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ABSTRACT

Student workers are an important component of the workforce in university dining services, but retention of these student employees is challenging. The purpose of this study was to examine relationships among the five sub scales of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty among student workers in university dining operations. In this study, 240 questionnaires were distributed to student employees of dining services at five universities during summer 2007: a total of 161 students responded (67.1%). Three group interviews were conducted with students to obtain more information about their perceptions of the three constructs. Results suggested that differences in ratings existed based on demographic characteristics (i.e., length of employment, hours worked per week, gender, and position held). Of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment, participating in decision making, confidence in high performance, and autonomy influenced job satisfaction while confidence in high performance influenced employee loyalty. Confidence in high performance and autonomy were significant indicators of employee loyalty to non-supervisory student workers while goal accomplishment was a significant indicator of employee loyalty to supervisory student workers. Findings suggested that leadership empowerment influences job satisfaction and employee loyalty. In order to increase student worker’s job satisfaction and loyalty, university dining managers might consider ways they can enhance leadership empowerment particularly by demonstrating their confidence in the student’s performance, and allowing them student workers to increase their input in decision making process.

Keywords: Leadership empowerment, Job satisfaction, Employee loyalty
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction, employee loyalty and empowerment have been raised as important issues and emphasized as ways to reduce employee turnover, improve workplace environments, and help organizations function effectively in the hospitality industry (Erstad, 1997). By empowering employees in the organization, managers can not only solve leadership problems but also increase employees’ job satisfaction and loyalty (Leong, 2001). Also, empowering employees can increase organization effectiveness because empowered employees tend to be more supportive, productive, and cooperative and recognize themselves as valuable workers in the organization (Kim & George, 2005).

The concepts of job satisfaction, leadership empowerment, and employee loyalty have been studied in several fields by numerous researchers (Borzaga & Tortia, 2006; Carson, Carson, & Birkenmeier, 2006; Coughlan, 2005; Cunha, 2002; Eskildsen & Nussler, 2000; Honold, 1997; King & Ehrhard, 1997; Niehoff, Moorman, Blakely, & Fuller, 2001; Ramaswami & Singh, 2003; Redman & Snape, 2005; Roehling, Roehling, & Moen, 2001). However, research is limited examining these constructs in university dining services especially with student employees.

High student employee turnover, limited employee loyalty, and disempowering organizational structures in college and university dining settings have been identified as operational challenges by college and university dining service researchers (Flynn, 1999; Sneed, 1988; Woods & Macaulay, 1989). Hiring student employees is not easy in college and university foodservice operations because college students tend to look for less demanding jobs such as working in the library or computer lab where they can do assignments or studies while working. Student workers seek flexible work hours that take
into consideration their class schedules and a supportive work environment to complete their degrees (Blake, 1997).

College and university dining service operations more routinely rely on student workers when compared to upscale restaurants (King, 1998). College and university dining managers struggle with retention of student worker every semester and strive to offer better work schedule options so student workers can coordinate employment schedules with their class schedules. Student workers tend not to stay at the same workplace more than two semesters because of pressures of study or unpleasant work environments (King, 1998). Williams (2001) explained that management has to encourage, motivate, and inspire student workers so that they are willing to be committed to their jobs.

Job satisfaction in the hospitality industry has been studied by several authors (Bartlett, Probber, & Scerbo, 1999; Choi, 2001; Doriann & Blair, 1985; Gray, Niehoff, & Miller, 2000; Hsiao & Kohnke, 1998; Jaffe, Almanza, & Chen, 1994), but only a few leadership empowerment (Ahearne, 2000; George & Hancer, 2003; Hui, 1994) and employee loyalty (Bloemer & Odekerken-Schroder, 2006; Silverstro, 2002) studies have been done. To date, little information is available on how leadership empowerment influences job satisfaction and employee loyalty in the college and university foodservice environment.
Objectives

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among perceived leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty of student workers in university dining.

Specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Examine the effects of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment on job satisfaction of student workers in university dining operations;
2. Examine the effects of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment on employee loyalty of student workers in university dining operations;
3. Explore the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty in student workers in university dining operations;
4. Examine whether leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty differ based on student worker demographic characteristics.

Definition of Terms

Job Satisfaction: Employees’ feelings or emotional responses to a job, which can be the result of the employee’s expectancy and actual outcomes from the work environments (Bartlett et al., 1999; Choi, 2001; Morrison, Jones, & Fuller, 1997).

Leadership Empowerment: Leaders’ effectiveness in empowering employees on the basis of conveying confidence in high performance, encouraging opportunities for participation in decision making, boosting meaningfulness of work, and offering autonomy from bureaucratic constraints (Ahearne, 2000).
Employee Empowerment: Employees’ competent feelings in the ability to perform the task, employees’ autonomy on the job, and employees’ decision-making power for task action (Honold, 1997; Niehoff et al., 2001).

Employee Loyalty: Employees’ behaviors related to work and the organization: retention of employee for a long time irrespective of downsizing status, participating in the organization’s activities spontaneously regardless of assigned duties, or stays late to finalize project (Bloemer & Odekerken-Schroder, 2006; Huang, Shi, Zhang, & Cheung, 2006).

Dissertation Organization

This dissertation consists of five chapters. The first chapter provides an introduction regarding leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty including the purpose of the study and definitions of specific terms. The second chapter presents a review of literature. Chapter three provides the methodology, including research methods, design, and sample selection. The fourth chapter includes the results of the study and discussions of the results. Chapter five summarizes findings of the study, limitations, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study examines the relationships among perceived leadership empowerment, job satisfaction and employee loyalty in student workers in university dining. This chapter reviews the variables related to: leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty.

The first part of literature review discusses definitions of empowerment, the theories of empowerment, factors affecting empowerment, and consequences of empowerment. Empowerment has been studied by many researchers and their findings suggest multiple dimensions of empowerment (e.g., meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact) in the organization. The most noticeable origin of empowerment was found in Conger and Kanungo’s (1988) empowerment process. To date, empowerment has considered a multifaceted construct that includes individual perspectives toward organization, organizational structure, and employee strategy.

The second part of literature review discusses job satisfaction. There have been many job satisfaction studies conducted in various fields. Researchers have studied how employee job satisfaction influences the work environment and identified factors that impact job satisfaction. In addition, numerous researchers have studied job satisfaction as it relates to other subjects, such as customer satisfaction, organizational commitment, loyalty to a supervisor, job design, and job characteristics.

The last part discusses the definition of employee loyalty, factors influencing employee loyalty, and consequences of employee loyalty. Employee loyalty has been linked with job satisfaction (Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, & Wilk, 2004; Meyer & Allen, 1991), employee empowerment, and motivation.
Leadership Empowerment

Definitions

The term, empowerment, has been widely used in a human resource context. A number of researchers have defined empowerment using different words to explain similar approaches or concepts (Brymer, 1991; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Erstad, 1997; Honold, 1997; Lashely, 1995; Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). There appear to be two themes for these definitions, one based on management practice and the other on employees’ perceptions of the work environment.

The first theme focuses on management practice and involves the delegation of responsibility among employees. Thomas and Velthouse (1990) defined empowerment as giving power to employees to assign work tasks and motivating employees in order to complete organizational goals. Brymer (1991) defined empowerment as giving more discretion and autonomy to employees in order to decentralize decision making power. Lashley (1996) defined empowerment as an employment strategy that gives discretion, autonomy, and power to employees so that employees take responsibility. Erstad (1997) proposed that empowerment enables employees to make decisions and increases responsibility for their own accomplishments. Honold (1997) described empowerment as a process of decision-making power in the organization.

The second theme in empowerment definitions considers employees’ perceptions and reflects an individual’s orientation toward work and work roles. Conger and Kanungo (1988) defined empowerment as “a process of enhancing feelings of self-efficacy among subordinates through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and through their removal by both formal organizational practices and informal techniques of providing
efficacy information” (p.474). Similarly, Spreitzer (1995) used motivational empowerment to explain an employees’ perception of empowerment based on his/her orientation to work.

Even though definitions of empowerment are conceptualized in many ways, leadership empowerment has not been clearly defined. Based on research by Conger and Kanungo (1988), Hui (1994), and Ahearne (2000) leadership empowerment could be described as leaders’ effectiveness for empowering employees by conveying confidence in employees’ high performance, encouraging opportunities for participation in decision making, increasing meaningfulness of work, and offering autonomy from bureaucratic constraints.

Theories of Empowerment

Conger and Kanungo’s concept of empowerment

Conger and Kanungo’s (1988) approach was a little different than other researchers (Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). They approached empowerment in terms of two points: 1) power approach and 2) motivational approach. First, the power approach described decentralizing of power and authority in order to allow employees to participate in decision making. Second, the motivational approach was explained through the concept of self-efficacy and self-determination. The researchers described how employees feel about themselves as more powerful when self-efficacy and self-determination were practiced.

The researchers identified five stages (Figure 1) in the process of empowerment: 1) “conditions leading to a psychological state of powerlessness”, 2) “the use of managerial strategies & techniques”, 3) “providing self-efficacy information to subordinates”, 4) “empowering experience of subordinate”, and 5) “behavioral effects of empowerment” (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, p. 475). The first stage was identified with four dimensions:
organizational factors (e.g., significant organizational change, centralized organizational system, or broken communication), supervisory style (e.g., high control, negativism, or lack of control), reward system (e.g., non-contingency or low incentive), and nature of job (e.g., lack of role, lack of training, or low opportunities).

Stage two included the managerial strategies and techniques in six dimensions: 1) participative management, 2) goal setting, 3) feedback system, 4) modeling, 5) contingent reward, and 6) job enrichment. Stage three described how to provide self-efficacy information to subordinates and included four dimensions: 1) enactive attainment, 2) vicarious experience, 3) verbal persuasion, and 4) emotional arousal. The conditions creating powerlessness were removed in this stage. At stage four, the researchers emphasized the empowerment experience of subordinates that if a subordinate experiences empowerment, a strengthening of their effort and improved performance were predictable. The last stage dealt with the behavioral effect of empowerment and suggested that subordinates are likely to persist in their behaviors in order to achieve organizational goals if they experience self-efficacy.
Figure 1. Five Stages in the Process of Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE 1</th>
<th>STAGE 2</th>
<th>STAGE 3</th>
<th>STAGE 4</th>
<th>STAGE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditions leading to a psychological state of powerlessness</td>
<td>The use of managerial strategies &amp; techniques</td>
<td>To provide self-efficacy information to subordinates using four sources</td>
<td>Results in empowering experience of subordinate</td>
<td>Leading to behavioral effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational factors</td>
<td>Participative management</td>
<td>Enactive attainment</td>
<td>Strengthening of effort-performance expectancy or belief in personal efficacy</td>
<td>Initiation/persistence of behavior to accomplish task objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>Vicarious experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward system</td>
<td>Feedback system</td>
<td>Verbal persuasion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of job</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Emotional arousal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingent/competence-based reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remove conditions listed under stage 1

Cognitive model of empowerment by Thomas and Velthouse

Thomas and Velthouse (1990) explained the cognitive model of empowerment, which focuses on an intra-personal cognitive process. The model used intrinsic task motivation to explain the empowerment process in individuals. The model (Figure 2) consists of six processes: 1) environmental events (i.e., training sessions or evaluation of performance), 2) task assessments (impact, competence, meaningfulness, or choice), 3) behavior (activity, concentration, initiative, resiliency, or flexibility), 4) global assessment (impact, competence, meaningfulness, or choice), 5) interpretive styles (attributing, evaluating, and envisioning), and 6) interventions. These processes although not linked in a direct linear manner are related.

As shown in the model in Figure 2, environmental events (i.e., Step 1) provide data about individual’s task results that influence the task assessments (i.e., Step 2). Behaviors (i.e., Step 3) link to the environmental events and task assessments. Global assessments (i.e., Step 4) represent individual beliefs about the four dimensions of the task assessment and influences task assessments (i.e., Step 2). Interpretive styles (i.e., Step 5) also impacts individual task assessments. Intervention (i.e., Step 6) influences environmental events (i.e., Step 1) and interpretive styles (i.e., Step 5).

A few differences were found in this model when compared to Conger and Kanungo (1988). First, the concept of empowerment was identified as intrinsic task motivation in this model. The intrinsic task motivation describes “positively valued experiences that individuals derive directly from a task” (p.668). Second, task assessments (i.e., impact, competence, meaningfulness, and choice) were identified as motivational effects. Lastly, the interpretive process was considered so that task assessment is influenced by individual differences.
Figure 2. Cognitive Model of Empowerment.


Spreitzer’s psychological empowerment

Spreitzer (1992) focused on the psychological empowerment construct and validation of empowerment. A model (Figure 3) of an initial nomological network of psychological empowerment described how antecedents of psychological empowerment (i.e., locus of
control, self-esteem, access to information, and rewards) influenced psychological
empowerment (i.e., meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact) and then this
psychological empowerment influenced consequences of psychological empowerment (i.e.,
managerial effectiveness and innovation). Four task assessments (i.e., impact, competence,
meaningfulness, and choice) used in Thomas and Velthouse (1990) were used to define
psychological empowerment.

Spreitzer (1995) examined a multidimensional measure of psychological
empowerment in a workplace. The researcher found the same results in the second study in
1995. There were four factors of psychological empowerment (i.e., locus of control, self-
esteeem, access to information, and rewards). Managerial effectiveness and innovation were
considered as outcomes.

Spreitzer (1996) investigated social structure characteristics of psychological
empowerment. In this study, the researcher found six characteristics of psychological
empowerment that were perception of role ambiguity, span of control, socio-political support,
information and resources, and work climate. Results showed that there was a negative
relationship between role ambiguity and empowerment, whereas other characteristics (i.e.,
span of control, socio-political support, information and resources, and work climate) were
positively related to empowerment.
Factors Influencing Leadership Empowerment

Spreitzer (1995) surveyed 393 mid-level managers in Fortune 50 industrial organizations using a self-administered questionnaire to develop and validate a multidimensional measurement of psychological empowerment in a workplace. The researcher also examined factors of antecedents and consequences of the psychological
empowerment structure using confirmatory factor analysis. Results revealed that self-esteem, information of unit performance, and reward performance were significantly related to psychological empowerment.

Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, and Drasgow (2000) collected data from interviews with 195 team members and leaders in three different organizations (i.e., a clothing retailer, building products supplier, and telecommunications corporation). The survey questionnaires were given to 205 employees from the customer service department of a building products supplier and 374 employees from a health care service, an accounting firm, a business supplier, and a food processing facility to examine the constructs of empowerment and the empirical evaluation of the measurement scale of empowering leadership behavior. Researchers found five important factors of the empowerment construct, which are coaching, informing, leading by example, showing concern/interacting with the team, and participative decision-making. These factors were highly correlated with leaders’ behaviors and influenced providing positive emotional support and encouraging positive persuasion.

**Hospitality field**

A review article by Brymer (1991) presented employee empowerment in terms of a guest-driven leadership strategy in the hospitality industry. The author described three factors: making the commitment, sharing vision, and setting goals. These should be met in order to practice employee empowerment. The author explained that employee empowerment can improve handling of customer complaints and provide a high quality service to make customers happy. In addition, the researcher explained why employees need to be empowered and described 14 steps of implementing empowerment in lodging settings: 1) meetings between employees and supervisors, 2) explaining empowerment to employees
for guest satisfaction, 3) scheduling a meeting with the general manager to focus on employee empowerment, 4) informing employees how this approach improves their organizations, 5) discussing types of employee empowerment, 6) introducing skills to provide guest service, 7) developing a list of suggestions for guest service, 8) shifting decision-making to employees to reinforce empowerment, 9) preparing a written report to implement a plan, 10) holding a meeting regarding employee empowerment guidelines, 11) providing motivation and support to employees, 12) reviewing employee empowerment programs, 13) supporting positive reinforcement to encourage employees, and 14) scheduling future meetings based on the ongoing process.

Lashley (1995) studied two general supervisors and 12 restaurant managers in McDonald’s in Wales (United Kingdom) using semi-structured formal interviews to compare the details of the new working arrangements with analytical models of employee empowerment, and investigate the changes made to the management of the McDonald’s restaurants in western and eastern Wales. Results revealed that the changes were intended to reorganize organizations from a hierarchy structure. Supervisors perceived that their areas of responsibility were being interfered with by managers. Also, supervisors and managers perceived empowerment as a management tool, which can improve operational performance in the long-run. The researcher recommended that companies need to give more detailed information about empowerment to managers and supervisors so that they can improve organizational performance.

Harrell (1996) studied 149 non-mangers and 108 managers from three different types of hotels in Houston using a self-administered questionnaire to measure the disparity in the perceptions and applications of empowerment. Results showed that there are different levels
of empowerment perceptions between managers and non-managers. Managers ranked highly “understanding the mission statement,” “knowing when to seek help,” and “improvement of quality ideas” in the empowerment categories, while non-managers ranked “knowing when to seek help,” “understanding the mission statement,” “having an approachable supervisor,” “understanding the organization’s expectations,” and “being trained to make immediate decisions” just as high. The researcher concluded that managers perceived a clear understanding toward the organization as the most important factor, while non-managers perceived timing to seek help as the most important factor.

George and Hancer (2003) surveyed non-supervisory employees in a full-service restaurant in the United States to determine five attributes (i.e., trust, training, communication openness, information accuracy, and leader member exchange) related to empowerment. A total of 798 (51% response rate) non-supervisory employees responded that trust and leader member exchange were highly associated with empowerment. However, researchers found that communication was moderately associated with empowerment and accuracy of information and training were rarely associated with empowerment. The researchers concluded that restaurant employees would be more empowered when managers communicate with employees to encourage and build credibility with employees.
Consequences of Leadership Empowerment

Chebat and Kollias (2000) studied 41 financial service managers in six branches of a prominent Canadian bank to examine three interfaces (i.e., employee-manager, employee-role, and employee-customers) related to empowerment, using a 56-item questionnaire. Factor analysis was used to measure underlying dimensions, which were role conflict, role ambiguity, self-efficacy, adaptability, job satisfaction, role-prescribed, and extra-role performance. The researchers found that empowerment positively impacted adaptability, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction in the employee-manager interface and significantly influenced the behavior and attitude among service employees. In addition, results indicated that role ambiguity was the most influential factor in the employee role interface and empowerment affected adaptability in the employee-customer interface. Therefore, researchers concluded that when employees perceived less role ambiguity, they were more satisfied with their jobs and showed less conflicted with their supervisors. Moreover, managers should have clear communication with their employees in order to reduce role conflict and increase lower level of adaptability.

Niehoff et al. (2001) studied 203 employees in restructured organizations to examine the relationship among managers’ empowerment behaviors, job loyalty, and job enrichment in a downsizing environment. Results revealed that empowerment did not directly impact loyalty but was indirectly influenced by loyalty behaviors through employee perception of job enrichment. The researchers concluded that job enrichment mediated the relationship between empowerment and loyalty in a downsizing event.

Leach, Wall, and Jackson (2003) collected data from in-depth interviews with 10 shop floor employees in a medium-sized steel company in the United Kingdom to examine
the linkage between empowerment and job knowledge. The researchers found that empowerment promoted the acquisition of fault-management knowledge and boosted self-efficacy and intrinsic task motivation.

Laschinger et al. (2004) studied 412 nurses from the College of Nurses of Ontario registry list to examine a longitudinal analysis of the impact of workplace empowerment on work satisfaction. Data were gathered utilizing a mail survey questionnaire. Factor analysis was used to identify underlying dimensions of structural empowerment (i.e., opportunity, information, support, resources, informal, power, and formal power) and psychological empowerment (i.e., meaning, confidence, autonomy, and impact). Results indicated that the changes in perception of structural empowerment were highly influenced by changes in psychological empowerment and job satisfaction, while psychological empowerment did not impact changes in job satisfaction over time. The researchers concluded that the structural empowerment may play an important role in boosting job satisfaction.

Ahearne, Mathieu, and Rapp (2005) collected data from a self-administered questionnaire survey of 231 salespeople and 864 customers, and job performance data in the pharmaceutical company. Researchers studied the impact of leadership empowerment behavior based on customer satisfaction, which was related to a function of employees’ empowerment readiness and salespersons’ characteristics (i.e., self-efficacy and adaptability). The researchers found that empowering leader behaviors and employees’ empowerment readiness significantly influenced salespeople’s self-efficacy and adaptability. In addition, researchers concluded that when employees have high self-efficacy, confidence, and adaptability, they can handle difficulties on the job, perform their job better, and provide great services to customers according to customers’ needs and wants.
Hospitality field

A review article by Becker (1996) suggested that empowerment can be used as a management survival tool in an organization. The researcher stated that firms must consider their own cultures and current status of human resource management to implement successful empowerment, such as hiring seasonal employees or employee turnover. The researcher emphasized that when empowerment strategies were appropriately employed, employees were able to have high levels of organizational commitment and exhibited high enthusiasm toward meeting organizational goals.

Leong (2001) surveyed 625 restaurant managers using a self-administered questionnaire to examine restaurant managers’ perceptions of empowerment, mentoring employees, and customer satisfaction in casual restaurants and quick service restaurant chains. A total of 46 restaurant managers responded that mentoring improved employees’ performances in the organization. Results revealed that empowerment positively influenced employees’ confidence in the decision-making process and can build trust and respect among employees. In addition, the researcher found that customer service was improved by mentoring and empowering employees.

Kim and George (2005) collected data from a survey questionnaire with 173 employees in a quick-casual restaurant chain in 26 states in the United States to study the relationships between leader-member exchange and psychological empowerment. Researchers used a factor analysis method to identify dimensions of psychological empowerment: attitude (i.e., meaning and competence) and influence (i.e., self-determination and impact). Results revealed that psychological empowerment was positively related to leader-member exchange and the leader-member exchange was linked to attitude and
influence. Thus, the researchers concluded that the relationship between managers and employees can be predicted by the employees’ perception of influence. The authors encouraged managers to use these results when conducting manager training programs to emphasize the effect of the manager’s relationship with their subordinates.

Salazar, Pfaffenberg, and Salazar (2006) studied 68 corporate managers, hotel general managers, and assistant general managers using a survey questionnaire in the southeastern United States to examine the effects of locus of control and empowerment on hotel managers’ job satisfaction. The researchers found that empowerment constructs (i.e., meaningfulness, competency, self-determination, impact, and trust) and locus of control were significantly correlated with the manager’s job satisfaction. The researchers concluded that more satisfied managers have low turnover intention. By nurturing empowerment environment, managers’ perception of empowerment can influence attitudinal responses.

**Job Satisfaction**

**Definitions**

Job satisfaction has been defined many different ways by numerous researchers (Gruneberg, 1976; Hopkins, 1983; Hsiao & Kohnke, 1998; Locke, 1969; Mumford, 1972; Willa & Blackburn, 1992). However, all agreed that job satisfaction is a nebulous, complex, but an important concept for human resource management practice because it depends on so many different factors such as work environments, job position, and work roles. In addition, it influences one’s feelings of expectations and attitudes toward a job.

Many researchers defined job satisfaction in terms of one’s perception of aspects of the job. Vroom (1964) defined job satisfaction as the positive perception of an individual’s
work and work role. According to Locke (1969), job satisfaction is “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (p.316).

Gruneberg (1976) proposed that “job satisfaction consists of the total body of feelings that an individual has about his job” (p.x). When the total feeling of job influences the perception of job satisfaction, one’s job satisfaction can be measured. Moreover, job satisfaction was defined as employees’ feeling about job characteristics, work climate, and work compensation (Jong, Ruyter, Streukens, & Ouwersloot, 2000; Wexley & Yukl, 1984). Hsiao and Kohnke (1998) defined job satisfaction as one’s emotional response to a job that results from the person’s expectations of job and the reality of the job situation.

Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar, and Brymer (2000) explained that job satisfaction represents the workplace and employees’ perceptions of their job. Job satisfaction can be predicted by employees’ evaluation of work climate, levels of organizational support, and employment situation.

The following researchers defined job satisfaction in terms of the harmony of individual’s needs (e.g., needs the skills and knowledge that one brings it to be used) and firm’s needs (e.g., needs a certain level of skill and knowledge, motivated employees, or achieve set output). Hopkins (1983) defined job satisfaction as “individuals’ responses to their work place, which includes unionization and its impact on perceptions of the work setting” (p.22). The author pointed out that job satisfaction can result from harmony of an individual’s needs and perceptions of the job. In addition, Topolosky (2000) stated that job satisfaction is determined by the simple agreement between employee’s needs and employer’s needs. In order words, when employees feel good about their jobs and themselves
and have a chance to accomplish something worthwhile as the firm expect and want, employees are satisfied with their jobs.

**Dimensions of Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction Factors**

The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) was developed by Hackman and Oldham (1976). Hackman and Oldham (1976) identified seven job characteristics in the job characteristics model: skill variety, task identity, significance, autonomy, feedback from the job, feedback from agents, and dealing with others. However, the researchers combined “feedback from the job” and “feedback from agents” into one feedback category and removed “dealing with others” to develop a new measurement scale later on.

The Job Characteristics Inventory (JCI) was developed by Sims, Szilagyi, and Keller (1976). Six dimensions were identified in JCI: skill variety, task identity, autonomy, dealing with others, feedback, and friendship opportunities and challenge and clarity were added by Szilagyi (1979) as an additional dimension later. JCI measured employees’ perception of job characteristics.

In the hospitality industry, both JDS and JCI were used many times by numerous hospitality researchers (Bartlett et al., 1999; Doriann & Blair, 1985; Duke & Sneed, 1989; Jaffe et al., 1994; Lam & Zhang, 2003; Sneed & Herman, 1990; Tas, Spalding, & Getty, 1989). In addition, these two job characteristic measurement constructs have been proved by other researches and reliability and validity of the constructs were verified.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967) to measure employee job satisfaction. The researchers created two forms of questionnaires: a long form (100 questions) and a short form (20 questions). The MSQ assesses three dimensions of job satisfaction: intrinsic dimension (e.g., type of
work, achievement, and ability utilization), extrinsic dimension (e.g., working condition, supervision, and co-workers), and overall satisfaction.

Several researchers have studied the concept of job satisfaction (Lalopa, 1997; Locke, 1969; Weiss et al., 1967). A variety of job characteristics and factors have been linked to job satisfaction. Eleven job characteristics (i.e., skill variety, task identity, task significances, autonomy, feedback, challenge, clarity, friendship opportunities, customer interaction, flexible schedule, parent figure) were identified in Table 1. Moreover, Table 1 lists the research on each of the dimensions of job characteristics. As shown in Table 1, the research by Bartlett et al. (1999) found that the characteristic of flexible schedule was perceived at the highest level among foodservice workers at university dining centers. In Doriann and Blair’s (1985) study, task significant was highly considered among foodservice workers as an important job characteristic in university foodservices. Therefore, job characteristics were highly related to job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction factors can be sorted into nine factors: pay, promotion, contingent rewards, communication, operating procedures, benefits, co-workers, nature of work, supervision, and physical evidence. Table 2 describes the nine job satisfaction factors. As shown in Table 2, all researchers found that the factors of nature of work and supervision were the most important factors and influenced employees’ job satisfaction. However, employees’ lower satisfaction with benefit, operating procedure, and communication were reported in several studies (Hsiao & Kohnke, 1998; Khaleque & Rahman, 1987; Lam, Baum, & Pine, 2001; Mount & Bartlett, 2002).
Table 2.1. Dimensions of Job Characteristics Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>The extent to which a job requires a variety of job duties so that employees can implement a variety of job skills and abilities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>The extent to which a job requires completion of work and employees perceive how their job performances impact the overall production or service</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>The extent to which a job has a substantial impact on work of other people; whether the task is important beside the task itself</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>The extent to which a job provides workers freedom so that employees are independent in scheduling work and responsible to complete work duties</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>The extent to which employees get information regarding work itself and the quality of employees' work performance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>The extent to which a job requires individual’s time and ability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>The degree to which a job provides job requirements, standards, and expectation in order to provide clear job guideline and be consistent with management team</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship Opportunities</td>
<td>The degree to which a job allows employee to meet and become friends with other co-workers in the organization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Interaction</td>
<td>The extent to which a job requires interaction with customers in the organization</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Schedule</td>
<td>The extent to which work schedule does not interrupt with other individual’s schedules or other activities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Figure</td>
<td>To what extent will the more mature employees in the workplace assist student employees with academic life</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2. Dimensions of Job Satisfaction Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Adequate salary regarding work duties</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>A particular activity that is intended to promote the position in the workplace</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>Rewards that are given to employees when they approached the goals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>The extent to which employees are satisfied with feedback of work and information, which is from supervisors</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Procedures</td>
<td>The extent to which employees feel satisfied with company’s operating system and procedure</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>The extent to which employees satisfied with given benefits such as vacation, sick leave, and medical insurance plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>The extent to which employees feel satisfied with their co-workers depending on how they treat each other with respect</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Work</td>
<td>The extent to which employees fell satisfied with work environment and work itself</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>The extent to which employees feel satisfied with supervisory attitudes and communication skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction

Thomas, Buboltz, and Winkelspecht (2004) gathered data using a mail survey from 163 recent graduates from a small liberal arts college in New York who were employed at the time of the study to examine the relationship between job characteristics, personality traits, and job satisfaction. In order to measure personality traits, researchers identified four dimensions: general attitude, sensation-intuition, thinking-feeling, and judgment-perception. Job characteristics were measured from the JCI (Job Characteristic Inventory). The researchers found that all job characteristics (i.e., dealing with others, task identity, feedback, variety, autonomy, friendship opportunities, and job satisfaction) influenced job satisfaction, but the four personality traits were not significantly correlated with job satisfaction.

Hospitality field

Tas et al. (1989) used an adapted job descriptive index (JDI) questionnaire sent by mail to 620 hourly job employees of 13 restaurants from a national company to better understand the employee turnover process for full-time and part-time employees by identifying job satisfaction determinants. Results indicated that no significant differences were found between full-time and part-time employees on the level of job satisfaction with current pay rate, supervisors or coworkers. Those results did not correspond with previous studies in the restaurant industry in which full-time employees had indicated higher levels of job satisfaction than part-time employees (Bergmann, Grahn, & Wyatt, 1986: Eberhardt & Shani, 1984).

Mount and Bartlett (2002) studied job satisfaction in the lodging industry in 52 hotels in 22 states: 22 full-service hotels, 17 limited-service hotels, and 13 extended-stay hotels. Their aims were to identify factors that influence job satisfaction and generalized factors of
job satisfaction in the hotel industry. A total of 1,991 questionnaires were considered useable. Factor analysis identified several factors of job satisfaction: organization climate, work team climate, departmental communication, supervisory communication, personal feedback, job introduction, role clarity, empowerment, and compensation. Results showed that hotel employees were most satisfied with the job introduction facet including job training and orientation and were least satisfied with compensation including pay rates and benefits. In addition, results indicated that overall job satisfaction was highly correlated with “work team climate”. The researchers concluded that when hotel employees felt a part of the team in their department, received recognition for their efforts, and were treated with respect, they were satisfied with their jobs.

**College and university dining settings**

Job satisfaction has been an issue for many years in college and university dining workplaces because of the labor intensive work environment. Doriann and Blair (1985) gathered data from survey questionnaires and interviews with 25 university foodservice employees to examine the kitchen helper job classification using the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), which describes relationships of job dimensions, critical psychological states, and personal and work outcomes. The researchers found that task significance had the highest mean score and skill variety had the lowest mean score among foodservice employees. The researchers also found that compensation highly influenced job satisfaction and job satisfaction can be increased depending on the degree of compensation. The researchers concluded that foodservice establishments need to redesign jobs to increase skills required and provide more variety in the work.
Jaffe et al. (1994) conducted a Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) by Spector (1985) and a Job Characteristics Inventory (JCI) by Sims et al. (1976) to examine the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction and to measure job satisfaction of 140 Purdue University foodservice employees. The researchers found that employees were most satisfied with "the nature of the work" and were least satisfied with "promotion and pay". Also, job characteristics significantly influenced job satisfaction. Employees who had a higher degree of feedback expressed higher job satisfaction than those who had a lower degree of feedback. Researchers suggested that when university foodservice managers understand job characteristics, they can improve employees’ job satisfaction.

Hsiao and Kohnke (1998) gathered data from 194 foodservice employees at 11 universities in Region VI of the National Association of College & University Food Services (NACUFS), consisting of the states of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. A total of 194 foodservice employees evaluated their level of job satisfaction and the relative importance of job satisfaction factors among non-managerial foodservice employees. Researchers found that part-time employees had a higher level of job satisfaction than full-time employees because of a more flexible schedule at the college and university foodservice workplace. The factors of “pay”, “contingent reward”, and “promotion” showed the lowest job satisfaction scores, while “nature of work”, “benefits”, and “supervision” scored as the most satisfied among employees. The researchers concluded that managers could increase job satisfaction by contingent rewards, such as showing appreciation to employees for jobs well done.

Bartlett et al. (1999) conducted a study similar to that done by Jaffe et al. (1994) to measure ten job characteristics and seven factors of job satisfaction in university dining settings. They assessed student employees’ job satisfaction in university foodservice and
compared job satisfaction and job characteristics of student employees in other campus jobs at Pennsylvania State University. A total of 656 student employees participated in this study and the results indicated that all student employees were dissatisfied with the pay but were satisfied with the job setting. “Flexible scheduling” was perceived by students to be the most important factor in job characteristics and was the best predictor of job satisfaction. Foodservice student employees also indicated they were most satisfied with their co-workers. The researchers concluded that job characteristics are significant predictors of job satisfaction.

Gray et al. (2000) gathered data from 185 student employees at three land grant universities in the Midwest, East Coast, and West Coast regions, using the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaires (MSQ) and the Job Characteristics Inventory (JCI) to examine the impact of job characteristics on student employee job satisfaction and intent to turnover. Results showed that task identity and feedback concerning job characteristics were negative predictors of student employees’ intent to turnover, while positive feedback, friendship opportunities, and autonomy were most significantly associated with positive job satisfaction among student employees. This study reported results similar to other studies (Bartlett et al., 1999; Jaffe et al., 1994; Sneed, 1988) that feedback was significantly associated with job satisfaction.

Mardanov, Sterrett, and Baker (2007) studied 126 employees at O’Charley’s chain restaurants in the Midwest and Southeast regions to examine member satisfaction with the supervisor and their job satisfaction. Minnesota Job Satisfaction (MSQ) and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) questionnaire were used to collect data. The results indicated that “the praise I get for doing a good job”, “the chance to try my own methods of doing the job”, “the
feeling of accomplishment I get from the job”, “the working conditions”, “the chances for advancement on this job”, “the competence of my supervisor in making decisions”, and “the way my co-workers get along with each other” significantly influenced job satisfaction. The researchers concluded that strong relationships between leaders and subordinates could impact overall job satisfaction.

**Consequences of Job Satisfaction**

Borycki, Thorn, and LeMaster (1998) studied 156 workers from both Mexico and the United States to compare the nature of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in a manufacturing plant. Results showed that job satisfaction among employees in the United States was positively related to organizational commitment, general self esteem, and age, while job satisfaction among the employees in Mexico was related to organizational commitment, general self esteem, and work group autonomy.

Homburg and Stock (2004) gathered data from phone interviews with 222 customers and 221 salespersons in manufacturing companies (i.e., chemical, machinery, and automotive) and service industries (i.e., banking and insurance) to study the relationship between salespeople’s job satisfaction and customer satisfaction. Results indicated that a salespersons’ job satisfaction influenced customer satisfaction in two ways: 1) in the process of emotional contact and 2) in the way salespeople interact with their customers. Moreover, this study revealed that salespersons with higher job satisfaction had more positive interactions with the customers.

Research on the consequences of job satisfaction has been conducted in the hospitality field as well. Li and Tse (1998) studied consequences of expatriate’s job satisfaction using a self-administered questionnaire with managers in the lodging industry in
China, Hong Kong, and Singapore. A total of 104 questionnaires were returned. The researchers found that job satisfaction can influence intention to quit among the expatriate hotel managers.

Susskind et al. (2000) studied 386 customer service employees’ levels of job satisfaction, extra-work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to quit from both hospitality (e.g., hotel and restaurant) and non-hospitality (e.g., retail store) organizations to examine construct validity and develop a path model. Results found that job satisfaction influenced life satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to quit. In addition, researchers found that hospitality workers had lower mean scores of job satisfaction, intention to quit, life satisfaction, and organizational commitment compared to non-hospitality workers. This study revealed that work context influenced service workers’ emotional evaluations of their job and life.

**Employee Loyalty**

**Definitions**

Many firms perceive employees as an asset of the company and employee loyalty has become as important of an issue as customer loyalty in the business industry. Even though companies have been striving to provide better support or opportunities to employees, they have been faced with difficulty in keeping employees in organizations (Voyles, 1999).

The terms “loyalty” and “employee loyalty” appear to be related distinctive terms. Ewin (1993) described loyalty as “an emotional attachment and an emotional reaction to its objects” (p.389). According to Morrall (1999), loyalty was defined as “a commitment to something or someone” (p.95). Hajdin (2005) explained that “the concept of loyalty
analogously creates a need for a theory that explains how doing something other than what should otherwise be done can be a good thing when it is a manifestation of loyalty” (p.261). Powers (2000) proposed loyalty as one’s devotion and emotional attachment toward specific things, which may be related to a person, group, task, or purpose.

In contrast, “employee loyalty” has been defined related to work, co-workers, supervisors, and organizations. Employee loyalty has been defined by numerous researchers (Drizin & Schneider, 2004; Ewin, 1993; Hajdin, 2005; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Powers, 2000; Solomon, 1992; Voyles, 1999). Voyles (1999) described employee loyalty using employee behaviors: when an employee remains in the organization for long periods of time; when an employee is devoted to reaching organization goals and purposes; and when an employee grows within the company and creates value for customers. Powers (2000) defined employee loyalty as specific actions and behaviors (participating in employer’s activities, willing to stay late to finish projects or organizational goals, or helping colleagues). Drizin and Schneider (2004) stated that loyal employees tended to commit and stay in the organization and were willing to help the company irrespective of their job assignments and descriptions.

Factors Influencing Employee Loyalty

A commentary article by Solomon (1992) described factors that can influence employee loyalty and retention. The author commented that in order to maintain employee loyalty, three factors must be considered in the organization: making employees partners in the organization; offering employee benefits related to financial and work care, such as a stock plan and day care system; and providing professional and personal development, such as training opportunities to learn more knowledge and skills.
Ali, Azim, and Falcone (1993) collected data from a survey questionnaire with 119 U.S. employees and 115 Canadian employees to compare the differences of work loyalty and individualism tendency in the organizations (i.e., manufacturing and service company). Results showed that there is no difference between U.S. employees and Canadian employees on individualism, but there was a difference in work loyalty. Researchers found three factors of work loyalty: industry, gender, and success. Industry and gender highly influenced work loyalty and individualism, while success did not impact the same. Canadian employees perceived less “obey me and comply with my instructions” than the U.S. employees. Females significantly perceived “loyalty toward superior” more than males. Results revealed that work loyalty and individualism were highly correlated to each other.

A review article by Morrall (1999) described employee loyalty factors in the organizations, and how employees feel when companies were downsized or had management teams restructured. The author stated that employee loyalty is important to maintain a successful organization and high organizational commitment builds mutual trust between employees and employers. The author suggested having honest communication because it is an essential factor between employees and employers when downsizing occurs in the organization. Moreover, the author explained that through the honest communication, employee loyalty can still remain with the company.

Eskildsen and Nussler (2000) studied linkages between the subsystems of human resource management, employee satisfaction, and loyalty among 215 human resource managers using a survey questionnaire. Researchers found that cultural, social, and technical subsystems (e.g., flexible work hours, employee benefits such as bonus programs, staff associations, or better pay rates) significantly impacted employee satisfaction and loyalty.
The researchers concluded that companies should focus on establishing structured career programs, bonus programs, and better pay rates compared to similar firms, as strategies for employee retention to improve employee loyalty in the organizations.

Roehling et al. (2001) conducted a telephone survey to collect data from American workers between the ages of 18 and 64 to assess the relationships among work-life, employee loyalty, child care policies, flexible work time, and informal support. A total of 2,885 respondents participated. Results of a hierarchical multiple regression analysis revealed that flexible work shifts, informal support such as supervisor support, and child care policies highly influenced employee loyalty. Researchers suggested that these factors must be considered by firms in order to increase employee loyalty.

Cunha (2002) conducted a case study of knowledge-intensive firms during spring 2000 using an interview and a survey questionnaire method to examine how leadership, culture, and structure are linked with employee loyalty. A total of 310 respondents completed the survey questionnaire and 70 people were interviewed. Results revealed that good leadership, low-profile organizational culture, and high performance organization structure positively influenced employee loyalty. The researcher concluded that employee loyalty can increase when firms provide a good work environment, mutual support, and opportunities.

Nikolaou and Tsaousis (2002) studied how emotional intelligence in the workplace impacts employee loyalty among 212 professional employees (i.e., nurses or social workers). Results showed that emotional intelligence is a determinant of employee loyalty and leads to high organizational commitment in the organization. Therefore, they concluded that there are relationships among the emotional intelligence, employee loyalty, and organizational commitment.
Coughlan (2005) reviewed employee loyalty studies and moral value based on loyalty and summarized factors of employee loyalty as follows: 1) personal characteristics aspects, 2) socialization and training practices within group efforts, and 3) traits of community members. The researcher concluded that these three factors were highly correlated with employee loyalty in the organization and companies can obtain more information regarding antecedents of employee loyalty by investigating employees’ behaviors and attitudes toward these factors. Moreover, the researcher found that in order to measure employees’ loyalty, two unique factors, attitudinal and applied loyalty need to be considered based on employees’ feelings of loyalty toward colleagues and workplace.

Bloemer and Odekerken-Schroder (2006) examined how employee relationship proneness (i.e., tendency) is related to three types of attitudinal loyalty (i.e., affective, calculative, and normative commitment) and behavioral loyalty (i.e., positive word-of-mouth communication, intention to stay, benefit, and complaining) using a survey questionnaire among 199 bank employees. Results revealed that employee relationship proneness predicted affective and normative commitment and positively impacted behavioral loyalty. As positive loyal behaviors, researcher found positive word-of-mouth communication and intention to stay. Researchers concluded that employee loyalty can be used as a determinant of customer loyalty and to measure the success of service firms.

Martin and Black (2006) conducted a survey questionnaire of 168 attorneys and 316 support staff and paralegals in a law firm in Atlanta, GA to collect data to examine the importance of the quality of workplace and how the results of the importance of the quality of the workplace impacts productivity, loyalty, satisfaction, and intention to stay in a knowledge-intensive firm. The researchers found that both female and male employees at the
firm were highly satisfied with the overall quality of workplace. Female employees considered the child care facility as the most important factor, while male employees considered dining room as the important factor. “Child care facility” and “dining room” also influenced employee loyalty. The researchers concluded that high quality of workplace and appropriate employee supports maximize retention of high quality employees and employee loyalty.

**Consequences of Employee Loyalty**

Silverstro (2002) conducted a survey questionnaire and collected private store data (i.e., sales per square foot, contribution per square foot, and contribution per staff hour) to measure how employee satisfaction and loyalty are related to service firms’ profitability in the United Kingdom. A total of 300 employees of 15 stores participated and correlation analysis was used to analyze data. The researcher found that employee satisfaction and employee loyalty (i.e., length of work and willingness of refer current workplace to friends) were highly correlated and employee loyalty highly influenced length of service.

Ali and Al-Kazemi (2005) studied work value and loyalty among 762 Kuwait managers to examine how managers perceive work value and loyalty differently based on demographic and organizational variables such as motivation and achievement. Data were collected from a questionnaire survey and participants were selected from private sectors and government. Researchers found that female managers showed a higher work value than male managers. Those managers, who had more education and a higher level position, expressed higher work values and loyalty toward their organizations. Results revealed that high loyalty toward work influenced professionalism and encouraged learning new skills and knowledge.
Redman and Snape (2005) examined consequences of employees’ multiple commitments for work attitudes and behaviors in diverse occupational and organizational contexts in the United Kingdom using semi-structured interviews with a plant manager, three specialists, a union convener, and other union representatives. A survey questionnaire was distributed to 378 plant employees. Also, interviews were conducted with two human resource management managers, two senior operation managers, and two branch managers. Researchers also used two focus groups to identify commitment to foci (i.e., commitment to boss, customers, or co-workers). Results revealed that employee loyalty influenced employees’ behaviors and attitudes such as commitment toward co-workers, the organization, customers, their boss, and the union.

Borzaga and Torita (2006) gathered data from a survey questionnaire with 2,066 employees of public, nonprofit, and profit organizations regarding whether employee satisfaction and loyalty toward the organization is impacted by employees’ motivation and incentives (e.g., wage or career promotion) of the organization. The researchers found that non-profit organization employees were more satisfied than other organization employees. Moreover, employees who are younger and have a higher level of education showed less loyalty compared to those who are older and had a lower level of education. Results revealed that employee satisfaction was influenced by employee motivation but employee loyalty was not influenced by employee motivation. Rather, employee loyalty was influenced by the incentives.
Chapter Summary

A literature review on leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty was presented in this chapter. Leadership empowerment included definitions of leadership empowerment, empowerment, and employee empowerment, theories of empowerment, influencing factors on empowerment, and consequence of empowerment. A literature review on job satisfaction included definitions, factors affecting job satisfaction, and consequences of job satisfaction. Employee loyalty comprised influencing factors on employee loyalty and consequence of employee loyalty.
A Proposed Model

A model (Figure 4) is proposed for this study to show the relationships among perceived leadership empowerment behaviors, job satisfaction and employee loyalty. First, the influence of leadership empowerment on student job satisfaction was tested. Each sub dimension (i.e., enhancing meaningfulness of work, fostering opportunities for participation in decision making, expressing confidence in high performance, facilitating good accomplishment, and providing autonomy from bureaucratic constraints) of leadership empowerment was examined to determine whether there were relationships with job satisfaction. Second, the relationships among the five dimensions of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty were examined. Third, the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty was also investigated.

Figure 4. A Proposed Model
Hypotheses

The study examined the following hypotheses:

H1: There is a positive predictive relationship between meaningful of work and job satisfaction.

H2: There is a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction.

H3: There is a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and job satisfaction.

H4: There is a positive predictive relationship between goal accomplishment and job satisfaction.

H5: There is a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction.

H6: There is a positive predictive relationship between meaningful of work and employee loyalty.

H7: There is a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and employee loyalty.

H8: There is a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and employee loyalty.

H9: There is a positive predictive relationship between goal accomplishment and employee loyalty.

H10: There is a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and employee loyalty.

H11: There is a positive predictive relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty.
H12: There are significant differences in leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty by students’ demographic characteristics.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the quantitative and qualitative research methods used to collect data for this study. A quantitative research survey methodology was used to examine the relationships among perceived leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty in student workers in university dining. This study also attempted to find out how student workers differently perceived leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty based on demographic characteristics.

The qualitative research consisted of group interviews with student workers. These interviews were used to capture participants’ own words about the constructs being studied and provide deeper insight about leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty.

Quantitative Research

Sample

This study sample was limited to student workers at five college and university dining centers. The survey questionnaires were distributed to the student workers at the dining centers where they worked. The target population for this study was current student workers, who had been working at the dining centers since May 1, 2007. A convenience sampling method was used to collect data from 240 student workers. A total of 48 student workers at each of five selected universities (i.e., Iowa State University, University of Iowa, Oklahoma State University, University of Nebraska, and Rochester Institute of Technology) were asked to complete a research questionnaire. Student workers on duty for the noon and the evening meals were asked to complete the questionnaire. Data were collected between June 26, 2007 and July 31, 2007.
Research instrument and measurement

The researcher developed a survey questionnaire based on relevant literature to meet the objectives of the study (Appendix A). The questionnaire was used to measure perceived leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty and collect demographic information. The research instrument consisted of four parts with a total of 69 questions including leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, employee loyalty, and demographic information.

Leadership empowerment

To measure perceived leadership empowerment, the researcher modified the leadership empowerment behavior questionnaire (LEB) developed by Hui (1994) based on the conceptual work of Conger and Kanungo (1988). All 27 questions from Hui’s (1994) questionnaire were included but were slightly modified to be applicable to the college and university dining environment. For example, the term “leaders” was modified to “managers” in the statements. This section of the questionnaire measured how student workers perceived their managers’ leadership empowerment behaviors. The 27 questions measured five dimensions of leadership empowerment behavior: meaningfulness of work, participation in decision making, confidence in high performance, goal accomplishment, and autonomy. A seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1-Strongly Disagree to 7-Strongly Agree was used to rate each statement. The reliability and validity of these items were established in previous studies (Ahearne, 2000; Hui, 1994).
Job satisfaction

To measure job satisfaction of student workers, the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, which was developed by Weiss et al. (1967), was used. The short form consists of 20 items (Appendix A). Each item was rated using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-Very Dissatisfied to 5-Very Satisfied. This questionnaire measured student workers’ job satisfaction. The reliability of this scale was verified in several studies (Choi, 2001; Gray et al., 2000; Mount & Bartlett, 2002; Weiss et al., 1967).

Employee loyalty

Mowday et al.’s (1979) instrument was used in this study to measure employee loyalty. Mowday et al. developed the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), which consists of 15 items. Ten of the 15 items (Appendix A) were used to examine employee loyalty: each was rated using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1-Strongly Disagree to 7-Strongly Agree. The organizational commitment questionnaire has been used to measure employee loyalty toward organization or job by several researchers (Coughlan, 2005; Jaussi, 2007; Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998). The reliability and validity were tested by previous researchers (Coughlan, 2005; Jaussi, 2007; Meyer et al., 1998; Mowday et al., 1979).

Demographics

The student workers’ demographic information section (Appendix A) consisted of 12 items including gender, ethnicity, year in school, status of enrollment, age, job classification, hourly wage, length of employment in the dining service, living status, and perception of summer work environment. Student workers were asked whether they perceived the summer work environment the same as a regular semester work environment.
Data collection

Before collecting data, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University reviewed and approved the questionnaire (Appendix B). Once IRB approval was obtained, a pilot test was conducted to evaluate the clarity and ease of completion of the questionnaire. A total of 38 student workers at the ISU dining center, who were not members of the study sample, were invited to participate in the pilot study. A cover letter (Appendix A) and survey questionnaire were distributed by the researcher. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire and provide comments about content of questions and format (Appendix C). According to the comments and recommendations, a few minor revisions were made. A student citizenship status question was added to determine whether each was an international or U.S. citizen. Questions about number of credit enrolled in and number of hours worked per week were changed to open-ended type questions.

The researcher contacted assistant directors at dining centers at each university through an e-mail in advance to get permission to ask student workers to participate (Appendix D). The researcher traveled to each university and distributed survey packets to participants during their breaks. The survey package included the questionnaire and a cover letter (Appendix A), which explained the purpose of the study. Participants were assured that collected data were confidential and anonymous. Participants completed the questionnaire in the researcher’s presence and returned it to the researcher. To increase the response rate, the researcher offered an incentive of a two dollar bill for participation.
Data analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 15.0 was used for all data analyses. Descriptive statistics were computed for all variables. Ratings for the three negatively worded employee loyalty statements were reverse coded prior to conducting data analysis. Cronbach’s alpha was used to examine reliability on all scales. According to Nunnally (1978), a Cronbach’s alpha greater than or equal to 0.70 is considered acceptable. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted to determine whether the original leadership empowerment sub scales by Hui (1994) were appropriate with data from this study.

Scores were calculated for each of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment by averaging the ratings given to statements included in that scale. Scale scores were also calculated for job satisfaction and employee loyalty by averaging the ratings given those statements.

Multiple regression analysis was used to explore the relationships between perceived sub scales of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction and employee loyalty. Dummy variables were created to assess the impact of supervisory and non-supervisory positions.

Correlations among the five leadership empowerment, job satisfaction and employee loyalty scores were computed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-tests were used to determine whether leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty differ based on student workers’ demographic information.
Qualitative Research

Group interviews

Group interviews were conducted by the researcher and an experienced interviewer. According to Barbour & Kitzinger (1999), such group discussions can generate rich and extensive data. The purpose of the group interviews in this study was to collect additional information in order to further explain the survey data. The group interview data were used to provide an interpretative aid to survey findings.

The group interview sessions focused on students’ perceptions of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and loyalty toward their current employer. Group participants discussed their perceived relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty. The group interview questions (Appendix E) consisted of 23 questions that served as prompts for additional exploration during the group discussions. Group interview questions were developed with the assistance of three experts who were hospitality faculty and dining center managers.

Participants

Participants were recruited from students employed at Iowa State University (ISU) dining centers and Oklahoma State University (OSU) dining centers. Student workers were invited to participate in a group interview through an invitation poster. The invitation poster was posted in selected dining centers at ISU and OSU after obtaining the managers’ permission. A meal was offered to participants as an incentive. Once participants submitted their names, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers, the researcher contacted them through e-mail to schedule a time and place for the group meeting. Each group consisted of six to eight student workers at dining centers from each university. According to Bloor, Frankland,
Thomas, and Robson (2001), group interviews generally consist of six to eight participants. A total of three group interviews were conducted in this study: one at ISU Dining Center and two at OSU Dining Center.

Procedures

Before collecting data, a pilot group interview was conducted with three student workers at ISU dining centers that were not included in this study sample. Through the pilot test, the moderator and researcher tested group interview questions and procedures in order to adjust their techniques. Each group interview lasted approximately 2 hours.

Before conducting the group interview, each participant was asked to sign an informed consent form (Appendix F). The form included the purpose of the study, a description of procedures, risks, benefits, compensation, participant’s right, and confidentiality including contact information of facilitators. During the group session, pseudo names were used and a pseudo name card was placed on the table in front of each participant.

The two different trained interviewers were hired to conduct the group interviews. One female interviewer conducted two group interviews at Oklahoma State University and one male interviewer conducted one group interview at Iowa State University. The researcher met with the interviewers in advance to review and discuss process and questioning to be used for the group discussion. At the beginning of the group session, the researcher and the interviewer introduced themselves and explained briefly procedures of the group session including length of time of the group interview, confidentiality of participants, and participant’s right. The researcher also explained terms (e.g., leadership empowerment) that were used in the group discussion. Moreover, participants were informed that there were no
right or wrong answers to the questions. Audiotapes were used to record the group sessions and the researcher took notes to collect accurate data during each session. As an incentive, a meal was provided during a break in the group discussion. When the group interview session was finished, the researcher thanked participants and indicated the importance of their participation to the research project. Appendix G includes the data collection form used by the researcher. After completing each group interview session, a debriefing session was conducted between the researcher and the facilitator. Through this debriefing session, the researcher captured information that was not recorded or noted during the group interview session. The information that was not collected during the session included the number of participants and personal comments that were not related to the study.

**Data analysis**

The recorded tapes were transcribed by an experienced transcriptionist. The researcher provided the transcriber with the group interview questions in order to have an accurate transcript. The transcribed data were coded by main themes of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty and were reread several times to find appropriate detailed categories of themes.
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes results of the study and includes a discussion of findings. A demographic profile of the respondents is presented. The chapter focuses on respondents’ ratings of the constructs, leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, employee loyalty, relationships, and correlations among the constructs. Qualitative data supporting the quantitative data are provided. Twelve research hypotheses were tested and results are discussed.

Data were collected from students at five universities (i.e., Iowa State University, University of Iowa, Oklahoma State University, University of Nebraska at Kearney, and Rochester Institute of Technology). Prior to data analysis, the similarity of response from students at the five schools was examined to determine the appropriateness of combining responses for all data analyses. Analysis of variance was used to examine responses. Results showed no differences among responses based on university, so data were combined into one data set for all data analyses.

Results

Demographic profile of the respondents

A total of 240 questionnaires were distributed to student employees in dining centers of five universities, Iowa State University (n= 48), University of Iowa (n=48), University of Nebraska at Kearney (n=48), Oklahoma State University (n= 48), and Rochester Institute of Technology (n=48). A total of 161 questionnaires were collected representing a response rate of 67.1%: Iowa State University (n= 38, 79.1 %), University of Iowa (n=20, 41.6 %), University of Nebraska at Kearney (n=18, 37.5%), Oklahoma State University (n=40,
83.3 %), and Rochester Institute of Technology (n=45, 93.5 %). A total of eight student
workers participated in the group interviews at Iowa State University and a total of 20
student workers participated in two group interviews at Oklahoma State University.

Table 4.1 includes demographic information about students who responded to the
questionnaire. More than half (n=104, 64.6%) were males. Caucasian-non-Hispanic (n=87,
54.5%) and Asians (n=49, 30.4%) were the prominent ethnic groups. More than half of the
respondents (n=94, 58.3%) were juniors and seniors in the universities. Most respondents
(n=127, 78.7%) ranged in age between 18 and 23 years, lived off-campus (n=113, 70.2%),
and were U.S. citizens (n=104, 64.6%).
Table 4.1. Demographic Profile of the Student Worker Respondents (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Caucasian-non-Hispanic</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living status</td>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student status</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S citizen</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 provides a summary of students’ jobs and job characteristics. More than half (n=105, 65.2%) earned more than $7.00 per hour. Job tasks were classified in nine different job categories. The most commonly held positions were cashier (n=29, 18.0%), dishwasher (n=26, 13.7%), and server (n=24, 14.9%). Some (15.5%) of the students were in supervisory positions (i.e., supervisor or student manager). Approximately one third of students (n=49, 30.4%) had worked for university dining services in excess of five semesters, 21 respondents (13.0%) worked for three semesters, and 35 respondents (21.7%) worked for
two semesters. About half of the student workers (n=73, 45.3%) were scheduled to work in excess of 20 hours per week and 46 respondents (28.6%) indicated 20 hours per week. Of the 161 respondents, 120 respondents (74.5%) indicated there was a difference between the summer work environment and a regular semester work environment. They perceived the summer work environment to be much slower than the regular semester work environment due to lack of business.

Table 4.2. Characteristics of Jobs Held by Student Workers in University Dining (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage</td>
<td>$5.00-$6.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.01-$7.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$7.01-$8.00</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8.01-$9.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tasks</td>
<td>Food preparation assistant</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food runner</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Server</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student manager</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dining room helper</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengths of employment</td>
<td>Less than one month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semesters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 semesters</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked per week</td>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 hours</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of summer work environment</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No difference</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership empowerment

Mean ratings of leadership empowerment

Table 4.3 includes mean ratings on a 7-point Likert-scale (1, Strongly Disagree to 7, Strongly Agree) for the construct, leadership empowerment. Nearly all statements were rated above 4 and 16 of the 23 statements were rated above 5 suggesting that students perceived leadership empowerment in their current positions. The statement, “managers believe that I can handle demanding tasks”, had the highest mean rating (m=5.83, SD=1.30) and “managers show confidence in my ability to do a good job” had the second highest mean rating (m=5.57, SD=1.40). The items, “managers encourage me to contact directly the people from whom I need information” (SD=1.26) and “managers believe in my ability to improve when I make mistakes” (SD=1.34), had mean ratings of 5.5. The statement, “managers take a ‘sink or swim’ attitude toward the difficulties that arise in my work”, had the lowest mean rating (m=3.96, SD=1.45).

Scale scores for each of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment were calculated by averaging the ratings for the statements in that dimension. Scales scores are shown in Table 4.3. Students perceived the dimension of confidence in high performance to be the most evident of the five dimensions, followed by goal accomplishment, meaningfulness of work, autonomy, and participation in decision making.

Confirmatory factor analysis (Appendix H) was conducted in order to confirm the five sub scales of leadership empowerment. Results supported that the five dimensions of leadership empowerment in this study were similar with five factors of leadership empowerment by Hui’s (1994) study.
Table 4.3. Mean Ratings of Leadership Empowerment Statements, Scale Scores, and Reliability Estimates of Scale Scores (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership empowerment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaningfulness of work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand the importance of my work</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me realize that I am part of a larger team</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand the purpose of what I do at work</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make me believe that my work can &quot;make a difference&quot;</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand how the objectives and goals</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand how my job fits</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision making</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers consult with me on issues pertaining to work</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to take the initiative in expressing my job related opinions</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers provide many opportunities for me to express my opinions</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to make important decisions that are directly related to my job</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make many decisions together with me</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence in high performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers believe that I can handle demanding tasks</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers show confidence in my ability to do a good job</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers believe in my ability to improve when I make mistakes</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers focus on my successes rather than my failures</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers recognize my good work by using it as an example</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal accomplishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make sure that I have the resources needed an effective performance</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me overcome obstacles to my performance</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me to develop good working relationships with those people who can affect my performance</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers provide the opportunity for training so that I can perform effectively</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me to identify what I need in order to achieve my performance goals</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers take a &quot;sink or swim&quot; attitude toward the difficulties that arise in my work</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to contact directly the people from whom I need information</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make it more efficient to do my job by keeping the roles and regulations simple</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers insist that I rigidly follow rules and procedures even when they interfere with my performance</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers allow me to do my job my way</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to cut through bureaucracy to get things done</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree to 7 Strongly Agree*
Reliability of leadership empowerment sub scales

Individual items ratings were averaged to create sub scale scores for each of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment identified by Hui (1994). In order to assess the internal consistency of the leadership empowerment sub scales, Cronbach’s alpha (α) was computed. Cronbach Alpha reliability estimates for the five subscales ranged from .91 for the confidence in high performance subscale to .57 for the autonomy subscale (Table 4.3). Reliability estimates exceeded correlations among the scales suggesting that the five sub scales, although somewhat related, were measuring different dimensions.

Correlations among five sub scales of leadership empowerment

Table 4.4 shows correlations among five sub scales of leadership empowerment. Moderate relationships were noted; with the strongest relationship being between confidence in high performance and goal accomplishment (r=0.68).

Table 4.4. Correlations among Five Sub Scales of Leadership Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meaningfulness of work</th>
<th>Participation in decision making</th>
<th>Confidence in high performance</th>
<th>Goal accomplishments</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness of work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision making</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in high performance</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal accomplishment</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlation significant at $p<0.01$
Comparison of leadership empowerment scores based on demographic characteristics

An analysis of variance, with Tukey post hoc test, was used to compare mean scores for the five sub scales of leadership empowerment based on demographic characteristics of the student workers (i.e., ethnicity, classification, age, wage, job tasks, length of employment, and hours worked per week). Differences in scores were found based on length of employment and hours worked per week ($p<.05$). No differences were found based on ethnicity, classification, age, job tasks, and wage. In order to find the differences between male and female, a $t$-test was conducted. The result showed that there were differences between males and females in the five sub dimensions of leadership empowerment. As shown in Table 4.5 and in Appendix H, leadership empowerment scores increased as length of tenure with the organization increased and as number of hours worked each week increased.
Table 4.5. Comparison of Leadership Empowerment Scores Based on Student Worker Demographic Characteristics (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sub scales of leadership empowerment</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 1 month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>More than 5 semesters</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meanfulness of work</td>
<td>Mean ±SD</td>
<td>3.96±1.85*</td>
<td>4.66±1.16</td>
<td>4.99±1.10</td>
<td>4.58±1.30</td>
<td>5.06±1.24</td>
<td>5.25±1.00*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision making</td>
<td>Mean ±SD</td>
<td>4.05±1.41*</td>
<td>3.79±1.47</td>
<td>4.75±1.34</td>
<td>4.10±1.41</td>
<td>5.25±1.03</td>
<td>5.30±.99*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in high performance</td>
<td>Mean ±SD</td>
<td>4.98±3.8</td>
<td>4.92±6.1*</td>
<td>5.19±5.7</td>
<td>5.30±5.3</td>
<td>5.51±4.4</td>
<td>5.87±3.7*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked per Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in high performance</td>
<td>Mean ±SD</td>
<td>5.09±0.97*</td>
<td>5.73±1.19*</td>
<td>5.41±1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal accomplishments</td>
<td>Mean ±SD</td>
<td>4.79±1.02*</td>
<td>5.37±0.93*</td>
<td>4.99±.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal accomplishments</td>
<td>Mean ±SD</td>
<td>4.87±1.21*</td>
<td>4.99±1.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree to 7 Strongly Agree
*p<0.05
Comparison of leadership empowerment scores on non-supervisory and supervisory student workers

A t-test was used to compare mean scores on the five sub scale of leadership empowerment based on whether students were in non-supervisory or supervisory positions. The non-supervisory group included the job tasks of food preparation assistant, dishwasher, cashier, food runner, server, and dining room helper. The supervisory group included those with job titles of supervisor and student manager. Results showed that there were differences in ratings between non-supervisory and supervisory student workers for some of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment. As shown in Table 4.6, supervisory student workers reported higher scores than the non-supervisory student workers for the leadership empowerment sub scales of participation in decision making and confidence in high performance.

Group interview comments on leadership empowerment and demographic characteristics

Responses from group interview participants showed a perceived relationship between length of employment and leadership empowerment. Students indicated that when they perceived leadership empowerment from management, they tended to stay at the same workplace longer. One expressed the following:

“If management will not be flexible or open minded, students will tend to quit.”
Table 4.6: Comparison of Leadership Empowerment Scores Based on Non-Supervisory and Supervisory Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Empowerment</th>
<th>Meaningfulness of Work Mean±SD</th>
<th>Participation in decision Making Mean±SD</th>
<th>Confidence in high performance Mean±SD</th>
<th>Goal Accomplishments Mean±SD</th>
<th>Autonomy Mean±SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student workers</td>
<td>4.83±1.21</td>
<td>4.62±1.33</td>
<td>5.33±1.19</td>
<td>5.01±1.02</td>
<td>4.84±.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>5.31±1.27</td>
<td>5.46±1.14</td>
<td>5.89±1.13</td>
<td>5.23+.77</td>
<td>4.98±1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>-3.28</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree to 7 Strongly Agree
\*p<0.05

Job satisfaction

Mean ratings of job satisfaction

Table 4.7 summarizes ratings of 20 job satisfaction statements by student workers using a 5-point Likert-scale (1, Very Dissatisfied to 5, Very Satisfied). All statements received ratings greater than 3 suggesting that student employees were generally satisfied with their jobs. Respondents’ rating of “the way my co-workers get along with each other” (m=4.17, SD=0.96) and “the way my job provides for steady employment” (m=4.08, SD=0.91) reported the highest ratings indicating that they were most satisfied with these components of their job. Respondents gave the statement “the chances for advancement on this job” the lowest mean rating (m=3.26, SD=1.08).
Reliability of job satisfaction scale

Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$) was computed to evaluate the job satisfaction scale’s internal consistency. The reliability estimate was 0.89 (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7. Mean Ratings of Job Satisfaction (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Statements</th>
<th>Mean$^a$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On my present job, this is how I feel about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the way my co-workers get along with each</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the working conditions</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being able to do things that don't go against my conscience</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to do things for other people</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the way my boss handles men</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the chances for advancement on this job</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Scale: 1=Very Dissatisfied to 5=Very Satisfied
Group interview comments on job satisfaction

The relationship with co-workers was a common theme in the comments from group interview participants. Most participants of the group interviews perceived that when they enjoyed working with co-workers and had a good working environment, they were highly satisfied with their jobs. Specific comments included:

“I feel satisfied with my job when I think about all the wonderful people I work with and also think about all the worth of jobs.”

“I am satisfied with my job such as people I work with and the tasks I do.”

Group interview participants indicated dissatisfaction with an unorganized work environment, unclear management direction, and routine jobs in university dining centers. Comments included:

“The only thing I would say that I am not satisfied with is sometimes I wish the process of doing things was a little bit more organized.”

“Unclear management directions.”

“A dining service work requires many of routine tasks repeating same things everyday. It makes me feel that I am not advancing or making a progress in my life.”

Comparison of job satisfaction score based on demographic characteristics

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), using Tukey’s post hoc test, was used to explore whether the job satisfaction scores differed based on demographic characteristics of the student workers (i.e., ethnicity, classification, age, wage, job tasks, length of employment, and hours work per week). As shown in Table 4.8, significant differences in job satisfaction scores were found based on wage rate and hours worked per week. Results showed that those
who were paid higher wages had a higher level of job satisfaction. Those who worked 20 hours per week or more were more satisfied than those who worked less than 20 hours per week. No other differences were found in job satisfaction based on demographic characteristics. A $t$-test was used to explore differences between males and females but no differences were found in gender.

Table 4.8. Comparison of Job Satisfaction Score Based on Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wage Group</th>
<th>Mean$^{a}$±SD</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5.00-6.00$</td>
<td>3.52±.55</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7.01-8.00$</td>
<td>3.83±.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.01-9.00$</td>
<td>3.99±.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.01-7.00$</td>
<td>3.53±.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8.01-9.00$</td>
<td>3.99±.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 hours/week</td>
<td>3.56±.53</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 hours/week</td>
<td>3.88±.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aScale: 1=Very Satisfied to 5=Very Satisfied*  
*P<0.05*

Comparison of job satisfaction score between non-supervisory and supervisory student workers

In order to compare the job satisfaction scores between non-supervisor and supervisory student workers, a $t$-test was used. Results showed that there was a difference between these two groups. Supervisory student workers were more satisfied than non-supervisory student workers (Table 4.9).
Group interview comments related to job satisfaction

Group interview participants expressed a relationship between pay and job satisfaction. Comments included:

“Somebody that is being paid for $5.15 an hour might not do a job like someone that is being paid for $16.00 an hour. The lower salary worker might not be satisfied.”

“Pay rate and wage affect job satisfaction.”

Table 4.9. Comparison of Job Satisfaction Score on Non-Supervisory and Supervisory Student Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Groups</th>
<th>Mean±SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory</td>
<td>3.71±.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory student</td>
<td>3.97±.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale: 1=Very Dissatisfied to 5= Very Satisfied
*p<0.05

Employee loyalty

Mean ratings of employee loyalty

Table 4.10 shows mean ratings of the 10 statements related to employee loyalty that were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1, Strongly Disagree to 7, Strongly Agree). Nearly all ratings were greater than 4 and several were greater than 5, suggesting that student workers generally were loyal to their employer. Students indicated strongest disagreement with the statement, “deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part” (reverse coded m=5.61). The lowest mean rating was 3.85 for the statement “I could just as
well be working for a different type of organization as long as the work was similar”.

Employee loyalty ratings were averaged to provide an overall score for employee loyalty.

Reliability of employee loyalty scale

To assess the internal consistency of the employee loyalty scale, Cronbach’s alpha (α) was computed. Reliability of the employee loyalty scale was .84 (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10. Mean Ratings of Employee Loyalty (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Loyalty</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.*</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very little loyalty to this organization.*</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really care about the fate of this organization.</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not too much to be gained sticking with this organization indefinitely.*</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me this is the best of all possible organization for which to work</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could just as well be working for a different type of organization as long as the work was similar</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aScale: 1=Strongly Disagree  to 7 Strongly Agree
*Denotes reverse-coded items.
Comparison of employee loyalty score based on demographic characteristics

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), with post hoc test (Tukey), was conducted to find whether employee loyalty score were different based on demographic characteristics but no differences were found among ethnicity, classification, age, wage, job tasks, length of employment, and hours work per week. A t-test was used to find whether employee loyalty differed by gender (Table 4.11). There was a difference between males and females; females were found to report higher loyalty than males.

Table 4.11. Comparison of Employee Loyalty Score Based on Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean±SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.79±0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.92±0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aScale:1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree
*p<0.05

Comparison of employee loyalty score of non-supervisory and supervisory student workers

A t-test was conducted to compare the employee loyalty score of non-supervisory and supervisory student workers. Results indicated that no differences were found between these two groups.

Relationship among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty

A major focus of this research project was to explore the relationships that may exist among the three constructs, leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty and to determine whether increases in scores of leadership empowerment result in corresponding increases in job satisfaction and employee loyalty scores. Correlation and regression analyses were used to help examine these relationships.
Relationship among five dimensions of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction

Five dimensions of leadership empowerment were found in previous studies (Ahearne, 2000; Hui, 1994). In order to explore relationships between sub scales of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction, multiple regression analysis was used.

The coefficient of relationship ($R^2$) of 0.53 showed that 53% of the variance in overall job satisfaction was explained by five sub scales of leadership empowerment. This means that student employees in university dining centers perceived there were positive relationships between the five dimensions of leadership empowerment and overall job satisfaction. As shown in Table 4.12, of the sub scales of leadership empowerment, three factors were related to job satisfaction: “participation in decision making” ($p=.03$), “confidence in high performance” ($p=.00$), and “autonomy” ($p=.02$). These factors highly influenced overall job satisfaction.

Table 4.12. Relationships among Five Dimensions of Leadership Empowerment and Job Satisfaction (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable in the equation</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$R^2$ (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05 (34.41)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness of work</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in decision making</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in high performance</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal accomplishment</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.05$
Group interview comments on leadership empowerment and job satisfaction

Participants of group interviews perceived leadership empowerment when managers made them feel a part of the organization. When they were encouraged by managers and when they made mistakes, managers showed confidence in their abilities to improve performance. Participants highly perceived that they could have autonomy in their jobs and managers encouraged student employees in university dining centers to develop their own ways to make a job better. Specific comments included:

“When managers empower employees, employees are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs and they make their work better.”

“When managers empower the workers, they feel more satisfied because they have more choices of how to do their tasks.”

“Leadership empowerment leads to more employee job satisfaction.”

Correlation among five dimensions of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction

As shown in Table 4.13, all five leadership empowerment sub scores showed a significant (p<.05) positive relationship with overall job satisfaction. The third dimension of leadership empowerment, “confidence in high performance” showed the strongest relationship (r=0.67).

Table 4.13. Correlation among Five Dimensions of Leadership Empowerment and Job Satisfaction (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meaningfulness of work</th>
<th>Participation in decision making</th>
<th>Confidence in high performance</th>
<th>Goal accomplishment</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlation significant at p< 0.01
Group interview comments

Confidence by managers was a theme in group interview comments. Participants expressed the following:

“"My managers are encouraging student workers to work harder and not judging them on the mistakes.""

“My managers show confidence in student worker’s ability to do a good job by helping them learn from mistakes rather than giving harsh comments.”

Relationships among the five dimensions of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction based on non-supervisory and supervisory status

Table 4.14 showed results of multiple regression analysis of the relationships using dummy variables among the five dimensions of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction based on whether students were categorized as non-supervisory or supervisory student workers. The dummy variable was coded as follows: when the non-supervisory group was coded as 1, the supervisory group was coded as 0. The coefficient of relationship (R²) of 0.55 showed that 55% of the variance in overall job satisfaction was explained by five sub scales of leadership empowerment. Of the five dimension of leadership empowerment, there were different effects of confidence in high performance, autonomy, and goal accomplishment between non-supervisory and supervisory groups on job satisfaction. Confidence in high performance and autonomy were significant indicators of job satisfaction to non-supervisory group than supervisory group while goal accomplishment was a significant indicator of job satisfaction to the supervisory group than non-supervisory group.
Table 4.14. Relationships among Five Dimensions of Leadership Empowerment and Job Satisfaction Based on Non-Supervisory and Supervisory Student Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction effect</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in high performance x non-supervisory group</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.55 (18.06)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy x non-supervisory group</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal accomplishment x supervisory group</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlation significant at $p<0.05$

Correlation among the five dimensions of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction based on non-supervisory and supervisory student worker ratings

All sub scales scores of leadership empowerment indicated a significant positive relationship with non-supervisory and supervisory groups. As shown in Table 4.15, of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment, confidence in high performance ($r=.68$) showed a strong relationship with job satisfaction on non-supervisory student workers while goal accomplishment ($r=.73$) showed a strong relationship with job satisfaction on supervisory student workers.

Table 4.15. Correlation among Five Dimensions of Leadership Empowerment and Job Satisfaction based on Non-Supervisory and Supervisory groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Meaningfulness of work</th>
<th>Participation in decision making</th>
<th>Confidence in high performance</th>
<th>Goal accomplishment</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supervisory</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlation significant at $p<0.01$
Relationships among five dimensions of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty

Table 4.16 reports that there were relationships between five dimensions of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty. The coefficient of relationship \( R^2 \) of 0.36 showed that 36% of the variance in overall employee loyalty was explained by five sub scales of leadership empowerment. Of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment, only one dimension, “confidence in high performance”, was related to overall employee loyalty \( (p=0.04) \). The other four factors were not significant predictors of employee loyalty.

Table 4.16. Relationships among Five Dimensions of Leadership Empowerment and Employee Loyalty (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable in the equation</th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness of work</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in decision making</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>(17.05)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in high performance</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal accomplishment</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p<0.05 \)

Relationships among the five dimensions of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty of non-supervisory and supervisory student workers

Table 4.17 shows relationships among the five sub scales of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty for non-supervisory and supervisory student workers. The dummy variable was coded: non-supervisory student workers \( (D=1) \) and supervisory student workers \( (D=0) \). The coefficient of relationship \( R^2 \) of 0.37 showed that 37% of the variance in
employee loyalty was explained by five sub scales of leadership empowerment. There was a different effect of confidence in high performance between non-supervisory and supervisory groups on employee loyalty. Confidence in high performance was a significant indicator of employee loyalty to non-supervisory group than supervisory group.

Table 4.17. Relationships among Five Dimensions of Leadership Empowerment and Employee Loyalty on Non-Supervisory and Supervisory Workers (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction effect</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R² (F-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>(8.76)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in high performance x non-supervisory group</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.37 (8.76)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<0.05

Correlation among five dimensions of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty

As shown in Table 4.18, all five factors of leadership empowerment showed a significant (p<.05) positive relationship with overall employee loyalty. Of the five sub scales of leadership empowerment, “goal accomplishment” (r=.54) showed the strongest relationship and “autonomy” (r=.44) showed the lowest relationship with employee loyalty.

Table 4.18. Correlation among Five Dimensions of Leadership Empowerment and Employee Loyalty (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meaningfulness of work</th>
<th>Participation in decision making</th>
<th>Confidence in high performance</th>
<th>Goal accomplishment</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee loyalty</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlation significant at p< 0.01
Group Interview Comments on Leadership Empowerment and Employee Loyalty

Group interview participants expressed as follows:

“Sometimes, if the manager allows the students to have a say in what happens, they will usually have more loyalty.”

“When employees are given more freedom to complete tasks, they generally have more loyalty.”

“When they put me to work and I am along in the work, it makes me feel like I am trusted and feel loyal.”

Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty

Relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty

Linear regression was computed to explore the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty (Table 4.19). The coefficient of relationship (R²) of 0.414 showed that 41% of the variance in employee loyalty was explained by job satisfaction. Job satisfaction (independent variable) was found to be a predictor of employee loyalty.

Table 4.19. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable in the equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>(112.52)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05
Group interview comments on a relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty

Students in the group interviews responded that they perceived a relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty. Their comments are as follows:

“If you are satisfied with your job, you will be loyal to your job.”

“There is a relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty. When employees have loyalty and are satisfied with a job, they can provide a better service to customers.”

“If a student is satisfied, they are more likely to stay longer at the position.”

“I think people who like working at their job more become more satisfied and become more loyal.”

Correlation between job satisfaction and employee loyalty

Using a bivariate correlation analysis, correlation between job satisfaction and employee loyalty was examined. There was a moderately positive relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty (r=0.586, p<0.05). The correlation indicated that job satisfaction was related to employee loyalty (Table 4.20).

Table 4.20. Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Employee Loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Employee loyalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.586*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation significant at p< 0.01
Table 4.21 shows whether the five dimensions of leadership empowerment predicted employee loyalty when job satisfaction was included in the model. The coefficient of relationship (R²) of 0.45 showed that 45% of the variance in employee loyalty was explained by job satisfaction and meaningfulness of work.

Table 4.21. Relationship Leadership Empowerment and Job Satisfaction on Employee Loyalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R² (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.63</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness of work</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<0.05
A hypothesized model test

Multiple hypotheses were proposed in this study related to the relationship of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty. Figure 5 illustrates the proposed model and identifies the hypotheses associated with the model. Table 4.23 details each hypothesis and the corresponding statistical analyses associated with that hypothesis.

Figure 5. A Hypothesized Model Test

*\(p<0.05\)
Table 4.22. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Regression (R²)</th>
<th>Regression Statistical Significance</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five sub scales of leadership empowerment and Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between meaningfulness of work and job satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and job satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between goal accomplishment and job satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five sub scales of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty</strong></td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between meaningful work and employee loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H7:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and employee loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H8:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and employee loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H9:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between goal accomplishment and employee loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H10:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and employee loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction and employee loyalty</strong></td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H11:</strong> There is a positive predictive relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H12:</strong> There is a significant difference of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty in student employees’ demographics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$
** $p<.01$
*** All correlation significant at $p<0.05$ (2-tailed)
The proposed model in this study was used to test hypotheses 1 to 12. Hypotheses 1 through 5 were tested to find relationships between five dimensions of leadership empowerment and overall job satisfaction.

- **H1**: There is a positive predictive relationship between meaningfulness of work and job satisfaction.

  Hypothesis 1 proposed a positive predictive relationship between meaningfulness of work and job satisfaction. Although there was a moderately positive correlation ($r=0.52$), regression analysis results indicated that meaningfulness of work was not predictive of job satisfaction ($p=0.79$). Therefore, the results did not support hypothesis 1.

- **H2**: There is a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction.

  Hypothesis 2 proposed a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction. Both correlation ($r=0.60$) and regression analysis ($p=0.03$) supported this hypothesis that participation in decision making was predictive of job satisfaction. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.

- **H3**: There is a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and job satisfaction.

  Hypothesis 3 proposed a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and job satisfaction. There was a positive relationship between confidence in high performance ($r=0.67$) and job satisfaction. Confidence in high performance was predictive of job satisfaction ($p=0.04$). Thus, the results supported hypothesis 3.

- **H4**: There is a positive predictive relationship between goal accomplishment and job satisfaction.
Hypothesis 4 proposed a positive predictive relationship between goal accomplishment and job satisfaction. Even though there was a moderately positive correlation ($r=0.62$), regression analysis results ($p=0.29$) showed that goal accomplishment was not predictive of job satisfaction. Therefore, the results did not support hypothesis 4.

- **H5**: There is a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that there is a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction. Correlation analysis showed a positive ($r=0.57$) relationship between the two variables and the results of regression analysis indicated that autonomy was predictive of job satisfaction ($p=0.02$). Therefore, hypothesis 5 was supported.

Hypotheses 6 to 10 proposed a positive predictive relationship between the five dimension of leadership empowerment (meaningfulness of work, participation in decision making, confidence in high performance, goal accomplishment, and autonomy) and employee loyalty.

- **H6**: There is a positive predictive relationship between meaningful of work and employee loyalty.

Hypothesis 6 proposed a positive predictive relationship between meaningful of work and employee loyalty. There was a moderate correlation ($r=0.49$) between the two variables, however, the results of regression analysis indicated that meaningful of work was not predictive of employee loyalty ($p=0.16$). Therefore, the results did not support hypothesis 6.

- **H7**: There is a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and employee loyalty.
Hypothesis 7 proposed a positive predictive relationship between participation in decision making and employee loyalty. There was a moderate correlation (r=0.49) between the two variables, but the results of regression analysis indicated that participation in decision making was not predictive of employee loyalty (p=0.26). Therefore, the results did not support hypothesis 7.

- H8: There is a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and employee loyalty.

Hypothesis 8 proposed a positive predictive relationship between confidence in high performance and employee loyalty. A positive correlation (r=0.53) was found between the two variables and confidence in high performance was predictive of employee loyalty (p=0.04). Therefore, hypothesis 8 was supported.

- H9: There is a positive predictive relationship between goal accomplishment and employee loyalty.

Hypothesis 9 predicted a positive relationship between goal accomplishment and employee loyalty. Even though there was a positive correlation (r=0.54) between the two variables, goal accomplishment was not predictive of employee loyalty (p=0.14). Therefore, hypothesis 9 was not supported.

- H10: There is a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and employee loyalty.

Hypothesis 10 proposed a positive predictive relationship between autonomy and employee loyalty. Although there was a positive correlation (r=0.44), autonomy was not predictive of employee loyalty from regression analysis results (p=0.51). Therefore, hypothesis 10 was not supported.
- H11: There is a positive predictive relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty.

Hypothesis 11 proposed a positive predictive relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty. The results showed a moderate correlation ($r=0.59$) between the two variables and job satisfaction was predictive of employee loyalty ($p=0.00$). Therefore, the result supported hypothesis 11.

- H12: There is a significant difference of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty based on student workers’ demographic information.

Hypothesis 12 proposed differences of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty scores based on student workers’ demographic information. Leadership empowerment differed based on length of employment and hour worked per week. Job satisfaction showed differences based on wage rate and work hours. Therefore, hypothesis 12 was supported.
DISCUSSION

This study explored relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty among student employees in university dining operations. The proposed model was developed based on previous study by Hui (1994) and tested to determine whether leadership empowerment behaviors influenced student workers’ job satisfaction and employee loyalty in university dining operations. Sub scales of leadership empowerment in this study were based on previous findings (Ahearne, 2000; Hui, 1994) and included: Meaningfulness of work, participating in decision making, confidence in high performance, goal accomplishment, and autonomy.

Leadership Empowerment

Mean ratings of leadership empowerment in this study indicated the statement: “managers believe that I can handle demanding tasks (m=5.83)”, had the highest mean rating and “managers take a ‘sink or swim’ attitude toward the difficulties that arise in my work (m=3.96)” had the lowest mean rating. Past research by Hui (1994) and Ahearne (2000) reported higher overall ratings for many of the leadership empowerment statements and different statements receiving the highest mean ratings. For example, Hui (1994) reported several items with mean ratings greater than 6 and the statement, “My leader believes that I can handle demanding tasks” had the highest mean rating (m=6.23) and “My leader makes many decisions together with me” (m=4.49) had the lowest mean ratings. Ahearne (2000) reported that “My manager allows my team to do our job our way” had the highest mean rating (m=6.22) and “My manager helps my team understand how our job fits into the bigger picture” had the lowest mean ratings (m=4.52). These differences may reflect the use of student workers in this study rather than full-time employees in the other studies. The
difference in work environment of dining services versus the pharmaceutical sales team setting used in the other study might also have impacted results.

The overall reliability of leadership empowerment (m=0.94) in this study was higher than Ahearne’s study published in 2000 (α=0.88). Hui (1994) reported a reliability coefficient of 0.80. The reliability of five sub scale of leadership empowerment was found as follows in this study: meaningfulness of work (α=0.90), participation in decision making (α=0.87), confidence in high performance (α=0.91), goal accomplishment (α=0.76), and autonomy (α=0.57). Ahearne (2000) found different reliability estimates for the five sub scales of leadership empowerment. Most notable was that the reliability of the autonomy scale was much higher than in this study. Ahearne’s reliability estimates were: meaningfulness of work (α=0.84), participation in decision making (α=0.87), confidence in high performance (α=0.87), goal accomplishment (α=0.83), and autonomy (α=0.93). The difference in work environment setting or type of employee might have impacted the different results.

Several differences in ratings of the five sub scales of leadership empowerment based on demographic characteristics were found in this study. Leadership empowerment scores increased as length of employment and work hours per week increased and gender showed differences in the five sub scales of leadership empowerment. Females rated leadership empowerment higher than males. Studies (Ahearne, 2000; Hui, 1994) did not compare mean scores for the five sub scales of leadership empowerment based on demographic characteristics. They only examined differences between the five sub dimensions of leadership empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviors. In order to compare differences among student workers’ job tasks, student workers were divided into two groups:
non-supervisory and supervisory student workers. Leadership empowerment ratings differed between these two groups of student workers. Supervisory student workers gave higher ratings for leadership empowerment scales than non-supervisory student workers did. When student employees are given additional supervisory responsibility, they may perceive being empowered by their managers.

**Job Satisfaction**

The results of job satisfaction showed the highest mean rating for the statement “my co-workers get along with each (m=4.17)” and the lowest mean score in the statement of “chances for advancement on this job (m=3.26).” However, George and Hancer (2003) found that “chances for advancement on this job” had the highest mean ratings. A study by Mardanov et al., (2007) had the highest mean rating in the statement of “the way my job provides me with steady employment (m=4.12).” Previous findings were not consistent with this study’s findings. The different results may be due to different work environments and status of employment. Past studies by George and Hancer (2003) and Mardanov et al. (2007) were based on non-supervisory and supervisory full-time employees and conducted in chain restaurants.

In this study, the reliability coefficient of job satisfaction was 0.89. This was similar to a study of Weiss et al. (1967) that reliability coefficient was 0.85. A previous research finding by Lim (2003) indicated the reliability coefficient was 0.90 in one Korean private organization. Jauhari (2001) found the reliability coefficient was 0.88 in a hotel service in Jamaica.

Results of this study suggest differences between job satisfaction based on wage rates and hours worked per week. Specifically, those who received higher pay were more likely to
show higher job satisfaction than those with lower wages. This result was consistent with previous findings by Hsiao and Kohnke (1998). Jaffe et al. (1994) found contradictory results with university foodservice employees. Differences may be due to their study being done with full-time employees’ in university dining services.

Those who had more hours of work scheduled each week tended to show higher levels of job satisfaction in this study. In addition, supervisory student workers were more satisfied than non-supervisory student workers. In the similar study by Bartlett et al. (1999) in university food service, flexible work schedules differed among university foodservice employees. Those who were satisfied with their work schedules showed higher levels of job satisfaction.

**Employee Loyalty**

The statement, “deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part” had the highest mean ratings (m=5.61, reverse coded) and the statement of “I could just as well be working for a different type of organization as long as the work was similar” had the lowest mean rating (m=3.85) in this study. The mean ratings were slightly different with previous findings by Mowday et al. (1979). Mowday et al. (1979) had mean ratings of employee loyalty from a low of 4.0 to a high of 6.1 but researchers did not itemized mean ratings of the items. The reliability coefficient for the employee loyalty scale in this study was 0.84. This result was consistent with previous studies (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Mowday et al., 1979) with reliability coefficients between 0.80 and 0.90. In this study, the results found a difference between males and females on employee loyalty. Females showed higher loyalty than males. Ali et al. (1993) found a similar difference in employee loyalty based on gender and females had higher loyalty than males.
Relationships among Leadership Empowerment, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Loyalty

Relationships among five dimensions of leadership empowerment and job satisfaction

The results showed relationships between the leadership empowerment sub scales, participating in decision making, confidence in high performance, and autonomy, and overall job satisfaction. Ahearne (2000) found relationships between leadership empowerment factors (meaningfulness of work, participating in decision making, confidence in high performance, goal accomplishment, and autonomy) and organizational citizenship behaviors. Of the five sub scales leadership empowerment, participating in decision making, confidence in high performance and autonomy predicted job satisfaction. In the case of participating in decision making, many student workers in university dining operations perceived some opportunities of participating in decision making when they work with managers. This result indicated that when managers provide more opportunities to student workers in decision-making in order to improve dining services, student workers perceived themselves important persons in university dining operations. This may lead to more ownership of work among student workers in university dining services. In this study, confidence in high performance and autonomy predicted non-supervisory student workers’ job satisfaction, while goal accomplishment predicted supervisory student workers’ job satisfaction.

Results suggested a relationship existed between confidence in high performance and overall job satisfaction and confidence in high performance was predictive of job satisfaction. When managers showed strong confidence in student worker’s job performance, provide autonomy, and believe in student workers’ handle mistakes, student workers in university dining operations were more satisfied with their jobs and work environments.
The results showed that there were different effects of leadership empowerment between non-supervisory and supervisory student workers on job satisfaction. Confidence in high performance and autonomy were important indicators of job satisfaction to non-supervisory student workers, while autonomy was a significant indicator of job satisfaction to supervisory student workers. Therefore, managers need to be aware of which leadership empowerment behaviors relatively influence non-supervisory and supervisory student workers’ job satisfaction.

**Relationship among five dimensions of leadership empowerment and employee loyalty**

Results in this study indicated that confidence in high performance was a predictor of employee loyalty. This suggested that when student workers in university dining operations perceived that managers had confidence in their abilities on the job, their loyalty increased and they were willing to take various types of jobs if necessary. Students who participated in the group interviews also commented that when dining managers showed confidence in how student workers handled mistakes or difficulties on the job, student workers performed better jobs and tended to show a strong sense of responsibility toward their jobs. Ahearne (2000) also found that confidence in high performance positively affected sales team engagement in the pharmaceutical industry. Of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment, confidence in high performance showed a significant indicator of employee loyalty to non-supervisory student workers. When non-supervisory workers highly perceive confidence in high performance on the job, their loyalty toward work can be increased. Thus, the results indicated how confidence in high performance is an important factor of predicting employee loyalty.
Relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty

Job satisfaction and employee loyalty were found to be related in this study. Job satisfaction was predictive of employee loyalty in student workers. Student workers in the group interviews explained that those who are more satisfied with their jobs tended to become more loyal employees and were likely to provide a better service to customers for their organization. This result coincided with previous findings by Silverstro (2002) in which the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty was demonstrated.

Relationship leadership empowerment and job satisfaction on employee loyalty

Employee loyalty was found related to leadership empowerment and job satisfaction in this study. Of the five dimensions of leadership empowerment, meaningfulness of work showed a significant predictor of employee loyalty when job satisfaction was included in the model. Result indicated when student workers perceived themselves as important members of university dining organization and their contributions to the organization, their loyalty tended to increase.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty of student workers in university foodservice settings. University dining service managers have been challenged to retain student workers from one semester to the next; many dining managers have wondered how they can influence student workers’ behaviors in order to increase loyalty toward the organization. This study was conducted at five universities in the states of Iowa, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and New York. In order to get more in-depth data, quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect data. A total of 161 student workers completed a written questionnaire and 28 students participated in one of three group interviews.

A questionnaire was developed to gather students’ perceptions of the three constructs, leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty. Five dimensions of leadership empowerment first identified by Hui (1994) were used in this study: meaningfulness of work, participation in decision making, confidence in high performance, goal accomplishment, and autonomy. The Minnesota Job Satisfaction short form (Weiss et al., 1967) and the employee loyalty scale developed by Mowday et al. (1979) were also used.

A total of 12 hypotheses were developed to test in this study. Results indicated that the sub dimensions, participation in decision making, confidence in high performance, and autonomy predicted job satisfaction, while only one sub dimension, confidence in high performance, predicted the employee loyalty. Leadership empowerment behaviors such as encouraging student workers, expressing confidence in their job performance, giving authorization to students for solving problems all were important manager behaviors to
increase student workers’ job satisfactions in this study. The results of qualitative group interviews supported the questionnaire results. Student workers in the group discussion sessions expressed that they were highly influenced by managers’ confidence, encouragement, and authorization when they worked with managers. Most student workers in the group discussion commented that students’ job satisfaction and loyalty could be influenced by managers’ leadership empowerment.

This study also explored whether there was a difference between job satisfaction and employee loyalty based on demographic characteristics. In order to explore possible differences by demographic characteristics, ethnicity, classification, age, wage, job tasks, length of employment, and hours worked per week were tested using ANOVA and t-tests were conducted for testing differences based on gender. Length of employment, hours worked per week, and gender showed significant differences in the five sub scales of leadership empowerment: meaningfulness of work, decision making, confidence in high performance, goal accomplishments, and autonomy. Leadership empowerment scores increased as the length of employment and hours worked per week increased. Males and females showed differences on leadership empowerment and employee loyalty. Females showed higher scores on leadership empowerment and employee loyalty. The group discussion comments supported the survey study results. Participants of the group discussion commented that wage rate and length of employment can impact job satisfaction and employee loyalty.

All sub scales of leadership empowerment showed a positive correlation with job satisfaction and employee loyalty. These results revealed that how these are correlated each other and as student workers perceived strong mangers’ leadership empowerment, student
workers’ job satisfaction and employee loyalty increased. Participants in the group discussion responded that when managers showed leadership empowerment behaviors such as encouragement or confidence, they were more likely to satisfy with their jobs and to work hard. Results of regression analysis indicated several of the subscales of leadership empowerment predicted job satisfaction but the predictive values differed based on whether students held supervisory positions. Regression analysis also indicated that job satisfaction and meaningfulness of work predicted employee loyalty.

Limitation

Several limitations exist in this study. First, this research was conducted only at five university dining operations and thus the findings are limited to those five universities. However, results of this study might provide valuable information to university dining managers at other universities.

Second, this study was limited to a small sample size of student workers. Since this research was conducted during the summer, the researcher had difficulties in attracting a large size sample of student workers compared to what might have been available during a regular semester.

Third, students indicated that the work environment was different in the summer as compared to the school year. This perception might influence student’s response to items on the questionnaire and further limit generalizability of findings.

Fourth, three group interviews were conducted at two different universities. The researcher was challenged with arranging group interviews, finding an appropriate moderator for each, and ensuring consistency between the moderator’s approaches to the group
interviews. These challenges might have resulted in incomplete or inconsistent data collection.

Finally, data were collected cross sectionally at one point in time. Collecting data over a period of time to explore changes in perceptions would enhance understanding of student’s changing perceptions leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that leadership empowerment is linked to student workers’ job satisfaction and loyalty in university dining services. Results indicated that the three of the sub scales of leadership empowerment (participation in decision making, confidence in high performance, and autonomy) predicted job satisfaction and job satisfaction and meaningfulness of work predicted employee loyalty.

Demographic characteristics of students also appear to influence student perceptions. Length of employment, hours worked per week, and gender showed differences on the leadership empowerment and wage rates and hours worked per week showed differences on job satisfaction.

This study provided valuable information to university dining managers on how they might maximize student workers’ job satisfaction and loyalty using leadership empowerment. The findings suggest that university dining managers may increase student workers’ job satisfaction and loyalty toward the work organization if they provide student workers with an opportunity for decision making, express confidence on their work performance, and give them the ability to make their own decisions.
Recommendation

Future study

This research was focused on relationships of leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty among student workers in university foodservice operations. A future study should consider different samples; not only student workers who work during the school year, but also full-time employees in university dining centers. In addition, the proposed model could be tested in different work environment settings such as restaurants, hotels, schools, and/or hospitals.

For future research, the researcher may conduct more group interviews in more diverse universities to further explore what the concept of leadership empowerment means to college students and how managers can improve use of empowerment techniques to increase retention of student workers.

Future researchers may want to consider different forms of incentive. Even though the researcher in this study provided meals and refreshment while conducting the group interviews, participation in the group interview was low. Based on comments by group interview participants, cash incentives might be more effective in increasing participation in the group interviews in the future.

An experimental study using leadership empowerment constructs could also add to the body of knowledge. Such a study might involve trained and non-trained managers to compare leadership empowerment behaviors before and after taking leadership empowerment training. Future study may measure how managers’ leadership empowerment behaviors are improved and how student workers differently perceive managers’ leadership
empowerment on the job. Continued research to explore effectiveness of leadership empowerment is needed in university dining settings.

**Implications for university foodservice managers**

The results of this study provided several implications for university dining managers. First, this study provided a desirable direction of leadership empowerment for university dining managers. It is important to understand how participation in decision making, confidence in high performance, and autonomy in leadership empowerment would influence each student worker’s performance and attitude toward work and the organization.

Second, university dining managers should be aware of how a student worker’s job satisfaction relates to their loyalty toward the organization. In order to increase student worker’s job satisfaction, university dining managers should create a pleasant work environment and give discretion to student workers. As shown in the findings, student workers indicated that when they were satisfied with their jobs, their loyalty toward their organization was increased. University dining managers may find it helpful to survey student workers periodically to assess their perceptions of empowerment, job satisfaction and loyalty using a formal questionnaire or more informal comments cards.

Lastly, university dining managers should consider participating in a leadership empowerment training program. Leadership empowerment behaviors can be learned. Through such training sessions, university dining managers may obtain better human management skills and knowledge that can improve their leadership empowerment behaviors.
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June 1, 2007

Dear Dining Student Employee,

I am a doctoral student at Iowa State University. My dissertation research focuses on the relationship among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty in university dining student employees. It will take approximately 10 to 15 minutes for you to complete this questionnaire. Your opinions will provide valuable information to university dining managers on ways to improve the work environment for student employees.

Your participation is voluntary and the collected data will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous. Your name will not be linked in any way with your responses. After completing the survey questionnaire, please return it to the researcher. If you are under 18 years old, please do not participate in this study.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact me or Dr. Mary Gregoire. Also, you may contact the Office of Research Assurance, Iowa State University, 1138 Pearson Hall, Ames, IA 50014 or 515-294-4566.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Seung Suk Lee
Doctoral Student
Iowa State University
Department of Apparel, Educational Studies, & Hospitality Management
Foodservice and Lodging Management
515-230-4352
Seung@iastate.edu

Mary Gregoire, PhD, RD
Director, Food and Nutrition Services
Rush University Medical Center
1653 West Congress Parkway
Chicago, IL 60612
312-942-5297
Fax: 312-942-5203
Pager: 5212 at 312-942-3263
Mary_Gregoire@rush.edu
Perceptions of Student Employees

A-1. We would like to ask you to indicate the extent of your agreement with your managers’ behaviors at the job and your feeling of workplace. Please, pick the rating, which describe your manager’s behavior using the following scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=</td>
<td>Moderately Disagree (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=</td>
<td>Slightly Disagree (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree (NA/ND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=</td>
<td>Slightly Agree (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=</td>
<td>Moderately Agree (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (SA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1 (SD)</th>
<th>2 (MD)</th>
<th>3 (SD)</th>
<th>4 (NA/ND)</th>
<th>5 (SA)</th>
<th>6 (MA)</th>
<th>7 (SA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Managers help me understand the importance of my work to the overall effectiveness of my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Managers help me understand how my job fits into “the bigger picture”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Managers help me understand how the objectives and goals of my department relate to that of the entire organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managers help me realize that I am part of a larger team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Managers make me believe that my work can “make a difference” in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Managers provide many opportunities for me to express my opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Managers often consult with me on issues pertaining to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Managers encourage me to take the initiative in expressing my job-related opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Managers recognize my good work by using it as an example for others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Managers always show confidence in my ability to do a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Managers believe that I can handle demanding tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Managers focus on my successes rather than my failures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Managers believe in my ability to improve even when I make mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Managers help me overcome obstacles to my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Managers help me to identify what I need in order to achieve my performance goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>1 (SD)</td>
<td>2 (MD)</td>
<td>3 (SD)</td>
<td>4 (NA/ND)</td>
<td>5 (SA)</td>
<td>6 (MA)</td>
<td>7 (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Managers provide the opportunity for training so that I can perform effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Managers always make sure that I have the resources needed an effective performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Managers help me to develop good working relationships with those people who can affect my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Managers encourage me to contact directly the people from whom I need information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Managers make it more efficient to do my job by keeping the roles and regulations simple.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Managers insist that I rigidly follow rules and procedures even when they interfere with my performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Managers allow me to do my job my way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Managers encourage me to cut through bureaucracy to get things done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Managers help me understand the purpose of what I do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Managers make many decisions together with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Managers encourage me to make important decisions that are directly related to my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Managers take a “sink or swim” attitude toward the difficulties that arise in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. There is not too much to be gained sticking with this organization indefinitely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I really care about the fate of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. For me this is the best of all possible organization for which to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I could just as well be working for a different type of organization as long as the work was similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A-2. Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Listed statements are about your feeling of job. Please, read the following statement and indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= Very Dissatisfied (VD)</th>
<th>2= Dissatisfied (DS)</th>
<th>3= Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (N)</th>
<th>4= Satisfied (S)</th>
<th>5= Very Satisfied (VS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>the chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>the chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>the chance to be “somebody” in the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>the way my boss handles his/her workers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>the competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>the way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>the chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>the chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>the chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>the way company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>my pay and the amount of work I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>the chances for advancement on this job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>the freedom to use my own judgment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>the chance to try my own methods of doing the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>the working conditions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>the way my co-workers get along with each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>the praise I get for doing a good job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>the feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A-3. Demographics

Please, tell us about yourself.

58. Gender
A. Male ( ) B. Female ( )

59. Ethnicity
A. Caucasian –Non-Hispanic ( )
B. Asian ( ) C. African American ( )
D. Hispanic ( )
E. Native American ( ) F. Others ( )

60. Classification
A. Freshman ( ) B. Sophomore ( )
C. Junior ( ) D. Senior ( )
E. Graduate ( )

61. How many credits do you enroll in this summer? ________________

62. Age
A. 18-20 ( ) B. 21-23 ( )
C. 24-26 ( ) D. 27-29 ( )
E. Over 30 ( )

63. Please indicate that which of the following tasks is most descriptive of the work you do in your current foodservice position.
A. Food preparation assistant ( )
B. Dishwasher ( ) C. Cashier ( )
D. Food runner ( ) E. Server ( )
F. Supervisor ( ) G. Student manager ( ) H. Dining room helper ( )
I. Others ________________________

64. What is your hourly wage?
A. $5.00-6.00 ( ) B. $6.01-7.00 ( )
C. $7.01-8.00 ( ) D. $8.01-9.00 ( )
E. $9.01 or higher ( )

65. How long have you worked for the dining service?
A. Less than one month ( )
B. 1 semester ( ) C. 2 semesters ( )
D. 3 semesters ( ) E. 4 semesters ( )
E. More than 5 semesters ( )

66. How many hours do you work per week?
______________________

67. Where do you live?
A. On campus ( ) B. Off campus ( )

68. Are you an international student?
A. Yes ( ) B. No ( )

69. Do you perceive the work environment differs in the summer as compared to a regular semester's work environment?
A. Yes ( ) B. No ( )
If yes, please describe the differences.
___________________________________
___________________________________
___________________________________
___________________________________

If yes, please describe the differences.
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APPENDIX C. PILOT STUDY EVALUATION FORM

1. Were the questions understandable and clearly stated?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

If not, please comment on what changes are needed in the questionnaires?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Were the scales understandable and appropriate?

________________________________________________________________________

If not, please describe your concerns with the scales.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Do you have any suggestion to improve the questionnaire?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I may have some questions regarding what you have written. If you would not mind, may I contact you to get clarification? Please, provide your name and e-mail address.
Your name ______________________________________
E-mail __________________________________________

Thank you for participating in the pilot study!
APPENDIX D. PERMISSION LETTER

PERMISSION LETTER

May 25, 2007

Dear Dr. Blackwell:

I am a doctoral candidate at Iowa State University. I am researching the relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty of students employed part-time in university dining. I would like to request your permission to post a sign in one or more of your dining centers telling about my research project and asking some of your student employees to participate in this study. I would be on campus one day this summer to hand out and collect the questionnaires during the student's lunch break.

The information obtained from this study will provide you with information about your student employees' feelings about leadership empowerment and how these feelings related to job satisfaction and job loyalty. I will provide you with a summary report after analyzing data.

I would greatly appreciate your consent. If you need more information regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact me (Seung Suk Lee) at 515-230-4352 or Dr. May Gregoire at 312-942-5297.

A duplicate copy of this request has been provided for your records. If you agree to allow me to conduct this study in your university dining operation, please sign the release form below and sending one copy with the self-addressed return envelope I have provided.

Sincerely,

Seung Suk Lee
Doctoral Student
Iowa State University
Department of Apparel, Educational Studies, & Hospitality Management
Foodservice and Lodging Management
515-230-4352
Seung@iastate.edu

Mary Gregoire, PhD, RD
Director, Food and Nutrition Services
Rush University Medical Center
1653 West Congress Parkway
Chicago, IL 60612
312-942-5297
Fax: 312-942-5203
Pager: 5212 at 312-942-3263
Mary Gregoire@rush.edu

[Signature]

Date of Approval

[Unreadable]

Name of University
July 3, 2007

Dear University dining assistant directors:

I am currently a doctoral candidate at Iowa State University. I would like to research relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty of student employed part-time in university dining. I would like to request permission to conduct this study in your university dining services.

The information obtained from this study will contribute your dining operation to improve an organization structure and manage employees more effectively by understanding of employees’ feelings about leadership empowerment and job satisfaction among student employed part-time in dining services. I will provide a summary report after analyzing data.

Your permission is very helpful and needed to get finished this study since you are the one who can give me permission to collect data. I would greatly appreciate your consent to my request. If you need more information regarding this study, please, do not hesitate to contact Seung Suk Lee at 515-230-4352 or Dr. Mary Gregoire at 312-942-5297.

A duplicate copy of this request has been provided for your records. If you agree to allow conducting this study in your university dining operations, please sign the release form below and sending one copy with the self-addressed return envelope I have provided.

Sincerely,

Seung Suk Lee  
Doctoral Student  
Iowa State University  
Department of Apparel, Educational Studies,  
& Hospitality Management  
Foodservice and Lodging Management  
515-230-4352  
Seung@iastate.edu

Mary Gregoire, PhD, RD  
Director, Food and Nutrition Services  
Rush University Medical Center  
1653 West Congress Parkway  
Chicago, IL 60612  
312-942-5297  
Fax: 312-942-5203  
Pager: 5212 at 312-942-3263  
Mary_Gregoire@rush.edu

[Signature]

[Name of University]
PERMISION LETTER

May 25, 2007

Dear Mr. Paul:

I am a doctoral candidate at Iowa State University. I am researching the relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty of students employed part-time in university dining. I would like to request your permission to post a sign in one or more of your dining centers telling about my research project and asking some of your student employees to participate in this study. I would be on campus one day this summer to hand out and collect the questionnaires during the student’s lunch break.

The information obtained from this study will provide you with information about your student employees’ feelings about leadership empowerment and how these feelings relate to job satisfaction and job loyalty. I will provide you with a summary report after analyzing data.

I would greatly appreciate your consent. If you need more information regarding this study, please, do not hesitate to contact me (Seung Suk Lee) at 515-230-4352 or Dr. May Gregoire at 312-942-5297.

A duplicate copy of this request has been provided for your records. If you agree to allow me to conduct this study in your university dining operation, please sign the release form below and sending one copy with the self-addressed return envelope I have provided.

Sincerely,

Seung Suk Lee
Doctoral Student
Iowa State University
Department of Apparel, Educational Studies, & Hospitality Management
Foodservice and Lodging Management
515-230-4352
Seung@iastate.edu

Mary Gregoire, PhD, RD
Director, Food and Nutrition Services
Rush University Medical Center
1653 West Congress Parkway
Chicago, IL 60612
312-942-5297
Fax: 312-942-5203
Pager: 5212 at 312-942-3263
Mary_Gregoire@rush.edu

Dining director’s Printed Name

Date of Approval

Signature

Name of University
PERMISION LETTER

May 25, 2007

Dear Mr. Black:

I am a doctoral candidate at Iowa State University. I am researching the relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty of students employed part-time in university dining. I would like to request your permission to post a sign in one or more of your dining centers telling about my research project and asking some of your student employees to participate in this study. I would be on campus one day this summer to hand out and collect the questionnaires during the student’s lunch break.

The information obtained from this study will provide you with information about your student employees’ feelings about leadership empowerment and how these feelings related to job satisfaction and job loyalty. I will provide you with a summary report after analyzing data.

I would greatly appreciate your consent. If you need more information regarding this study, please, do not hesitate to contact me (Seung Suk Lee) at 515-230-4352 or Dr. Mary Gregoire at 312-942-5297.

A duplicate copy of this request has been provided for your records. If you agree to allow me to conduct this study in your university dining operation, please sign the release form below and sending one copy with the self-addressed return envelope I have provided.

Sincerely,

Seung Suk Lee
Doctoral Student
Iowa State University
Department of Apparel, Educational Studies,
& Hospitality Management
Foodservice and Lodging Management
515-230-4352
Seung@iastate.edu

Mary Gregoire, PhD, RD
Director, Food and Nutrition Services
Rush University Medical Center
1653 West Congress Parkway
Chicago, IL 60612
312-942-5297
Fax: 312-942-5203
Pager: 5212 at 312-942-3263
Mary_Gregoire@rush.edu

[Signature]

6/18/07

[Assistant director’s Printed Name]

5-30-07

[Date of Approval]

UNIV. OF IOWA

[Name of University]
July 3, 2007

Dear University dining assistant directors:

I am currently a doctoral candidate at Iowa State University. I would like to research relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty of student employed part-time in university dining. I would like to request permission to conduct this study in your university dining services.

The information obtained from this study will contribute your dining operation to improve an organization structure and manage employees more effectively by understanding of employees’ feelings about leadership empowerment and job satisfaction among student employed part-time in dining services. I will provide a summary report after analyzing data.

Your permission is very helpful and needed to get finished this study since you are the one who can give me permission to collect data. I would greatly appreciate your consent to my request. If you need more information regarding this study, please, do not hesitate to contact Seung suk Lee at 515-230-4352 or Dr. May Gregoire at 312-942-5297.

A duplicate copy of this request has been provided for your records. If you agree to allow conducting this study in your university dining operations, please sign the release form below and sending one copy with the self-addressed return envelope I have provided.

Sincerely,

Seung Suk Lee
Doctoral Student
Iowa State University
Department of Apparel, Educational Studies, & Hospitality Management
Foodservice and Lodging Management
515-230-4352
Seung@iastate.edu

Mary Gregoire, PhD, RD
Director, Food and Nutrition Services
Rush University Medical Center
1653 West Congress Parkway
Chicago, IL 60612
312-942-5297
Fax: 312-942-5203
Pager: 5212 at 312-942-3263
Mary_Gregoire@rush.edu

Carol A. Peterson
Assistant director’s Printed Name

Signature

Date of Approval

Name of University

July 5, 2007

ISU
APPENDIX E. GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

General questions

1. Could you tell me how long have you been working in your workplace?
2. Could you tell me what manager’s empowerment behavior means to you?
3. Do you perceive leadership empowerment in your organization?
4. Could you tell me what job satisfaction means to you?

Leadership empowerment

5. Let’s talk about leadership empowerment behaviors. I will explain five categories of leadership empowerment behaviors. After reviewing these behaviors, could you provide me some examples of your managers’ behaviors exhibit related to these categories?
   ➢ How does your manager emphasize the purpose and meaning of work so that student workers identify themselves as an important person?
   ➢ How does your manager include student workers in problem solving or in the decision making process?
   ➢ How does your manager show confidence in student worker’s ability to do a good job?
   ➢ How does your manager enhance student workers skills and provide resources needed for effective organization performance?
   ➢ How does your manager allow student workers to do their job in their way and minimize regulations so that student workers can perform their jobs in the manner?
   ➢ When do you feel empowered?

Job satisfaction

6. Let’s talk about job satisfaction.
   ➢ How do you feel about your current job?
   ➢ What things are you satisfied with your job?
   ➢ What things are you not satisfied with your job?
   ➢ How much are you satisfied your job?
**Employee loyalty**

7. Let’s talk about employee loyalty. I would like you to think how you perceive your organization or job in terms of loyalty. We will discuss four types of loyalty categories. Could you provide me your perceptions below categories and some examples, which are based on your experiences?

- Discuss your willingness to take any job assignment if necessary.
- Describe your feeling of pride in your organization.
- What do you tell your friends about your job?
- Describe your feeling toward your organization.
- Do you think you have a loyalty toward a current workplace or job, why or why not?

**Relationships**

8. What relationship do you think there is between manager’s empowerment behaviors and student employees’ job satisfaction?

9. What relationship do you think there is between job satisfaction and employee loyalty?

10. What factors may impact the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty?

11. Do you think that manager’s empowerment behavior influences employee loyalty toward organizations? If so, how and why?

12. Could you tell me your opinion if there is relationship among leadership empowerment, employees’ job satisfaction, and loyalty, why or why not?

13. One of the demographic categories (e.g., age, wage, length of work, gender, or job classification), what categories are strongly impact leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty?

Thank you for your participation!
APPENDIX F. CONSENT FORM DOCUMENT FOR GROUP INTERVIEW

Title of study: Relationships among leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty
Investigators: Seung suk Lee and Mary Gregoire, PhD

You are invited to participate in a research study. We are asking you to be a participant in this study because your work experiences and perception of management behaviors are important to help and improve the work environment in university dining centers.

The purpose of the study
The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among job satisfaction, perceived leadership empowerment, and employee loyalty of student employees in university dining.

Description of Procedures
If you agree to participate in this focus group, your participation will last about two hours including a short break. Participants will be given a 15 minutes break between the first session and the second session. In the focus group session, we will use audiotape to record what is said and will take notes to accurately capture what is said.

Risks
We do not believe that there are any risks to participants in participating.

Benefits
There will be no direct benefits to you as a participant but the collected information can be used to provide valuable information about leadership empowerment, job satisfaction, and employee loyalty in university foodservice settings. Through this information, dining service management will get ideas about how they can improve the work environment for student employees.

Compensation
Participants will not get compensated in this study. However, as an incentive, a meal will be provided and refreshments such as beverages and cookies will be available throughout the entire session.

Participation Rights
If you decide not to participate, you are free to leave at any time. Your participation is fully voluntary. In addition, you can leave the discussion session if you need a break at any time.

Confidentiality
Our notes and records will be kept confidential. Participant’s true name will not be used in the discussion. We will only summarized results and not disclose any information that can be identified with participants. As soon as the audiotapes are transcribed, the audiotapes will be erased. However, Institutional Review Board (IRB) that reviews and approves human subject research studies may examine the records for quality assurance.

Questions
If you have any questions regarding this study and participant’s rights, please feel free to contact the researchers (Seung suk Lee: seung@iastate.edu and Dr. Mary Gregoire:Mary_B_Gregoire@rush.edu). You can also contact the Human Subject Research Office, 2910 Beardshear Hall, (515) 294-4566: austingr@iastate.edu or the Research compliance Officer, Office of Research compliance, 2910 Beardshear Hall, (515) 294-3115: dament@iastate.edu.

Your signature indicates that you have read the information provided above and have decided to participate voluntarily. Your signature also indicates that you allow audiotaping of the during focus group session.

_____________________________________________                 _____________________
Signature of Participant                                                                    Date

_____________________________________________                 _____________________
Signature of Researcher                Date
### APPENDIX G. DATA COLLECTION FORM FOR GROUP INTERVIEW

**Information about focus group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response to Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Remarkable Quotes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H. ANOVA AND CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS TABLES

ANOVA summary of length of work on leadership empowerment (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sums of square</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10230.49</td>
<td>2046.10</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>93989.29</td>
<td>14791.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>104219.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

ANONA Test Results of Work Hours on Leadership Empowerment (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sums of square</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4535.29</td>
<td>2267.65</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>99684.49</td>
<td>5750.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>104219.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

ANOVA Summary of Wage Rate on Job Satisfaction (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sums of square</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2036.66</td>
<td>678.88</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>17290.33</td>
<td>3970.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>19326.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
Multiple Comparisons of Length of Work for Leadership Empowerment (Tukey HSD method) (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of work</th>
<th>Independent variable length of work</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Empowerment</td>
<td>Less than one month</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>-14.32</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semesters</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 semesters</td>
<td>-19.35</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than one month</td>
<td>2 semester</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semesters</td>
<td>-4.11</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 semesters</td>
<td>-7.36</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semesters</td>
<td>-10.23</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>-14.34</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 semesters</td>
<td>-17.59</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semesters</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 semesters</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than one month</td>
<td>4 more than 5 semester</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semesters</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 semesters</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
Multiple Comparison of Work Hours for Leadership Empowerment (Tukey HSD method) (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work hours</th>
<th>Independent variable work hours</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Empowerment</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>-13.94</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>More than 20 hours</td>
<td>-4.68</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours</td>
<td>More than 20 hours</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours</td>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>-9.25</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05

ANOVA Test Results of Work Hours on Job Satisfaction (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sums of square</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work hours</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>924.14</td>
<td>462.07</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>18402.85</td>
<td>1535.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>19326.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Leadership Empowerment (n=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Meaningfulness of work</th>
<th>Participation in decision making</th>
<th>Confidence in high performance</th>
<th>Goal accomplishment</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand the importance of my work</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me realize that I am part of a larger team</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand the purpose of what I do at work</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make me believe that my work can &quot;make a difference&quot;</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand how the objectives and goals</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me understand how my job fits</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers consult with me on issues pertaining to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to take the initiative in expressing my job related opinions</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers provide many opportunities for me to express my opinions</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to make important decisions that are directly related to my job</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make many decisions together with me</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers believe that I can handle demanding tasks</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers show confidence in my ability to do a good job</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers believe in my ability to improve when I make mistakes</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers focus on my successes rather than my failures</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers recognize my good work by using it as an example</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make sure that I have the resources needed for effective performance</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me overcome obstacles to my performance</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me to develop good working relationships with those people who can affect my performance</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers provide the opportunity for training so that I can perform effectively</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers help me to identify what I need in order to achieve my performance goals</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers take a &quot;sink or swim&quot; attitude toward the difficulties that arise in my work</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to contact directly the people from whom I need information</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers make it more efficient to do my job by keeping the roles and regulations simple</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers insist that I rigidly follow rules and procedures even when they interfere with my performance</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers allow me to do my job my way</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers encourage me to cut through bureaucracy to get things done</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Chi-square= 53.47 (p=0.01), CFI=0.82
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