

An Examination of Job Satisfaction of Hotel Front Office Managers According to Extrinsic, Intrinsic, and General Motivational Factors

William D. Frye, PhD, CHE

Associate Professor of Hotel Management
College of Hospitality and Tourism Management
Niagara University
414 St. Vincent's Hall
Niagara University, NY 14109, USA

Abstract

Job satisfaction can be conceptualized in a variety of ways, including extrinsic, intrinsic, and general satisfaction. Such job satisfaction is generally attributed to various intrinsic and extrinsic factors that are motivators of employee behaviors. How an employee perceives and feels about these various factors and how they affect their job is the basis for assessing job satisfaction. This study explores the extent of the relationship among various extrinsic, intrinsic, and general motivational factors and overall job satisfaction of hotel front office managers with a leading international hotel company. Corporate culture and self actualization issues had the greatest impact on the job satisfaction of the front office managers. The majority of these extrinsic factors was related to matters that were often outside of the control of the respondents. Hotels that can permit high levels of creativity, empowerment, and ability utilization while removing or overcoming inflexible barriers that tend to hinder such achievements will achieve higher levels of satisfaction from its front office managers.

Key Words: job satisfaction; front office manager; extrinsic; intrinsic; motivational factors

1. Introduction

The measurement of a manager's job satisfaction has often been considered an important dimension of workplace productivity (Hosie et al., 2012; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Okpara, 2007; Patterson et al., 2004; Petty, Mcgee, & Cavender, 1984; Sheridan & Slocum Jr., 1975). As an independent variable, job satisfaction is generally used to predict worker behaviors such as turnover, morale, and commitment to the organization (Anton, 2009; DeMoura et al., 2009; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). As a dependent variable, satisfaction is frequently used to assess the relationship of employee characteristics on staff satisfaction. Job satisfaction is generally attributed to various intrinsic and extrinsic factors that are motivators of employee behaviors. How an employee perceives and feels about these various factors and how they affect their job is the basis for assessing job satisfaction.

Since a single traditional approach to ensuring job satisfaction may not be adequate, alternative and innovative approaches may have to be considered. Therefore, it is appropriate that hospitality management companies should be concerned about their investments in "human capital." Researchers and practitioners alike agree that the cost to retain existing personnel is considerably less than the expenses that must be incurred to advertise for a vacant position, filter through and interview the various applicants, select the right person for the job, and to train the successful candidate to corporate standards.

Generally, the time and expense of this recruitment, selection, and training process is significantly greater for vacant management positions than for line level positions. Therefore, the need exists for lodging management companies to be able to ascertain the job satisfaction of their key managers, determine what intrinsic and extrinsic factors serve as the motivating drivers for hotel front office managers, and understand the extent of the influence that such drivers have on the organization's ability to retain their key managers.

The purpose of the study was to explore the extent of the relationship among various intrinsic, extrinsic, and general motivational factors and overall job satisfaction of hotel front office managers. To that end, the following research question served as the basis for the exploratory inquiry:

R₁: What is the extent of the relationship between various intrinsic, extrinsic, and general motivational factors and overall job satisfaction of hotel front office managers?

2. Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and General Motivational Factors

Job satisfaction can be conceptualized in a variety of ways, including extrinsic, intrinsic, and general satisfaction. Job Satisfaction may be characterized as an emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences and developed by various intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Segmenting satisfaction with the job into components relating to the employee, relating to the nature of the job itself, and those relating to the job, but external to it, is an approach incorporated into some of the most widely studied models of satisfaction (Bagozzi, 1980; Pepe, 2010; Porter & Lawler, 1968; Walker, Churchill, & Ford, 1977).

Extrinsic job satisfaction is the emotional state that one derives from the rewards associated with one's job that are controlled by the organization, his peers, or superiors (Bhuiyan & Islam, 1996; Pepe, 2010; Pritchard & Peters, 1974). Sometimes referred to as hygiene factors, these facets are external to the job itself and often affect the level of dissatisfaction experienced by an employee more than determining his satisfaction (Lucas, 1985). While certain levels of extrinsic rewards and comforts are necessary for a job to achieve its motivating potential, in and of themselves extrinsic job characteristics are not sufficient to determine intrinsic motivation (Lambert, 1991). Such extrinsic characteristics usually include compensation, job security, tenure, seniority, opportunity for promotion, quality of coworker relationships, and job safety.

Intrinsic motivation is an emotional state that one derives from the job duties engaged in and reflecting the employee's attitude towards tasks of the job. More specifically it is defined as the extent to which workers are motivated for reasons other than financial reward, such as feelings of heightened self-esteem, personal growth, and worthwhile accomplishment (Pritchard & Peter, 1974). The level of intrinsic motivation experienced by a particular worker and the extent of intrinsic job satisfaction depends to a great extent on the fit between the employee and the job (Chuang et al., 2009; Lawler, Hackman, & Kaufman, 1973). Intrinsic satisfaction refers to the inherent fulfillment that a worker obtains in the course of performing the work and experiencing the feelings of accomplishment and self-actualization (Cherniss & Kane, 1987). These fulfillments usually represent all five levels in Maslow's *Hierarchy of Needs* (1954) and may be characterized by career opportunity, job autonomy, skill variety, task identity, skill utilization, task significance, feedback, and perceived power.

General satisfaction, or overall job satisfaction, refers to an aggregation of satisfaction with various job facets or an aggregation of a few measures of general satisfaction (Bhuiyan & Islam, 1996; Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Levin & Stokes, 1989). Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) measure general satisfaction as the aggregate of an employee's perception of twelve intrinsic facets and six extrinsic rewards derived from their job plus the technical abilities of the employee's supervisor and the humanistic relationship between the employee and the supervisor. Building on previous studies conducted by Mount (2006) and Frye (2007), this research employed a modified version of Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist's (1967) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to calculate the overall job satisfaction of hotel front office managers and to explore the extent of the relationship between its intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

2.1 Measuring Job Satisfaction

While a considerable number of conceptual models of job satisfaction have been developed that lead to a variety of methods of measuring job satisfaction (Wanous, 1973), some researchers originally advocated that there was no best way to measure job satisfaction (Bergmann, Grahn, & Wyatt, 1986; Herzberg, et al., 1957). Essentially, the best way depends on the specific variables being measured and the situation under which they are being measured (Bergmann et al., 1986). Scarpello and Campbell (1983) concluded that a single-item measure of overall job satisfaction was preferable to a scale that is based on a sum of specific job item satisfactions. However, there are major drawbacks to this technique, the primary being that one cannot conclusively estimate the internal consistency reliability of single-item measures for psychological constructs.

Many early attempts to investigate job characteristic-job satisfaction relationships typically employed univariate rather than multivariate techniques of data analysis (Lee, McCabe, & Graham, 1983). However, instruments used to measure job characteristics or job satisfaction generally contain factors that are highly correlated within the instrument. Also, it seems reasonable to assume that job characteristics and job satisfaction share a common domain of psychometric behavior. Finally, a distorted picture of between group differences is possible when successive *t* tests or *F* tests are performed on correlated measures (Tatsuoka, 1970). For these reasons, and because most recent researchers concur that satisfaction is not a unidimensional variable, this study has incorporated an investigation of the underlying components of job satisfaction for hotel front office managers through the adaptation and administration of an established multi-scale survey instrument.

2.2 Theory of Work Adjustment

There has been a prevalence of speculation that the extent of employee job satisfaction is a direct function of the perceived discrepancy between what an employee desires from the job and what he actually receives from it (Scarpello & Vandenberg, 1992). According to Dawis (1980), at the heart of the *Theory of Work Adjustment* is the concept of interaction between individual and work environment. The theory uses the correspondence (or lack of it) between the work personality and the work environment as the principal explanation for observed work adjustment outcomes, such as job satisfaction and tenure (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967). While the work environment serves various organizational needs, the individual employee also has various needs such as those for recognition, fringe benefits, and accomplishment. Hence, work adjustment is indicated by both the individual's satisfaction and the satisfaction of the organization with the individual, whereby job tenure can be predicted (Dawis, 1980). The theory further asserts that vocational abilities and vocational needs are the significant aspects of the work personality, while ability requirements and reinforcer systems such as organizational policies are the significant aspects of the work environment. Since work adjustment is predicted by matching an individual's work personality with work environments, work adjustment, and ultimately job satisfaction, depends on how well an individual's abilities correspond to the ability requirements in work and how well his needs correspond to the reinforcers available in the work environment (Weiss et al., 1967).

2.3 Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

An outcome of the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, better known as the Work Adjustment Project, was the development of the *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* (MSQ). The MSQ, developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967), is a survey instrument designed to be administered to either a homogeneous or heterogeneous group of individuals to assess their overall job satisfaction. This is accomplished by measuring satisfaction with several individual aspects of work and work environments. As an aggregate but individualized measure of satisfaction the MSQ is useful because two individuals may express the same amount of general satisfaction, but for entirely different reasons. These individual differences in vocational needs may affect satisfaction in different way among diverse classifications of workers. Such understanding of workers' needs should contribute to the effectiveness of vocational planning and operational considerations (Weiss et al., 1967).

The *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* was developed into two instruments, a long form consisting of 100 items and 21 scales, and a short form consisting of 20 items and 3 scales. Because of the time considerations associated with administering the long form (20-25 minutes) the short form was adopted for use in this study. Each of the items in the short form refers to a reinforcer in the work environment (Table 1). The various items may be summated to arrive at three scales: extrinsic, intrinsic, and general (overall) job satisfaction.

The MSQ short form has been shown to demonstrate a high degree of internal consistency. To assess its reliability the developer administered the questionnaire to 1,723 subjects that comprise six different occupations (assemblers, office clerks, engineers, maintenance men, machinists, and salesmen). Median reliability coefficients were .86 for intrinsic satisfaction, .80 for extrinsic satisfaction, and .90 for general satisfaction. Subsequent studies that have employed the MSQ short form have experienced similar high degrees of reliability (Bergmann, 1981; Duvall-Early & Benedict, 1992; Ghazzawi, 2010; Hauber & Bruininks, 1986; Hirschfeld, 2000; Mount & Frye, 2006; Roberson, 1990; Scarpello & Campbell, 1983).

Because the MSQ short form is derived from a subset of the long form items, validity of the short form is inferred in part from the validity of the long form as well as its continuing usage by several other researchers (Arvey, Abraham, Bouchard, Jr., & Segal, 1989; Bergmann, 1981; Duvall-Early & Benedict, 1992; Frye & Mount, 2007; Ghazzawi, 2010; Hauber & Bruininks, 1986; Hirschfeld, 2000; Keller, Bouchard, Jr., Arvey, Segal, & Dawis, 1992; Mount & Frye, 2006; Roberson, 1990; Scarpello & Campbell, 1983). Analyses of the data from the original validation studies conducted by the instrument's developers yielded good evidence of construct validity for most of the long form's 21 scales (Weiss et al., 1967). Additional evidence for the validity of the MSQ as a measure of general job satisfaction comes from other construct validation studies where the MSQ was paired with the *Minnesota Importance Questionnaire* and based on the *Theory of Work Adjustment* as outlined in *An Inferential Approach to Occupational Reinforcement* (Weiss, 1965). Furthermore, validation testing of the short form by the developers revealed occupational group differences in mean satisfaction scores were statistically significant for each of the three scales among the seven different occupational groups. This infers that the instrument may be reliably administered across homogeneous and heterogeneous occupational groups with a high degree of validity. Because the MSQ short form was deemed to be reliable and valid, could be administered in less than 10 minutes, and permitted the inclusion of 20 different satisfaction job items, it was chosen for use in the study.

3.0 Methodology

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey research design to answer the question posed by this enquiry. Employing Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist's *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* for the study (1967), various intrinsic and extrinsic items were measured to assess their effect on the job satisfaction of hotel front office managers. To achieve this, a survey instrument was designed to gauge the job satisfaction perceptions of hotel front office managers from hotels of various sizes and service types within an internationally recognized, American, lodging ownership and management company (hereafter, "the participating hotel company") at a single point in time. The participating hotel company's portfolio encompassed five internationally recognized brand names, consisting of over 700 limited-service and full-service hotels. Prior to first-class mail distribution, a validity check of the survey instrument was conducted among a convenience sample of ten hotel front office managers.

The survey instrument was a paper and pencil questionnaire composed of twenty-eight satisfaction questions and twelve self-reporting demographic questions. The satisfaction questions represented various motivational summary measures of factors that comprise intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. This section was adopted from the *Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire Short Form* because of the instrument's demonstrated high degree of reliability, its ability to assess intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction across several variables (Weiss, et al., 1967), and the ease by which it may be modified to measure perceived comparisons between hotel service types. All responses were recorded on a 7-point attitude (Likert) scale with 1= "not at all satisfied" and 7= "extremely satisfied". The twelve demographic questions inquired as to each respondent's property service type, the front office manager's longevity in their current position, length of service with the participating hotel company, the respondent's age, gender, and educational background.

4.0 Data Analysis and Findings

The self-administered survey was distributed via first-class mail to 266 front office managers at full-service hotels and 287 front office managers of limited-service hotels. The return rate was 26% (n=70) for full-service managers, 23% (n=65) for limited-service managers.

The average profile of the front office managers that participated in this study was a 32 year-old female, who had completed two years of college or the equivalent and who had been employed in the hospitality industry for seven years. The average respondent had been a hotel manager for not quite five years and had been a front office manager for slightly less than three years; almost two years at her current property. Table 2 provides a summarized breakdown of the gender, age, educational background, and hospitality work experience of the sample.

Before examining the overall job satisfaction results, the internal consistency of the satisfaction portion of the survey instrument was subjected to statistical reliability analysis.

The reliability of the survey was strengthened by the exclusion of the first (“being able to keep busy all the time”) of the 28 items in the satisfaction portion of the survey. The reliability coefficient for the new 27-item scale increased from .9551 to .9555. As a diagnostic rule of thumb, the agreed upon lower limit for Cronbach’s alpha is .70, though it may decrease to .60 in exploratory research (Hair, Jr., Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). This scale posted a high measure of reliability.

4.1 Exploratory Analysis

A recognized method for discovering patterns in a set of scores from collected data is exploratory data analysis (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Since the research question addressed the extent of the relationship of the aggregate satisfaction levels of the front office managers and grouping patterns of the 28 intrinsic, extrinsic, and general motivational items, exploratory analysis was utilized. In order to identify factors underlying the set of 27 adopted items used to assess front office manager job satisfaction and to cluster this large number of variables into a smaller and more manageable number of homogenous sets for subsequent examination and interpretation, exploratory factor analysis was utilized.

Using a principal factor solution and the Kaiser criterion, the resulting principal factor matrix was rotated to a varimax solution converging in six iterations. Deleting all factors with an eigenvalue of less than 1.00, a principal factor component analysis yielded four factors. The factor count was confirmed through visual inspection of the scree plot. The cumulative percentage of variance explained in the four factors solution was 64%. The accepted guideline for identifying factor loadings based on a sample size needed for .05 significance level is .45 for a sample size of 150 respondents and .50 for a sample size of 120 respondents (Hair, Jr., et al., 1998). Since the sample size for this research was 135 respondents, it was determined through extrapolation that the minimum needed significant factor loading was .47. All but one of the 27 items loaded on exactly one of the four factors at or above the .47 threshold. Table 3 contains the factor loading results showing the highest values from each item loading on a single factor.

The four derived factors were named using a title that describes those items that loaded into each factor. Table 4 exhibits the item factor assignments by highest factor loading values. Factor I, accounting for 47% of the variance, was labeled Corporate Culture, and was defined as the working conditions and environment the front office manager experienced in regards to his or her job. These were all items that the FOM had little or no control over. Several of the thirteen items for this factor demonstrated high loading values and focused on communication and perception issues between the FOM and the company or his supervisor.

Factor II accounts for 7% of the common variance and was labeled Self Actualization. This was defined as the perceptions and intangible appreciation that the FOM held about himself as he fulfilled his position. The item with the highest loading value for this factor was Ability Utilization, thus indicating that respondents’ job satisfaction was highly influenced by whether the FOM could make use of his skills, training and abilities.

Factor III accounted for 5% of the common variance and was named Job Dynamics. This factor was defined as the more observable and tangible benefits accorded to the FOM by occupying his position. The four items that loaded highest on this factor each illustrate definitive and sought after benefits, such as job authority, job security, independence on the job and the ability to maintain one’s personal conscience in his work.

Finally, Factor IV was labeled Job Latitude and was defined as the extent of control that the front office manager exercised over his or her job. The two items, responsibility and creativity, would be appropriate traits for hotel front office managers. As a hotel manager in a 24-hour/day department, supervision from superiors is often limited and the FOM is often left in his own realm to define the parameters and avenues for fulfilling his position.

Alpha internal consistency reliabilities of the four factors ranged from a high of .95 on Factor I to a low of .75 on Factor III. The reliabilities for Factors I (.95), II (.87), and III (.77), and IV (.88) are adequate for most research and evaluation purposes.

Additional data analysis for this study was conducted to assess the extent of the relationship between the derived motivational factors and overall job satisfaction of the hotel front office managers utilizing correlational analysis and confirmed through a review of the scatter plots for each independent variable factor and the dependent variable, job satisfaction.

As Table 5 reveals, each of the four derivative factors were very significantly correlated ($p < .001$) with overall job satisfaction. The correlations ranged from an association of .949 for corporate culture to .705 for job latitude. A review of the scatter plots for each independent variable factor and the dependent variable, job satisfaction, revealed that each bivariate association was fairly linear and positive. There were no curvilinear associations apparent so it was not necessary to transform the variables to better explain their relationship. Of the four factors, corporate culture had the greatest predictive correlation ($r_p = .949$) and the second highest internal consistency ($\alpha_{CR} = .95$). Table 6, which will be discussed in more detail in the Discussion section, illustrates the mean satisfaction scores by service type across the 27 items and grouped according to factors on which each item loaded.

4.2 Discussion

Through exploratory factor analysis techniques, four unique factors were identified as accounting for 64% of the common variance in the determination of overall job satisfaction of the front office managers from both service types combines. Corporate Culture, accounting for 47% of the variance, was comprised of 13 different items. Three of the four items loading on Corporate Culture with the greatest loading values, feedback (.83), effectiveness of manager orientation (.80), and downward communications (.80), are all extrinsic motivators. Other extrinsic items contributing to the corporate culture include recognition (.77), the level of support from the general manager provided to the FOM (.75), training (.71), conflict resolution (.62), timeliness of performance evaluations (.56), the amount of paperwork (.51), and the perceived working conditions (.49). The sole intrinsic items for this factor were co-workers getting along (.52) and the perceived working conditions (.49). Supervision-technical (.78) and supervision-human relations (.81) were the sole supervisory items identified as integral determinants of job satisfaction.

As is the case with many hotels, front office managers often suffer from a lack of resources within the lodging property's operating environment. Free-flowing communications, extensive training prior to assuming responsibility, on-the-job coaching, recognition and even praise are often found in short supply in many hotels. Part of this phenomenon may be attributed to the 24-hour environment in which the front office operates while other departments, especially the executive offices, tend to keep more traditional work days and hours. Another issue to consider is the lack of mobility for many front office managers in the normal course of their duties. A contained work environment often precludes Front Office Managers from being able to effectively interact on a casual and easy basis with other peers. Finally, the extensive paperwork burden typically associated with a front office management position certainly affects an FOM's overall job satisfaction. Not surprisingly, as each of these items contribute to define the hotel's work culture, the perceived working environment and all items that affect it play the most significant role in determining to what extent Front Office Managers will be satisfied in their jobs.

Contributing to and building upon Corporate Culture is the second factor, Self Actualization, which contributed 7% to the common variance. Six closely related items loaded on this factor. The chance to do something that makes use of the FOM's abilities (.81), the chance to be perceived as "somebody" in the community (.67), the chance to do things for other people (.64), and the feeling of accomplishment derived from the job (.62) are all intrinsic items that extensively affect one's internal perspective toward their employment position. Job variety (.66) and the way company policies are implemented (.52), though extrinsic in nature, also affect the self actualization process.

The third factor, Job Dynamics, accounted for 5% of the common variance and also included four intrinsic items and two extrinsic items. The chance to work alone (.63), being able to do things that do not go against one's conscience (.61), the opportunities for advancement (.49), and the compensation associated with the FOM position (.38) were each intrinsic items. Managerial authority (.69) and job security (.64), both extrinsic items, were the greatest contributors to the factor of job dynamics.

The fourth factor, Job Latitude, accounted for 5% of the common variance and was comprised of FOM responsibility (.78) and creativity (.72). As is the case with many hotel companies, and for reasons already mentioned, hotel front office managers often receive limited supervision from their general managers. Those entrepreneurial-minded front office managers that prefer a corporate hands-off approach regarding their department would likely aspire to such a situation and, if the front office meets requisite objectives, subsequently realize a high level of job satisfaction ensuing from such goal attainment.

Conversely, at those hotels where Front Office Managers fail to meet established business objectives, the general manager then is likely to hold them accountable for the hotel's performance and consequently the FOM will experience a low level of job satisfaction. Hence, it is easy to see how realizable outcomes and the means by which such results are arrived at in the daily management process can play such a seminal role in job satisfaction.

Of interesting note, and contradicting Mount & Frye's (2006) previous finding that full-service managers experienced greater job satisfaction than did their limited-service counterparts, this study reveals the opposite. To test for the difference in the general satisfaction of the hotel front office managers between service types, an independent samples t-test was performed. Results of the t-test are presented in Table 7 and indicate that there was a significant difference between the front office manager job satisfaction means of the two service types.

It is logical to surmise that the front office managers of limited-service properties might experience significantly lower levels of item satisfaction because of the multi-faceted roles that they fulfilled at their property, the lower levels of staffing, and the lack of opportunities to delegate tasks. It is not uncommon to see a limited-service Front Office Manager working prolonged shifts as a front desk clerk. To a large extent most limited-service lodging properties may have only a couple of managers to oversee their hotel's overall operations and to complete required paperwork. Without such an extensive support infrastructure within their hotel to assign areas of responsibility and task requirements, limited-service front office managers indeed may have to become proficient at multi-tasking within a limited time frame. The stress associated with such diverse responsibilities can often have detrimental effects of the manager's job satisfaction.

It is no mystery that full-service front office managers oversee larger properties with greater service offerings and larger staffs. With greater service focuses, broader target market segments, opportunities to delegate paperwork and restrictive tasks, and as a result, more availability of time afforded to the full-service front office manager, it is plausible to believe that these FOMs would have greater opportunities to attend to various operational aspects as they choose, possibly contributing to a higher satisfaction mean. However, a comparison review of the 27 items (see Table 6) that comprise job satisfaction shows that for every item, the limited-service satisfaction exceeded that of its full-service counterpart.

A comprehensive review of the qualitative responses in the survey provides no rational explanation for this phenomenon. One might assume that managing the front office at a limited-service property is not quite as intricate; a review of the educational level attainment of limited-service vs. full-service FOMs seems to confirm this. This aspect should be analyzed in greater detail through the use of confirmatory studies across various subsets of limited-service types and brands.

5. Conclusions

As introduced in this study, the exploration into the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that had the greatest influence on the determination of front office manager job satisfaction confirmed many of the findings in Mount and Frye's (2006) previous examination of hotel employee and manager satisfaction but contradicted others. Corporate culture and self actualization issues had the greatest impact on the job satisfaction of the front office managers. The majority of these issues was extrinsic in nature and was related to matters that were often outside of the control of the respondents. Hotels that can permit high levels of creativity, empowerment, and ability utilization while removing or overcoming inflexible barriers that tend to hinder such achievements will achieve higher levels of satisfaction from its front office managers.

For future research considerations, adding a single item summary satisfaction measure that can be used as the dependent variable is advisable. The inclusion of such an item would permit the researchers to utilize step-wise regression techniques to add and delete factors in order to calculate a best-fit predictive model based on the factor analysis. Because this study used an aggregate calculated measure, the investigator was limited from employing regression techniques to obtain an appropriate predictor model.

References

- Anton, C. (2009). The impact of role stress on workers' behavior through job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Psychology*, 44(3), 187-194.
- Arvey, R.D., Abraham, L.M., Bouchard, T.J. Jr., & Segal, N.L. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 187-193.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1980, Spring). Performance and satisfaction in an industrial sales force: An examination of their antecedents and simultaneity. *Journal of Marketing*, 44, 65-77.
- Bergmann, T.J. (1981). Managers and their organizations: An interactive approach to multidimensional job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 54(4), 275-289.
- Bergmann, T.J., Grahn, J.L., & Wyatt, R. (1986). Relationship of employment status to employee job satisfaction. *Akron Business & Economic Review*, 17(2), 45-50.
- Bhuiyan, S.N., & Islam, M.S. (1996). Continuance commitment and extrinsic job satisfaction among novel multicultural expatriate workforce. *The Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*, 32(1), 35-46.
- Cherniss, C., & Kane, J.S. (1987). Public sector professionals: Job characteristics, satisfaction, and aspirations for intrinsic fulfillment through work. *Human Relations*, 40(3), 125-136.
- Chuang, N.K., Yin, D., & Dellman-Jenkins, M. (2009). Intrinsic and extrinsic factors impacting casino hotel chefs' job satisfaction. *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21(3), 323-340.
- Dawis, R.V. (1980). Personnel assessment from the perspective of the Theory of Work Adjustment. *Public Personnel Management*, 9(4), 268.
- DeMoura, G., Abrams, D., Retter, C., Gunnarsdottir, S., & Ando, K. (2009). Identification as an organizational anchor: How identification and job satisfaction combine to predict turnover intention. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(4), 540-557.
- Duvall-Early, K., & Benedict, J.O. (1992). The relationships between privacy and different components of job satisfaction. *Environment and Behavior*, 24(5), 670.
- Frye, W.D. & Mount, D.J., (2007). An examination of job satisfaction of hotel general managers based on hotel size and service type. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 6(2), 109-134.
- Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Ghazzawi, I. (2010). Gender role in job satisfaction: The case of the U.S. information technology professionals. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, 14(2), 1-34.
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hair, J.F. Jr., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hauber, F.A., & Bruininks, R.H. (1986). Intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction among direct-care staff in residential facilities for mentally retarded people. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 46(1), 95-105.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R.O., & Capwell, D.F. (1957). *Job attitudes: Review of research and opinion*. Pittsburgh, PA: Psychology Services of Pittsburgh.
- Hirschfeld, R.C. (2000). Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire short form make a difference? *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(2), 255-270.
- Hosie, P., Willemyns, M., & Sevastos, P. (2012). The impact of happiness on managers' contextual and task performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 50(3), 268-287.
- Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P.M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97(2), 251-273.
- Keller, L.M., Bouchard, T.J. Jr., Arvey, R.D., Segal, N.L., & Dawis R.V. (1992). Work Values: Genetic and environmental influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(1), 79-89.
- Lambert, S.J. (1991). The combined effects of job and family characteristics on the job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation of men and women workers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(4), 341-363.
- Lawler, E., Hackman, J.R., & Kaufman, S. (1973). Effects of job redesign: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 3, 49-62.
- Lee, R., McCabe, D., & Graham, W. (1983, January). Multivariate relationships between job characteristics and job satisfaction in the public sector: A triple cross-validation study. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 18, 47-62.
- Levin, I., & Stokes, J.P. (1989). Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 752-758.
- Lucas, G.H. (1985). The relationships between job attitudes, personal characteristics, and job outcomes: A study of retail store managers. *Journal of Retailing*, 61(1), 35-62.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108, 171-194.
- Mount, D. J. & Frye, W. D., (2006). The impact of hotel size and service type on employee job satisfaction. *FIU Hospitality and Tourism Review*, 24(1) 60-68.

- Okpara, J.O. (2007). The effect of culture on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A study of information system managers in Nigeria. *Journal of African Business*, 8(1), 113-130.
- Patterson, M., Warr, P., & West, M. (2004). Organizational climate and company productivity: The role of employee affect and employee level. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 77(2), 193-216.
- Petty, M.M., McGee, G.W., & Cavender, J.W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(4), 712-721.
- Pepe, M. (Sept. 2010). The impact of extrinsic motivational dissatisfiers on employee level of job satisfaction and commitment resulting in the intent to turnover. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 8(9), 99-107.
- Porter, L.W., & Lawler, E.E. III (1968). *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Pritchard, R.D., & Peters, L.H. (1974). Job duties and job interests as predictors of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 12, 315-330.
- Roberson, L. (1990). Prediction of job satisfaction from characteristics of personal work goals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(1), 29-42.
- Scarpello, V., & Campbell, J.P. (1983). Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 577-600.
- Scarpello, V., & Vandenberg, R.J. (1992). Generalizing the importance of occupational and career views to job satisfaction attitudes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 125-141.
- Sheridan, J.E., & Slocum Jr., J.W. (1975). The direction of the causal relationship between job satisfaction and work performance. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 142(2), 159-172.
- Tatsuoka, M.M. (1970). *Discriminant analysis: The study of group difference*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Walker, O.C. Jr., Churchill, G.A. Jr., & Ford, N.M. (1977, May). Motivation and performance in industrial selling: Present knowledge and needed research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14, 156-168.
- Wanous, J. P. (1973). Individual differences and employee reaction to job characteristics. *Proceedings*, 81st Annual Convention, APA, 599-600.
- Weiss, D.J. (1965). *An inferential approach to occupational reinforcement: Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation, No. 19*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Weiss, D.J., Dawis, R.V., England, G.W., & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation, No. 22*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Table 1: Questionnaire Items

#	Item Statement	Item Name	Item Type
1.	Being able to keep busy all the time	Activity	Intrinsic
2.	The chance to work alone on the job	Independence	Intrinsic
3.	The chance to do different things from time to time	Variety	Extrinsic
4.	The chance to be "somebody" in the community	Social status	Intrinsic
5.	The way my supervisor handles (his/her) workers	Supervision-human relations	Supervisory
6.	The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	Supervision-technical	Supervisory
7.	Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience	Moral values	Intrinsic
8.	The way my job provides for steady employment	Security	Extrinsic
9.	The chance to do things for other people	Social service	Intrinsic
10.	The chance to tell other people what to do	Authority	Extrinsic
11.	The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	Ability utilization	Intrinsic
12.	The way company policies are put into practice	Company policies	Extrinsic
13.	My pay and the amount of work I do	Compensation	Intrinsic
14.	The chances for advancement on this job	Advancement	Intrinsic
15.	The freedom to use my own judgment	Responsibility	Extrinsic
16.	The opportunity to try my own methods of doing the job	Creativity	Intrinsic
17.	The working conditions	Working conditions	Intrinsic
18.	The way my fellow GMs get along with each other	Co-workers	Intrinsic
19.	The praise I get for doing a good job	Recognition	Extrinsic
20.	The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	Achievement	Intrinsic
21.	The level of support I receive from the corporate office	Corporate support	Extrinsic
22.	The time I have to complete administrative paperwork	Paperwork	Extrinsic
23.	The resolution of conflicts between corporate staff and myself	Conflict resolution	Extrinsic
24.	The downward flow of communication from the corporate office	Corporate communications	Extrinsic
25.	The effectiveness of the front office manager orientation process	Orientation process	Extrinsic
26.	The training that I received for my job	Training	Extrinsic
27.	The timeliness of my scheduled performance evaluations	Performance evaluations	Extrinsic
28.	The informal feedback about my progress in my job	Feedback	Extrinsic

Table 2: Descriptive Profile of Respondents

Descriptive Indicators				
	<u>Gender</u>			<u>Age</u>
Female		69%	19-20	4%
Male		31%	21-30	49%
			31-40	28%
			41-50	14%
			51-60	4%
			61-70	1%
	<u>Highest Educational Level</u>			<u>Annual Salary</u>
Less than 12 years		1%	\$12,000 - \$20,000	19%
High school graduate		32%	\$20,001 - \$30,000	40%
2 years college or Associate's Degree		33%	\$30,001 - \$40,000	26%
4 years college or Bachelor's Degree		30%	\$40,001 - \$50,000	12%
Graduate degree		4%	\$50,001 - \$60,000	3%
	<u>Employed in the Hotel Industry</u>			<u>Employed as a Hotel Manager</u>
0-5 years		46%	0-5 years	70%
6-10 years		35%	6-10 years	20%
11-15 years		12%	11-15 years	6%
16-20 years		3%	16-20 years	1%
21-25 years		3%	21-25 years	3%
More than 25 years		1%	More than 25 years	0%
	<u>Employed as a Hotel Front Office Manager</u>			<u>Employed as a FOM for Present Company</u>
0-5 years		82%	0-5 years	95%
6-10 years		15%	6-10 years	4%
11-15 years		3%	11-15 years	1%
16-20 years		0%	16-20 years	0%
21-25 years		0%	21-25 years	0%
More than 25 years		0%	More than 25 years	0%
	<u>Employed as FOM at Current Property</u>			
	0-5 years		95%	
	6-10 years		4%	
	11-15 years		1%	
	16-20 years		0%	
	21-25 years		0%	
	More than 25 years		0%	

Table 3: Varimax Factor Matrix of Satisfaction Items for All Respondents (N = 135)

#	Item	Component			
		<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>
1	Independence			.63	
2	Variety		.66		
3	Social status		.67		
4	Supervision-human relations	.81			
5	Supervision-technical	.78			
6	Moral values			.61	
7	Job security			.64	
8	Social service		.64		
9	Authority			.69	
10	Ability utilization		.81		
11	Company policies		.52		
12	Compensation			.38	
13	Advancement			.49	
14	Responsibility				.78
15	Creativity				.72
16	Working conditions	.49			
17	Co-workers	.52			
18	Recognition	.77			
19	Achievement		.62		
20	Corporate support	.75			
21	Paperwork	.51			
22	Conflict resolution	.62			
23	Downward communications	.80			
24	Orientation process	.80			
25	Training	.71			
26	Performance evaluations	.56			
27	Feedback	.83			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (rotation converged at 6 iterations)

Table 4 : Item Factor Assignments by Highest Factor Loading

#	Item	Statement	Loading
Factor I – Corporate Culture ($\alpha_{CR} = .95$)			
27	Feedback	The informal feedback about my progress in my job	.83
4	Supervisor-human relations	The way my supervisor handles (his/her) workers	.81
24	Effectiveness of mgr. orientation	The effectiveness of the FOM orientation process	.80
23	Downward communications	The downward flow of communication from the GM	.80
5	Supervision-technical	The competence of my supervisor in making decisions	.78
18	Recognition	The praise I get for doing a good job	.77
20	GM support	The level of support I receive from my general manager	.75
25	Training	The training that I received for my job	.71
22	Conflict resolution	The resolution of conflicts between staff and myself	.62
26	Performance evaluations	The timeliness of my scheduled performance evaluations	.56
17	Co-workers	The way my fellow managers get along with each other	.52
21	Paperwork	The time I have to complete administrative paperwork	.51
16	Working conditions	The working conditions	.49
Factor II – Self Actualization ($\alpha_{CR} = .85$)			
10	Ability utilization	The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities	.81
3	Social status	The chance to be “somebody” in the community	.67
2	Variety	The chance to do different things from time to time	.66
8	Social service	The chance to do things for other people	.64
19	Achievement	The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job	.62
11	Company policies	The way company policies are put into practice	.52
Factor III – Job Dynamics ($\alpha_{CR} = .77$)			
9	Authority	The chance to tell other people what to do	.69
7	Job security	The way my job provides for steady employment	.64
1	Independence	The chance to work alone on the job	.63
6	Moral values	Being able to do things that do not go against my conscience	.61
13	Advancement	The chances for advancement on this job	.49
12	Compensation	The pay and the amount of work I do	.38
Factor IV – Job Latitude ($\alpha_{CR} = .88$)			
14	Responsibility	The freedom to use my own judgment	.78
15	Creativity	The opportunity to try my own methods to do the job	.72

Table 5: Correlation between Identifying Factors and Job Satisfaction

		Job Satisfaction	Corporate Culture	Self Actualization	Job Dynamics	Job Latitude
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	---				
	N	135				
Corporate Culture	Pearson Correlation	.949**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	---			
	N	135	135			
Self Actualization	Pearson Correlation	.840**	.688**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	---		
	N	135	135	135		
Job Dynamics	Pearson Correlation	.832**	.689**	.682**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	---	
	N	135	135	135	135	
Job Latitude	Pearson Correlation	.705**	.610**	.548**	.587**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	---
	N	135	135	135	135	135

Table 6: Independent Samples t-Test for Difference in Item Satisfaction by Service Type

Item #	Item	Service Type	Mean Satisfaction	Mean Difference	df	Significance
27	Feedback	Limited-service	5.25	.91	132	.005**
		Full-service	4.34			
4	Supervisor-human relations	Limited-service	5.80	1.19	132	.000***
		Full-service	4.61			
24	Effectiveness of mgr. orientation	Limited-service	5.48	1.58	132	.000***
		Full-service	3.90			
23	Downward communications	Limited-service	5.77	.91	133	.002**
		Full-service	4.86			
5	Supervision - technical	Limited-service	5.97	.68	133	.010**
		Full-service	5.29			
18	Recognition	Limited-service	5.55	1.28	133	.000***
		Full-service	4.27			
20	GM support	Limited-service	6.02	.83	132	.007**
		Full-service	5.19			
25	Training	Limited-service	5.43	1.30	133	.000***
		Full-service	4.13			
22	Conflict resolution	Limited-service	5.86	1.23	133	.000***
		Full-service	4.63			
26	Performance evaluations	Limited-service	4.80	.56	128	.103
		Full-service	4.25			
17	Co-workers	Limited-service	5.97	1.43	132	.000***
		Full-service	4.54			
21	Paperwork	Limited-service	5.66	1.12	133	.000***
		Full-service	4.54			
16	Working conditions	Limited-service	5.95	1.08	133	.000***
		Full-service	4.87			
10	Ability utilization	Limited-service	5.95	.28	133	.215
		Full-service	5.67			
3	Social status	Limited-service	5.34	.88	133	.001***
		Full-service	4.46			
2	Variety	Limited-service	6.09	.74	133	.001***
		Full-service	5.36			
8	Social service	Limited-service	6.45	.57	133	.000***
		Full-service	5.87			
19	Achievement	Limited-service	5.69	.42	133	.084
		Full-service	5.27			
11	Company policies	Limited-service	5.26	.94	132	.000***
		Full-service	4.32			
9	Authority	Limited-service	5.40	.36	133	.108
		Full-service	5.04			
7	Job security	Limited-service	6.34	.52	133	.003**
		Full-service	5.81			
1	Independence	Limited-service	5.79	.59	129	.020*
		Full-service	5.21			
6	Moral values	Limited-service	6.20	.61	132	.002**
		Full-service	5.59			
13	Advancement	Limited-service	5.06	.58	132	.054
		Full-service	4.48			
12	Compensation	Limited-service	4.09	.14	133	.652
		Full-service	3.96			
14	Responsibility	Limited-service	6.14	.60	131	.007**
		Full-service	5.54			
15	Creativity	Limited-service	6.02	.46	133	.045*
		Full-service	5.56			

* Significant at .05 level

** Significant at .01 level

*** Significant at .001 level

Note: Items are listed in order of their factor variance weight and then according to loading value.

Table 7: Independent Samples t-Test for Difference in FOM Satisfaction by Service Type

Service Type	N	Mean Satisfaction	Mean Difference	df	Significance (2-tailed)
Limited-service	65	5.70	.79	133	.000
Full-service	70	4.91			