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ABSTRACT

In the past two decades, researchers have implied organizational success was contingent on the compatibility between employees and organizations, known as person-organization (PO) fit. The lack of congruence between employees and their organizations may result in employee turnover. Although the body of literature in the human resources management and organizational development is vast, the hospitality literature demonstrates a need for further research in PO fit and employee turnover intention. The purpose of this research study was to assess several relationships pertaining to hotel organizational culture, employee personality types, PO fit, and turnover intention.

Data were collected by using items from Dawson, Abbott and Shoemaker’s (2011) hospitality culture scale, Edward (1991), Cable and Judge (1996) and Piasentin and Chapman (2006) PO fit items, Roodt’s (2004) turnover intention scale and Porter’s (2005) strength deployment inventory. Lastly, demographic characteristic items were included. A response rate of 34% (N = 231) was received on a paper questionnaire sent to hourly and non-hourly employees from 14 upper-upscale hotels located throughout the southern region of California.

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson’s coefficient correlation analysis, regression analysis, independent samples t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to answer five research questions. A correlation was found between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type \( r (226) = .301, p < .001 \). Multiple regression showed hotel organizational culture \( r (225) = 15.448, p < .001 \) statistically significantly predicted PO Fit \( F (1,224) = 238.635, p < .001 \). Regression showed personality type \( r (225) = 5.189, p < .001 \) statistically significantly predicted PO fit \( F (1, 227) = 26.930, p < .001 \). An inverse relationship was found between PO fit and employee turnover intention \( r (226) = -.759, p < .001 \).
Lastly, independent samples t-test and ANOVA found no significant difference between three demographic characteristics and turnover intention: sex \( t(224) = 1.57, p = 0.118 \), employment status \( t(224) = 0.292, p = 0.771 \) and employee age \( F(3,172) = 1.762, p = 0.156 \). Practical and research implications are discussed. Limitations and recommendations for further research are also provided.

*Keywords:* organizational culture, personality, person-organization fit, turnover intention.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

The topic of organizational culture has received attention from researchers, consultants, and practitioners since the rise of the industrial revolution. In fact, more than 4,600 articles on the subject have been published since 1980 (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011). Hospitality literature demonstrates that the hospitality industry has a unique and distinct culture (Dawson, Abbott, & Shoemaker, 2011; Kemp & Dwyer, 2001; Koutroumanis, 2005; Tepeci & Barlett, 2002; and Woods, 1989). As competition increases, hospitality executives are faced with the dilemma of maintaining a competitive advantage. Well-known hospitality organizations such as Marriott International, Ritz-Carlton, and Walt Disney Resorts instill a culture of successful customer service that creates financial success (Ford & Sturman, 2011).

Bretz and Judge (1994) implied that organizational success is contingent on the fit between employees and their organizations; a misalignment between employees and their organizations may lead to turnover. The Society for Human Resource Management’s 2011-2012 Human Capital Benchmarking Database reported the average annual turnover rate was 35% for the accommodation and food sectors in the United States (Jacobs, 2011). Tracey and Hinkin (2006) reported turnover costs in economy, midmarket, upscale, and luxury hotels ranging from $5,700 (low-complexity jobs) to $9,932 (high-complexity jobs) per employee. Several studies (Alniaçık, Alniaçık, Erat, & Akçin, 2013; Jung & Yoon, 2013; Meyer, Hecht, Gill, & Toplonytsky, 2010; Tepeci & Bartlett, 2002) have found that person-organization (PO) fit contributed to organizational success by decreasing turnover.

Previous researchers have used qualitative methods to study hospitality culture in either restaurants (Woods, 1989) or hotels (Kemp & Dwyer, 2001). More recently, quantitative studies
of hospitality culture have been limited to the restaurant industry (Koutroumanis, 2005; Øgaard, Larsen, & Marnburg, 2005; Riggs & Hughey, 2011). Other studies in hospitality culture have focused on PO fit and developing instruments to assess culture and individuals’ values (Dawson, et al., 2011; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991; Tepeci & Barlett, 2002). Nevertheless, it appears there are opportunities for further research investigating hospitality culture and its impact on PO fit.

To better understand organizational culture in hospitality, researchers should consider the role of personality in human communication. Organizational culture scholar Edgar Schein (2010) contended that “culture is to a group what personality is to an individual” (p. 14), emphasizing the mutual roles played by culture and personality types. Culture, in this sense, is the set of meanings and values within an organization that provide a context for interpretation of information by its members through a communicative perspective (Eisenberg, Goodall, & Trethewey, 2010). According to Scudder and Lacroix (2013), personality can be understood through an individual’s behavior (the way a person acts or communicates) and motives (the reason why something is done). Hence, hospitality organizations today can maintain an even stronger competitive advantage by understanding both organizational culture and employee personality types.

Despite theoretical contributions to the study of organizational culture in hospitality, studies that have investigated organizational culture, personality types, PO fit and their impact on turnover intention are rare. Based on organizational culture elements found in the literature on hospitality culture, researchers have developed instruments to determine whether an individual is “fit for hire” by a particular organization. Previously, consideration of personality type, which is
rooted in one’s behavior and motives, was not a factor in hospitality culture studies, explaining the lack of understanding as to why members of an organization quit (i.e., turnover intention).

**Purpose and Research Questions**

This study examined the congruence between hotel organizational culture and hotel employee personality type. Hotel organizational culture, employee personality type, and their relationship to PO fit were also examined. Lastly, the relationship between PO fit, demographic characteristics and turnover intention were analyzed. For this study, three previously developed and tested scales were used to investigate the organizational culture of hotels, hotel employee personality types, and employee turnover intention. The PO fit scale is a compilation of previous researchers’ items. The questionnaire consisted of Dawson et al.’s (2011) hospitality culture scale (HCS) and Porter’s (2005) strength deployment inventory (SDI). The questionnaire measured turnover intention using Roodt’s (2004) turnover intention scale (TIS-6) and PO fit was assessed using works by Edward (1991), Cable and Judge (1996), and Piasentin and Chapman (2006).

The research questions and applicable hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1) What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type?

2) What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit?

\[ H_{A1}: \text{There is a relationship between the three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit.} \]

\[ H_{A2}: \text{There is a relationship between a composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit.} \]
3) What is the relationship between hotel employee personality type and PO fit?

Hₐ₃: There is a relationship between any employee personality type (Altruistic-Nurturing, Assertive-Directing, and Analytic-Autonomizing) and PO fit.

Hₐ₄: There is a relationship between a composite score of employee personality type and PO fit.

4) What is the relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention?

5) Are there differences in turnover intentions based on demographic characteristics (employee sex, employment status, and employee age)?

Hₐ₅: There is a significant difference between turnover intention for males as compared to females.

Hₐ₆: There is a significant difference between turnover intention for full-time as compared to part-time employees.

Hₐ₇: There is a significant difference between turnover intention of younger employees as compared to older employees.

Significance of the Study

Findings from this study provided insight into the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type and their influence on PO fit. The relationships between PO fit and employee turnover intention were explored. Lastly, differences in turnover intention based on employee demographic characteristics were analyzed. Although hospitality culture has previously been researched, few studies have examined PO fit in the context of hotels. This study represents the first known attempt to investigate the relationship between hotel culture and employee personality type and the impact of employees’ fit with an organization, and thereby better explain employee turnover intentions.
From a practical standpoint, the findings of this study may aid hotel managers in their quest to maintain a competitive advantage and thus achieve financial success. Bretz and Judge (1994) argued that a misalignment between employees and their organizations may lead to turnover. Therefore, hotel managers that hire individuals who share similar values with the hotel organization’s cultural values (high PO fit) are likely to improve employee retention and, correspondingly, reduce turnover costs. Lastly, an understanding of the role employee personality types play in the context of hotel organizational culture may be beneficial. For example, Zhao, Qu, and Ghiselli (2010) found that conflict in the workplace negatively impacted employees’ jobs and personal lives. Practitioners may find the SDI useful in improving internal employee relations.

From a research perspective, this is one of the first known studies to explore PO fit in the context of hotel employee personality types and hotel culture. Although previous information on organizational culture exists in the hospitality literature, those studies were limited to conceptual and more qualitative methods or done within the context of the restaurant industry. Accordingly, this study helps fill an informational gap in the literature and contributes to the ongoing discussion of PO fit and its impact on employee turnover intention.

**Definition of Terms**

Listed below are the key terms used throughout the study and their definitions.

**Behavior:** “the way a person acts or communicates” (Scudder and Lacroix, 2013, p. 1).

**Culture:** “a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (Schein, 2010, p. 18).
Internal communication: “communication between an organization’s strategic managers and its internal stakeholders, designed to promote commitment to the organization, a sense of belonging to it, awareness of its changing environment and understanding of its evolving aims” (Welch & Jackson, 2007, p. 186).

Motive: “underlying reason why something is done” (Scudder and Lacroix, 2013, p. 2).

Organizational culture: “refers to the taken-for-granted values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in the organization. It represents ‘how things are around here.’ It reflects the prevailing ideology that people carry inside their heads. It conveys a sense of identity to employees, provides unwritten and unspoken guidelines for how to get along in the organization, and it helps stabilize the social system that they experience” (Cameron & Quinn, 2011, p. 19).

Personality: the total genetic makeup of an individual combined with their experiences, motivations, attitudes, beliefs, values, and behaviors (Funder, 2006).

Person-organization fit: “the compatibility between people and entire organizations” (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005, p. 285).

Turnover intention: an individual’s awareness of leaving an organization in the near future (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982), and the greatest predictor of actual turnover (Joo & Park, 2010; Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Upper upscale hotel: oriented toward commercial and convention travelers and provide a variety of high quality services, amenities, furniture and fixtures, specifically multiple food and beverage outlets, meeting rooms, concierge services and recreational facilities (Corgel, Mandelbaum, & Woodworth, 2011; STR Global, 2014).
Summary

For this study, the relationship between hotel employee personality type and employee perception of hotel organizational culture and its impact on PO fit were examined. The findings yielded a better understanding of employee turnover intention through explanations of PO fit. The findings should help practitioners understand the implications of hotel organizational culture and employee personality type’s role in PO fit. Moreover, practitioners will gain a better understanding of PO fit and its impact on employee turnover intention. Scholars will also benefit as this study fills a gap in the literature and contributes to the ongoing discussion of PO fit and its impact on employee turnover intention.

This dissertation consists of five chapters in the traditional dissertation format. Following this introduction in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature, including a comprehensive examination of hotel organizational culture, PO fit, PO fit and turnover intention, communication and personality, and finally employee demographic characteristics and turnover intention. Chapter 3 presents the methodology. Results and discussion are presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 presents the summary and conclusions to the study. Lastly, several appendices contain copies of the questionnaire and other supporting material. A list of references can be found at the end of each chapter.
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CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the literature in related areas and consists of four sections. The first section outlines the concept of organizational culture. This section covers the definition of organizational culture and hospitality culture. The section also includes relevant literature on person-organization (PO) fit and organizational culture and PO fit instruments. The third section presents communication and personality, and introduces internal communication and relationship awareness theory. Finally, the fourth section presents literature findings on employee demographic characteristics and turnover intention within the context of hospitality.

Organizational Culture

Schein (1990) formally defined culture as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p. 18). Organizational culture is comprised of three different levels at which the cultural phenomenon is visible to the observer (Schein, 2010). The three levels of culture are (1) artifacts, (2) espoused beliefs and values, and (3) basic underlying assumptions. First, artifacts are tangible and visible to an observer who is unfamiliar with the organization, such as its physical environment; its language; its technology; its style, as demonstrated with uniforms, and emotional displays; its myths and stories about the organization; its vision statements; and its observable rituals and ceremonies (Schein, 2010). Second, espoused beliefs and values provide meaning and comfort to the members of an organization. The values of an organization reflect someone’s original beliefs and values of what the organization ought to be. For example, in the case of Kimpton Hotels & Restaurants, the company maintains a culture based on Bill Kimpton’s vision—caring for co-
workers, caring for guests, caring for the environment, community, and investors (About Kimpton cares, n.d.). Finally, understanding the learning process by which basic underlying assumptions evolve is critical to a better understanding of an organization’s culture (Schein, 2010). Culture, as a set of basic assumptions, requires members to pay attention, decipher, translate, and react emotionally to what is going on within the environment. Members of a new organization bring their own set of cultural values from prior organizations into the new organization. The cultural values new members bring into an organization may modify the established organization’s original set of assumptions. For example, a new member who worked in a prior group, such as Kimpton Hotels and Restaurants, brings the cultural value of “care” into an organization that does not share the same cultural values. Over time, the members of the established organization may adopt the basic set of assumptions (e.g., the cultural value of “care”).

It is not uncommon for subcultures to develop in an organization where several of its members are working toward a common organizational purpose (Schein, 2010). Conversely, members of an organizational culture may partially accept the values or beliefs to which the organization subscribes; therefore, members that work closely with one another may develop an alternate view of the values and beliefs of an organization’s culture through mutual experience (Bloor & Dawson, 1994). A subculture therefore may develop a different view of the organizational culture, as its members subscribe to alternative values, beliefs, and assumptions. Other scholars, however, argue that culture has the same content and meaning at the subculture and organizational level (Ostroff, Kinicki, & Tamkins, 2003). For example, O’Reilly and Chatman (1996) discovered that subcultures and organizational cultures are similar to one another because each influences behavior through shared beliefs and values. In other words,
members at the subculture level subscribe to the same values, beliefs, and assumptions as members at the organizational level.

**Hospitality Culture**

Previous studies have identified the uniqueness of hospitality culture but have been limited to either restaurants (Koutroumanis, 2005; Øgaard, Larsen & Marnburg, 2005; Woods, 1989) or hotels (Kemp & Dwyer, 2001). Woods (1989) is the earliest known study that examined the culture of hospitality companies throughout the United States. Woods observed and interviewed over 300 managers and employees of five restaurants. Woods aligned Schein’s (2010) definition of culture and Lundberg’s (1988) three levels of cultural meaning to better understand hospitality culture levels. Similar to Schein’s (1990) view of cultural levels, Lundberg’s (1988) three levels of cultural meaning are: (1) manifest level, such as symbolic artifacts, language, stories, ritualistic activities, and patterned conduct; (2) strategic level, such as beliefs about strategic vision, capital-market expectations, product-market expectations, and internal approaches to management; and (3) deep meaning, such as values and assumptions. Woods (1989) provided examples of the restaurant industry culture within the context of these cultural levels of meaning. Examples included characteristics such as high turnover rates for management and employees, the need for supportive and communicative relationships between management and employees, and emphasis on teamwork. Additionally, Woods (1989) suggested the five companies were similar in culture because employees and managers could move easily from one restaurant to another due to shared cultural levels of meaning. Woods (1989) concluded that the restaurant industry had a distinct culture where values, assumptions, and beliefs were different from other industries.
Woods’ assertion that service-based industries had a unique culture was later confirmed by Kemp and Dwyer’s (2001) study of hospitality lodging. They examined the links between organizational culture, strategy and performance at the Regent Hotel, Sydney, Australia using a paradigm known as the cultural web. The components of the cultural web are the symbols, power structures, organizational structures, control systems, stories, routines and rituals of an organization which reflect on the collective experience of an organization (Kemp & Dwyer, 2001). The authors used triangulation methods such as face-to-face interviews, in-house publications, staff bulletin boards, advertising material, and observations of hotel employees and guests (Kemp & Dwyer, 2001). The authors concluded that the Regent Hotel’s employees were instilled with a sense of commitment to the hotel’s values; that the work environment was both internally and externally focused on employees and guests; and that the hotel had a distinct culture where values, assumptions, and beliefs were unique from other industries. This aligns with Woods’ (1989) study on service-based industries.

Koutroumanis (2005) studied organizational culture types in full-service restaurants. That study deployed Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) to six independently owned full-service restaurants to determine the specific cultural types as identified in Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) Competing Values Framework (CVF). In a sample of 293 respondents, the findings indicated a high level of correlation between the clan type culture and service quality in the full-service restaurants ($r = 0.56, p <.001$) (Koutroumanis, 2005). Several years later, Koutroumanis and Alexakis (2009) published a conceptual paper contending that organizational culture literature in the foodservice sector of the hospitality industry was very limited. Koutroumanis and Alexakis (2009) declared that “much of the academic and mainstream sources of hospitality research have not significantly advanced the
level of discourse in the area of organizational culture” (p. 47). The authors argued that Cameron and Quinn’s (2011) OCAI would assist management of full-service restaurants in diagnosing the current culture type within the organization and deciding if cultural change was necessary to increase profitability (Koutromannis & Alexakis, 2009).

Øgaard et al. (2005) analyzed the relationship between organizational culture and performance in the restaurant industry. The authors explored the relationship between culture and managers’ individual outcomes, employing Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) CVF as the theoretical underpinning of organizational culture. Managers’ perceptions and outcome responses were collected by pen and paper questionnaires. The correlation coefficients revealed that organizational culture perceptions were related to individual outcomes, commitment and efficacy. The authors found that market ($r = 0.29$) and adhocracy culture ($r = 0.38$) were positively correlated with efficacy and that hierarchy cultural values were positively correlated with commitment ($r = 0.31$) and efficacy ($r = 0.27$). Lastly, the clan culture was not significantly related to any of the individual outcomes ($r = 0.14$). Øgaard et al.’s (2005) study demonstrated the importance of organizational culture and the indirect effects of performance in the restaurant industry.

Although the findings from Kemp and Dwyer (2001), Koutroumanis (2005), Øgaard et al. (2005), and Woods (1989) all demonstrate the need to examine organizational culture in hospitality, the aforementioned studies fail to offer specific instruments with which to assess fit between individuals and their organizations, despite the fact that, for many years, researchers have theorized that fit between individuals and their organizations (person-organization fit) contributes to organizational success (Bretz & Judge, 1994).
Person-Organization Fit

Schein (2010) theorized that organizational culture might be an important factor in determining how well an individual assimilates into an organization. Chatman (1989) referred to this phenomenon as person-organization (PO) fit, defined as “the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons” (p. 346). Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) defined PO fit as “the compatibility between people and entire organizations” (p. 285). The key premise of PO fit is that employees whose values align well with their organization’s values will be satisfied and will stay and contribute to the organization, while those whose values do not align may eventually quit (i.e., turnover intention). Turnover intention is defined as an individual’s awareness of leaving an organization in the near future (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982), and it is the greatest predictor of actual turnover (Joo & Park, 2010; Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) investigated four types of person-environment (PE) fit: person-job (PJ), person-organization (PO), person-group (PG), and person-supervisor (PS) fit. They defined PE fit broadly as “the compatibility between an individual and a work environment that occurs when their characteristics are well matched” (p. 281). They addressed the relationships between the four types of PE fit with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, satisfaction with coworkers, and satisfaction with supervisors, and found that the four types of fit were moderately related to each other, thus emphasizing the uniqueness of each type of fit. They also reported a strong correlation between PO fit and personality ($r = .08$) thus suggesting the role personality may play at the pre-entry phase of hiring employees. The authors also found that PO fit had a moderate correlation for intent to quit ($r = -.35$).
Chatman’s (1989) article introduced a conceptual model of PO fit and its relationship to organization characteristics (values and norms) and individual characteristics (personal values). Chatman defined PO fit as “the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons” (p. 339). The author contended that when employees are open to influence and the organization has strong values, the employee would change his or her personal values. Conversely, when employees are not open to influence and the organization has strong values, the employee will likely leave the organization. Chatman stated, “PO fit can identify discrepancies and similarities between people and organizations, and can identify what kinds of behavior and normative changes may occur” (p. 346). To assess the values of organizations and the values of employees, Chatman introduced the organizational culture profile (OCP) instrument; subsequently validated in a later study (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991).

**Organizational Culture and PO Fit Instruments**

O’Reilly et al. (1991) explored the relationship between organizational culture values and individual personality types. The authors developed the Organizational Culture Profile (OCP) instrument to assess a person’s fit with a particular culture or industry. O’Reilly et al. (1991) suggested that employees who were not a good fit with an organization, either because of job tasks or organizational culture, were likely to quit because of reduced job satisfaction and commitment to the organization as compared to employees who were a good fit. In their study of 224 graduate students in the MBA program, they reported an average reliability coefficient of .73 for the instrument. Two other studies confirmed the reliability of the instrument. First, Chatman (1991) reported a reliability coefficient of .88 for 171 entry-level auditors in eight U.S. public accounting firms. Second, Vandenberghe (1999) reported a reliability coefficient of .86 for 565 individuals belonging to 19 hospitals in healthcare organizations. However, the OCP
lacks elements commonly found in hospitality culture such as service quality or valuing customers (Enz, 1988; Woods, 1989), and honesty and ethics (Enz, 1988).

To address this shortcoming, Tepeci and Barlett (2002) developed the Hospitality Industry Culture Profile (HICP) instrument to assess participants’ individual values and their perceptions of organizational culture in hospitality organizations. Tepeci and Bartlett utilized O’Reilly et al.’s (1991) organizational cultural profile instrument and Woods’ (1989) value characteristics, as well as adding three new dimensions: valuing customers, honesty and ethics, and respect for people. One hundred and eighty two hospitality management students (118 employed in a hospitality job and 64 not employed in a hospitality job), were asked to describe their perceived and preferred organizational culture. Factor analysis identified eight dimensions for perceived organizational culture: (a) team and people orientation; (b) innovation; (c) fair compensation; (d) attention to detail; (e) valuing customers; (f) employee development; (g) honesty and ethics; and (h) results orientation. Further factor analysis for the preferred organizational culture identified four dimensions with eigenvalues greater than one: (a) employee development; (b) fair compensation; (c) team- and people-orientation; and (d) honesty and ethics.

The authors investigated whether participants were an appropriate fit for hospitality by correlating three factors (job satisfaction, intent to quit, and willingness to recommend the organization) with the aforementioned dimensions. Results for job satisfaction indicated that team- and people-orientation ($\beta = .25, p < .05$), innovation ($\beta = .15, p < .05$), valuing customers ($\beta = .28, p < .01$), and employee development ($\beta = .22, p < .05$) were the primary factors associated with employee and organization fit (Tepeci & Barlett, 2002). For intent to quit, employee development ($\beta = .34, p < .01$) and honesty and ethics ($\beta = .21, p < .05$) were the
primary indicators for employee and organization fit. Lastly, willingness to recommend the
organization and team- and people-orientation ($\beta = .26, p < .05$) were found to be the primary
individual factors.

The results confirmed the presence of relationships among various measures of employee
and organization fit. Furthermore, the findings support previous claims that the hospitality
industry is a unique and distinct culture. It must be noted that the sample of hospitality students
did not sufficiently assess the dependent variables of job satisfaction and intent to quit because
35% of these students were not currently employed in a hospitality position. At the time of
Tepeci and Barlett’s (2002) study, the HICP was the first known instrument to assess
organizational culture and individual values in hospitality organizations.

In 2011, Dawson, Abbott, and Shoemaker’s study led to the development of another
culture instrument that measured multiple facets of the hospitality industry: the Hospitality
Culture Scale. Dawson et al. (2011) examined hospitality culture by determining the
organizational culture (characteristics) and personal attributes (values) of hospitality employees.
Variables of hospitality culture were identified in two steps, leading to the development of the
Hospitality Culture Scale (HCS). First, Dawson et al. (2011) developed a theoretical definition
of hospitality culture through an exhaustive review of relevant literature. Second, the authors
recruited 12 industry advisory board members from the Conrad N. Hilton College of Hotel and
Restaurant Management at the University of Houston. Members of the advisory board were
asked to review and establish a set of identifiers that represented hospitality culture. The items
identified in the literature review and by the advisory board were used to create the HCS survey.
The survey utilized a seven-point Likert-type scale ($1 = $least characteristic to $7 = $most
characteristic) and was sent to 2,125 alumni of the Conrad N. Hilton College. Participants
returned 741 surveys for analysis (35% response rate) and 49% of the sample was from the hotel industry.

The authors identified four factors of organizational culture: management principles, customer relationships, job variety, and job satisfaction. Furthermore, the authors identified six personal factors specific to hospitality culture: principles, propitiousness, leadership, risk taking, accuracy, and composure. The HCS was recommended by Dawson et al. (2011) for use by hospitality hiring managers to screen potential job candidates as a way to match their personal attributes with the culture of the organization (e.g., PO fit). Aligning employee personal attributes with the culture of an organization may contribute to increased employee retention. In fact, prior studies have found that PO fit alignment contributes to organizational success by alleviating turnover intention.

**PO Fit and Turnover Intention**

Meyer, Hecht, Gill, and Toplonytsky (2010) examined the relationship between PO fit and employee commitment and intent to stay at a Canadian energy company. The authors hypothesized that employee commitment and intent to stay would be greater when there was PO fit congruence between the employees’ perceived and preferred organizational culture. They assessed pre-change employee commitment and intent to stay one month prior to company reorganization. Paper surveys were distributed to the entire workforce ($N = 1041$) and 699 (67%) responded. Seven months after the reorganization, the researchers assessed post-change employee commitment and intent to stay via a second paper survey that was distributed to the entire workforce ($N = 1075$), of whom 637 (59%) responded. The authors deployed polynomial regression and response surface analysis to each of the dependent variables (commitment and intent to stay) to determine employee alignment with PO fit (organizational culture), and found
that PO fit correlated with pre-change employee commitment and intention to stay. Subsequently, PO fit congruence had positive outcomes for post-change employee commitment and intent to stay.

Alniaçik, Alniaçik, Erat, and Akçin (2013) examined the relationships between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions by moderating the level of fit between the employee and the organization he or she worked for. Data were collected by an online questionnaire sent to 1247 academic and administrative staff working at 32 universities in Turkey. Two hundred and twelve (17%) responses were used for analysis. The researchers employed regression analysis and found that increased levels of organizational commitment ($\beta = -0.465; t = -7.598; p < .001$) and job satisfaction ($\beta = -0.511; t = -8.588; p < .001$) led to decreased turnover intention. Moreover, they found that PO fit moderated the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention ($\beta = 0.242; t = 4.085; p < .001$). Lastly, PO fit had a marginally significant effect on the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention ($\beta = 0.105; t = 1.676; p = 0.0095$). These findings reveal the important role PO fit plays in the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. The findings also support previous research results demonstrating the relationship between PO fit and turnover intention (Meyer et al., 2010) and the relationship between PO fit and job satisfaction (Chatman, 1989; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Tepeci & Barlett, 2002).

Jung and Yoon (2013) investigated the effect of organizational service orientation on employee PO fit and turnover intention. Five hundred self-administered questionnaires were distributed to employees in deluxe hotels throughout Seoul, Korea and 311 (62.2%) useable questionnaires were analyzed. Confirmatory factor analysis was used to determine the validity of the three-factor model (organizational service orientation, PO fit, and turnover intention). The
authors found that four constructs of organizational service-orientation were significantly and positively related to employees’ PO fit: service leadership practices ($r = .50$), service encounter practices ($r = .46$), human resource management practices ($r = .48$), and service system practices ($r = .52$). Negative relationships of turnover intention with organizational service orientation were reported for service leadership practices ($r = -.28$), service encounter practices ($r = -.25$), human resource management practices ($r = -.30$), and service system practices ($r = -.19$). The findings from confirmatory factor analysis indicated that organizational service orientation had a positive influence on PO fit and a negative influence on turnover intention. The results confirmed that PO fit had a negative influence on turnover intention.

After the three-factor model was validated, the authors used structural equation modeling to analyze the cause-and-effect relationships between the three factors. Their first hypotheses suggested that, as organizational service orientation increased, employees’ level of PO fit also increased. The first hypothesis was confirmed ($\beta = 0.65; t = 9.59; p < .001$). The second hypothesis suggested that organizational service orientation would exert a negative influence on turnover intention. This second hypothesis was not supported ($\beta = .02; t = .25$). The third hypothesis predicted that PO fit would have a negative influence on turnover intention; this hypothesis was supported ($\beta = -.53; t = -6.41; p < .001$) indicating that as an employee’s level of PO fit increased, turnover intention decreased, thus increasing the likelihood he or she would remain at the organization.

Jung and Yoon’s (2013) research is the first known study to examine the interrelationships among organizational service orientation, PO fit, and turnover intention in the context of hotels. They found a significant relationship between PO fit and turnover intention.
Their findings confirmed O’Reilly et al. (1991), who suggested that an employee’s turnover intention is reduced when he or she is a better fit for the organization.

Much of the hospitality literature provides evidence that the hospitality industry, specifically hotels, possesses a unique and distinct culture. Currently, Tepeci and Bartlett’s (2002) Hospitality Industry Culture Profile (HICP) and Dawson et al.’s (2011) Hospitality Culture Scale (HCS) are the only developed instruments that assess PO fit in hospitality organizations. Moreover, no known studies to date have investigated PO fit using an instrument tailored to the hospitality industry and its relationship to employee turnover intention. Therefore, future researchers should consider studies that will generalize results of PO fit and turnover intention across sectors of the hospitality industry, specifically hotel lodging — for example, PO fit and turnover intention in various hotel classifications (e.g., budget, limited-service, boutique, upscale, upper-upscale, and luxury hotels) should be considered.

As an industry, practitioners would generally agree that hospitality is a labor-intensive and people-centered industry that requires effective communication between divisions, departments, and personnel (Deery & Jago, 2011; Mount & Back, 1999). Personality plays an important role in communication. Although Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) meta-analysis found a correlation between PO fit and personality types of employees, little research has been done in identifying relationships between PO fit and personality types of hospitality employees. To address this shortcoming, analyzing PO fit and personality types of hospitality employees may provide a better understanding of turnover intention and the role hotel organizational culture plays. Therefore, the next section presents an overview of communication and personality.
Communication and Personality

To better understand the role communication plays between individuals, personality types of employees’ should be considered. Personality is defined as the total genetic makeup of an individual combined with experiences, motivations, attitudes, beliefs, values, and behaviors (Funder, 2006). In other words, it is plausible to understand a person’s personality based on characteristics such as behavior and internal motivations. Once behavior and internal motivations are observed and understood, people may better understand personality types when involved in communicative relationships.

Communication

Gray and Laidlaw (2004) reported that poor communication could lead to uncertainty about interpersonal relationships and therefore increase the probability of occupational stress and burnout. They surveyed employees of an Australian retail organization to identify differences in communication satisfaction at the operations level; a 30% response rate (N = 127) was used for analysis. The research findings suggested that positive communication enhances effective working relationships within an organization, thus emphasizing the importance of effective communication throughout organizations.

Ruck and Welch (2012) explored internal communication at organizations from both management and employee perspectives and subsequently developed a conceptual model of employee communication as a framework for internal communication assessments. The authors analyzed 12 academic and consultancy studies of internal communication published from 2004 to 2010. The analysis suggested that internal communication assessments often excluded employee perspectives of internal communication. In other words, assessments used in internal communication research are generally formulated from management’s perspective.
Consequently, a conceptual model that engages both management and employee perspectives is essential for an accurate understanding of interpersonal relationships within an organization.

Ruck and Welch’s (2012) findings suggested that current internal communication assessments do not go far enough. Thus, when assessing internal communication and interpersonal relationships, both management and employee perspectives should be considered since the communication itself and how it is understood by employees throughout an organization may illuminate an individual’s motives when communicating.

**Personality**

Jung (1933) declared that “the meeting of two personalities is like the contact of two chemical substances; if there is any reaction, both are transformed” (p. 49). When two or more individuals come together they may be transformed as Jung described. In other words, when two or more individuals encounter one another, there are two personalities that impact one another; whether positively or negatively. Porter’s (1976) theory of relationship awareness assumes that an individual’s external behavior is a product of internal motives. Relationship awareness theory provides an understanding of individual personality types by exploring internal motives that can be observed through external communicative behaviors.

Observing a person’s behavior and learning the motive behind the behavior can yield a better understanding of their personality. Behavior is defined as “the way a person acts or communicates” (Scudder & Lacroix, 2013, p. 1). Behavior then is an external output that can be observed through verbal and/or non-verbal communicative behaviors. Motive is defined as “the underlying reason why something is done” (Scudder & Lacroix, 2013, p. 2). Motive then is why a person intends to do or say something, whether consciously or unconsciously.
Relationship awareness theory describes personality types under two conditions: (1) when people perceive that things are going well, and (2) when people perceive that they are experiencing conflict, as shown in Table 1 (Porter, 1976). The theory assumes that human beings exhibit external behaviors based on their internal motives and provides an understanding of the ways people encode and decode messages during communication.

Table 1

*Motivations Under Two Conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Going Well</th>
<th>In Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurturant (Blue)</td>
<td>Actively seeking to help others</td>
<td>Efforts to preserve or restore harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive (Red)</td>
<td>Actively seeking opportunities to achieve results</td>
<td>Efforts to prevail over another person or obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomizing (Green)</td>
<td>Actively seeking logical orderliness and self-reliance</td>
<td>Efforts to conserve resources and assure independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Adapted from Porter (1976)*

Porter developed four premises to relationship awareness theory.

1. Behavior is driven by the motivation to achieve self-worth. This is the foundational premise of relationship awareness theory and is drawn from Tolman’s (1967) work, which concluded that “behavior traits arise from purposive strivings for gratification mediated by concepts or hypotheses as to how to obtain those gratifications” (Porter, 1976, p. 305).

Essentially, individuals want to feel valuable and worthwhile in themselves. Achieving self-worth requires them to choose behaviors and select appropriate tactics for speaking and listening. When individuals communicate, they place a higher priority on internal motivation to get the message across (motivational value system) than on external behaviors. The motivational value
system drives individuals to behave in ways that makes them feel good about themselves. When individuals misinterpret a person’s internal motives for communicating, conflict may occur.

2. Motivation changes during conflict. Porter assumed that, under a normal set of circumstances, individuals act in a predictable way to achieve self-worth. Under other circumstances, when an individual confronts conflict, the person may or may not still act in a predictable manner; his or her behavior may vary widely.

3. Strengths, when overdone or misapplied, can be perceived as weakness. Porter borrowed the third premise from Fromm’s (1947) non-productive orientations of personality. An individual is operating from a personal strength when his behavior leads to a relationship that is mutually productive, whereas an individual is operating from a personal weakness when his or her behavior decreases the likelihood of a mutually productive relationship (Porter, 1996). When an individual operates from their strengths or weaknesses, others should be able to assess the effectiveness of their beliefs and know how to interact with them in order to obtain the gratification they seek (Porter, 1996). For example, to act in a nonproductive ambitious manner may be perceived by others as ruthless. To act in an overly supportive manner may be perceived by others as self-sacrificing.

4. Personal experiences influence perceptions of self and others. According to Porter, “the more a personality theory can be for a person rather than about a person, the better it will serve that person” (Porter, 1996, p. 9). Porter wanted to create an instrument that would be useful for people in applying the concept of relationship awareness theory. The Strength Deployment Inventory (SDI) was the first personality assessment that used colors to identify personality types, making it simple to interpret the instrument’s results and apply them to a person’s life (Personal Strengths Publishing, c.1980).
Brink’s (1991) applied research study is one of the first known non-academic published studies to identify organizational culture and employee personality types by deploying Porter’s (1976) relationship awareness theory and the SDI. Brink stated that “organizational cultures tend to be self-perpetuating because the dominant culture affects such things as who is selected for employment, who is promoted, and who is rewarded” (p. 39). The author identified corporate cultures by looking at employee personality types and how employees behave within the context of a corporation.

Brink (1991) incorporated Porter’s (1976) theory of relationship awareness, claiming that the theory is applicable in the context of a corporation. Using Porter’s color code system, Brink labeled the four personality types as persons motivated by autonomy (green), assertive and directive (red), helpful and concerned (blue), and bureaucratic (gray). It must be noted that bureaucratic (gray) is not one of Porter’s motivation values, but Brink believed there were corporate cultures that aligned with the bureaucratic style. Brink identified the following professions that align with each of the four motivational styles: (a) green—physicians, senior law partners in a law firm, management consultants, professors, and engineers; (b) red—executives with subordinates, entrepreneurs, and high level managers; (c) blue—individuals who typically accept low paying jobs, resist change, and are mutually supportive; (d) gray—government agencies and persons that follow a set of established rules.

Brink’s (1991) article is one of the first documented accounts of applying Porter’s (1976) relationship awareness theory to corporate cultures. However, the author provides no empirical research or literature review to support his conclusion that the theory can be used to identify employee personality types in the context of corporate cultures. Future research may benefit
from Brink by empirically investigating personality types within corporate cultures using Porter’s relationship awareness theory.

**Employee Demographic Characteristics and Turnover Intention**

A review of the hospitality literature on PO fit indicated significant relationships between three demographic characteristics (employee sex, employment status, and age) and turnover intention. In terms of sex, Bretz and Judge (1994) found that women were more likely to stay with their organizations than men. More recently, however, Josiam, Devine, Baum, Crutsinger, and Reynolds (2010) found no significant correlation between sex and turnover intention. In terms of employment status, Tidball (1988) discovered that restaurant employees working more than 40 hours per week were more satisfied with their jobs compared to employees working less than 40 hours per week and were more likely to remain with their organizations. Moreover, despite a general belief that working long hours in hospitality leads to turnover, Ghiselli, La Lopa, and Bai (2001) were unable to demonstrate a direct link between long hours and turnover intention. In terms of age, some studies found a significant predictor of turnover intention; as people get older they tend to remain with their organization (Josiam et al., 2010; Pizam & Thornburg, 2000). Maier (2011), however, found that as hotel employee age levels increased, their intention to leave the organization also increased. Lu and Gursoy (2013) found that mid- or upscale hotel employees born between 1981-2000 (i.e., Millennials) were likely to have higher turnover intentions than older employees (Millennials vs. Gen-Xers: \( b = .14, p < .01 \); Millennials vs. Boomers: \( b = .23, p < .01 \); Gen-Xers vs. Boomers: \( b = .10, p < .05 \)).

**Summary**

The preceding pages provided a review of recent literature of organizational culture, PO fit and turnover intention, communication and personality, and employee demographic
characteristics and turnover intention. In the review, it was suggested that members of an organization bring a variety of personalities that impact organizational culture. Although several definitions of culture exist, scholars generally agree that members of an organization bring values (norms, ideologies, charters, and philosophies) and assumptions (perceptions, feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of members) into the workplace, thus impacting the culture. In other words, organizational cultures are formed through members’ communication of the values and assumptions they bring into the workplace.

After reviewing the literature, it is clear that culture can be both organization-specific and industry-specific. Hospitality cultures are arguably different cultures than other organizations; however, the methodology and samples of studies alleging this come into question. For example, in Kemp and Dwyer’s (2001) study investigating hotel cultures, the methodology employed (strictly qualitative) was limited; in addition, the validity of the research is questionable because the results are not generalizable outside of Australia. Tepeci and Bartlett (2002) developed an instrument to assess hospitality management students’ perception of organizational culture in hospitality organizations but their findings too may not be generalizable because although the results confirmed relationships among various measures, the sample consisted solely of students. Dawson et al. (2011) developed the hospitality culture scale (HCS) to measure PO fit across multiple facets of hospitality (e.g., hotels, food and beverage, casino, clubs, support to industry, and other), but no known studies have deployed the HCS to correlate PO fit, turnover intention, and personality types of hotel employees. Lastly, although Brink’s (1991) applied research is the first known attempt to analyze organizational cultures and personality types using Porter’s (1976) relationship awareness theory, Brink did not incorporate any empirical investigation into corporate cultures.
According to Bretz & Judge (1994), organizational success is contingent on the fit between employees and their organizations. The present study investigated how hotel culture and individual personality type may correlate to an employee’s fit with an organization, measuring PO fit to determine the impact of employee turnover intention. Moreover, the present study is the first empirical investigation that analyzed hotel organizational culture, employee personality type, PO fit, and turnover intention by deploying several scales including Dawson et al.’s (2011) hospitality culture scale, Porter’s (2005) strength deployment inventory, Roodt’s (2004) turnover intention scale, and items from Edward (1991), Cable and Judge (1996) and Piasentin and Chapman (2006).
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CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Organizational success is contingent on the fit between employees and their organization’s values (Bretz & Judge, 1994). Hospitality studies investigating the relationship between person-organization (PO) fit and employee turnover intention have been limited. The present study examined the congruence between hotel organizational culture and hotel employee personality type. Hotel organizational culture, employee personality type and its relationship to PO fit were also examined. Lastly, the relationships between PO fit and turnover intention, and between demographic characteristics and turnover intention were analyzed. The specific research questions and null hypotheses used for testing were:

1) What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type?

2) What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit?

   \( H_01 \): There is no relationship between the three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit.

   \( H_02 \): There is no relationship between the composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit.

3) What is the relationship between hotel employee personality type and PO fit?

   \( H_03 \): There is no relationship between any employee personality type (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing) and PO fit.

   \( H_04 \): There is no relationship between a composite score of employee personality type and PO fit.
4) What is the relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention?

5) Are there differences in turnover intentions based on demographic characteristics (employee sex, employment status, and employee age)?

   $H_05$: There is no significant difference between turnover intention for males as compared to females.

   $H_06$: There is no significant difference between turnover intention for full-time as compared to part-time employees.

   $H_07$: There is no significant difference between turnover intention of younger employees as compared to older employees.

To address the research questions of this study, a more quantitative approach was employed to collect, analyze, and explain the topic. A questionnaire was developed based on previous literature to gather data from hourly and non-hourly employees of hotels located throughout the southern region of California. This questionnaire was pilot-tested, and the final version was distributed to a sample of hotel employees. This chapter describes the use of human subjects, research design, questionnaire development, data collection, research model, and data analysis for this study.

**Use of Human Subjects**

Upon approval from the Program of Study committee, and prior to data collection, the study was submitted for consideration to the Iowa State University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board to guarantee that the health, safety, and rights of participants were protected (Appendix A). The primary researcher and others involved in the data analysis have completed
the Human Subjects Research Assurance Training program and are certified by Iowa State University.

Research Design

For this study, previously developed scales were used to construct a questionnaire to investigate the complexities of organizational culture and personality types of hotel employees, and their impact on PO fit and turnover intention. Data were collected from hourly and non-hourly (i.e., management) employees of upper-upscale hotels throughout the southern region of California.

Sample Selection

The target population for this study consisted of hourly and non-hourly hotel employees age 18 or over who had worked for a minimum of 90 days for a hotel property. Participation was limited by location (40-mile radius around Costa Mesa, CA) and the primary researcher’s ongoing relationships with hotel representatives from upper-upscale hotels. Nineteen upper-upscale hotels throughout southern California were contacted and fourteen agreed to participate in the study.

Corgel, Mandelbaum, and Woodworth (2011) defined upper-upscale hotels as properties oriented towards commercial and convention travelers that provide a variety of high quality services, amenities, furniture and fixtures, multiple food and beverage outlets, meeting rooms, concierge services and recreational facilities. Southern California is defined as the seven southern counties of the state and is dominated by the Greater Los Angeles area (“Local Profiles,” 2014). The 2010 United States Census Bureau reported the population of southern California as 22,680,010 (61% of California’s total population). According to Dean Runyan
Associates (marketing consultants for the California Travel and Tourism Commission), direct employment by the accommodation and food service segment of the region in 2011 was 271,300.

Upper upscale hotels throughout the southern region of California (southern California) were selected as the targeted population for this study for several reasons. First, STR Global Inc. reported the demand for room accommodations in the southern California grew 3% from 2012 to 2013 and continues to outpace nationwide demand (D. Vinson, personal communication, March 4, 2014). Second, domestic commercial travel to the region is projected to outpace the United States domestic leisure segment through 2016 by 0.5-1% (Buckley, 2013). Lastly, of the 202,859 available hotel rooms throughout southern California, the upper upscale hotel segment accounts for 25% (50,642 available rooms). It can be concluded from these figures that upper upscale hotels throughout southern California are a viable population for this study as continued interest and growth throughout the region are projected to increase.

**Instrument and Measurements**

Investigation of hotel organizational culture, hotel employee personality type and the link between PO fit and turnover intention among hotel employees were analyzed. A paper questionnaire was developed consisting of four sections (Appendix B). Statements in Section 1 examined the participants’ perceptions of hotel culture based on Dawson, Abbott, and Shoemaker’s (2011) hospitality culture scale (HCS). Section 2 assessed the participants’ perceptions of PO fit and turnover intention. PO fit was measured using six items based on the work of Edward (1991), Cable and Judge (1996) and Piasentin and Chapman (2006). Turnover intention was measured using Roodt’s (2004) turnover intention scale (TIS-6). Section 3 explored the participants’ personality type using Porter’s (2005) strength deployment inventory (SDI). Section 4 included demographic questions about the hotel employees’ sex, age, education
level, employment status, supervision role, length of time worked for the hotel company, length of time worked in the hospitality industry, primary division, and job title. Measurements of constructs in each section are described below.

Section 1: Hospitality Culture Scale (HCS)

The Organizational Culture Profile (O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) and the Hospitality Industry Culture Profile (Tepeci & Bartlett, 2002) were the two most common instruments used in hospitality PO fit research prior to 2011. Subsequently, Dawson et al. (2011) contended that these two instruments inadequately measured all facets of hospitality (e.g., food and beverage, casino, clubs, and recreation) and therefore developed the Hospitality Culture Scale (HCS). The HCS was designed to help identify the current culture of a hospitality organization (characteristics) and the personal attributes (values) of hospitality employees.

The most influential scholars of organizational culture (Cameron & Ettington, 1988; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996; Schein, 1996) have adopted a sociological perspective regarding how members within an organization viewed values, underlying assumptions, and expectations and how they interpreted the surrounding environment. The HCS provides a framework that has a high degree of congruence with the sociological perspective of organizational culture and thus, was used in this study as a measurement of hotel culture.

HCS content. Three scales from Dawson et al.’s (2011) HCS (discussed later in this section) were deployed. In its original format, the HCS measured organizational culture using four scales (management principles, customer relationships, job variety, and job satisfaction) with 22 items. Moreover, the HCS included six scales of personal attributes (principles, propitiousness, leadership, risk taker, accuracy, and composure) using 33 items. For each question, participants were asked to respond on a Likert scale of 1-7. For both the organizational
and personal variables, a rating of “1” indicates strongly disagree and a rating of “7” indicates strongly agree (Dawson et al., 2011).

Dawson et al. (2011) calculated the mean scores for organizational culture and personal attributes by averaging scores from each scale. They reported the overall mean score of organizational culture as 5.23 and a mean score of 5.82 for personal attributes. The findings suggested that mean scores higher than 5.23 and 5.82 for culture and personal attributes, respectively, would likely be a good match to the hospitality industry. The interpretation of mean scores is consistent with Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) who stated, “higher values indicate a better fit of the data” (p. 543). Dawson et al. (2011) reported the mean scores of each scale for organizational culture and personal attributes of hotel employees. The mean scores for each of the four scales of hotel organizational culture were reported as: 5.50 (management principles); 5.89 (customer relationships); 6.32 (job variety) and 3.95 (job satisfaction). The mean scores for each of the six scales for personal attributes of hotel employees were reported as: 6.52 (principles); 5.90 (propitiousness); 6.00 (leadership); 5.61 (risk taker); 6.08 (accuracy); and 5.10 (composure). Job satisfaction, risk taker, and composure were reported and did not meet the minimum mean scores of 5.23 (hotel organizational culture) and 5.82 (personal attributes of hotel employees) and therefore suggested that these scales may not indicate an accurate measurement of PO fit.

**HCS reliability.** Dawson et al. (2011) used a Cronbach’s alpha greater than .60 to determine the internal consistency reliability for each of the four scales of organizational culture. The reported Cronbach’s alpha for the four scales of organizational culture were: .90 (management principles); .85 (customer relationships); .65 (job variety) and .54 (job satisfaction). Although job satisfaction failed to satisfy the minimum Cronbach’s alpha, the
authors chose to retain job satisfaction because these scales were central to the underlying constructs of their study. Dawson et al. (2011) reported the Cronbach’s alpha for the six scales of personal attributes as: .90 (principles); .88 (propitiousness); .79 (leadership); .78 (risk taker); .69 (accuracy) and .59 (composure). The authors chose to include “composure” in the HCS given its relatively close Cronbach score of .60 and the importance to the construct of their study. Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) suggested an alpha value greater than .70 is appropriate to determine the internal consistency reliability of an instrument. Subsequently, this study established a Cronbach’s alpha greater than .70 to estimate the internal consistency reliability of the HCS.

**HCS scale strategy and configuration.** The HCS was designed to identify the current culture of a hospitality organization (characteristics) and the personal attributes (values) of hospitality employees. The relationship between hotel organizational culture and personality types of hotel employees and its relationship to PO fit was analyzed. Therefore, Dawson et al.’s (2011) three scales (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) to measure hotel organizational culture and Porter’s (2005) strength deployment inventory to measure personality types of hotel employees were adopted. The reason to eliminate Dawson et al.’s personal attributes scale was based on Ryan and Kristof-Brown’s (2003) article, which suggested that personality traits are more stable and visible in others’ behavior than are personal attributes. Although the HCS includes four scales to measure hospitality culture, the job satisfaction scale was eliminated from the questionnaire. The reason for eliminating the fourth scale is twofold. First, job satisfaction was not part of the theoretical construct for this study. Second, Dawson et al. (2011) reported a Cronbach alpha of .54 (less than .60) and a mean score of 3.95 (less than
5.23) for the job satisfaction scale. Permission to use the HCS was granted by the primary author (Appendix C).

Section 2: Person-Organization Fit Scale and Turnover Intention Scale

PO Fit scale. There are several approaches that can be used to measure person-organization (PO) fit, including subjective, objective, and indirect methods (Piasentin & Chapman, 2006). Piasentin and Chapman defined the subjective and objective approaches accordingly, “subjective measures of fit capture individuals’ perceptions about the extent to which they feel like they fit into their organization; objective measures of fit calculate the similarity between the characteristics of an individual and the characteristics of an organization” (p. 203). Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson (2005) described indirect PO fit methods as, “comparing separately rated person and environment variables” (p. 291). Researchers have found that subjective measures of fit (i.e., perceptions of fit) better predict work outcomes compared to actual or objective measures of fit (Cable and Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996).

Therefore, this study measured PO fit through subjective measures (i.e. participants’ feelings of how they fit).

PO fit was measured using six items based on the work of Edward (1991), Cable and Judge (1996) and Piasentin and Chapman (2006). The PO fit scale subjectively measured participants’ perceived feelings as to whether or not they were a fit for their hotels.

PO Fit content. Osgood’s (1964) semantic differential technique was adopted to measure participants’ responses against a series of bipolar 5-step response scales defined by two opposites (e.g., not at all - completely). Example items included: “This hotel has the same values as I do with regard to concern for others” and “My values match those of current employees in the hotel.”
PO Fit reliability. Jung and Yoon (2013) reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.93 for the PO fit scale. In the present study, an internal consistency reliability estimate of .70 was established as a cut off point as recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994).

Turnover Intention Scale (TIS-6). The turnover intention scale (TIS-6) is a six-item scale adapted by Roodt (2004) from his unpublished 15-item turnover intention scale as a measure for assessing employees’ intentions of either staying with or leaving an organization. The scale was selected for this study because of its brevity and proven reliability and validity. Although turnover intentions have been thoroughly covered in the literature, previous studies employed questionnaires with a relatively small number of items to measure turnover intentions. For example, some previous researchers have used a single-item scale (Lambert, Hogan & Barton, 2001) while others deployed a three-item scale (Becker, 1992; Fox & Fallon, 2003).

TIS-6 content. The TIS-6 measures participant’s responses using Osgood’s (1964) semantic differential technique of bipolar 5-step response scales defined by two opposites (e.g., never - always; to no extent - to a very large extent; highly unlikely - highly likely). Items included in the TIS-6 include “How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?” and “How often have you considered leaving your job?” Permission to use the TIS-6 was granted by the author (Appendix D).

TIS-6 reliability. In Jacobs’ (2005) dissertation, the author completed an exhaustive study in validating Roodt’s (2004) original 15-item turnover intention scale. He reported a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91 for the 15-item scale. Bothma and Roodt’s (2013) more recent study confirmed the reliability of the six-item TIS-6 (α = 0.80). As recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), an alpha of .70 was used as the cutoff point to estimate the internal consistency reliability of the TIS-6.
Section 3: Strength Deployment Inventory

The strength deployment inventory (SDI) is based on Porter’s (1976) relationship awareness theory, which is the theoretical model for assessing personality types. In its original published form, the SDI is a 20-item ipsative assessment that requires participants to respond to two sets of items relating to: (1) when they perceive things are going well and (2) when they perceive they are experiencing conflict. Ipsative rating scales ask participants to distribute points across a series of statements.

The instrument was selected for this study for two reasons. First, no known empirical studies using the SDI in the hospitality industry have been published. One reason is that the SDI requires the administrator to obtain level one certification from Personal Strengths Publishing prior to purchasing and administering the instrument. Researchers may not be interested in becoming certified or may not be aware that the instrument exists. The primary researcher for the present study obtained level one and two certification in 2006 and 2012 respectively from Personal Strengths Publishing. Second, although better-known personality type instruments exist, such as Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), the SDI focuses on interpersonal relationships and individuals’ motives when communicating whereas the MBTI is intended to provide individuals with a practical understanding of personality types (Myers, McCaulley, Quenk, & Hammer, 1998). Permission to use the SDI was granted by the publisher (Appendix E).

SDI content. A modified version of Porter’s (2005) SDI (discussed later in this chapter) was used. In its original format the SDI has two sets of items (when people perceive that things are going well, and when people perceive that they are experiencing conflict), each with three scales; each scale contains 10 items whose combined total equals 100 points. For each item,
participants are asked to distribute 0 to 10 points across three different sentence endings. The scores from the first set (when people perceive that things are going well) are used to assign them to one of the seven personality types. These are: altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, analytic-autonomizing, assertive-nurturing, judicious-competing, cautious-supporting, and flexible-cohering (Appendix F). The scores from the second set (when people perceive that they are experiencing conflict) are used to assign them to one of 13 CS types (Appendix G).

**SDI reliability.** Porter (1996) conducted research to establish reliability of the SDI. The original study conducted in 1973 (as cited in Porter, 1996) reported the Pearson coefficients between test and re-test results for three personality types: altruistic-nurturing (A-N); assertive-directing (A-D); and analytic-autonomizing (A-A). One hundred participants—nurses, social workers, engineers, police cadets, police sergeants, prisoners, and college students majoring in business—participated in the study (Porter, 1996). Porter reported Pearson coefficients of correlation between the test-retest for each scale as A-N, r=0.78; A-D, r=0.78; and A-A, r=0.76. The reliability of the test-retest method indicated that participants who retested within six days to eight weeks fluctuated no more than 6 points (1/2 standard deviation) which was not statistically significant (Porter, 1996).

In 1988 and 1989, 564 individuals from 10 states across the U.S. participated in a validation study to determine the internal consistency and normality of the SDI. These individuals included government employees, secretaries, police sergeants, nurses, computer technicians, accountants, instructors, sales personnel, students, and managers. Porter categorized the occupations based on the United States Census Bureau’s occupational classifications as follows: working professionals (37.6%), students (28.9%), and managers (23.2%). The remaining participants (10.3%) were grouped into a non-professional category. More than half
of the population was male (51.8%) and the ethnic distribution included 72.5% Caucasian, 7.1% African American, 6.7% Hispanic, 9.9% Asian American, 0.9% Native American, and 0.4% Pacific Islander. In terms of academic experience, 93.2% had some level of college education. Using factor analysis, Porter compared the 1988-1989 validation study ($N = 564$) to the 1973 study ($N = 100$). He found the internal consistency of the inventory to be high and observed a normal distribution with each score type (A-N, A-D and A-A). A confidence level of .0000 was found for 19 out of the 20 statements in the inventory. A confidence level of .0039 was reported for A-N in statement number 20. Lastly, Porter found external validity with nurses (A-N) and college students majoring in business (A-D).

More recent studies (Farris, 2001 and Scudder, 2013) have confirmed the reliability of the SDI. Farris (2001) found the reliability of the SDI was reasonably high. Using 0.60 as the acceptable benchmark for internal consistency reliability, Farris reported Cronbach’s alpha values of 0.77 (A-N), 0.81 (A-D), and 0.70 (A-A). Scudder’s (2013) seminal work provided evidence for the reliability of the three primary personality types based on relationship awareness theory. He collected 9,798 SDI instruments and reported Cronbach’s alpha values for internal consistency reliability ranging from 0.78 to 0.85 (0.80 for A-N, 0.85 for A-D, and 0.78 for A-A). Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) recommended a minimum Cronbach alpha of .70 as an acceptable level for internal consistency reliability. Therefore, for the present study, a Cronbach’s alpha greater than .70 was established to assess the internal consistency reliability of each of the three primary hotel employee personality types.

**SDI scale strategy and configuration.** The SDI was designed to identify personality types of participants under two conditions: (1) when they perceive things are going well and (2) when they perceive they are experiencing conflict. The present study was interested in analyzing
the relationship between hotel organizational culture, employee personality types, and PO fit when employees perceived things were going well. Therefore, the present study did not investigate Porter’s 13 personality types when participants perceive they are in conflict with others.

Porter’s (2005) SDI is a 20-item ipsative rating scale that asks participants to distribute points across a series of statements. A theoretical debate on the pros and cons of employing statistical analysis when collecting data from ipsative instruments continues. However, a small group of authors have taken a stance that ipsative data are amenable to conventional statistical analysis (Baron, 1996; Barney, 1998; Saville & Willson, 1991). In fact, Barney (1998) demonstrated through factor analysis that both ipsative and Likert-scale versions of the SDI produced a similar factor structure, thus providing not only additional support for the SDI’s validity and reliability, but evidence that the SDI can be given to participants in a Likert-scale format. Barney (1998) reported scale reliabilities between 0.70 and 0.81 for the Likert-scale version of the SDI. Subsequently, Porter’s (2005) ipsative SDI was converted by Barney (1998) to a 10-item Likert-scale instrument to measure the three primary personality types.

**Section 4: Demographics**

The demographic section of the questionnaire gathered key demographic information from participants. Previous research on PO fit and hospitality literature supported the need to better understand how demographics may relate to employee turnover intention. Information solicited consisted of nine items: sex, age, education level, employment status, supervisory role, length of time worked for the hotel company, length of time worked in the hospitality industry, hotel division, and job title.
The questionnaire asked participants to select a hotel division from an option of 16 choices. Participants were asked to provide their job title in a separate question. To streamline presentation of the data and to ensure accuracy of departments represented, the division was cross-referenced with the written job title. For example, participants that selected “front office” as the division may have written down various job titles: front desk associate, guest care agent, and front office representative. In this case, each of the various job titles was grouped into the front office division category.

**Pilot Test**

Pilot testing of the questionnaire was conducted with hourly and non-hourly (management) employees from an upper-upscale chain hotel located in Southern California. The purpose of the pilot study was to obtain participant feedback regarding the questionnaire through a pilot study form asking participants how easy it was to understand the words used in the questionnaire and how much time they needed to complete it (Appendix H). A total of 100 questionnaires were distributed to participants at one upper-upscale hotel chain location. Participants were asked to indicate any areas of the questionnaire that were not clearly understandable and to provide suggestions on how to improve the instrument. Based on feedback from 25 hotel employees (25% response rate), two separate questions in section 4 (demographics) were changed to make them easier to understand and answer. Participants were also provided a cover letter explaining the study’s purpose, background, and procedures (Appendix I).

**Data Collection**

A self-administered paper questionnaire was used to collect data. A paper questionnaire was expected to produce a higher response rate than an internet-based questionnaire because not
all employees had access to the Internet. Generally, paper questionnaires have been used in other studies involving hospitality employees for this same reason (Strohbehn et al., 2014; Ungku Zainal Abidin, Strohbehn, & Arendt, 2014). No personal information was attached to individual participants, thereby guaranteeing complete anonymity.

Nineteen upper-upscale hotels were contacted to participate in the study. Five declined to participate. Three properties declining to participate were under a collective bargaining agreement (i.e., “union hotels”). No unionized property was represented in the sample. The two remaining properties did not provide a reason for declining. The number of questionnaires provided to each hotel was dictated by the amount requested by the hotel General Manager (GM) or Human Resources (HR) representative. Although the 14 participating hotels had approximately 3,247 hourly and non-hourly employees combined, a total of 674 questionnaires were distributed. To ensure an appropriate response rate, a minimum sample size of 88 participants was established based on Cohen’s rule of thumb for regression analysis (Maxwell, 2000). Data were collected between September 19, 2014 and October 27, 2014.

Prior to distributing the questionnaires, ten GM or HR representatives were contacted by phone and four were contacted in person to establish a date for the representatives to receive the questionnaires. A total of 280 questionnaires were hand-delivered to representatives at sites located within a 20-mile radius of Costa Mesa, California, and 80 questionnaires were hand-delivered to hotel representatives at a local hotel and lodging association network event. For hotels located outside of the 20-mile radius, 314 questionnaires were sent priority mail via United States Postal Services (USPS). A personalized cover letter addressed to the hotel representative accompanied the questionnaires; this letter explained the purpose of the study and guaranteed anonymity to individuals (Appendix J).
The researchers had little control over how the questionnaires were distributed; however, the GM and HR representatives who distributed the questionnaires were provided directions on how to distribute them. Representatives were asked to provide the questionnaire to hotel employees age 18 or over who had worked with the hotel property for a minimum of 90 days. Each questionnaire included a cover letter that notified participants about their rights and how confidentiality would be maintained (Appendix K). A self-addressed postage-paid envelope was provided to participants to facilitate the return of questionnaires. As recommended by Dillman (2007), a postcard (Appendix L) was sent to hotel representatives one week after they received the questionnaire packets to remind them to distribute the questionnaires to their employees and to thank those who had already distributed the questionnaires. Furthermore, a personalized phone call to the GM or HR representative was made five days after the follow-up card was mailed.

Data Analysis

Each questionnaire’s responses were first manually entered in a Microsoft Excel 2013 spreadsheet and converted to a comma-separated value (CSV) file. The CSV file was uploaded into the Statistical Program for Social Science SPSS (Version 22) where statistical analyses were performed. Cronbach’s alpha was used to measure questionnaire internal consistency reliability for the four scales (hotel organizational culture, hotel employee personality type, PO fit, and turnover intention). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson’s coefficient correlation analysis, regression analysis, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t-test. Data were checked for normality and linearity. Normality was assessed by visual inspection of the scatterplots. Linearity and the presence of outliers were assessed by visually
examining the scatterplots of measured variables. The research questions and associated hypotheses are presented below.

**RQ1:** What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type?

Empirical evidence (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Cable & Judge, 1994) supports the notion that job seekers are affected by congruence between their personalities and an organization’s attributes (e.g., cultural factors). In fact, Bowen, Ledford, and Nathan (1991) believed PO fit could be measured by how closely the personality of an individual fits in with the culture of the organization. Accordingly, the three culture factors (management principles, customer relations, job variety) from Dawson et al.’s (2011) study were identified. Next, Porter’s (2005) three primary personality types (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, analytic-autonomizing) were correlated with Dawson et al.’s three culture factors. Finally, a composite hotel organizational culture mean score and personality type mean score were developed and the two variables were tested using Pearson’s correlation analysis.

**RQ2:** What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit?

H01: There is no relationship between the three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit.

H02: There is no relationship between a composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit.

To examine the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee PO fit, regression analysis was employed for each of Dawson et al.’s (2011) three factors of organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety). The
first factor, “management principles,” is related to managing employees and includes attributes such as support, training, cultural diversity, and employee focus. The second factor, “customer relationships,” is commonly associated with guest service relationships, such as creating memories for guests, helping guests celebrate milestones, and repeat guests. The third and final factor, “job variety,” is related to employee perception of job diversification. Regression analysis identified which of the three cultural factor had the most/least impact on PO fit.

RQ3: What is the relationship between hotel employee personality type and employee PO fit?

H03: There is no relationship between any employee personality type (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing) and PO fit.

H04: There is no relationship between a composite score of employee personality type and PO fit.

To examine the relationship between hotel employee personality type and employee PO fit, regression analysis was employed for each of Porter’s (2005) three primary personality types (assertive-directing, altruistic-nurturing, and analytic-autonomizing). “Assertive-directing” is when individuals seek opportunities to achieve results; “altruistic-nurturing,” is when individuals actively seek to help others; and “analytic-autonomizing,” is when individuals actively seek logical orderliness and self-reliance. Regression analysis identified which of Porter’s (2005) personality types had the most/least impact on PO fit.

RQ4: What is the relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention?

Several studies (Alniaçık, Alniaçık, Erat & Akçin, 2013; Jung & Yoon, 2013; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Meyer, Hecht, Gill, & Toplonytsky, 2010; O’Reilly et al., 1991) found that employees who were not a good fit with an organization were likely to quit. Conversely,
employees who were a good fit were likely to remain with the organization. Only one known hospitality study (Jung & Yoon, 2013) examined the relationship between PO fit and turnover intention in luxury hotels throughout Seoul, Korea. Jung and Yoon (2013) found PO fit had a negative influence on turnover intention. In other words, a relationship between PO fit and turnover was present. Moreover, PO fit could predict turnover intention. However, these findings should be interpreted with caution as they can only be generalized in the northwestern region of South Korea. As a contribution to the ongoing discussion of PO fit congruence and turnover intention of hotel employees, the present study employed regression and correlation analysis to determine the relationship between PO fit and turnover intention of hotel employees.

**RQ5:** Are there differences in turnover intentions based on demographic characteristics (employee sex, employment status, and employee age)?

- **H05:** There is no significant difference between turnover intention for males as compared to females.
- **H06:** There is no significant difference between turnover intention for full-time as compared to part-time employees.
- **H07:** There is no significant difference between turnover intention of younger employees as compared to older employees.

Previous studies in the PO fit and hospitality literature have produced contradictory findings regarding employee demographic characteristics (employee sex, employment status, and age) and turnover intention. For instance, Bretz and Judge (1994) confirmed that women were more likely to stay with their organization than men. Josiam, Devine, Baum, Crutsinger, and Reynolds (2010), however, found no significant difference between sex and turnover intention. In a study of restaurant working hours, Tidball (1988) found that employees who worked more
than 40 hours per week were less likely to turnover. However, Ghiselli, La Lopa, and Bai (2001) were unable to confirm Tidball’s (1988) findings. Josiam et al. (2010), Lu and Gursoy (2013), Maier (2011) and Pizam and Thornburg (2000) were unable to agree on whether age could predict turnover intention. Based on these contradictory findings, the present study employed independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA to determine differences between turnover intention for males and females, full-time and part-time employees, younger and older employees. Levene’s test for equality of variance were used to identify variances between groups. Brown-Forsythe F-test were conducted when the variances between groups were not equal.

Summary

There is evidence that the link between PO fit and turnover intention of hotel employees deserves more study. The research discussed here investigates relationships using descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation analysis, regression analysis, independent samples t-test, and one-way ANOVA. Data from hourly and non-hourly employees of hotels located throughout the southern California region were collected using four scales previously developed and validated: Dawson et al.’s (2011) HCS and Porter’s (2005) SDI to identify hotel organizational culture and personality types respectively, Roodt’s (2004) TIS-6 to measure turnover intention, and Jung and Yoon’s (2013) scale to measure PO fit of hotel employees.
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CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents results and a discussion of these results. A demographic profile of the participants is provided. The chapter focuses on participants’ ratings of hotel organizational culture, personality type, and correlations between the two relationships. In addition, the relationship between hotel organizational culture, person-organization fit, and turnover intention are presented. Quantitative data supporting the findings are provided. Five research questions were tested and results are discussed.

Description of Sample

Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009) recommended using multiple methods of contact (e.g., human interaction and mail) to improve response rates. Of the 674 questionnaires distributed to hotel hourly and non-hourly employees, 231 were returned (34% response rate). Of the 674 questionnaires, 360 were hand delivered to six hotel representatives and 314 were delivered via United States Postal Services (USPS) priority mail to the remaining eight hotel properties. As presented in Table 2, response rates for hand-delivered questionnaires were higher than for those sent via priority mail. This is consistent with the findings of Brown and Arendt’s (2011) study of hotel front desk employees (they hand delivered questionnaires to 41 hotels and achieved an 83% response rate). In the present study, a response rate 13.5 percentage points higher was achieved when personally delivering the questionnaires to hotel representatives. This is also consistent with Dillman et al. (2009) who declared that “human interaction can be used to encourage response [rates]” (p. 370). Ravichandran and Arendt (2008) found that increased response rates for mail questionnaires yielded higher response rates with hospitality managers and executives when making an initial personalized contact prior to mailing questionnaires. The primary researcher’s personal relationships and ongoing network efforts
with hotel management representatives may have contributed to the high response rate received when using the hand delivery method versus the priority mail method.

Table 2

*Questionnaire Distribution and Response Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Distributed (%)</th>
<th>Returned (%)</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hand Delivered</td>
<td>360 (53.4)</td>
<td>146 (63.2)</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Mail</td>
<td>314 (46.6)</td>
<td>85 (36.8)</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Profile of Participants**

As shown in Table 3, the majority of participants were female (58.4%). According to the United States 2013 Bureau of Labor Statistics Population Survey, 1.37 million people were employed in the travel accommodation sector of hospitality and the majority (57.6%) were females. Thirty-one percent of participants were between the ages of 18 and 25 and 47% were between the ages of 26 and 39. The highest level of education completed was: high school (32.9%), associate degree (10.8%), college degree (54.1%), and graduate degree (2.2%). The majority of participants had obtained a college degree. However, the questionnaire did not define the terms “associate” and “college” and thus the terms may have had different meanings for each participant. Therefore it may be difficult to interpret the data and generalize the findings related to highest level of education completed. In previous research (Dawson, Abbott, & Shoemaker, 2011; Jung & Yoon, 2013), 43.7% and 36.4% respectively of participants reported they had a college diploma (four-year undergraduate degree).
Over three-fourths of the participants (77.9%) worked full-time (40-hours or more per week) and 42.9% served in a supervisory capacity. Slightly more than a third of participants (38.1%) had been employed at their respective hotels for one to five years. Conversely, 31.6% reported working in the hotel industry one to five years while 9.1% had accrued 21 or more years in the hotel industry. Lee and Way’s (2011) study of hotel employee characteristics and work retention found that 32.9% of participants had been employed from one to five years in the hotel industry.

Participants were asked to select a hotel division from 16 options. Participants were also asked to provide a job title so that accuracy of the hotel division category could be verified. In the hotel division category, 98.7% (n = 228) of the participants selected one of the 16 divisions. Two participants selected “other” and provided the written responses “executive team” and “parking.” These two questionnaires were grouped in the “other/missing category.” One participant did not select a hotel division category and was also grouped in the “other/missing category.” The open-ended question, “What is your job title at this hotel property?” was answered by 97% (n = 224) of the participants. Seven participants did not provide a job title. However, of these seven, six selected a hotel division category and one participant did not.

Written job titles were compared to divisions to ensure accuracy of hotel divisions responses. Findings indicate that participants’ (n = 224) written job title accurately reflected one of the 16 hotel divisions provided, presumably demonstrating that participants gave careful consideration when selecting their hotel division.

Of the 16 hotel divisions, the front office was represented more than any other division (n = 65, 28.3%). Typical job titles in the front office division were front desk agent, guest service agent, concierge, bell services, valet, door, and telephone operator. The restaurant division was
the second most reported (n = 36, 15.7%) division. Typical job titles in the restaurant division were food server, food runner, host(ess), busser, cook, and expeditor. Sales (n = 22, 9.6%), administration (n = 17, 7.4%), and housekeeping (n = 17, 7.4%) were ranked as the next highest divisions. The housekeeping division was not among the top three most represented divisions. In their sample (N = 1,115,630) the Bureau of Labor Statistics national industry-specific occupational employment and wage estimates survey (2013) confirmed that food and beverage (n = 457,330; 25%), housekeeping (n = 432,980; 23.6%), and front office (n = 225,320; 12.3%) were the top three represented divisions in U.S. hotels. In a sample of U.S. hotel employees (N = 359), Lee and Way (2011) found the three most represented divisions at hotels were housekeeping (n = 111; 30.9%), food and beverage (n = 74; 20.6%), and front office (n = 73; 20.3%).

Table 3

**Demographics of Participants (N = 231)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-39</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or older</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (Masters, Ph.D, J.D., M.D.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time (40 hours or more per week)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (less than 40 hours per week)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position Level at Hotel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hourly (supervise other employees)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly (supervise other employees)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly (do not supervise other employees)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure at Hotel Property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11 months</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure in Hotel Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-11 months</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Office</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar/Lounge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquets/Catering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Data for Questionnaire Scales

The following section presents descriptive data obtained from the questionnaire. Participants’ perceptions of hotel culture, person-organization (PO) fit, personality type, and turnover intention are presented and discussed.

Mean Ratings of Hotel Organizational Culture

Dawson et al. (2011) found that the hospitality culture scale (HCS) was reliable for each of the three factors (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) when deployed across multiple facets of hospitality (e.g., hotels, food and beverage, casino, clubs). Cronbach’s alpha values for each factor were: management principles ($\alpha = .90$); customer relationships ($\alpha = .85$); and job variety ($\alpha = .65$). As recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) a Cronbach’s alpha value greater than $.70$ was established to assess the internal consistency reliability of the HCS in the present study. The HCS was found to be reliable for two factors: management principles ($\alpha = .93$) and customer relationships ($\alpha = .87$). Job variety was found to be slightly less than the established Cronbach alpha value of $.70$ ($\alpha = .67$). However, when all three organizational culture factor mean scores were combined to create one composite mean score, the scale was found reliable at $\alpha = .94$. Interpretation of Cronbach’s alpha values should be perceived with caution as a large number of items, 23, were used to measure hotel organizational culture.

Table 4 provides mean ratings of 22 hotel organizational culture statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 7=Strongly Agree). Self-reported responses to the statements “Employees at my hotel are in the business of creating memories for its customers,” “I have a job that can be challenging at times” and “Employees at my hotel develop relationships with customers,” were reported as the three highest mean ratings of 6.16, 6.16, and 6.19
respectively, indicating a response between moderately agree and strongly agree. These results support similar findings by Dawson et al. (2011) who reported that the most distinctive feature of hospitality culture was the “customer relationships” factor. Although Dawson et al. did not report mean ratings for individual organizational culture statements, the present study found that participants agreed that a focus on customer relations were present in hotel organizational cultures.

The lowest mean ratings were for the two self-reported response statements, “There are many opportunities to geographically relocate with my hotel company” and “Employees within my hotel enjoy handling unusual challenges” (5.18 and 5.35, respectively), indicating a response between mildly agree and moderately agree. Opportunities to relocate were found to have the lowest mean rating compared to the other 21 statements. A possible reason is that distribution of questionnaires was limited to hotel properties located within southern California, and these hotels may offer limited relocation opportunities. For example, six of the 14 hotels that participated in the study had properties located in California, Florida, Hawaii, Nevada, and Utah only. Therefore, participants may have believed they were unable to relocate within the specific hotel brand given the limited number of hotel locations. Lastly, recall that participants reported a high mean rating for the item “I have a job that can be challenging at times.” Conversely, for the item “Employees within my hotel enjoy handling unusual challenges,” participants self-reported a low mean rating, indicating employees did not enjoy handling unusual situations within the hotel.
Table 4

*Mean Ratings of Organizational Culture Statements (N = 228-231)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational culture statements (α = .94)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees at my hotel develop relationships with its customers</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a job that can be challenging at times</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees at my hotel are in the business of creating memories for its customers</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural diversity is a reality at my hotel</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees at my hotel provide “a home away from home” for its customers</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees at my hotel are in the business of helping customers celebrate the milestones in their lives</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a job where every day is different</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company’s culture is constantly reinforced at my hotel</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors at my hotel support employees</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high percentage of our business is repeat customers</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor(s) are employee focused</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors at my hotel empower employees</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors at my hotel reward employees</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees at my hotel practice the motto: “Treat others as I wish to be treated”</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor treats mistakes as opportunities to learn</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors at my hotel believe training is important</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervisors at my hotel have an entrepreneurial (“go-getting”) spirit</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees do more than is required of them at my hotel</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees at my hotel believe that: “to be of service is the most noblest profession”</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A focus on employee retention is emphasized at my hotel</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees within my hotel enjoy handling unusual challenges</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many opportunities to geographically relocate with my hotel company</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Scale is 1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree*

Although participants reported that their job was challenging, participants did not enjoy the unusual challenges that come with working at a hotel. This finding may suggest that participants need a stronger sense of self-confidence so they believe they can succeed. Robbins and Judge (2013) suggested that management could help build self-confidence in employees by “providing training to improve members’ technical and interpersonal skills” (p. 321). Therefore, based on the findings of the current study, further training in their positions might instill a sense of self-confidence in participants, giving them the ability to handle unusual challenges faced in the hotel organizational culture.
One outcome of using Dawson et al.’s (2011) HCS was the ability to assess the overall hotel organizational culture by determining a mean rating derived from the 22 statements. Dawson et al. (2011) concluded that an overall mean rating higher than 5.23 for culture indicated that participants were a good match for the hospitality industry. Findings from the present study demonstrate an overall mean rating of 5.75 for hotel organizational culture, indicating participants were a good match for hotel organizational cultures.

**Mean Ratings of Personality Types**

In the present study of hotel employees, Cronbach’s alpha levels were .82 altruistic-nurturing (A-N), .87 assertive-directing (A-D), and .79 analytic-autonomizing (A-A), well above the .70 cutoff for internal consistency reliability, suggesting an acceptable degree of reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Others have also found the SDI to be reliable. For example, Barney (1998) deployed the SDI among university students, childcare workers, accountants, sales and medical employees throughout New Zealand and reported Cronbach’s alpha values of .80 (A-N), .87 (A-D), and .73 (A-A). In the present study, the items included in the A-A personality type may not be as internally consistent as the A-N and A-D personality types; however, the A-A personality type was found to have higher internal consistency with hotel employees than with Barney’s (1998) sample. A total of 10 statements per each personality type were used; consequently, Cronbach’s alpha values should be interpreted with caution as several items were used to assess the reliability of personality types.

Table 5 shows mean ratings for A-N, A-D, and A-A personality types on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree). The highest-rated A-N personality type statements were “Friendly, open and who sees some good in almost everyone” “Helping others do what they want to do” and “To be trusting of them and loyal to them” (means of 4.47,
4.49, and 4.57, respectively) indicating a response between agree and strongly agree. The lowest mean ratings were for the two statements, “Doing what I want to do without having to count on others” and “The major decisions have been made by others and how I can help is clear” (3.23 and 3.71, respectively), indicating a response between agree and disagree equally and agree. Mean ratings for the three highest-rated A-D personality type statements—“Energetic, self-confident and one who sees opportunities others miss” “An energetic person who is quick to see opportunities and advantages” and “To be full of ambition and initiative,”—were 4.10, 4.11, and 4.22 respectively, indicating a response between agree and strongly agree. Mean ratings for the lowest-rated two statements, “Actively curious about them to learn if there is something in it for me” and “Getting others to do what I want to do” were 2.89 and 3.50, respectively, indicating a response between agree and disagree equally and agree. Lastly, mean ratings for the three highest-rated A-A personality type statements—“I’ve had time to study a major decision and determine my own best course of action,” “To be resolute in my convictions and my principles” and “Cautious and fair and who stands by what I believe to be right”—were 4.47, 4.49, and 4.57 respectively, indicating a response between agree and strongly agree. Mean ratings for the two lowest-rated statements, “Politely cautious until I’ve learned what they might want from me” and “Neither a leader nor a follower but free to pursue my own independent way,” were 3.29 and 3.71 respectively, indicating a response between agree and disagree equally and agree.
Table 5

Mean Ratings of Personality Statements (N = 231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altruistic-Nurturing (α = .82)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be trusting of them and loyal to them</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others do what they want to do</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly, open and who sees some good in almost everyone</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing others benefit from what I have been able to do for them.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting others to do what I want to do</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the best I can and trust in others to recognize my contribution</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nice one on whom others can generally count to lend a helping hand</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of support to a strong leader in whom I have faith</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The major decisions have been made by others and how I can help is clear</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing what I want to do without having to count on others</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assertive-Directing (α = .87)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be full of ambition and initiative</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An energetic person who is quick to see opportunities and advantages</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic, self-confident and one who sees opportunities others miss</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strong one who supplies the direction for others</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having others turn to me to lead and guide them and give them purpose</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The one who provides the leadership others want to follow</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take the lead in developing opportunities and influencing decisions</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others count on me to make the major decisions and them what to do</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting others to do what I want to do</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively curious about them to learn if there is something in it for me</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytic-Autonomizing (α = .79)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious and fair and who stands by what I believe to be right</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be resolute in my convictions and my principles</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve had time to study a major decision and determine my own best course of action</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be patient, practical and sure of what I am doing</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing what I want to do without having to count on others</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A practical person who is careful not to rush into things before I am ready</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thinking one who studies things carefully before acting</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being my own boss and doing things for myself and by myself</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither a leader nor a follower but free to pursue my own independent way</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politely cautious until I’ve learned what they might want from me</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale. 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree*
The overall purpose of the personality type scale was to assess the various employee personality types found in hotel organizational cultures. Employee personality type was determined based on the overall mean rating for each type (A-N, A-D, and A-A). Participants scored highest in the A-N personality type (M = 4.23) followed by A-D (M = 3.86) and A-A (M = 3.79). Further exploring the definitions of “hospitality” and “altruistic-nurturing” may explain why hotel employees scored highest in the A-N personality category. The Oxford English Dictionary defines hospitality as “the act or practice of being hospitable; the reception and entertainment of guests, visitors or strangers with liberality or goodwill.” Conversely, Scudder and Lacroix (2013) defined altruistic-nurturing as “unselfish concern for the welfare of others [through] protecting, supporting, and encouraging” (p. 23). Individuals employed in a hospitality organization are by definition willing to give to and serve others, therefore it is not surprising that they would tend to score highest in the A-N personality category because hotel employees are generally required to selflessly be hospitable when serving and entertaining hotel guests.

Mean Ratings of Person-Organization Fit

In the present study, a Cronbach’s alpha of .70 was used to determine internal consistency reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The PO fit scale was found to be reliable (α = .91) indicating internal reliability consistency. Previous researchers have also found the scale to be reliable; for example, Jung and Yoon (2013) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .93 when they used the scale among hotel employees in South Korea.

Table 6 shows the mean ratings of self-reported responses to PO statements based on the work of Edward (1991), Cable and Judge (1996) and Piasentin and Chapman (2006). Mean ratings for all six statements were between 4.02 and 4.41, indicating a response between moderately and completely. The lowest mean rating was for the statement “My hotel meets my
major needs well” ($M = 4.02$) and the highest mean rating was for the statement “I genuinely care for this hotel” ($M = 4.41$). Jung and Yoon (2013) did not report mean ratings for each item in their study, therefore a comparison of item mean ratings is not provided in the present study. Jung and Yoon did, however, report an overall mean rating of 4.59 as an assessment of overall PO fit. The overall mean rating in the present study was slightly lower ($M = 4.16$) but still tending towards completely, indicating that employees’ were a good fit for hotels.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person-organization fit statement ($\alpha = .91$)</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I genuinely care for this hotel</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really fit this hotel</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my personal values are a good fit with this hotel</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This hotel has the same values as I do with regard to concern for others</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My values match those of current employees in the hotel</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My hotel meets my major needs well</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Scale is 1 = Not At All to 5 = Completely*

**Mean Ratings of Turnover Intention**

In the present study, a Cronbach’s alpha of .70 was established to determine the internal consistency reliability of Roodt’s (2004) turnover intention scale (TIS-6). An alpha of .88 was found, suggesting an acceptable degree of internal consistency reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Others have also found the scale to be reliable. For example, Bothma and Roodt (2013) reported the TIS-6 to be reliable ($\alpha = .80$) when used in a sample of communication and technology employees throughout South Africa.

Table 7 provides the mean ratings of self-reported responses to turnover intention statements. Bothma and Roodt (2013) developed the TIS-6 based on Osgood’s (1964) semantic differential technique of using a series of bipolar 5-step response scales defined by two opposites
(e.g., never - always; to no extent - to a very large extent; highly unlikely - highly likely).

Responses to the statements “How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals?” and “How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?” gave the two highest mean ratings of 2.77 and 2.94 respectively, indicating a response between almost never and occasionally/sometimes.

The two lowest mean ratings were for two negatively phrased statements that were reverse coded. After reverse coding, the mean rating for the statement “How often do you look forward to another day at work?” was 2.15 (1 = always, 2 = almost always, 3 = occasionally/sometimes, 4 = almost never, 5 = never) and the mean rating for the statement “To what extent is your current job satisfying your personal needs?” was 2.27 (1 = to a very large extent, 2 = to a fairly large extent, 3 = to some extent, 4 = to a rare extent, 5 = to no extent). These findings suggest that participants looked forward to work and that their current job was satisfying. Bothma and Roodt’s (2013) study focused on the validation of the TIS-6; individual item and overall mean ratings were not reported. In the present study, a mean rating of 2.53 was found, indicating a neutral response for participants’ turnover intention.
Table 7

Mean Ratings of Turnover Intention Statements (N = 228-231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover intention statement (α = .88)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?</td>
<td>2.94&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals?</td>
<td>2.77&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you considered leaving your job?</td>
<td>2.55&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?</td>
<td>2.50&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is your current job satisfying your personal needs?</td>
<td>2.27&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you look forward to another day at work?</td>
<td>2.15&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Scale: 1 = Never to 5 = Always
<sup>b</sup>Scale: 1 = Highly unlikely to 5 = Highly likely
<sup>c</sup>Reverse coding used to compute item mean scale. Item mean scale 1 = To a very large extent to 5 = To no extent.
<sup>d</sup>Reverse coding used to compute item mean scale. Item mean scale 1 = Always to 5 = Never.

Research Questions and Hypotheses Explored

In the next section, results related to the five research questions are addressed. The specific research questions and tested null hypotheses for this study were:

1) What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type?

2) What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit?

H<sub>0</sub>1: There is no relationship between the three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There is no relationship between a composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit.
3) What is the relationship between hotel employee personality type and PO fit?

H₀₃: There is no relationship between any employee personality type (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing) and PO fit.

H₀₄: There is no relationship between a composite score of employee personality types and PO fit.

4) What is the relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention?

5) Are there differences in turnover intentions based on demographic characteristics (employee sex, employment status, and employee age)?

H₀₅: There is no significant difference between turnover intention for males as compared to females.

H₀₆: There is no significant difference between turnover intention for full-time as compared to part-time employees.

H₀₇: There is no significant difference between turnover intention of younger employees as compared to older employees.

**Hotel Organizational Culture and Employee Personality Type**

The first research question, “What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type?” was explored using Pearson’s correlation analysis. Pearson correlation analysis was done to assess the relationship between management principles, customer relationships, and job variety. A statistically significant positive but weak relationship between assertive-directing (A-D) personality type \( r (228) = .252, p < .001 \) and the management principles factor was found (Table 8). Also, a statistically significant positive but weak relationship between analytic-autonomizing (A-A) personality type \( r (228) = .132, p = .046 \) and management principles factor was found. Although \( p \) values were statistically
significant, the relationships were “positive but weak.” A positive but weak relationship exists when \( r \) is between 0.1 and 0.4 (George & Mallery, 2013).

Table 9 shows a statistically significant positive but weak relationship between the customer relationship factor and the A-D personality type \([r (228) = .316, p < .001]\). A statistically significant positive but weak relationship was also found between the customer relationships factor and A-A personality type \([r (228) = .153, p = .021]\). The A-N personality type was weak \([r (228) = .123, p = .064]\) when correlated to customer relationships.

Table 10 shows another statistically significant positive but weak relationship between the job variety factor and the A-D personality type \([r (231) = .250, p < .001]\). No relationship was found between the job variety factor and A-N personality type \([r (231) = .12, p < .852]\) or with the job variety factor and A-A personality type \([r (231) = .45, p < .493]\).

When all three factors of hotel organizational culture mean scores were combined, the relationship strength increased slightly. As demonstrated in Table 11, there was a statistically significant moderate relationship between hotel organizational culture and A-D personality type \([r (226) = .329, p < .001]\). George and Mallery (2013) indicated that a positive, moderate relationship exist when \( r \) is .30 to .39.

Lastly, the three personality types were combined into a single score and averaged to test the relationship between hotel organizational culture and personality type. Table 12 shows a statistically significant positive but weak relationship between personality type \([r (226) = .301, p < .001]\) and hotel organizational culture.
Table 8

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Scores for Management Principles by Employee Personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Principles</th>
<th>Altruistic-Nurturing</th>
<th>Assertive-Directing</th>
<th>Analytic-Autonomizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.252**</td>
<td>.132*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).**

*Correlation is significant at the .005 level (2-tailed).*

Table 9

**Correlation Analysis for Customer Relationships Mean Scores by Employee Personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Relationships</th>
<th>Altruistic-Nurturing</th>
<th>Assertive-Directing</th>
<th>Analytic-Autonomizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.316**</td>
<td>.153*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).**

*Correlation is significant at the .005 level (2-tailed).*

Table 10

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Scores for Job Variety by Employee Personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Variety</th>
<th>Altruistic-Nurturing</th>
<th>Assertive-Directing</th>
<th>Analytic-Autonomizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).**
Table 11

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Scores for Hotel Organizational Culture by Employee Personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel Organizational Culture</th>
<th>Altruistic-Nurturing</th>
<th>Assertive-Directing</th>
<th>Analytic-Autonomizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.329**</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).**

Table 12

**Correlation Analysis for Mean Scores for Hotel Organizational Culture by Personality Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel Organizational Culture</th>
<th>Personality Type</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.301**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).**

Research question one was to determine the relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type. The present study found statistically significant yet weak relationships between the A-D personality type and three hotel organizational culture factors: management principles, customer relationships, and job variety. Moreover, a statistically significant weak relationship was present between the A-A personality type and two hotel organizational culture factors: management principles and customer relationships. No relationship was found between the A-A personality type and the job variety factor of hotel organizational culture. Relationships were not found between the A-N personality type and any of the three factors of hotel organizational culture.
Correlation analysis of the management principles factor by employee personality type demonstrated similarities between Dawson et al.’s (2011) definition of the management principles organizational culture factor and Porter’s (1996) definition of A-D personality types; no such similarity was observed with the customer relationships and job variety organizational culture factors and the A-A and A-N personality types. Dawson et al. (2011) defined “management principles” as “the principles related to managing employees, employee focused, employee retention, entrepreneurial spirit, doing more than is required, and using mistakes as opportunities to learn” (p. 296). Individuals identified as A-D personality types were defined by Porter (1996) as “organizing others, entrepreneurial, quick-to act, and influencing others” (p. 68) Pearson’s correlation coefficient suggests that the A-D personality type had a weak relationship with the management principles factor of hotel organizational culture. Findings may provide further understanding of how individuals can or do align their personality type with specific hotel organizational culture factors.

Pearson’s correlation coefficient did not demonstrate a relationship between Dawson et al.’s (2011) definition of the customer relationships organizational culture factor and Porter’s (1996) definition of the A-N personality type. Dawson et al. defined “customer relationships” as individuals “developing relationships with customers, helping guests celebrate milestones, [concern for] repeat guests, and creating a home away from home for guests” (p. 296). Porter defined individuals with A-N personality types as exhibiting concern for the protection of others by creating a better work environment for all individuals including employees and customers.

In the present study, Porter’s (1996) definition of the A-D personality type aligned with Dawson et al.’s (2011) definition of the management principles organizational culture factor. Although weak, the alignment of each of these definitions demonstrates that individuals in
management roles may have characteristics of A-D personality types and will likely thrive in an environment where the basic principles of management could be exercised through an entrepreneurial spirit (e.g., directing others, retaining employees, persuading others).

A positive but weak relationship between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type were present. However, it must be noted that the cause of correlation is unknown. The cause of the correlation could be hotel organizational culture influences employee personality culture, personality type influences hotel organizational culture, or other factor influence both hotel organizational culture and personality types. Previous research has found that job seekers align their personality types with organizational culture attributes (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Judge & Bretz, 1992; O’Reilly, Chatman & Caldwell, 1991). The present study provides further exploration into the phenomenon of organizational culture and employee personality types. In sum, findings demonstrate a relationship between personality type (A-N, A-D, and A-A) and organizational culture factors (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety). For example, as discussed previously, the A-D personality type employee may align well with the management principles factor of hotel organizational culture.

**Hotel Organizational Culture and PO Fit**

The second research question was “What is the relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit?” Two linear multiple regression models were developed to test two null hypotheses:

- **H01**: There is no relationship between three factors of hotel organizational culture and PO fit.
- **H02**: There is no relationship between a composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit.
The first model regressed Dawson et al.’s (2011) three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit. The second regression model applied a composite hotel organizational culture mean score as a single predictor of PO fit. For both regression models, correlation matrices were part of the multiple regression output so preliminary issues with multicollinearity between independent predictor variables could be determined. According to Peck and Devore (2011), multicollinearity leads to instability of estimated coefficients if there is a strong linear relationship between values of the predictors. Multicollinearity is assessed based on the variance inflation factor (VIF) which provides an index number that measure how much the variance of an estimated regression coefficient was increased because of collinearity (Peck & Devore, 2011).

Visual inspection of the residuals were used to determine error as the observed dependent variable increased (heteroscedasticity), to find any outliers, and to identify any other sources of error. Preliminary results of the analyses indicated a possible violation of the normality assumption because the residuals appeared smaller when looking at the positive predicted values. Koenker’s test for normality was significant ($p < 0.05$) indicating a violation of the normality assumption. Therefore, transformation of the dependent variable (PO fit) was used and regression analysis was deployed. Subsequently, visual inspection of the residual plots and Koenker’s test was not significant ($p < 0.05$); indicating the normality assumption was met.

For the first multiple regression model, Table 13 was used to identify preliminary issues with multicollinearity and relationships between variables. Table 14 summarizes the various diagnostic results for the multiple regression model including the coefficient of determination ($R^2$). The coefficient of determination $R^2$ demonstrates that 58.7% of the variance in the level of PO fit can be explained by the three-predictor variables of hotel organizational culture.
Table 15 shows the regression model was significant. The model coefficients and significance level for each of the independent variables are displayed in Table 16. The table also shows the tolerance values were closer to 1 than to 0, so no multicollinearity is present (Peck & Devore, 2011). Significant independent predictor variables \( p < .05 \) were found for management principles \( t(225) = 7.301, p < .001 \) and customer relationships \( t(225) = 5.858, p < .001 \). Job variety was not a significant predictor variable \( t(225) = 1.284, p < .179 \). Table 17 summarizes the residuals from the predictor model. Visual inspection of the residuals (Figure 1), Q-Q plot of standardized residuals (Figure 2) and Koenker’s test for normality was not significant \( p < 0.05 \) indicating the residuals are normally distributed.

The null hypotheses, *There is no relationship between the three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit*, is thus rejected and the alternate hypothesis, *There is a relationship between the three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit*, is accepted, as management principles, and customer relationships could statistically significantly predict PO fit \( F(3, 221) = 104.767, p < .001 \). The multiple regression model is:

\[
(1 - \text{Lg}10(6-\text{PO Fit})) = .075 \text{ management principles} + .067 \text{ customer relationships} + .009 \text{ job variety} - .114
\]

The non-standardized regression coefficients (B) were used to express the relationship between each significant predictor variable and the dependent variable. The B value for the management principles factor of organizational culture was .075 indicating that, given a one percent increase in the management principle factor, the prediction of PO fit results in a 7.5% change. This indicates that the management principle factor had the greatest effect on PO fit. Likewise, a B = .067 for the customer relationships factor means that, given a one percent
increase in the customer relationships factor, the prediction of PO fit results in a 6.7% change. This indicates that the customer relationships factor also has an effect on PO fit.

Table 13

*Correlation Matrix for Hotel Organizational Culture Factors and Person-Organization Fit*

*Model (N = 225)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Person-Organization Fit</th>
<th>Management Principles</th>
<th>Customer Relationships</th>
<th>Job Variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Principles</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationships</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Variety</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed) Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Principles</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationships</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Variety</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

**Regression Model Summary - Hotel Organizational Culture Factors and Person-Organization Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
<th>R² Chg.</th>
<th>F Chg.</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.11219</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>104.767</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Predictors: (Constant), job variety, customer relationships, management principles
Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit

Table 15

**ANOVA Table for Regression Model - Hotel Organizational Culture Factors and Person-Organization Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.956</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>104.767</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.781</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.737</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Predictors: (Constant), job variety, customer relationships, management principles
Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit

Table 16

**Regression Coefficients - Hotel Organizational Culture Factors and Person-Organization Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Principles</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Relationships</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Variety</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dependent variable: Mean score for transformed person-organization fit
Table 17

*Residuals from Regression Model - Hotel Organizational Culture Factors and Person-Organization Fit Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>.2427</td>
<td>.9468</td>
<td>.7633</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-3.431</td>
<td>.3124</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-3.918</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-3.059</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Dependent Variable: Mean score for transformed person-organization fit

Scatterplot

*Dependent Variable: Transformed PO Fit =1-log10(6-meanscorepofit)*

*Figure 1.* Scatterplot of Predicted Value by Standardized Residual - Hotel Organizational Culture Factors and Transformed Person-Organization Fit Model
The second multiple regression model was built to include the overall mean scores of each of the three hotel organizational culture factors (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) as a composite mean score. Table 18 shows the correlation matrix for the composite hotel organizational culture mean score and person-organization model. The coefficient of determination \( R^2 \) demonstrates that 51.7% of the variance in the level of PO fit can be explained by the composite hotel organizational culture mean score (Table 19). Table 20 shows that the regression model was significant and tolerance values were closer to 1 than 0, indicating that no multicollinearity was present (Peck & Devore, 2011). From Table 21, the multiple regression model is:

\[
(1 - \log_{10}(6 \text{-PO Fit})) = 0.150 \text{ composite hotel organizational culture mean score} - 0.118
\]
The null hypothesis, *There is no relationship between a composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit*, is rejected and the alternate hypothesis, *There is relationship between a composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit*, is accepted because the composite hotel organizational culture mean score \( t (225) = 15.448, p < .001 \) statistically significantly predicts PO fit \( F (1,223) = 238.635, p < .001 \).

Unstandardized regression coefficients (B) were used to express the relationship between each significant predictor variable and the dependent variable. The B value for the composite hotel organizational culture mean score was .150, indicating that given a one percent increase in the composite hotel organizational culture mean score, the prediction of PO fit results in a 15% change. This indicates that the composite hotel organizational culture mean score has an effect on PO fit. Table 22 summarizes the residuals from the predictor model. Visual inspection of the residuals (Figure 3), Q-Q plot of standardized residuals (Figure 4) and Koenker’s test for normality was not significant \( p < 0.05 \) indicating the residuals are normally distributed.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Matrix for Composite Hotel Organizational Culture Mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model</th>
<th>Mean Organizational Culture(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Person-organization fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>Person-organization fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Person-organization fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel organization culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes three hotel organizational culture factors: management principles, customer relationships, and job variety.
Table 19

Regression Model Summary - Composite Hotel Organizational Culture Mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
<th>R² Chg.</th>
<th>F Chg.</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.12081</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>238.635</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Predictors: (constant), hotel organizational culture. Dependent Variable: Transformed person-organization fit

Table 20

ANOVA Table for Regression Model - Composite Hotel Organizational Culture Mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3.483</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.483</td>
<td>238.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.254</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.737</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Predictors: (constant), hotel organizational culture. Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit

Table 21

Regression Coefficients - Composite Hotel Organizational Culture Mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>1.000 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel organizational culture</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.719 15.448 .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit
Table 22

Residuals from Regression Model - Composite Hotel Organizational Culture Mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>.2191</td>
<td>.9562</td>
<td>.7633</td>
<td>.1247</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-.3440</td>
<td>.3397</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.1205</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-4.364</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.848</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit

Scatterplot

*Figure 3.* Scatterplot of Predicted Value by Standardized Residual - Composite Hotel Organizational Culture Mean Score and Transformed Person-Organization Fit Model
O’Reilly et al. (1991) suggested that employees who were not a fit with an organization because of organizational culture were likely to quit. Prior to analyzing the relationship between PO fit and turnover intention, the relationships between each of Dawson et al.’s (2011) three hospitality organizational culture factors and PO fit were analyzed. No known research has deployed Dawson et al.’s HCS to determine a relationship with PO fit in the context of hospitality lodging (i.e., hotels). This study found Dawson’s two factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles and customer relationships) have an effect on PO fit. Consistent with previous research on PO fit (Chatman, 1991; Dawson et al. 2005; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman & Johnson, 2005; O’Reilly et al., 1991; Tepeci & Barlett, 2002), this study found a relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit.
Employee Personality Type and PO Fit

The third research question, “What is the relationship between employee personality type and PO fit?” was explored using linear multiple regression to test two null hypotheses:

H₀₃: There is no relationship between any of the three employee personality types (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing) and PO fit.

H₀₄: There is no relationship between a composite score of employee personality types and PO fit.

The first model regressed Porter’s (1996) three employee personality types (A-N, A-D, and A-A) on PO fit. The second regression model applied a composite employee personality type mean score as a single predictor of PO fit. Correlation matrices were analyzed to determine preliminary issues with multicollinearity (Peck & Devore, 2011). A preliminary analysis of the data indicated a violation of the normality assumption. Koenker’s test for normality was significant (p < 0.05) and thus confirmed violation of the normality assumption. Therefore, transformation of the dependent variable (PO fit) was used and regression analysis was deployed. Subsequently, visual inspection of the residual plots and Koenker’s test was not significant (p < 0.05) indicating the normality assumption was met.

For the first regression model, Table 23 was used to identify preliminary issues with multicollinearity and relationships between variables. The coefficient of determination $R^2$ demonstrates that 14.6% of the variance in the level of PO fit could be explained by the three employee personality types (Table 24). Table 25 indicates that the regression model was significant [$F(3, 225) = 12.778, \ p < .001$]. The null hypothesis, There is no relationship between any of the three employee personality types (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing) and PO fit, is thus rejected and the alternate hypothesis, There is a
relationship between the three employee personality types (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing) and PO fit, is accepted because the A-D personality type \( t (229) = 5.497, p < .001 \) statistically significantly predicts PO fit.

The model coefficients and significance level for each of the employee personality types are displayed in Table 26. From Table 26, tolerance values are closer to 1 than to 0, indicating no multicollinearity is present (Peck & Devore, 2011). The multiple regression model is:

\[
(1 - \log_{10}(6 - \text{PO Fit})) = .093 \text{ assertive directing personality score} + .298
\]

Unstandardized regression coefficients (B) were used to express the relationship between each employee personality type and PO fit. The B value for A-D was .093, indicating that, given a one percent increase of the A-D personality type score, the prediction of PO fit results in a 9.3% change, thus demonstrating an effect on PO fit. Table 27 summarizes the residuals from the predictor model. Visual inspection of the residuals (Figure 5), Q-Q plot of standardized residuals (Figure 6) and Koenker’s test for normality was significant \( p < 0.05 \) indicating the residuals are normally distributed.
Table 23

Correlation Matrix for Employee Personality Type and Person-Organization Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation Fit</th>
<th>Altruistic-Nurturing</th>
<th>Assertive-Directing</th>
<th>Analytic-Autonomizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic-Nurturing</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive-Directing</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic-Autonomizing</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig. (1-tailed)</th>
<th>Person-Organization Fit</th>
<th>Altruistic-Nurturing</th>
<th>Assertive-Directing</th>
<th>Analytic-Autonomizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic-Nurturing</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive-Directing</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

Regression Model Summary - Employee Personality Type and Person-Organization Fit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
<th>R² Chg</th>
<th>F Chg</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.16118</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>12.778</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Predictors: (constant), analytic-autonomizing, altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing
Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit
### Table 25

**ANOVA Table for Regression Model - Employee Personality Type and Person-Organization Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>12.778</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5.845</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.841</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Predictors: (Constant), analytic-autonomizing, altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing

### Table 26

**Regression Coefficients - Employee Personality Type and Person-Organization Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic-Nurturing</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive-Directing</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic-Autonomizing</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit

### Table 27

**Residuals from Regression Model - Employee Personality Type and Person-Organization Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>.5589</td>
<td>.8846</td>
<td>.7655</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-.4077</td>
<td>.3560</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-3.127</td>
<td>1.802</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.529</td>
<td>2.209</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dependent Variable: Transformed person-organization fit
Figure 5. Scatterplot of Predicted Value by Standardized Residual - Employee Personality Type and Transformed Person-Organization Fit Model

Figure 6. Normal Q-Q Plot of Standardized Residual - Employee Personality Type and Transformed Person-Organization Fit Model
The second regression model was built to include a composite mean score for each of the employee personality types (A-N, A-D, and A-A) by combining and averaging the overall mean values. A regression model was produced and tested the composite personality type mean score with the dependent variable (PO fit). A summary of the regression results is provided in Table 28. When producing a composite personality type mean score, a slight decrease in the ability to predict PO fit occurred. The value of the $R^2$ coefficient of determination decreased from 14.6% to 10.6% (Table 28).

Table 29 demonstrates that the composite personality type mean score ($p < .001$) was a statistically significant predictor of PO fit. Table 30 shows a statistical significant relationship between the composite employee personality type mean score and PO fit. Therefore the null hypothesis, *There is no relationship between a composite score of employee personality type and PO fit*, is rejected and the alternate hypothesis, *There is a relationship between a composite score of employee personality type and PO fit*, is accepted because the composite personality type mean score [$t (225) = 5.189, p < .001$] statistically significantly predicts PO fit [$F (1, 227) = 26.930, p < .001$]. The regression prediction equation is: $(1 - \text{Lg10}(6-\text{PO Fit})) = .141 \text{ composite personality mean score} + .210$

Unstandardized regression coefficients (B) were used to express the relationship between the composite employee personality type mean score and PO fit. The B value for personality was .141, indicating that, given a one percent increase of the composite employee personality type mean score the prediction of PO fit results in a 14.1% change, thus demonstrating an effect on PO fit. Table 31 shows the correlation matrix for the mean composite personality type mean score and PO fit model. Table 32 summarizes the residuals from the predictor model. Visual inspection of the residuals (Figure 7), Q-Q plot of standardized residuals (Figure 8) and
Koenker’s test for normality was not significant \((p < 0.05)\) indicating the residuals are normally distributed.

Table 28

*Regression Model Summary* - *Composite Personality Type Mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>Std. Err. of Estimate</th>
<th>R² Chg.</th>
<th>F Chg.</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.16414</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>26.930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Predictors: (Constant), Mean score for personality type  
Dependent Variable: Mean score for transformed person-organization fit

Table 29

*ANOVA Table for Regression Model* - *Composite Personality Type mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>26.930</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6.116</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.841</td>
<td>228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* Predictors: (constant), Mean score for personality type  
Dependent variable: Mean score for transformed person-organization fit

Table 30

*Regression Coefficients* - *Composite Personality Type Mean Score and Person-Organization Fit Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Type</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dependent variable: Mean score for transformed person-organization fit
Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personality Typea</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Type</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personality Type</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aIncludes all three personality types: altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing

Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>.6172</td>
<td>.8884</td>
<td>.7666</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-.4202</td>
<td>.3589</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-2.630</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-2.560</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent variable: Transformed person-organization fit
Figure 7. Scatterplot of Predicted Value by Standardized Residual - Composite Personality Type Mean Score and Transformed Person-Organization Fit Model

Figure 8. Normal Q-Q Plot of Standardized Residual - Composite Personality Type Mean Score and Transformed Person-Organization Fit Model
Previous studies examined personal attributes (individual values and characteristics) of hospitality employees (Dawson et al., 2011; Ladkin, 1999; Mullins & Davies, 1991). However, these studies did not account for individual personality types of employees. In their meta-analyses of PO fit, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found a strong correlation between employee personality and PO fit ($r = .08$). To date, no known research has examined the relationship between employee personality type and PO fit in the hospitality industry, specifically the lodging sector. The present study found a relationship between hotel employee personality type and PO fit—specifically, the A-D personality type was found to be a good predictor of PO fit. The two remaining personality types (e.g., A-A, A-N), were not found to be statistically significant and were weaker in ability to predict PO fit. Lastly, the composite personality type mean score indicated a relationship between personality type and PO fit. Thus, rejecting the null hypotheses because a composite personality type mean score could predict PO fit.

**PO Fit and Employee Turnover Intention**

The fourth research question, “What is the relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention?” was first explored using linear regression. Preliminary regression analysis results showed that a violation of the normality assumption was present and Koenker’s test for normality was significant ($p < 0.05$). Therefore, transformation of the dependent variable (turnover intention) was used and regression analysis was again deployed. Consequently, transformation of the dependent variable produced issues with normality of the residuals and thus failed the heteroscedasticity test. However, interpretation and presentation of the data are provided in the present study to demonstrate the justification in using Pearson’s correlation
analysis. Pearson’s correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether a relationship existed between PO fit and employee turnover intention.

The coefficient of determination $R^2$ demonstrates that 54.1% of the variance in turnover intention could be explained by PO fit (Table 33). Table 34 shows that the regression model is significant [$F (1, 224) = 263.677, p < .001$]. Table 35 displays the regression coefficients used in producing a prediction equation and determining the standardized relationship from the predictor (PO fit) to the dependent variable (TO). Visual inspection of the residuals (Figure 9), P-P plot of standardized residuals (Figure 10) and Koenker’s test for normality was significant ($p < 0.05$) indicating the residuals were not normally distributed.

Table 33

<p>| Regression Model Summary - Employee Turnover Intention and Person-Organization Fit Model |
|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>$R^2$ Chg.</th>
<th>F Chg.</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Chg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.12550</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>305.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Predictors: (constant), person-organization fit. Dependent Variable: Transformed turnover intention

Table 34

<p>| ANOVA Table for Regression Model - Employee Turnover Intention and Person-Organization Fit Model |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------|---------|---------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4.153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.153</td>
<td>263.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.528</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.681</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Predictors: (constant), person-organization fit. Dependent variable: Transformed turnover intention
### Table 35

**Regression Coefficients - Employee Turnover Intention and Person-Organization Fit Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score for Person-Organization Fit</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Dependent variable: Mean score for transformed turnover intention*

---

**Scatterplot**

**Dependent Variable: Transformed TO Intent = log10(mean score to intent)**

*Figure 9. Scatterplot of Predicted Value by Standardized Residual - Mean Person-Organization Fit and Transformed Personality Type Model*
Figure 10. Normal P-P Plot of Regression by Standardized Residual - Mean Person-Organization Fit and Transformed Personality Type Model

Heteroscedasticity was present when regression was used to analyze the relationship between PO fit and turnover intention. Therefore, Pearson’s correlation analysis was deployed to examine whether a relationship was present between PO fit and employee turnover intention. George and Mallery (2013) indicated that a negative strong relationship exists when \( r \) is between -0.85 to -0.70. Table 36 shows a statistically significant negative strong relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention \( [r (226) = -.759, p < .001] \). The results mean, as PO fit increases, employee turnover intention decreases. Conversely, as PO fit deceases, employee turnover intention increases. The coefficient of determination \( (r^2) \) revealed PO fit statistically explained 57.6% of the variability in turnover intention. However, the nature of the relationship cannot be established. In other words, a possibility that other variables influenced the results
may exist. For example, perhaps employees in one division are paid higher salaries than employees from a different division and thus have lower turnover intentions. Thus, suggesting an external variable such as low pay may increase turnover intentions. Birdir’s (2002) study found that low pay increased hotel employees’ turnover intentions.

Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person-Organization Fit</th>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Person-Organization Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.759</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover Intention</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Person-Organization Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed).**

Alniaçık, Alniaçık, Erat, and Akçin (2013), Jung and Yoon (2013), Meyer, Hecht, Gill, and Toplonytsky (2010) found that the better the PO fit, the less intention employees had to quit. In other words, as employee PO fit increased, turnover intention decreased. The aforementioned studies were conducted in Turkey, South Korea, and Canada respectively. In the present study of U.S. upper-upscale hotels, the results of regression analysis show that as an employee’s level of PO fit increases, turnover intention decreases. However, the regression analysis should be interpreted with caution as the assumption of normality of the residuals was violated. The correlation analysis showed an inverse strong relationship between PO fit and turnover intention George and Mallery (2013). Although the cause of the relationship is unknown, the results demonstrate a relationship between PO fit and turnover intention.
Bretz and Judge (1994) contended for organizations to succeed, a good fit between employees and the organization must occur. Although company representatives may define the term “success” differently, generally an acceptable measurement of success is profitability. In their research on turnover costs in the lodging sector of the hospitality industry, Tracey and Hinkin (2006) reported that the cost of turnover ranged from $5,700 (low-complexity jobs) and $9,932 (high-complexity jobs) per employee. The present study provides further understanding of the relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention. Costs associated with employees quitting may be reduced if employees are a better fit for organizations. Hotel organizations could reduce the probability of an employee leaving by ensuring that job candidates are the right fit for their organization prior to hire and therefore, reduce the costs associated with employees’ quitting.

**Employee Demographics and Turnover Intention**

The final research question, “Are there differences in turnover intentions based on demographic characteristics (employee sex, employment status, and employee age)?” was explored using an independent samples t-test and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) deployed to test three hypotheses:

- **H₀₅:** There is no significant difference between turnover intention for males as compared to females.
- **H₀₆:** There is no significant difference between turnover intention for full-time as compared to part-time employees.
- **H₀₇:** There is no significant difference between turnover intention of younger employees as compared to older employees.
An independent samples t-test was used to determine if the turnover intention mean was significantly different for males as compared to females. Levene’s test for equality of variance resulted in an $F$-value of 0.749 ($p = 0.388$), which was insignificant ($p < .05$) and indicates that both groups have equal variances. Therefore, the assumption of equal variances required for the independent sample t-test was confirmed. The t-value when comparing male and female employees was 1.57 ($p = 0.118$), which indicates no significant difference between males and females in their levels of turnover intention. Subsequently, the null hypothesis ($H_0$) is not rejected because there is no significant difference between turnover intention for males as compared to females.

To determine if turnover intention was significantly different between full-time and part-time employees, an independent sample t-test was used. Levene’s test for equality of variance was not significant ($p < .05$) and the equal variances required for the independent sample t-test was confirmed [$F (224) = 0.683, p = 0.409$]. The null hypothesis ($H_0$) is not rejected because there is no significant difference between full-time and part-time employees in their levels of turnover intention [$t (224) = 0.292, p = 0.771$].

One-way ANOVA was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the overall mean level of turnover intention between four age groups. Mean score and standard deviation by age group for employees’ turnover intention were: 18-25 year olds ($M = 2.71, SD = 0.99$), 26-39 year olds ($M = 2.48, SD = 1.08$), 40-59 year olds ($M = 2.42, SD = 1.01$), and 60 or older ($M = 2.09, SD = 1.03$). Levene’s test for equality of variance was significant ($p < .05$) so a more robust F test were used [$F (226) = 3.614, p = .014$]. Brown and Forsythe’s (1974) test is useful when the variances across groups are not equal. Brown-Forsythe F-test results suggested no significant difference in the mean level of turnover intention between age groups [$F (3,172) = $]
1.762, \( p = 0.156 \). Therefore, the null hypotheses (H\(_{07}\)) is not rejected because there is no significant difference between age groups and levels of turnover intention.

Previous research (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Ghiselli, La Lopa & Bai, 2001; Josiam, Devine, Baum, Crutsinger & Reynolds, 2010; Lu & Gursoy, 2013; Maier, 2011; Pizam & Thornburg, 2000; Tidball, 1988) shows contradictory findings between three demographic variables (sex, employment status, age) and turnover intention. Josiam et al., (2010) found no relationship between sex and turnover intention. The present study also found no significant difference between turnover intention for males and females. Although the present study found no significant differences between age and turnover intention, recent research has found age to be an effective moderator in predicting turnover intention. Josiam et al. (2010) and Pizam and Thornburg (2000) found as employees get older, the likelihood they would remain at the organization. Conversely, Maier (2010) found as hotel employees’ became older, their intention to leave the organization increased. Lu and Gursoy (2013) found that younger employees have higher turnover intentions than older employees. Lastly, no statistically significant difference between hours worked and turnover intention was found in the present study. Ghiselli et al., (2001) also found no relationship between hours worked in the hospitality industry and turnover intention.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was threefold. First, the study examined the congruence between hotel organizational culture and each of the three employee personality types (A-N, A-D, and A-A). Second, the relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit as well as the relationship between the three employee personality types and PO fit were explored. Lastly,
this study analyzed relationships between PO fit and turnover intention as well as employee
demographic characteristics and turnover intention.

The findings of this study show that relationships exist between the A-D personality type
and Dawson et al.’s (2011) three hotel organizational culture factors (management principles,
customer relationships, and job variety). Moreover, a relationship was found between A-A
personality type, the management principles factor, and the customer relationships factor. Some
alignment between Porter’s (1996) definition of the A-D personality type and Dawson et al.’s
(2011) definition of “management principles” was observed. The present study also found
relationships between organizational culture and PO fit, similar to those found in previous
research (Chatman, 1991; Dawson et al., 2005; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; O’Reilly et al., 1991;
Tepeci & Barlett, 2002). One employee personality type (A-D) was found to be statistically
significant in predicting PO fit. Furthermore, the composite personality type mean score could
statistically significantly predict PO fit.

Previous hospitality research (Alniaçik et al., 2013; Jung & Yoon, 2013; Meyer et al.,
2010) explored the impact PO fit had on turnover intention outside the U.S. hospitality industry
(e.g., Turkey, South Korea and Canada). This study helped advance the literature by analyzing
the relationship between PO fit and turnover intention in the context of the U.S. hotel lodging
sector. Findings show an inverse relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intentions.
Lastly, no relationships were found between the three employee demographic characteristics
(sex, employment status, and age) and turnover intention.
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CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A more quantitative approach to collecting, analyzing, and explaining several relationships associated with person-organization (PO) fit, including hotel organizational culture, employee personality type, and turnover intention were explored in this study. Significant differences between hotel employee demographic characteristics and turnover intention were also presented. Data were collected from hourly and non-hourly hotel employees of upper-upscale hotels throughout southern California and relationships between the variables were determined. This chapter contains a summary of findings, implications of the study, limitations of the study, and recommendations for further research.

Summary of Findings

Descriptive Results

Fourteen upper-upscale hotels throughout southern California participated in the study. Of the 674 questionnaires distributed, 231 questionnaires were returned (34% response rate). Participants (47%) were between the ages of 26 and 39 and the majority were female (58.4%). The majority of participants (77.9%) worked full-time (40 hours or more per week) and 42.9% served in a supervisory role. Participants (38.1%) had been employed at their respective hotels for one to five years. The front office and restaurant were the two most represented divisions (28.3% and 15.7% respectively).

As recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994), a Cronbach’s alpha value greater than .70 was established to estimate the reliability of Dawson, Abbott, and Shoemaker’s (2011) hospitality culture scale (HCS), Porter’s (2005) strength deployment inventory (SDI), the PO fit scale of Cable and Judge (1996) and Piasentin and Chapman (2006), and Roodt’s (2004)
turnover intention scale (TIS-6). Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (.60) was used to determine internal consistency reliability in the context of hotel lodging. Cronbach alpha levels for each of the scales were: HCS, $\alpha = .94$; SDI (altruistic-nurturing, $\alpha = .82$), (assertive-directing, $\alpha = .87$), analytic-autonomizing, ($\alpha = .79$); PO fit, $\alpha = .91$; and TIS-6, $\alpha = .88$.

Descriptive data for the questionnaires provided several findings. First, based on self-reported responses to the HCS items, participants were generally a suitable match with hotel culture ($M = 5.75$, $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $7 = \text{strongly agree}$). Second, for employee personality type, participants scored highest in the altruistic-nurturing category ($M = 4.23$, $1 = \text{strongly disagree}$ to $5 = \text{strongly agree}$). Third, responses to the PO fit items suggested that a majority of the participants believed they were a good fit with the hotel organization ($M = 4.16$, six-item intensity scale; $1 = \text{not at all}$ to $6 = \text{completely}$). Fourth, self-reported responses to the TIS-6 items indicated a neutral opinion as to whether participants intended to quit their present job ($M = 2.53$, $1 = \text{highly unlikely}$ to $6 = \text{highly likely}$).

**Hotel Organizational Culture and Employee Personality Type**

Pearson’s correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether a relationship existed between hotel organizational culture and employee personality type of hotel employees. Twenty-two questions from Dawson et al.’s HCS assessed the three factors of culture (management principles, customer relations, and job variety) found in hotel organizations. Ten questions from Porter’s (2005) SDI assessed three employee personality types (altruistic-nurturing [A-N], assertive-directing [A-D], and analytic-autonomizing [A-A]).

George and Mallery (2013) indicated that a positive but weak relationship exists when Pearson’s correlation coefficient is between 0.1 and 0.4. Statistically significant positive but weak relationships were found between A-D personality type and three hotel organizational
culture factors: management principles \( r (228) = .252, p < .001 \), customer relationships \( r (228) = .316, p < .001 \), and job variety \( r (231) = .250, p < .001 \). Moreover, significant positive but weak relationships were found between A-A personality type and two hotel organizational culture factors (management principles \( r (228) = .132, p = .046 \) and customer relationships \( r (228) = .153, p = .021 \)). Lastly, when the mean scores for each of the three factors of hotel organizational culture and the three primary personality types were combined into two composite (hotel organizational culture and personality type) mean scores, a statistically significant but weak relationship was found between them \( r (226) = .301, p < .001 \).

**Hotel Organizational Culture and PO Fit**

Two linear multiple regression models were developed to determine the relationship between hotel organizational culture and PO fit. The first model regressed Dawson et al.’s (2011) three factors of hotel organizational culture on PO fit. The second model regressed a composite hotel organizational culture mean score as a single predictor of PO fit.

The first alternate hypothesis, *There is a relationship between the three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relationships, and job variety) and PO fit*, was accepted, because Dawson et al.’s (2011) three factors of hotel organizational culture (management principles, customer relations, and job variety) predicted PO fit \( F (3, 221) = 104.767, p < .001 \). The second alternate hypotheses, *There is a relationship between a composite score of hotel organizational culture and PO fit*, was also accepted, because the composite hotel organizational mean culture score \( t (225) = 15.448, p < .001 \) could statistically significantly predicted PO Fit \( F (1,224) = 238.635, p < .001 \).
Employee Personality Type and PO Fit

Two linear multiple regression models were developed to determine the relationship between employee personality type and PO fit. The first model regressed Porter’s (2005) three primary personality types (A-N, A-D, and A-A) on PO Fit. The second model regressed a composite of the three primary personality types mean score as a single factor to predict PO fit.

The first model found that 14.6% of variance in PO fit can be explained by the three personality types. The A-D personality type $[t (229) = 5.497, p < .001]$ statistically significantly predicted PO fit. Therefore the first alternate hypothesis, *There is a relationship between an employee personality type (altruistic-nurturing, assertive-directing, and analytic-autonomizing) and PO fit,* was accepted. The second model combined Porter’s (2005) three primary personality types as a single factor to predict PO fit. A slight decrease in predictive ability was found with the second model. The overall model found that 10.6% of the variance in PO fit can be explained by the composite three personality types mean score. The second alternative hypothesis, *There is a relationship between a composite score of employee personality type and PO fit,* was accepted, because the composite personality type score $[t (225) = 5.189, p < .001]$ statistically significantly predicted PO fit $[F (1, 227) = 26.930, p < .001]$.

The first model was found to be better at determining which of the three personality types predicted PO fit the best. The first model predicts PO fit from three different proportions of personality type (A-N, A-D, and A-A). The second model predicts PO fit from a linear combination of each personality type (A-N, A-D, and A-A) but the predictor is forced to be equal parts of each personality type. In other words, because the second model combines each personality type into a single predictor, some of the information carried in each of the variables was lost, thus decreasing its ability to predict PO fit.
**PO Fit and Employee Turnover Intention**

A linear regression model was first developed to determine the relationship between PO fit and employee turnover intention. Heteroscedasticity was present with the dependent variable (turnover intention) and thus, a transformation of the dependent variable was deployed. Consequently, transformation of the dependent variable still presented issues with normality of the residuals and thus failed the heteroscedasticity test. Data and interpretation of the regression analysis were provided to support justification in using Pearson’s correlation analysis.

Pearson’s correlation analysis was then deployed to further understand the relationship between PO fit and turnover intention. A statistically significant negative relationship was found between PO fit and employee turnover intention \[ r (226) = -0.759, p < .001 \]. Although the cause of the relationship is unknown, the results demonstrate a strong relationship between PO fit and turnover intention. Thus, building upon previous research (Alniaçik et al., 2013; Jung & Yoon, 2013; Meyer et al., 2010) in the hospitality PO fit and employee turnover intention arena.

**Employee Demographics and Turnover Intention**

Finally, independent samples t-test and ANOVA was conducted to examine differences between three relationships: (a) turnover intention for males as compared to females, (b) turnover intention for full-time as compared to part-time employees and (c) turnover intention of younger employees as compared to older employees. No significant difference between males and females in their levels of turnover intention were present \[ t (224) = 1.57, p = 0.118 \]. A significant difference between turnover intention for full-time as compared to part-time employees was not found \[ t (224) = 0.292, p = 0.771 \]. Lastly, ANOVA results suggested no significant difference in the mean level of turnover intention between age groups \[ F (3,172) = 1.762, p = 0.156 \].
Previous research found relationships between sex, age, employment status and turnover intention (Bretz & Judge, 1994; Ghiselli, La Lopa & Bai, 2001; Josiam, Devine, Baum, Crutsinger & Reynolds, 2010; Lu & Gursoy, 2013; Maier, 2011; Pizam & Thornburg, 2000; Tidball, 1988). In the present study, no statistically significant differences were found between sex, age, employment status and turnover intention. The present study contributed to the ongoing debate in the hospitality literature on whether relationships exist between demographic characteristics and employee turnover intention.

**Implications of the Study**

**Practical Implications**

The study’s findings have several practical implications. First, the study may provide insight for hospitality human resource practitioners wishing to understand the implications of turnover intention and its impact on hotel organizations and employees. In addition to Tracey and Hinkin’s (2006) turnover cost estimates, Davidson, Timo, and Wang (2010) examined turnover costs at four- and five-star hotels in Australia and found that hotels spent approximately $7 million a year on managerial employees and approximately $42 million a year on line-level employees. Although their study did not examine actual costs of turnover, it did demonstrate that employee personality type and employee perception of hotel organizational culture may predict their fit with an organization and therefore influence employee turnover intention.

Practitioners may find Porter’s (2005) SDI helpful for three reasons. First, practitioners may use the SDI to measure personality types of applicants during the recruitment phase. Deploying the SDI during the applicant recruitment phase may help human resource practitioners better identify individuals that are willing to serve guests. For example, the present study found that participants employed in hotels scored highest in the A-N personality type, suggesting they
were more likely to give to and serve others selflessly. Second, practitioners may find the SDI helpful when assessing current hotel employees. Similar to Brink’s (1991) study of personality types and corporate cultures, practitioners may find that individuals with a particular personality type are attracted to certain divisions in hotels. For example, practitioners may find that A-D personality type individuals are well-suited for executive managerial roles and A-A personality type individuals are suited for accounting divisions. Third, understanding the personality types of employees across all hotel divisions may improve communication and reduce conflict in the workplace. Previous research has found that conflict in the workplace may negatively impact an employee’s job and personal life (Zhao, Qu, & Ghiselli, 2010). Therefore, if deployed among current employees, the SDI may lead to improved internal relations between employees, thus decreasing the likelihood of interpersonal conflict.

The potential benefits for practitioners to invest in the SDI or similar personality instrument may prove invaluable to hotel organizations. Hotel organizations interested in using such instruments will want to evaluate the costs and benefits of using these tools. For example, the cost for each SDI instrument is about $50.00 (USD) excluding trainer fees (Personal Strengths Publishing, 2015).

**Research Implications**

Findings of this study contribute to the body of knowledge on hotel organizational culture, PO fit and employee turnover intention in three ways. First, although over 4,600 articles related to organizational culture have been published since 1980 (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011), several have confirmed that the hospitality industry has a unique and distinct culture (Dawson et al., 2011; Kemp & Dwyer, 2001; Koutroumanis, 2005; Tepeci & Barlett, 2002; Woods, 1989). With the exception of Kemp and Dwyer’s (2001) study of the Regent Hotel in Sydney, Australia,
no other known study has examined hospitality culture in the context of the lodging sector. Moreover, previous research examined hospitality culture in the context of restaurants (Koutroumanis, 2005; Tepeci & Barlett, 2002; Woods, 1989) or general hospitality sectors such as banquets, casinos, food and beverage, and recreation (Dawson et al., 2011). This study may be one of only a few attempts to empirically assess the interrelationship among hotel organizational culture, PO fit and employee turnover intention. Thus, it might be useful to identify hotel organizational culture factors which may lead to higher person-organization fit, lower turnover intention, and increased profitability.

Second, this study is the first known investigation of hotel employee personality types using Porter’s (2005) SDI. Findings from this study show that the SDI’s three primary personality types are reliable and valid when applied to hotel employees. Although better-known personality type instruments exist, such as the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, the SDI may assist researchers in better understanding interpersonal relationships and their impact on hotel organizational culture, PO fit, and turnover intention. Furthermore, researchers may be interested in identifying different hotel classifications (i.e., budget, mid-service, luxury) and studying the relationship between employee personality types and turnover intention of employees from other hotel classifications.

Lastly, researchers that wish to use questionnaires in research on U.S. hotels may find the methods of this study to be valuable. This study was able to achieve a 13.5% higher response rate by developing relationships with and personally delivering questionnaires to hotel representatives. Aligning with previous research findings from Brown and Arendt (2011), this study confirmed that making personal contact with those distributing the questionnaires significantly improved response rates.
Limitations of the Study

This study is not without limitations. This section discusses the following three limitations: (1) there was no representation of unionized hotel properties, (2) there was no equity in hotel division representation, and (3) the questionnaire was offered in English only.

First, no unionized hotel property was represented in the sample. The 14 hotels that agreed to participate were not subject to a collective bargaining agreement. Based on the primary researcher’s experience and personal relationships with several hotel representatives in southern California, union properties are relatively common in major metropolitan (e.g., Los Angeles and San Diego). However, collecting data from unionized properties can be difficult due to strict collective bargaining agreements, which may limit cooperation from hotel management.

Second, the goal was to obtain data from hourly and non-hourly hotel employees from various hotel divisions, but the divisions were not evenly represented in the data set. The primary researcher had no control in how questionnaires were distributed to hotel employees by the GM and/or HR representatives. This may explain why there was a disproportional distribution of participants from hotel divisions. For example, 28.3% of participants were employed in the front office division. However, 7.4% were employed in the housekeeping division. A more equitable distribution of hotel employees from multiple divisions may assist in generalizing the results across upper-upscale hotels.

Lastly, the questionnaire was written and offered in one language; English. A Flesch-Kincaid grade level test was conducted in Microsoft Word and indicated a sixth grade reading level. Participants with literacy issues and/or read a different language may have opted not to complete the questionnaire. According to the U.S. 2010 census, in Los Angeles, Orange, and
San Diego counties, 66.5% of the population speaks Spanish other than English in the home. This finding may indicate that participants’ employed in hotels that read below the sixth grade level and/or in a language other than English may not have completed the questionnaire.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

There are opportunities to expand upon the findings and to further explore hotel organizational culture, employee personality type, PO fit and turnover intention. From a methodological stance, longitudinal research that explores hotel organizational culture and PO fit may help researchers further understand the extent to which hotel culture and PO fit may change for organizations and individuals over the course of time. There has been a lack of research on the longitudinal aspects of culture change over time (Jacobs et al., 2013). Previous research has demonstrated that the level of fit employees’ experience may change over time (e.g., from pre-entry to post-entry; Cable & Judge, 1996). Future researchers can evaluate employees’ pre-entry/post-entry PO fit levels as there is potential that employees may adapt to organizational cultures and therefore PO Fit improves.

For the present study, the first 10 questions of Porter’s (2005) SDI were deployed to understand the three primary personality types when “things are going well.” Further research could deploy the entire version of Porter’s (2005) SDI to understand the 13 personality types when “in conflict with others.” By understanding employee personality types when in conflict, researchers may better understand employee turnover intention. Moreover, although the SDI was found to be valid and reliable in previous studies (Barney, 1998; Farris, 2001; Porter, 1996; Scudder, 2013), if the full version of the SDI were to be used in the context of hotel organizations, the SDI would need to be validated.
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## APPENDIX B. QUESTIONNAIRE

**Section 1: Organization**

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete the following questions as truthfully as possible on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree equally</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My supervisor(s) are employee focused.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisors at my hotel support employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisors at my hotel empower employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisors at my hotel reward employees.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employees at my hotel practice the motto: &quot;Treat others as I wish to be treated.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A focus on employee retention is emphasized at my hotel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The company’s culture is constantly reinforced at my hotel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My supervisor treats mistakes as opportunities to learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employees within my hotel enjoy handling unusual challenges.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The supervisors at my hotel have an entrepreneurial (&quot;go-getting&quot;) spirit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Cultural diversity is a reality at my hotel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Employees do more than is required of them at my hotel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There are many opportunities to geographically relocate with my hotel company.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supervisors at my hotel believe training is important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Employees at my hotel are in the business of creating memories for its customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Employees at my hotel provide “a home away from home” for its customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Employees at my hotel develop relationships with its customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Employees at my hotel believe that: &quot;To be of service is the most noblest profession.&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Employees at my hotel are in the business of helping customers celebrate the milestones in their lives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A high percentage of our business is repeat customers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I have a job that can be challenging at times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I have a job where every day is different.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2: Job

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please read each question and indicate your response using the scale provided for each question. Use a pen or pencil to make your selection.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I really fit in at this hotel.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My values match those of current employees in the hotel.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How often are you frustrated when not given the opportunity at work to achieve your personal work-related goals?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My hotel meets my major needs well.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How often do you look forward to another day at work?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel that my personal values are a good fit with this hotel.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>This hotel has the same values as I do with regard to concern for others.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>How often do you dream about getting another job that will better suit your personal needs?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>How often have you considered leaving your job?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I genuinely care for this hotel</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>To what extent is your current job satisfying your personal needs?</td>
<td>To no extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>How likely are you to accept another job at the same compensation level should it be offered to you?</td>
<td>Highly Unlikely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue
### Section 3: Values

**INSTRUCTIONS:** When you answer the questions on this page, think about situations at work, school, home, and with friends. Always think of situations where things are going well for you and you feel **good** about yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I generally enjoy things when I am...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping others do what they want to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting others to do what I want to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing what I want to do without having to count on others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Most of the time I am likely to be...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling person who is quick to respond to other people’s needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An energetic person who is quick to see opportunities and advantages.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A practical person who is careful not to rush into things before I am ready.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. When I meet people for the first time I am most likely to be...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with whether or not they find me to be a likeable person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively curious about them to learn if there is something in it for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politely cautious until I’ve learned what they might want from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Most of the time I find myself being...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nice one on whom others can generally count to lend a helping hand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The strong one who supplies the direction for others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thinking one who studies things carefully before acting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel most satisfied when...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The major decisions have been made by others and how I can help is clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others count on me to make the major decisions and tell them what to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve had time to study a major decision and determine my own best course of action.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3: Values (Continued)

INSTRUCTIONS: When you answer the questions on this page, think about situations at work, school, home, and with friends. Always think of situations where things are going well for you and you feel good about yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. People who know me best see me as a person who can be counted on...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be trusting of them and loyal to them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be full of ambition and initiative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be resolute in my convictions and my principles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. It is most like me to...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the best I can and trust in others to recognize my contribution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take the lead in developing opportunities and influencing decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be patient, practical and sure of what I am doing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. I would describe myself as a person who most of the time is...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly, open and who sees some good in almost everyone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic, self-confident and one who sees opportunities others miss.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautious and fair and who stands by what I believe to be right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. I find those relationships most gratifying in which I can be...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of support to a strong leader in whom I have faith.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The one who provides the leadership others want to follow.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither a leader nor a follower but free to pursue my own independent way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. When I am at my best, I most enjoy...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree and Disagree Equally</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeing others benefit from what I have been able to do for them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having others turn to me to lead and guide them and give them purpose.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being my own boss and doing things for myself and by myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Demographics

1. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male

2. What is your age?
   - 18 to 25 years
   - 26 to 39 years
   - 40 to 59 years
   - 60+ years

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   - High School
   - Associate
   - College
   - Graduate (Master, Ph.D., J.D., MD)
   - Others (Please Specify)

4. What is your employment status?
   - Full-time (40 hours or more per week)
   - Part-time (less than 40 hours per week)

5. What is your current position at this hotel property?
   - Hourly Employee (I do not supervise other employees)
   - Hourly Employee (I do supervise other employees)
   - Non-Hourly Salaried Employee (I do supervise other employees)
   - Other (Please Specify)

6. How long have you worked at this hotel property?
   - less than 3 months
   - 3-11 months
   - 1-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11-15 years
   - 16-20 years
   - 21 or more years

Please continue
Section 4: Demographic (Continued)

7. How long have you worked in the hotel industry?
   - less than 3 months
   - 3-11 months
   - 1-5 years
   - 6-10 years
   - 11-15 years
   - 15-20 years
   - 21 or more years

8. In which primary division do you work at this hotel property? (Please Select One)
   - Accounting
   - Administration
   - Bar/Lounge
   - Banquets/Catering
   - Distribution
   - Engineering/Maintenance
   - Front Office
   - Housekeeping
   - Human Resources
   - Marketing
   - Recreation
   - Reservations
   - Restaurant
   - Retail Outlets
   - Revenue Management
   - Sales
   - Security
   - Spa
   - Uniformed Services
   - Others (Please Specify)

9. What is your job title at this hotel property? (Please write)

We thank you for your time in taking part in this research project. Please return your questionnaire by folding it in half. Seal the envelope and place in a mailbox. No stamp is needed.
Re: Inquiry to the Hospitality Culture Scale

Dawson, Mary <mdawson@central.uh.edu>  
To: Ryan Giffen <rgiffen@iastate.edu>  

Tue, Jun 17, 2014 at 12:22 PM

The survey looks good. Good luck collecting your data.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 17, 2014, at 3:11 AM, "Ryan Giffen" <rgiffen@iastate.edu> wrote:

Good morning Dr. Dawson,

First, thank you again for sending the HCS and allowing me to review/study the instrument. If permitted, I would like to incorporate the first three factors of organizational culture questions into my personality questionnaire. Attached, you will find the 1st draft of the questionnaire (note: the personality questionnaire is not included in the attachment). Hope you’re having a great productive summer!

<HCS Draft1.pdf>

Best,

Ryan Giffen  
Ph.D. Candidate  
Iowa State University—Hospitality Management

---

On May 22, 2014, at 9:50 AM, Dawson, Mary <mdawson@central.uh.edu> wrote:

Ryan,

I have attached the survey. I look forward to reading your study in the future.

Mary Dawson EdD  
Associate Professor  
Conrad N. Hilton College
APPENDIX D. PERMISSION FOR USE AND REPRODUCTION OF TIS-6

RE: Access and Permission to the TIS-6

| From: Gert Roodt <groodt@uj.ac.za> | To: Ryan Giffen <rgiffen@iastate.edu> | Date: Wed, Jun 25, 2014 at 11:18 PM |

Dear Ryan,

Please find a copy of the longer 15-item version of the scale attached. The six items of the shorter TIS-6 are highlighted. You may use any of these two versions.

You will note that an 'R' follows some of the item numbers. This is to mark those items where the scores need to be reflected or reversed scored.

Please acknowledge the authors via conventional referencing techniques. This is the only condition for its use.

Good luck with your research!

Prof Gert Roodt
APPENDIX E. PERMISSION FOR USE AND REPRODUCTION OF SDI

March 7, 2014

Iowa State University
Apparel, Events, and Hospitality Management
MacKay Hall
Ames, IA  50011-1121

To Whom It May Concern:

Personal Strengths Publishing, Inc. (PSP) is the owner of the Strength Deployment Inventory (SDI) ©1973, 2005.

PSP authorizes Ryan Giffen to reproduce the SDI with the appropriate acknowledgements: copyright (year and owner), owner website address and the statement, “use with permission of PSP. No further reproduction is permitted”. This authorization does not include the right to grant others permission to photocopy or otherwise reproduce the SDI without the written consent of PSP.

The SDI may be used solely for the purposes of Mr. Giffen’s dissertation and publication of findings.

Sincerely,

Tim Seudder, PhD
Partner
APPENDIX F. DESCRIPTION OF PERSONALITY TYPES
(MOTIVATIONAL VALUE SYSTEM - GOING WELL)

The SDI describes seven personality types based on Porter’s motivational typology:
Altruistic-Nurturing (A-N); Assertive-Directing (A-D); Analytic-Autonomizing (A-A);
Assertive-Nurturing (AS-N); Judicious-Competing (J-C); Cautious-Supporting (C-S); and
Flexible-Cohering (F-C). The following definitions are used with permission from Personal
Strengths Publishing (Appendix M).

**Altruistic-Nurturing (A-N).** Individuals with an A-N motivational value system (MVS)
(hereafter referred to as Blues) demonstrate internal motives that are consistent with the
protection, growth, and welfare of others. Such individuals may be more willing to bend a rule or
let go of a desired outcome in exchange for better morale or the benefit of an individual
employee; trusting that creating a better work environment will ultimately lead to better results.

**Assertive-Directing (A-D).** Individuals with an A-D MVS (hereafter referred to as Reds)
demonstrate internal motives that are authoritative with a concern for accomplishment, time,
money, and management of people to obtain desired goals. Such individuals may try to find the
quickest route to a desirable result and want to be the first to market new products or ideas. They
tend to be persuasive and able to organize people and resources to get things accomplished. They
may be willing to cut research time or over-burden individuals in pursuit of results.

**Analytic-Autonomizing (A-A).** Individuals with an A-A MVS (hereafter referred to as
Greens) demonstrate internal motives centered on meaningful thought and orderly conduct, and
desire self-reliance and self-dependency. They may prioritize standards, accuracy, and
thoroughness in their decision-making. They may be willing to defer an opportunity or restrict
access to needed resources until they are certain of the appropriate action.
*Assertive-Nurturing (AS-N).* Individuals with an AS-N MVS (hereafter referred to as Red-Blues) demonstrate internal motives that are centered on developing others to ensure their success. They tend to be enthusiastic and like to build support for key ideas or initiatives. They may be willing to discount facts that do not support their objectives or overlook details that appear insignificant at the time.

*Judicious-Competing (J-C).* Individuals with a J-C MVS (hereafter referred to as Red-Greens) demonstrate internal motives that lend towards logical plans and principles as the quickest means to a desirable end. They may be intently focused during key times and prefer to remain behind the scenes otherwise. They may be willing to accept reduced morale or people problems as a matter of course if the objectives are valuable enough.

*Cautious-Supporting (C-S).* Individuals with a C-S MVS (hereafter referred to as Blue-Greens) demonstrate internal motives that focus on building the capacities and capabilities of their staff. They want people to be able to do things on their own without too much reliance on the leader. They may be willing to suffer initial setbacks or forgo desirable results during times of transition in order to achieve a self-sufficient workforce who can learn from their own mistakes.

*Flexible-Cohering (F-C).* Individuals with an F-C MVS (hereafter referred to as Hubs) demonstrate internal motives that focus on incorporating input from multiple sources to produce a result acceptable to all parties. They tend to select strategies that allow future flexibility and preserve or generate future options. In an effort to balance their decision-making, their decisions may appear inconsistent to observers.
APPENDIX G. DESCRIPTION OF PERSONALITY TYPES
(CONFLICT SEQUENCE - IN CONFLICT)

The SDI describes 13 personality types observed when individuals experience conflict. When individuals face a condition that may negatively impact self-gratification, they may experience conflict. Therefore, conflict sequence (CS) describes individuals who want to keep peace and harmony within a group. A person responds to conflict in three stages: (1) blue, harmony-seeking; (2) red, outcome-seeking; (3) green, logic-seeking. In the blue stage, individuals respond to conflict by focusing on the totality of the situation...In the red stage, individuals respond by focusing on themselves and the problem...In the green stage, individuals respond to conflict by focusing on themselves. The 13 personality types, are identified by the color in which participants’ SDI results are scored. The following definitions are used with permission from Personal Strengths Publishing (Appendix M).

*Blue-Red-Green (B-R-G).* First, the individual will attempt to maintain peace and harmony; however, if this does not work the individual will stand up for their rights and demand a platform to be heard. Lastly, if the first and second attempts fail, the individual resorts to stage three and tend to abandon or insulate themselves from others and the problem.

*Blue Red-Green (BR-G).* First, the individual will press others assertively to maintain harmony and peace. In stage two, individuals will intensely focus on the problem; however, if this fails, the individual will completely withdrawal from the situation.

*Red-Blue-Green (R-B-G).* First, the individual will assertively face conflict head on and challenge the opposition; however, if this does not work, the individual will initiate efforts to restore the relationship. Lastly, if stages one and two fail, the individual will completely withdrawal from the relationship.
**Red-Blue Green (R-BG).** First, the individual will assert their rights and fight for them. Secondly, the individual will either give in or surrender conditionally. If stage three is achieved, they individual will withdrawal and break off the relationship.

**Red-Green-Blue (R-G-B).** First, the individual will rise to the challenge with the intent to win; however, if the individual does not win, he or she will retreat to analysis, logic, reason and rules. In stage three, the person will give in to the situation.

**Red Green-Blue (RG-B).** First, the individual meets conflict head on but with a set of strategies to deal with the situation. If the individual’s strategies fail, he or she will give in and surrender to the situation.

**Green-Red-Blue (G-R-B).** First, the individual deploys logic, reason, and analysis to resolve the conflict. In stage two, the individual becomes more assertive and forceful based on logic and strategies. Lastly, if the aforementioned strategies fail, the individual will give in and surrender to the situation.

**Green-Blue Red (G-BR).** First, the individual will resist conflict on the basis of logic, reason, analysis, and rules. If the conflict continues, the individual will either fight, if the cause is important to him, or give in, if the cause is unimportant.

**Green-Blue-Red (G-B-R).** First, the individual examines the situation critically and logically by gathering facts and information prior to making any commitments. Second, if no important principle is involved, the individual will defer to others for the sake of achieving harmony. Lastly, if the conflict continues, the individual will fight to win.

**Blue Green-Red (BG-R).** First, the individual will strive to achieve peace and harmony for the group while still using analytical and factual data in the process. If these efforts fail, the individual will fight for their rights, possibly authoritatively.
**Blue-Green-Red (B-G-R).** First, the individual tries to keep harmony and peace. In stage two, they will disengage and deploy analytical skills to logically pursue the relationship. Lastly, in stage three the individual will fight for their rights, possibly in an explosive manner.

**Blue-Red Green (B-RG).** First, the individual pursues peace and harmony by accommodating others. If pressed hard enough, the individual will go into stages two and three by logically and assertively deploying strategies to preserve integrity and avoid complete defeat.

**Blue Red Green (BRG).** The individual meets conflict flexibly, with no set sequence of behaviors. Rather, the individual will deploy the three stages however is necessary at that particular moment. Individuals of the BRG type may be confusing to others who may perceive them as unpredictable.
APPENDIX H. PILOT TEST EVALUATION FORM

1. **How long did it take you to complete the questionnaire?**

   ___________ minutes

2. **Were the questions easy to understand?**

   ________ Yes  ________ No*

   * If no, please indicate below (or directly on the questionnaire) which question was not easy to understand and needs to be clarified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Was the scale (asking you to distribute points for each question) clear and understandable**

   ________Yes  ________ No*

   *If no, please suggest below what could be done to make it more clean and understandable

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

4. **Do you have any other suggestions to improve the questionnaire?**

   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

We thank you for your time in taking part in this pilot study. Please return your questionnaire by folding it in half. Seal the envelope and place in a mailbox. No stamp is needed.
APPENDIX I. PILOT TEST COVER LETTER

Introduction:
We are interested in examining how hotel culture and employee personality types may explain the reason why employees’ leave their jobs. Because you work in the hotel industry, your opinions are valuable in helping us examine the types of culture and employee personality types present throughout the work place.

Purpose of pilot test:
The purpose of the pilot test is to gage participants’ feedback in how easy it was to understand the words throughout the survey and the total time needed to complete it. Furthermore, the pilot test will allow us to test the reliability of the questionnaire.

Procedures of pilot test:

1) Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time.
2) Your individual responses will not be shared with your manager and/or supervisor and is completely confidential.
3) After the survey is complete, please complete the pilot test form attached to the questionnaire. This form will ask you how understandable and clear the words or scales were used throughout the survey.
4) Mail the entire questionnaire booklet according to the directions found on the form.

If you have any questions, please contact one of us at the e-mails or phone numbers listed below. Thank you in advance for your support with this research.

Best regards,

Ryan Giffen
PhD. Candidate (Primary Researcher)
Department of AESHM
31 MacKay Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1121
rgiffen@iastate.edu
(714) 987-2468

Susan W. Arendt
Associate and Major Professor
Department of AESHM
31 MacKay Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1121
sarendt@iastate.edu
(515) 294-7575
APPENDIX J. COVER LETTER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION

Dear Hotel General Manager,

This document is prepared to provide you with guidelines on how to recruit employees as participants for this study. Furthermore, guidelines on distributing the questionnaire to employees are provided. This is to ensure that the employees selected represent the overall population of the hotel.

**Employee Selection criteria**

(1) The employee must be over the age of 18 years old at the time the questionnaire is distributed.

(2) The employee must have worked at the hotel property for a minimum of 90-days.

**Questionnaire distribution guidelines**

(1) After you receive the questionnaire packet, your help is needed to distribute the packets to various department heads throughout the hotel (e.g., the housekeeping department, the front office department, the food and beverage department, and the accounting department).

(2) The department head or a designated department manager is requested to distribute the envelopes containing the questionnaire to the employees of their respective departments. It is requested that the envelopes are distributed within 3 days of the week questionnaires were received.

(3) All employees should receive only one envelope containing the questionnaire, cover letter, and self-addressed envelope.

(4) Employees may complete the questionnaire at a time that is convenient for them. **Please encourage employees to complete and return the questionnaire before October 23, 2014.**

If you have any questions, please contact us at the e-mails or phone numbers listed below. Thank you in advance for your support with this research.

Best regards,

Ryan Giffen
PhD. Candidate
Iowa State University
rgiffen@iastate.edu
714-351-4371

Susan W. Arendt
Associate and Major Professor
Iowa State University
sarendt@iastate.edu
515-294-7575
Dear hotel employee,

We are interested in examining how hotel culture and employee personality types may explain the reason why employees’ leave their jobs. Because you work in the hotel industry, your opinions are valuable in helping us examine the types of culture and employee personality types present throughout the workplace. The data from this study will provide researchers an opportunity to understand why hotel employees’ may leave their jobs and develop strategies to prevent employees from leaving.

We would greatly appreciate your valuable input. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may refuse to participate. You may also skip questions you do not wish to answer. There are no foreseeable risks at this time or any costs for you to participate in this study and you will not be compensated for participating in this study. The questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your individual responses will not be shared with your manager and/or supervisor and are completely anonymous. Return of a completed questionnaire indicates your willingness to participate in this study.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: (1) questionnaire responses remain completely anonymous and no identifiers are used, (2) completed questionnaires should be sealed and mailed directly back to us (see instructions at the end of the questionnaire), (3) the data will be stored in an electronic database, secured with an encrypted password on the primary researcher’s personal computer while printed data will be kept in a locked file cabinet and locked office, (4) only the primary researcher and the major professor will have access to the electronic and printed research records, and (5) printed research records will be destroyed after one year; however, the electronic database records will be destroyed after 3 years.

If you have any questions regarding this questionnaire or research, you are encouraged to contact either of the researchers at the contact information provided below. If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, Office for Responsible Research, (515) 294-3115, 1138 Pearson Hall, Ames, IA 50011. Thank you in advance for your support with this project!

Best regards,

Ryan Giffen
PhD. Candidate (Primary Researcher)
Department of AESHM
31 MacKay Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1121
rgiffen@iastate.edu
(714) 987-2468

Susan W. Arendt
Associate and Major Professor
Department of AESHM
31 MacKay Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1121
sarendt@iastate.edu
(515) 294-7575
### APPENDIX L. QUESTIONNAIRE FOLLOW-UP CARD

Dear Hotel Manager,

About one week ago, you received envelopes containing questionnaires regarding employee personality types and hotel culture.

If you have already distributed the envelopes to your department heads or managers, please accept our sincere thanks. If you have not had time to distribute the envelopes, we would appreciate you taking the time to do so. We are especially grateful for your help with this important study.

If you did not receive the packet of questionnaires, or if it was misplaced, please contact us and we will send one in the mail today.

Ryan Giffen
PhD Candidate
Iowa State University
rgiffen@iastate.edu
714-351-4371

Susan W. Arendt
Associate and Major Professor
Iowa State University
sarendt@iastate.edu
515-294-7575
APPENDIX M. PERMISSION FOR USE OF COPYRIGHTED TEXT

March 7, 2014

Iowa State University
Apparel, Events, and Hospitality Management
MacKay Hall
Ames, IA 50011-1121

To Whom It May Concern:

Personal Strengths Publishing, Inc. (PSP) is the owner of certain copyrights and trademarks related to the Strength Deployment Inventory (SDI).

PSP authorizes Ryan Giffen to reproduce limited copyrighted text from the SDI and the SDI triangle, which is a registered trademark of the corporation. This intellectual property may be used for purposes of the dissertation and publication of findings. No further reproduction is permitted.

Sincerely,

Tim Scudder, PhD
Partner