



**SCIREA Journal of Management**

**ISSN: 2995-777X**

<http://www.scirea.org/journal/Management>

**October 7, 2024**

**Volume 8, Issue 2, April 2024**

<https://doi.org/10.54647/management630150>

## **EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT IN HOSPITALITY UNITS**

**Vasiliki Karioti <sup>1</sup>, Panagiota Vathi-Sarava <sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Tourism Administration, University of Patras

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Tourism Administration, University of Patras

### **ABSTRACT**

Employees play a key role in the success of businesses. In particular, in hospitality units, the study of job satisfaction is very important as the effort and dedication of the employees are fundamental for customer satisfaction. Moreover, job satisfaction in hospitality units has a direct correlation to the ability of these units to increase guest satisfaction and improve services.

The main purpose of this descriptive research study is to examine factors influencing job satisfaction using an online questionnaire. Beyond investigating the level of job satisfaction, this research aims to explore its relationship with specific organizational aspects of hospitality units. To achieve this goal, a series of hypotheses are proposed and tested using various statistical methods.

This study examines not only the general factors that influence employee satisfaction but also the emotional dimensions that contribute to a thorough understanding of the workforce in hospitality units. An emotional index has been calculated based on questions related to emotional satisfaction. In conclusion, employee satisfaction is a multidimensional

phenomenon with several significant factors. The research analysis revealed that the overall level of job satisfaction among employees is satisfactory.

**Keywords:** employee satisfaction, hospitality units, factors, emotional dimensions

## **Introduction**

Tourism has become one of the primary income sources for many developing countries and has contributed to numerous improvements among industrialized nations. The hospitality industry, part of the service industry, relies heavily on services provided by employees. When employees are satisfied with their jobs, they tend to provide high-quality service to customers. Satisfied employees are typically more productive, positive, and creative than those who are not satisfied (Kong, Jiang, Chan & Zhou, 2018).

In recent decades, job satisfaction has become a significant research topic because it is positively related to service quality, extra-role customer service behaviors, cooperation, organizational commitment, intention to stay, and other positive organizational citizenship behaviors (Gu & Siu, 2009; Jung & Yoon, 2015).

According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction is defined as a positive state resulting from an individual's evaluation of their work or work experiences. Earlier, Locke (1969) noted that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are functions of the perceived relationship between what one wants from their job and what one perceives it as offering. Spector (1997) claimed that job satisfaction is a general feeling or a set of attitudes towards various aspects of work based on attention to cognitive processes. Robbins and Coulter (1996) suggested that job satisfaction is the general attitude of employees toward their job, indicating a general positive attitude.

Various studies of job satisfaction have been conducted in the hospitality industry. In this study, several variables that may influence job satisfaction levels have been identified. The organization of hospitality units differs from one another. The structure of each organization helps to divide tasks, specify jobs for each department, and delegate authority within and among departments. The workforce of each hospitality unit is organized differently.

Understanding and enhancing job satisfaction within the workforce is not merely a matter of employee welfare; it is crucial from a strategic perspective for organizations trying to thrive in a competitive landscape.

The hospitality industry presents unique challenges that can significantly impact job satisfaction, including long and irregular working hours, customer interactions, and a high-pressure environment. Exploring the interplay between these challenges and job satisfaction is essential for understanding the employee experience and finding solutions to improve individual well-being and organizational performance.

The relationship between job satisfaction and performance is pivotal. Research has consistently shown that satisfied employees are more engaged, innovative, and committed. By examining the connection between job satisfaction and performance metrics within hospitality units, this study aims to provide actionable insights for organizations seeking a competitive edge in an industry defined by customer satisfaction.

This research aspires to contribute to the ongoing dialogue within the hospitality industry. By highlighting the factors of job satisfaction, we hope to inspire discussions, policies, and practices that foster a workplace culture where employees not only survive but thrive. The implications of such studies extend beyond individual units, influencing the industry's collective ability to adapt, innovate, and deliver unique experiences.

Using a well-designed questionnaire, a quantitative analysis was carried out as the main part of the research. Utilizing the power of statistical tools, we aim to reveal relationships and patterns that will contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the subject, helping hospitality managers develop policies and strategies based on important evidence to promote a more satisfying work environment.

## **Research Method**

The main purpose of the study is to examine factors influencing job satisfaction.

The research questions are the following:

- What are the general factors that influence employee satisfaction?
- What is the relationship between job satisfaction and specific organizational aspects of hospitality units?
- What are the emotional dimensions that contribute to a thorough understanding of the workforce in hospitality units?

### *Participants*

Primary data was collected from 96 people working in hospitality units who answered a questionnaire consisting of 40 questions.

### *Research tool*

The questions were based on research literature and books. The reliability of the questionnaire was pre-tested with 20 respondents, and a Cronbach's Alpha test established the high reliability of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into two parts: Part one contains the personal and demographic characteristics of the respondents, while Part two contains information about the working environment and factors affecting job satisfaction.

### Research outcomes

Of the respondents, 56.3% are female, 67.7% belong to Millennials, 53.2% have a degree, 53.1% work in 5-star hotels, and 61.5% hold positions in restaurants/pool bars/beach bars (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Population and Demographic Profile of the Responses

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	42	43,8
Female	54	56,3
Total	96	100,00
<b>Age</b>		
18-34 Years old (Millennials)	65	67,7
35-58 Years old (Generation X)	29	30,2
59 and above (Baby Boomers)	2	2,1
Total	96	100,00
<b>Highest educational Attainment</b>		
Compulsory Education	5	5,2
High School	16	16,7
Technical	21	21,9
Undergraduate	51	53,2
Msc/Phd	3	3,1
Total	96	100,00
<b>Hotel Classification</b>		
5 – Star Hotels	51	53,1

4 – Star Hotels	13	13,5
3 – Star Hotels and Below	4	4,2
Rent Rooms	4	4,2
Villa	8	6,3
Other	18	18,8
Total	96	100,00
<b>Department</b>		
Reception/Front Office, Back Office, Housekeeping	26	27,1
Restaurants, Pool Bars, Beach Bars	59	61,5
Management, Accounting, Marketing & Sales	7	7,3
Banquet, Conferences, Social Events	0	0
Spa, Gym	4	4,2
Total	96	100,00
<b>Position of Responsibility</b>		
Yes	42	43,8
No	54	56,3
Total	96	100,00
<b>Years of Work</b>		
0-1	34	35,4
1-3	22	22,9
3-5	11	11,5
5-8	14	14,6
8-10	7	7,3
10+	8	8,3
Total	96	100,00

Based on the data in Table 2, we can conclude that 69.8% of the hospitality units have a Human Resource Department, 51% of them have an evaluation system, and 34.4% of them do not announce evaluation results.

**Table 2:** Evaluation system in hospitality units

	<b>Human Resource Department</b>	<b>Evaluation System</b>	<b>Results of Evaluation</b>	<b>Renewal of responsibility and obligations</b>
<b>Yes</b>	69,8%	51%	22,3%	57,3%

<b>No</b>	28,1%	46,9%	34,4%	21,9%
-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Regarding benefits, the majority do not offer them, but 57.3% provide educational programs.

**Table 3: Methods of Employ Selection**

	<b>Management</b>		<b>Reception</b>		<b>F&amp;B</b>		<b>Cleaning</b>		<b>Housekeeping</b>	
	<b>f</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
<b>Interviews</b>	76	80	80	85,1	77	82,8	67	72	66	71
<b>Applications</b>	7	7,4	7	7,4	5	5,4	15	16,1	16	17,2
<b>Psychometric Test</b>	1	1,1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1,1
<b>Ability Test</b>	3	3,2	5	5,3	6	6,5	6	6,5	5	5,4
<b>Other</b>	8	8,4	2	2,1	5	5,4	5	5,4	5	5,4

About 80% of the hospitality units use the interviews as a method of employee choice.

**Table 4: Level of satisfaction**

<b>Job factors</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Descriptive Interpretation</b>
Unbiased Methods	3,27	Satisfied
Cultural Diversity	3,48	Very Satisfied
Only qualified People	2,50	Satisfied
Equality between men and Women	3,58	Very Satisfied
Support for family obligations	2,89	Satisfied
Encouragement	3,11	Satisfied
Discussion	3,11	Satisfied
Decision making by Employees	2,20	Not Satisfied
Satisfaction	3,06	Satisfied
Possible Waiver	2,58	Satisfied

Confidence	3,15	Satisfied
Importance	4,02	Very Satisfied
Skills	3,78	Very Satisfied
Autonomy	3,91	Very Satisfied
Freedom	3,23	Satisfied
Self Confidence	4,06	Very Satisfied

The overall level of job satisfaction among employees is satisfactory.

Furthermore, the existence of a Human Resource Department depends on the category of the hospitality unit. According to a  $\chi^2$  test (p-value < 0.001), there is a strong correlation between the existence of a Human Resource Department and the category of the hospitality unit (Cramer's V = 0.567).

The next step was to calculate an emotional satisfaction index based on questions related to emotional satisfaction. The mean of this index is 3,2 with a minimum value of 2.25 and a maximum of 4.5. The Cramer's V is 0.225 between index and gender, indicating a small association strength between them.

### ***Logistic Regression***

Logistic regression is useful for predicting the presence or absence of a characteristic or outcome based on values of predictor variables. It is similar to a linear regression model but is suited to models where the dependent variable is dichotomous. Logistic regression coefficients can be used to estimate odds ratios for each of the independent variables in the model. Logistic regression is applicable to a broader range of research situations than discriminant analysis.

For logistic regression, the predicted dependent variable is a function of the probability that a particular subject will be in one of the categories. The dependent variables considered are "Position of Responsibility," "Human Resource Department," "Evaluation System," and "Educational Programs," while the predictor variables are all measured on a Likert scale. The results are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5:** Results of Logistic Regression

<b>Dependent Variables</b>	<b>Overall Classification Accuracy Percentage</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>Hosmer &amp; Lemeshow Test</b>
<b>Position of Responsibility</b>	71,4%	ln(odds)=6,352-0,750 Discussion-0,433possible waiver-0,646importancy	$\chi^2=9,673$ (p-value=0,289)
<b>Human Resource Department</b>	72,2%	ln(odds)=-2,055+0,402possible waiver	$\chi^2=0,352$ (p-value=0,950)
<b>Evaluation System</b>	71,1%	ln(odds)=0,437+0,495possible waiver-0,548cultural diversity	$\chi^2=13,791$ (p-value=0,087)
<b>Educational Programs</b>	79,1%	ln(odds)=2,682+0,579possible waiver-0,730discussion-0,745cultural diversity	$\chi^2=8,559$ (p-value=0,381)

The overall classification accuracy percentage indicates how well the model predicts the binary outcome. The coefficients represent the impact of each predictor on the odds of the binary outcome. Discussion, possible waiver, and importance have a negative impact on the position of responsibility, while the possible waiver has a positive impact on the Human Resource Department. The possible waiver and cultural diversity have positive and negative impacts, respectively, on the evaluation system. Finally, in educational programs, the possible waiver has a positive impact, while discussion and cultural diversity have a negative impact. In each case, the Hosmer and Lemeshow test suggests a good fit to the data.

### ***Conclusions***

Based on the findings of the study, a significant proportion of respondents in the hospitality sector are female, belong to the Millennial generation, and have a degree. Moreover, the majority work in 5-star hotels, and a significant number hold positions in food sector.

Nearly 70% of hospitality units have a Human Resource Department, indicating a prevalent organizational structure. The existence of this department is dependent on the category of the hospitality unit.



The overall level of job satisfaction among employees is satisfactory. While the majority of hospitality units do not offer benefits, some provide educational programs. The negative impact of certain variables on job satisfaction indicators suggests areas of potential improvement.

## References

- [1] Gu, Z., & Siu, R. (2009). Drivers of job satisfaction as related to work performance in Macau casino hotels: An investigation based on employee survey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 21(5), 561-578.
- [2] Jung, H., & Yoon, H. H. (2015). The impact of employees' positive psychological capital on job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviors in the hotel. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(6), 1135-115
- [3] Kong, H., Jiang, X., Chan, W., & Zhou, X. (2018). Job satisfaction research in the field of hospitality and tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(5), 2178-2194.
- [4] Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(4), 479-493.
- [5] Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (1st ed., pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- [6] Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (1996). *Management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.
- [7] Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol.3). USA: Sage Publications.