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.
- Mowday, Richard T., Lyman, Porter W. & Steers, Richard M. (1982). <u>Employee-organizational linkages: The</u> <u>psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover</u>. New York: Academic Press.
- Muchinsky, Paul M. & Taylor, Susan M. (1976). Intrasubject predictions of occupational preference: the effect of manipulating components of the valence model. <u>Journal</u> <u>of Vocational Behavior</u>, <u>8</u>, 185-195.
- Norussis, M.J. (1988). <u>SPSS/PC+ V2.0 base manual for the</u> <u>IBM PC/XT/AT and PS/2</u>. USA: SPSS Inc.
- Olson, R.E. (1981) <u>Performance appraisal: A guide to</u> <u>greater productivity</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- O'Reilly III, C.A. & Caldwell, D.F. (1981). The commitment and job tenure of new employees: Some evidence of postdecisional justification. <u>Administrative Science</u> <u>Ouarterly</u>, <u>26</u>, 597-616.

- Perrella, Vera C. (1970). Moonlighters: Their motivations and characteristics. <u>Monthly Labor Review</u>, <u>93</u>, 57-64.
- Pierce, J.L. & Dunham, R.B. (1987). Organizational commitment: Pre-employment propensity and initial work experiences. Journal of Management, <u>13</u>, 163-178.
- Pizam, I. (1982). Tourism manpower: the state of the art. Journal of Travel Research, 21 (2), p. 5-9.
- Plunkett, L. M. (1990). The 1980's: a decade of job growth and industry shifts. <u>Monthly Labor Review</u>, <u>113</u>, 3-16.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Applied Psychology</u>, <u>59</u>, 603-609.
- Pryor, R.G. (1980). Some types of stability in the study of students' work values. <u>Journal of Vocational</u> <u>Behavior, 16</u>, 1980).
- Pryor, R.G. (1982). Values, preferences, needs, work ethics, and orientations to work: Toward a conceptual and empirical integration. <u>Journal of Vocational</u> <u>Behavior, 20</u>, 40-52.
- Randall, D.M. & Cote, J. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. <u>Work and Occupations</u>, <u>18</u>, 194-211.
- Reichers, A.E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. <u>Academy of Management</u> <u>Review, 10, 465-476.</u>
- Ricks, T.E. (1994, March 30). Out and down: New military retirees turn bitter as many can't find a good job. <u>The Wall Street Journal</u>, pp. A1, A6.
- Ritzer, G. & Trice, H. (1969). An empirical study of Howard Becker's side-bet theory. <u>Social Forces</u>, <u>47</u>, 475-479.
- Rhodes, S.R. & Doering, M.D. (1983). An integrated model of career change. <u>Academy of Management Review</u>, <u>8</u>, 631-639.
- Roberts, P.C. (1992). Trickle-down triumph: In the '80s, the poor got...richer. <u>Business Week</u>, <u>July 13</u>, 18.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). <u>The nature of human values</u>. New York: Free Press.

- Ross, G.F. (1993). Tourism and hospitality employment and career perceptions among high school students. <u>Visions</u> in Leisure and Business, <u>12</u>, 13-33.
- Sager, J.K. & Johnston, M.W. (1989). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment: A study of salespeople. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales <u>Management</u>, 9, 30-41.
- Sager, J.K. (1991). Recruiting and retaining committed salespeople. <u>Industrial Marketing Management</u>, <u>20</u>, 99-103.

- Salancik, G.R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In Staw, B.M.& Salancik, G.R. (Eds.), <u>New directions in organizational</u> <u>behavior</u>, 1-54. Chicago: St. Clair Press.
- Saleh, S. D. & Hosek, J. (1976). Job involvement: Concepts and measurements. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>19</u>, 213-224.
- Santee, R.T. & Jackson, S.E. (1979). Commitment to selfidenification: A sociopsychological approach to personality. <u>Human Relations</u>, <u>32</u>, 141-158.
- Schein, E.H. (1978). <u>Career dynamics: Matching individual</u> <u>and organizational needs</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Welsey.
- Shaub, M.K. (1991). A psychometric comparison of two organizational commitment scales. <u>Psychological</u> <u>Reports</u>, <u>68</u>, 419-426.
- Shavelson, R.J. (1988). <u>Statistical reasoning for the</u> <u>behavioral sciences</u>. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Shaw, M.E. & Wright, Jack M. (1976). <u>Scales for the</u> <u>measurement of attitudes</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Sheldon, S. & Serpe, R.T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience, and role behavior: Theory and research example. In Ickes, W. & Knowles, E.S. (Eds.), <u>Personality, Roles, and Social Behavior</u>. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sheridan, John E., Slocum, Jr., John W. & Richards, Max D. (1974). Expectancy theory as a lead indicator of job behavior. <u>Decision Sciences</u>, <u>5</u>, 507-522.

- Shoemaker, D.J., Snizek, W.E. & Bryant, C.D. (1977). Toward a further clarification of Becker's side-bet hypothesis as applied to organizational and occupational commitment. <u>Social Forces</u>, <u>56</u>, 598-603.
- Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin (1969). <u>The measurement of</u> <u>satisfaction in work and retirement</u>. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P.E. (1992). <u>Summated rating scale construction:</u> <u>An introduction.</u> Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Spotts, D.M. (1992). Instruction sheet used in a lodging mail survey.
- Steers, R.M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. <u>Administrative Science</u> <u>Ouarterly</u>, <u>22</u>, 46-56.
- Stevens, J.M., Beyer, J.M. & Trice, H. (1978). Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>21</u>, 380-396.
- Stinson, Jr., John F. (1986). Moonlighting by women jumped to record highs. <u>Monthly Labor Review</u>, <u>109</u>, 22-25.
- Toffler, A. The third wave. New York: Bantam Books.
- Tourism Industry Coalition of Michigan (1994). <u>Michigan</u> <u>travel and tourism handbook: Tourism works for</u> <u>Michigan</u>. Lansing, MI: Author.
- Tull, D.S. & Hawkins, D.I (1990). <u>Marketing research:</u> <u>Measurement and method</u> (5th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishers.
- U.P. group works to protect interests. (1993, March). Lansing State Journal, p.3B.
- Uttal, B. (December, 1987). Companies that serve you best. Fortune, 98-116.
- Vandenberg, R.J. & Lance, C.E. (1992). Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Journal of Management, <u>18</u>, 153-167.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). <u>Work and motivation</u>. New York: Wiley.
- Wallace, J.E. (1993). Professional and organizational commitment: Compatible or Incompatible. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Vocational Behavior</u>, <u>42</u>, 333-349.

- Wiener, Y. & Gechman, A.S. (1977). Commitment: A behavioral approach to job involvement. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Vocational Behavior</u>, <u>10</u>, 47-52.
- Whiteley, R.C. (1991). <u>The customer driven company: Moving</u> <u>from talk to action</u>. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment to organizations: A normative view. <u>Academy of Management Journal</u>, <u>7</u>, 418-428.
- Wiener, Y. & Vardi, Y. (1980). Relationships between job, organization, and career commitments and work outcomes-An integrative approach. <u>Organizational Behavior and</u> <u>Human Performance</u>, <u>26</u>, 81-96.
- Williams, L.J. & Hazer, J.T. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, <u>71</u>, 219-231.
- Witt, A.L. & Beorkrem, M.N. (1991). Satisfaction with initial work assignments and organizational commitment. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21, 1783-1792.
- World Travel and Tourism Council (1993). <u>Travel and</u> <u>tourism, the world's largest employer</u>. Brussels: Belgium.
- Ybarra, M.J. (1994). Paradise lost: Maui may be heaven to tourists, but locals say it's hardly divine. <u>The Wall</u> <u>Street Journal</u>, pp. A1, A6.
- Zachary, P.G. & Ortega, B. (1993, March 10). Workplace revolution boosts productivity at a cost of job security. <u>The Wall Street Journal</u>, pp. A1, A8.
- Zytkowski, D.G. (1970). The concept of work values. <u>Vocational Guidance Quarterly</u>, <u>18</u>, 176-186.

APPENDIX A

PRETEST SURVEY BOOKLET

Resort Employment Survey





Travel, Tourism, and Recreation Resource Center



Michigan State University

MICHIGAN RESORT EMPLOYMENT SURVEY

This research is being conducted by Michigan State University and the Michigan Travel, Tourism and Recreation Resource Center to get a better understanding of resort employment. We are very interested in learning more about resort jobs and the people who work in them. <u>YOU ARE THE EXPERTS</u>!

It would be greatly appreciated if you would take approximately 30 minutes out of your busy schedule to complete this questionnaire. The information you provide in this questionnaire will be kept confidential. Management will be given a report of the study, but it WILL NOT include the names of individual employees for any reason whatsoever. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact Joe La Lopa.

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME BELOW:

I have agreed to be a volunteer in this study, and fill out a questionnaire, as long as my name is kept confidential and not attached to the information that is shared with resort management.

Signature

Date

IMPORTANT REMINDER

Please read the instructions carefully before filling out each of the seven sections of this questionnaire. It is extremely important that you fully complete each of the sections contained in this questionnaire. Any questionnaire that does not have all seven sections properly filled out can NOT be used in this study. **PLEASE NOTE**; questions in one section may seem similar to questions being asked in another section - THIS IS NOT A MISTAKE! Though questions may seem similar to one another, they are being asking for entirely different reasons.

SECTION ONE - ATTITUDE TOWARD YOUR JOB

This part of the questionnaire is designed to learn more about your attitude toward your job here at the resort.

Below is a list of statements about the job you are currently working in.

<u>Please place an X before each statement with which you AGREE, in reference</u> to your job here at the resort.

- ____An intelligent person wouldn't be satisfied in this job very long.
- _____This job is good enough for me.
- _____This job has many advantages.
- _____This is the worst job at the resort.
- _____The best one can hope for from this job is a life of poverty.
- ____I wouldn't mind working seven days a week on this job.
- _____I cannot keep up a decent standard of living in this job.
- _____I have no desire to do this job to the best of my ability.
- ____I love to do this job.
- _____This is a pleasant job some of the time.
- _____The most lasting satisfactions in life come to one in this job.
- _____This job gives me a great deal of pleasure.
- _____This job is more enjoyable than most play.
- _____This job has its merits.
- _____Part of the time I enjoy this job.
- _____This job has several very decided advantages over most other jobs.
- _____This job offers me a chance to put my ideas into operation.
- _____I like this job too well to give it up.
- _____Why should one work on this job when so many other jobs are better?
- _____This is a good job.
- _____This job will bring benefits to everyone who does it.

- _____The less I see of this job, the happier I am.
- _____This job is a good pastime.
- _____I don't think this job would harm anyone.
- _____There are many more disadvantages than advantages in this job.
- _____This job would be all right if no others were available.
- _____The advantages and disadvantages of this job about balance each other.
- _____This job is one of my favorite pastimes.
- _____Under no conditions would I like this job.
- _____Many people do not like this job.
- _____I'd rather work at this job than eat.
- _____The advantages of this job will never outweigh the disadvantages.
- _____I feel as though I am of benefit to mankind in this job.
- _____I would not want to stay in this job very long.
- ____This job seems to be satisfactory.
- _____This job is definitely worth having.
- _____Only a very stupid person could be satisfied with this job.
- _____This job can be buried for all I care.
- ____I have a feeling of hatred for this job.
- ____I would be better off without this job.
- _____My job fascinates me.
- _____My job could be much more interesting.
- _____My job will mean a great deal to me when I am older.
- _____My job is more or less boring.
- ____For the most part, I do not like doing this job.

END OF SECTION ONE, PLEASE CAREFULLY READ NEXT PAGE ---->

^{.....}continue to place an X before each statement with which you AGREE

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE STARTING SECTIONS TWO AND THREE

In SECTION TWO and SECTION THREE you will find several different kinds of questions about your job. Specific instructions are given at the start of each section. Please read them carefully. It should not take very long to complete this portion of the questionnaire.

The questions are designed to obtain <u>your</u> perceptions of your job and <u>your</u> reactions to it. There are no "trick" questions.

Please do <u>not</u> use Section Two and Section Three to show how much you like or dislike your job. Instead, try to make your descriptions as accurately and as objectively as you possibly can.

A SAMPLE OUESTION TO HELP COMPLETE SECTION TWO IS SEEN BELOW

Sample Ouestion

A. To what extent does your job require you to work with mechanical equipment?

1	-3	۲ ۲
Very little; the job requires almost no contact with mechan- ical equipment of any kind.	Moderately	Very much; the job requires almost constant work with mechanical equipment.

You are to CIRCLE the number which is the most accurate description of your job.

If for example, your job requires you to work with mechanical equipment a good deal of the time - but also requires some paperwork - you might circle the number six, as done in the example above.

IF YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND THESE INSTRUCTIONS, PLEASE ASK FOR ASSISTANCE. IF YOU DO UNDERSTAND THEM, TURN THE PAGE AND BEGIN SECTION TWO ------>

SECTION TWO - QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR JOB

Please remember to CIRCLE the number below each question which is the most accurate description of your job.

1. To what extent does your job require you to <u>work closely with other</u> <u>people</u> (either "clients," or other people in related jobs in your own organization)?

1-----5-----6------7

Very little; dealing with other people is not at all necessary in doing my job. Moderately; some dealing with others is necessary

Very much; dealing with other people is an absolutely essential part of doing the job. 2. How much <u>autonomy</u> is there in your job? That is, to what extent does your job permit you to decide <u>on your own</u> how to go about doing the work?

1-----5-----6-----7

Very little; the job	Moderate autonomy;	Very much; the job
gives me no personal	many things are	gives me almost com-
"say" about how and	standardized and not	plete responsibility
when the work is done.	under my control, but	for deciding how and
	I can make some deci-	when the work is done.
	sions about the work.	

3. To what extent does your job involve doing a <u>"whole" and identifiable</u> piece of work? That is, is the job a complete piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end? Or is it only a small part of the overall piece of work, which is finished by other people or by automatic machines?

1-----5-----6-----7

My job is only a tiny part of the overall piece of work; the results of my activities cannot be seen in the final product or service. My job is a moderate-sized chunk of the overall piece of work; my own contribution can be seen in the final outcome My job involves doing the whole piece of work, from start to finish; the results of my activities are easily seen in the final product or service. 4. How much <u>variety</u> is there in your job? That is, to what extent does the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?

122	-35	7
Very little; the job requires me to do the same things over and over again	Moderate variety	Very much; the job requires me to do many different things, using a number of skills and talents.

5. In general, how <u>significant or important</u> is your job? That is, are the results of your work likely to significantly affect the lives or well being of other people?

1-----5-----6-----7

Not very significant; the outcomes of my work are <u>not</u> likely to have important effects on other people. Moderately significant Highly significant; the outcomes of my work can affect other people in very important ways. ٦.

11. N. 1. MILE

 To what extent do <u>managers</u> or <u>co-workers</u> let you know how well your are doing on the job?

1-----5-----6-----7

Very little; people almost never let me know how well I am doing. Moderately; sometimes people may give me "feedback"; other times they may not. Very much; managers or co-workers provide me with almost constant "feedback" about how well I am doing.

7. To what extent does <u>doing the job itself</u> provide you with information about your work performance? That is, does the actual <u>work itself</u> provide clues about how well you are doing-aside from "feedback" coworkers or supervisors may provide?

1-----5-----6-----7

Very little; the job itself is set up so I could work forever without finding out how well I am doing.

Moderately; sometimes doing the job provides "feedback" to me; sometimes it does not. Very much; the job is set up so that I get almost constant "feedback" as I work about how well I am doing.

END OF SECTION TWO, PLEASE GO TO SECTION THREE ----->

SECTION THREE - DESCRIPTION OF YOUR JOB

Listed below are a number of statements which could be used to describe a job. Once again, be as objective as you can in deciding how accurately each of the following statements describes your job - Regardless of whether you like or dislike your job.

You are to indicate whether each statement is an <u>ACCURATE</u> or <u>INACCURATE</u> description of <u>your</u> job.

Please CIRCLE the number below each statement, based on the following scale:

How ACCURATE or INACCURATE is each statement in describing your job?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
VERY	MOSTLY	SLIGHTLY	UNCERTAIN	SLIGHTLY	MOSTLY	VERY
INACCURATE	INACCURATE	INACCURATE		ACCURATE	ACCURATE	ACCURATE

1. The job requires me to use a number of complex, high-level skills.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. The job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. The job is arranged so that I do <u>not</u> have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- 4. Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.
 - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 5. The job is quite simple and repetitive.
 - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 6. The job can be done adequately by a person working alone-without talking or checking with other people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. The supervisors and co-workers on this job almost <u>never</u> give me any "feedback" about how well I am doing in my work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5 6 7 1 2 3 4 VERY **SLIGHTLY** VERY MOSTLY UNCERTAIN **SLIGHTLY** MOSTLY ACCURATE ACCURATE INACCURATE INACCURATE INACCURATE ACCURATE This job is one where a lot of people can be affected by how well the 8. work gets done. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement 9. in carrying out the work. 3 5 6 7 1 2 4 Supervisors often let me know how well they think I am performing the 10. job. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 11. The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin. 1 2 7 3 5 6 4 The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am 12. performing well. 3 5 1 2 4 6 7 13. The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 14. The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader

The Party of the P

14. The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

END OF SECTION THREE, PLEASE GO TO SECTION FOUR ----->

SECTION FOUR - ATTITUDE TOWARD WORKING AT THIS RESORT

Listed below are a series of statements that represent possible feelings that employees might have about working for this resort. This section provides an opportunity to indicate your own feelings about the resort for which you are now working.

Please CIRCLE the number below each statement based on the following scale:

How much do you AGREE or DISAGREE with each statement as to how you feel about working at this resort?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
STRONGLY	MODERATELY	BLIGHTLY	NEITHER	SLIGHTLY	MODERATELY	STRONGLY
DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	AGREE	AGREE
			NOR			
			AGREE			

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this resort be successful.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I talk up this resort to my friends as a great organization to work for.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I feel very little loyalty to this resort.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- 4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this resort.
 - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 5. I find that my values and the resort's values are very similar.
 - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- 6. I am proud to tell others I am part of this resort.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I could just as well be working for a different resort as long as the type of work was similar.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

STRC DIS	L DNGLY AGREE	MODE DIS	2 Rately Agree	3 Blight Disagi	rly ne Ree di A	4 ITHER 8AGREE NOR GREE	5 Blightly Agree	6 Moderately Agree	7 Strongly Agree
8.	This perf	resc orman	ort real ce.	ly ins	pires (the very	y best	in me in the	e way of job
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
9.	It we to l	ould (eave	take very this res	y little ort.	e chang	e in my	present	circumstance	s to cause me
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
10.	I am busi	extr nesse	emely g s I was	lad tha conside	nt I ch ering a	nose thi t the ti	s resor ime I jo	t to work fo ined.	r over other
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
11.	Ther inde	e's i finit	not too ely.	much	to be	gained	by st	icking with	this resort
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
12.	Ofte: impo:	n, I rtant	find it matters	diffi relati	cult to .ng to	o agree its emp]	with the state of the second s	his resort's	policies on
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
	I rea	ally	care abo	ut the	fate o	f this r	esort.		
13.		•		•	-			_	
13.		+	2	3	4	5	6	7	
13. 14.	For	ne th	2 is is th	s e best	4 of all	5 possibl	6 e place	7 s to work.	
13. 14.	For 1	ne th 1	2 is is th 2	3 e best 3	4 of all 4	5 possib] 5	6 e place. 6	7 s to work. 7	
13. 14. 15.	For a	ne th 1 ling '	2 is is th 2 to work	3 e best 3 for thi	• of all • • • reso	5 possib] 5 rt was a	6 e place 6 defini	7 s to work. 7 te mistake or	my part.

END OF SECTION FOUR, PLEASE GO TO SECTION FIVE ----->

SECTION FIVE - PERSONAL REASONS FOR WORKING AT THIS RESORT

The following list contains personal reasons employees could have for working at this resort.

You are now being asked to indicate whether each statement is an <u>ACCURATE</u> or <u>INACCURATE</u> description of your personal reasons for working at this resort.

Please CIRCLE the number below each statement based on the following scale:

How ACCURATE or INACCURATE is each statement in describing your personal reasons for working at this resort?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
VERY	MOSTLY	SLIGHTLY	UNCERTAIN	SLIGHTLY	MOSTLY	VERY
INACCURATE	INACCURATE	INACCURATE		ACCURATE	ACCURATE	ACCURATE

1. I want a career for myself working in the resort/tourism business.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I really enjoy doing this kind of work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I was layed off by another employer.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. This resort was willing to provide me with my very first job.

2 3 4 5 6 7

5. This resort is a convenient place for me to work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I have to pay off debts I owe.

1

1

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I need something to do to occupy my free time.

2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I am trying to save money for the future.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

ERY CURATE	MO INAC	STLY Curate	BLIGH INACCU	TLY Rate	UNCERTAI	N 8 2	S BLIGHTLY ACCURATE	MOBTLY Accurate	VERY ACCURATE
I need family	d addi /•	tional	money	to me	et current	t liv	ving expe	nses for m	yself, or
:	L	2	3	4	5	6	7		
I am q own so	gettin omeday	g expei •	rience	in th	is job in	orde	er to sta	rt a busin	ess of my
:	L	2	3	4	5	6	7		
I just	want	ed to t	ry my	hand a	at a diffe	erent	: line of	work.	
1	L	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Iama	stude	ent, th	is job	allow	s me an o	ppor	tunity to	earn extr	a income.
1	L	2	3	4	5	6	7		
I am resort	only 1 : has '	here to to offe	o take er when	advan I gei	tage of t t off wor	the : (.	recreatio	nal activ	ities the
1	L	2	3	4	5	6	7		
Iamv	orkin	g here	in ord	er to	live in t	his	part of M	lichigan.	
1	L	2	3	4	5	6	7		
I deci	ded to	o work	here u	ntil]	I find a m	nore	interest	ing job.	
1	L	2	3	4	5	6	7		
None c	of the	above	reason	s best	t describe	e why	I work h	nere. I wo	rk here
becaus	e:								
	SRY SURATE I need family I am of own so J I just I am a J I am a I am a I am v J I am v J I am v J I deci J None of becaus	I need addi family. I need addi family. I I am gettin own someday I I just want I I am a stude I I am only I resort has I I am workine I I decided te I None of the because:	ZRY MOSTLY CURATE INACCURATE I need additional family. 1 2 I am getting expendence own someday. 1 2 I just wanted to formation 1 2 I am a student, the 1 2 I am only here to resort has to offer 1 2 I am working here 1 2 I decided to work 1 2 None of the above because:	ZRY MOSTLY SLIGH CURATE INACCURATE INACCU I number number number 1 2 3 3 I am getting experience own someday. 1 2 3 I am getting experience own someday. 1 2 3 I just wanted to try my 1 2 3 I am as student, this job 1 2 3 I am only here to take resort has to offer when 1 2 3 I am am an working here in ord 1 2 3 I decided to work here und 1 2 3 3 None of the above reasonable because:	ZRY MOSTLY SLIGHTLY URATE INACCURATE INACCURATE I need additional money to mean family. 1 2 3 4 I need additional money to mean family. 1 2 3 4 I am getting experience in the own someday. 1 2 3 4 I am getting experience in the own someday. 1 2 3 4 I just wanted to try my hand at 1 2 3 4 I am a student, this job allow 1 2 3 4 I am only here to take advanted to offer when I get 1 2 3 4 I am only here to take advanted to offer when I get 1 2 3 4 I am working here in order to 1 1 2 3 4 I dm of the above reasons best 1 2 3 4	ERY MOSTLY SLIGHTLY UNCERTAIN JURATE INACCURATE INACCURATE INACCURATE I need additional money to meet current family. 1 2 3 4 5 I need additional money to meet current family. 1 2 3 4 5 I am getting experience in this job in own someday. 1 2 3 4 5 I just wanted to try my hand at a different of the additional money have an operation of the additional money is a student, this job allows me an operation of the additional money have a student of the additional money have additional money have a	ERY MOSTLY SLIGHTLY UNCERTAIN A CURATE INACCURATE INACCURATE Incertain Incertain	RY MOSTLY SLIGHTLY UNCERTAIN SLIGHTLY URATE INACCURATE INACCURATE ACCURATE I need additional money to meet current living experiantly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I need additional money to meet current living experiantly. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am getting experience in this job in order to state own someday. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I just wanted to try my hand at a different line of 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am a student, this job allows me an opportunity to 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am only here to take advantage of the recreation resort has to offer when I get off work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am working here in order to live in this part of N 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I decided to work here until I find a more interesti 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 None of the above reaso	RY MOSTLY SLIGHTLY UNCERTAIN SLIGHTLY MOSTLY NCCURATE CURATE INACCURATE INACCURATE ACCURATE ACCURATE ACCURATE I need additional money to meet current living expenses for m family. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I need additional money to meet current living expenses for m family. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am getting experience in this job in order to start a busin own someday. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I just wanted to try my hand at a different line of work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am a student, this job allows me an opportunity to earn extr 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am only here to take advantage of the recreational activ resort has to offer when I get off work. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am working here in order to live in this part of Michigan. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 <td< td=""></td<>

END OF SECTION FIVE, PLEASE GO TO SECTION SIX ----->

SECTION SIX - BENEFITS OF WORKING AT THIS RESORT

This section covers employee benefits. Please follow instructions carefully.

Step 1. Place an X before each benefit that is IMPORTANT to you.

Step 2. Next, CIRCLE the number beside each benefit you indicated as being important, based on the following scale:

How SATISFIED are you with the benefits you placed an X before as being important?

	1 Very Dissatisfied	2 Nostly Dissatispied	3 Slightly Dissatisfied	4 Uncertain	5 Slightly Satisfied	1 51	6 Hostly Atisfi	ED	V Bat	7 Ery Ispie	D
>	Opportun	ity to work in	my special fi	eld of inter	est 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Opportun	ity to live in	this part of	Michigan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Attracti	ve working hou	rs		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	High sal	ary			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	A chance	to gain valua	ble work exper	ience	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Job secu	rity			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Opportun	ity to establi	sh meaningful	friendships.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Attracti	ve fringe bene	fits		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<pre>A chance leisure/</pre>	to engage in recreation act	my favorite ivities		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Particip	ation in team	effort on the	job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Challeng	ing work assig	nments		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Work wit	h modern equip	ment		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Opportun	ity to make de	cisions to hel	p the resort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Continua	tion of formal	education		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Advancem	ent/promotion	with the resor	t	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	High pre	stige and stat	us		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Satisfac	tion from work	ing with custo	mers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	An oppor	tunity to do i	nteresting wor	:k	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Personal	growth			1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	A Sense	of accomplishm	ent		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Other; (please be spec	ific):		······						

END OF SECTION SIX, PLEASE GO TO SECTION SEVEN ----->

216

SECTION SEVEN - PERSONAL INFORMATION

The Reme	questions in this section are designed to understand you better. mber, your name will NOT be given to management in the final report.									
1.	Name (please print)									
2.	What is your job title? (please print)									
3.	Which department do you work in? (please print)									
4.	Which of the following is your employment status?									
	Full-time PermanentPart-time Permanent									
5.	If you are a part-time employee now, would you work full-time if you had the opportunity?NOYES									
6.	How old were you on your last birthday?									
7.	Are YOU:MaleFemale									
8.	Marital Status:SingleMarriedDivorced									
	WidowedOther									
9.	If married, how many dependents do you have at home?									
10.	Please CIRCLE the number that represents the highest level of education you have completed.									
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 89 10 11 1213 14 15 1617 18 19 20(Grade School)(High School)(College)(Graduate School)									
11.	How many years have you worked at this resort?									
12.	Do you currently have another job with a different employer? NOYES> (IF "YES" ANSWER QUESTIONS 12a AND 12b)									
12a.	What is your job title in your other job?									
12b.	Do you work your other job?Full-timePart-time									

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!!!!

APPENDIX B

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL FORM

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Employee Name			Date	
	ipinase printj			
Job Title			Department	
	للملمو محمدتها	SECTION I		iginaan galad

INSTRUCTIONS. Please rate the employee on the basis of actual work he or she is now doing. Before attempting to evaluate the performance of the employee in this section, it is important to have a clear idea of the qualities that are being evaluated. Read the definitions very carefully. Please place a check in the space provided that best describes the actual performance of the employee for each of the four areas listed here in Section I.

State of the second sec

1. QUALITY OF WORK

UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	ACCEPTABLE	CONNENDABLE	OUTSTANDING
Poor quality of work, continually makes errors, requires exc- essive supervision.	Careless, inclined to make mistakes, work is barely acceptable	Heets minimum req- uirements of accur- accy and neatness, average quality of work, needs normal supervision	Exceeds minimum requ- irements of accuracy and makes few errors, follows instructions with little supervision.	Consistent high deg- ree of accuracy and neatness, work can be relied upon, seldom needs supervision.
2. ATTENDANCE				
UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	ACCEPTABLE	COMMENDABLE	OUTSTANDING
Often absent or late. Does not report abs- ence or lateness in advance. Very unde- pendable.	Erratic in attend- ance and punctuality. Seldom reports absence or lateness in advance. Not dependable.	Occasionally absent or late. Reports absence or lateness in advance.	Seldom absent or late. Always reports absence or lateness. Dependable.	Excellent attendance. Always at work on time. Very dependable.
3. JOB KNOWLEDGE				
UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	ACCEPTABLE	CONVENDABLE	OUTSTAND ING
Definite lack of know- ledge. Nas little understanding of job duties. Needs consid- erable instructions.	Inadequate knowl- edge of duties. Understanding of job duties not sufficient.	Has adequate know- ledge of duties. Needs a little add- ional instruction.	Good knowledge of duties. Well info- rmed. Occasionally needs directions.	Excellent understanding of job assignments. Requires very little direction. Extremely capable
4. WORK ATTITUDE				
UNSATISFACTORY	MARGINAL	ACCEPTABLE	COMMENDABLE	OUTSTANDING
Difficult to work with. Uncooperative with other em ployees.	Occasionally unw- illing to follow orders without some resistance.	Tries to cooperate. Usually agreeable and gets along well with others.	Cooperative most of the time. Interest- ed in work. Quick to offer assistance.	Always cooperative. Shows a high interest in work. Goes out of way to be helpful.

SECTION II

Stop and think again about the employee being evaluated. Circle the number which best describes how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with the following statements about the employee now being evaluated here in Section II.

	STRONGLY D I SAGREE	DISAGREE	UNDECIDED	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1.	Enjoys their work1			4	·····s
2.	Seems committed to the success of the resort1	·····2····			5
3.	Puts in effort beyond what is expected1	2		4	5
4.	Handles pressure of the job	·····2····	3	4	5
5.	Follows work rules and resort policies1	·····2····		4	5
6.	Commes up with good ideas to solve problems1	·····2····		4	·····s
7.	Willing to take on more responsibility1	·····2····	3		5
8.	Dedicated to doing the best job possible1	·····2····		· · · · · 4 · · ·	5
9.	Complains about conditions of the job1	•••••2••••		4	5

APPENDIX C

EMPLOYEE TURNOVER QUESTIONNAIRE

EMPLOYEE TURNOVER QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer all of the following questions on this form and have it mailed to Joseph "Mick" La Lopa at Michigan State University.

<u>INSTRUCTIONS.</u> Please CIRCLE the letter that best answers each of the following questions below, in reference to the employee who has <u>voluntarily</u> left the resort.

1. Would you rehire this person to work for you?

- a. I would definitely hire this person to work for me again.
- b. I would slightly prefer to hire this person (rather than someone else) to work for me again.
- c. I am indifferent as to whether this person ever works for me again.
- d. I would prefer to hire someone else to work for me.
- e. Under no circumstances would I hire this person to work for me again.

2. How would you rate this person's performance while working for you?

- a. Inadequate; clearly failed to meet minimum job requirements.
- b. Generally adequate; met most job requirements; however, required close supervision.
- c. Competent; met all requirements; required only minimal supervision.
- d. High quality work; exceeded most requirements; made a valuable contribution and showed initiative.
- e. Exceptional; consistently demonstrated outstanding performance.
- 3. In general, how easy would it be to find someone who would do as good a job as this person did?
 - a. Very easy

.

- b. Somewhat easy
- c. Somewhat difficult
- d. Very difficult

APPENDIX D

SUPERVISOR WAIVER FORM

MICHIGAN RESORT EMPLOYMENT SURVEY

This research is being conducted by Michigan State University and the Michigan Travel, Tourism and Recreation Resource Center, to get a better understanding of resort employment. We are very interested in learning more about resort jobs and the people who work in them. <u>YOU ARE THE EXPERTS!</u>

Your participation in this study would be greatly appreciated. However, your participation in this study is voluntary. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact Joe La Lopa, at Michigan State University at (517) 353-0793.

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND SIGN YOUR NAME BELOW:

I have agreed to be a volunteer in this study, and fill out a performance appraisal on my employees.

Supervisor's Signature

Date

PLEASE NOTE; all supervisors, who fill out performance appraisals for their employees, will receive a Michigan State University pen and pencil set as a token of my deep appreciation for helping to make this survey a success. APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER

June 1, 1993

Good Morning!

Thank you so much for agreeing to fill out the attached questionnaire. Before you begin, please do the following:

- 1. Before filling out the questionnaire; first fill out the Employee Name, Job Title, Date and Department of the <u>single-</u> <u>page</u>, Employee Performance Appraisal form. Once you have filled out the top portion <u>only</u>, give the form to your immediate supervisor before you leave work today.
- 2. After you have given the performance appraisal form to your supervisor, you may begin to fill out the questionnaire. Please be sure to follow the instructions carefully when filling out the questionnaire.

Note: Should you have any questions about how to fill out the questionnaire, I can be reached at the _______ Motel, phone (999) 999-9999, room 999, or ask for Joe La Lopa. I will be available to receive your calls and answer any questions you may have from 2-4, and 6-10 p.m. in the evening.

- 3. Once you have finished filling out the questionnaire, you may return it to either the main office or the main security gate today or tomorrow. There will be a box there for you to drop your completed questionnaire into when you are done.
- 4. I will be at the resort at the end of the day tomorrow, from 4-6 p.m., for employees who would like to comment on the questionnaire itself. This will help me to improve the questionnaire for other resort employees who will take it again in the future.

And remember, <u>all employees who properly fill out their</u> <u>questionnaire</u> will be eligible to have their name entered into a raffle. The first place winner will receive a \$75.00 cash prize. The second place winner will receive a \$25.00 cash prize.

Once again, thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Joseph "Mick" La Lopa Senior Research Assistant, MSU APPENDIX F

BREAKDOWN OF RESORT JOBS

Department/Jobs	Frequency	Percent
Property Maintenance (N=153)		
Missing	1	.7
Ground Crew	5	3.3
Greeenskeeper	7	4.6
Golf Course Crew	2	1.3
Inside Maintenance	4	2.6
Supervisor-Lead	22	14.4
Golf Course Technician	1	.7
Carpenter	2	1.3
Maintenance Worker	13	8.5
Building Maintenance	1	.7
Housekeeper	33	21.6
Qualtiy Control Director	1	.7
Publics Person	2	1.3
Laundry	11	7.2
Repair Person	1	.7
Janitor	4	2.6
Fairway Mower	4	2.6
Mechanic	3	2.0
Operations	1	.7
Projects	1	.7
Welder	1	.7
Golf Course Maintenance	3	2.0
Security Officer	14	9.2
Irrigation	2	1.3
Sanitation	1	.7
Furniture Repair	1	.7
Lift Maintenance	3	2.0
Rough Mower	1	.7
Golf Course	1	.7
Snowmaker-Woodcutter	3	2.0
Golf Course Mower	1	.7
Grounds Maintenance	3	2.0
<u>Food and Beverage (N=64)</u>		
Buffet-Line Runner	1	1.6
Dishwasher	4	6.3
Supervisor-Lead	1	1.6
Pastry Chef	1	1.6
Chef	1	1.6
Line Cook	7	10.9
Waitress	18	28.1
Hostess	3	4.7
Food Service	1	1.6

Table A-1.	Breakdown of jobs by department	for	all
	resorts in study.		

Table A-1. (cont'd.).		
Bus Person	3	4.7
Bartender	11	17.2
Salad Person	1	1.6
Convention Staff	8	12.5
Cashier	2	3.1
Crew Chief	1	1.6
Food Delivery	1	1.6
<u>Service-Sales-Safety (N=57)</u>		
Marketing Specialist	1	1.8
Public Relations	1	1.8
Group Sales Coordinator	1	1.8
Sales Person	2	3.5
Reservationist	17	29.8
Activities Assistant	2	3.5
Golf Staff-Operation	3	5.3
Cart Person	3	5.3
Information Systems	1	1.8
Pool Attendant	1 -	1.8
Peak Staff	1	1.8
Reservation Coordinator	1	1.8
Ranger	3	5.3
Bevarage Cart	1	1.8
Property Owner Relations	1	1.8
Sales Manager	2	3.5
Day Camp Staff	1	1.8
Front Desk Clerk	7	12.3
Tee Time Operator	2	3.5
Phone Operator	1	1.8
Switchboard Operator	2	3.5
Starter	1	1.8
Receptionist	1	1.8
Clerk	1	1.8
<u>Administrative (N=26)</u>		
Accounts Receivable	2	7.7
Supervisor-Lead	1	3.8
Payroll	1	3.8
Accounts Payable	2	7.7
Adminsitrative Assistant	1	3.8
Typist	1	3.8
Accounting Clerk	1	3.8
Night Auditor	3	11.5
Purchasing	1	3.8
Secretary	2	7.7
Bookkeeper	10	38.5
Office Worker	1	3.8

APPENDIX G

JOB TITLES OF LEAVERS BY DEPARTMENT

Table B-1. Job titles of leavers by department (N=47).

Department/Jobs	Frequency	Percent
Property Maintenance (N=22)		
Supervisor-Lead	1	4.5
Maintenance Worker	4	18.2
Building Maintenance	1	4.5
Housekeeper	6	27.3
Laundry	1	4.5
Janitor	3	13.6
Golf Course Maintenance	3	13.6
Lift Maintenance	1	4.5
Snowmaker-woodcutter	1	4.5
Golf Course Mower	T	4.5
Food and Beverage (N=10)		
Buffet-Line Runner	1	10.0
Line Cook	1	10.0
Waitress	4	40.0
Hostess	1	10.0
Convention Staff	2	20.0
Food Delivery	1	10.0
<u>Service-Sales-Safety (N=14)</u>		
Group Sales Coordinator	1	7.1
Sales Person	1	7.1
Reservationist	2	14.3
Activities Assistant	1	7.1
Golf Staff-Operation	1	7.1
Cart Person	1	7.1
Ranger	3	21.4
Sales Manager-Lead	1	7.1
Front Desk Clerk	1	7.1
Starter	1	7.1
Clerk	1	7.1
<u>Administrative (N=1)</u>		
Bookkeeper	1	100.0
APPENDIX H

SECOND JOBS HELD BY EMPLOYEES

.

Table C-1. Second jobs held by employees. (N=46)

Second Jobs	Frequency
Factory Worker	1
House Cleaner-Sitter	3
Babysitter	1
Cashier & Bookkeeper	2
Cashier & Housekeeper	2
Waitress	1
Bartender	6
Self-Employed	3
Mary Kay Sales	1
Line Cook	2
Beauty Consultant	1
Construction	1
Adminsitrative Assistant	1
Maintenance Worker	3
College Professor	1
High School Teacher	1
Windsurf Technician	1
Rental Manager	1
EMT Specialist	1
Painter	1
Lawnmower Maintenance	1
Self-Employed Autobody Repair	1
Farming	1
"Co-Owner"	1
Aviation Weather Observer	1
Networking Mechanic	1
Machinist-Toolmaker	1
Subsitute Teacher	1
Clerical & Typist	1
Dishwasher & Prep-Cook	1
Pastor	1
Retiree	1