HOTEL JOB CHARACTERISTICS IN CHINA AND THE UNITED STATES,
AN APPLICATION OF THE JOB CHARACTERISTICS MODEL TO
TURNOVER INTENTION

A Thesis
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
TIAN TIAN LI
Dr. Seonghee Cho, Thesis Supervisor

JULY 2021

© Copyright by Tiantian Li 2021

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined
the thesis entitled

HOTEL JOB CHARACTERISTICS IN CHINA AND THE UNITED STATES,
AN APPLICATION OF THE JOB CHARACTERISTICS MODEL
TO TURNOVER INTENTION

presented by Tiantian Li,

a candidate for the degree of Master of Science,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Seonghee Cho

Professor Dae-Young Kim

Professor Matthew Easter

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Seonghee Cho for her guidance, support and encouragement throughout my master program. She is knowledgeable and enthusiastic. I am very lucky to have her as my mentor to start my academic journey.

I sincerely thank Dr.Easter and Dr.Kim, my committee members, for their insights and directions along the way. Dr.Easter introduced me to the statistic science. He is always willing to help me to develop the research plan and the data analysis. My committee members' insight and feedback helped greatly in revising my study.

Also, I am very grateful to all of my fellow graduate students. They are committed to their study which motivated me to pursue my degree. The emotional support from them has helped in a great way.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 OVERVIEW	1
1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	2
1.3 PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY	6
1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS	7
1.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS.....	8
1.6 SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY	12
1.7 DEFINITION OF TERMS	14
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	16
2.1 JOB CHARACTERISTICS MODEL.....	16
2.1.1 <i>Job Characteristics Model</i>	16
2.1.2 <i>Five Core Dimensions of Job Characteristics</i>	18
<i>Skill Variety</i>	18
<i>Task Identity</i>	19
<i>Task Significance</i>	20
<i>Autonomy</i>	21
<i>Feedback</i>	22
2.1.3 <i>Critical Psychological States</i>	23
<i>Relationship between the Five Core Job Characteristics and the Critical Psychological States</i>	23
<i>Relationship between the Critical Psychological States and the Outcome Variables</i>	24
<i>Existing Research regarding the Critical Psychological States</i>	24
2.2 APPLICATION OF THE JOB CHARACTERISTICS MODEL	32
2.2.1 <i>Application of Job Characteristics Model in General</i>	32
<i>Job Characteristics and Employee Outcomes</i>	32
2.2.2 <i>Application of Job Characteristics Model in the Hospitality Industry</i>	34
2.3 HOTEL INDUSTRY.....	36

2.3.1 <i>The Development of Hotel Industry in general</i>	36
2.3.2 <i>The Development of Hotel Industry in the UNITED STATES</i>	38
2.3.3 <i>The Development of Hotel Industry in China</i>	38
2.3.4 EMPLOYEE TURNOVER IN THE HOTEL INDUSTRY	40
<i>Influences of High Employee Turnover</i>	41
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	16
3.1 INTRODUCTION	44
3.2 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	44
3.3 JOB DIAGNOSTIC SURVEY	45
3.4 RESEARCH DESIGN.....	46
3.5 INSTRUMENTATION	46
3.5.1 <i>Measurement</i>	46
3.5.2 <i>Institutional Review Board</i>	48
3.5.3 <i>Data Collection</i>	48
3.4.5 <i>Data Analysis</i>	52
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	53
4.1 INTRODUCTION	53
4.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE.....	53
4.3 RELIABILITY OF MEASUREMENT ITEMS	62
4.4 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	62
4.4.1 <i>The Five Core Job Characteristic, Critical Psychological States and Turnover Intention in China and the UNITED STATES</i>	64
4.5 PATH ANALYSIS	65
4.5.1 <i>Hypothesis Testing</i>	65
4.5.2 <i>Path Analysis between China and the United States</i>	68
4.6 MEDIATION EFFECT OF THE CRITICAL PSYCHOLOGICAL STATES	70

4.7 MODERATING EFFECT OF COUNTRY	75
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	79
5.1 INTRODUCTION	79
5.2 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	80
5.2.1 <i>Demographic profile</i>	80
5.2.2 <i>Research Model</i>	81
5.3 LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH	84
CHAPTER 6.REFERENCE	85
CHAPTER 7. APPENDIX	90
5.1 SURVEY.....	90

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Reliability test of measurement items.....	48
Table 3.2 Required sample size (g*power)	49
Table 4.2 Demographic profile of the participants.....	53
Table 4.3.2 Reliability of measurement items	61
Table 4.4.1 The codes for each variable.....	62
Table 4.4.2 Descriptive statistics for items in each variable.....	62
Table 4.4.3 Simple t-test of the five core job characteristics between china and the United States.	64
Table 4.5.1 The correlation matrix.....	65
Table 4.6.1 Mediation effect of the experienced meaningfulness of work	70
Table 4.6.2 Mediation effect of the experienced outcome of responsibility.....	72
Table 4.6.3 Mediation effect of the knowledge of results.....	73
Table 4.7.1 Moderating effect of the country in the relationship between the five core job characteristics and the turnover intention.....	74
Table 4.7.2 Moderating effect of the county in the relationship between the critical psychological states and the turnover intention.....	72
Table 4.7.3 Moderating effect of the country in the relationship among the five core job characteristics, the critical psychological states, and the turnover intention.....	76
Table 4.7.4 Moderating effect of the country in the relationship between the five core job characteristics and the experienced outcome of work	77
Table 5.1 Hypotheses test results.....	78

List of Figures

Figure 1. Research model	7
Figure 2. Hackman and Oldham's (1975) job characteristics model	17
Figure 3.4.1. Research model	45
Figure 4.2.1 Participants gender	55
Figure 4.2.2 Participants age	56
Figure 4.2.3 Participants' education level	57
Figure 4.2.4 Participants' income level.....	58
Figure 4.2.5 Participants' occupation.....	59
Figure 4.2.6 Participants' employment status.....	60
Figure 4.5.1 Path diagram.....	66
Figure 4.5.2 Path diagram in China	68
Figure 4.5.3 Path diagram in United States.....	68

HOTEL JOB CHARACTERISTICS IN CHINA AND THE UNITED
STATES, AN APPLICATION OF
THE JOB CHARACTERISTICS MODEL TO TURNOVER
INTENTION

Tiantian Li

Dr. Seonghee Cho, Thesis Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This study investigated hotel employees' job characteristics, their critical psychological states, and their relationship with the hotel employees' turnover intention using the complete Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model. In addition, it further compared the cultural differences between China and the United States. The survey was distributed to hotel employees in China and the United States. Descriptive analysis and path analysis were used to interpret the data. The finding of this research provided the in-depth knowledge of hotel employees' job characteristics. Including all three critical psychological states enhanced our understanding of the interrelationship between the five core job characteristics and the turnover intention. The significant mediating role of the critical psychological states between the relationship of five core job characteristics and the hotel employees' turnover intention was confirmed in this research. It also provided insight into the cultural difference between China and the United States.

Keywords: Job Characteristics Model, Critical Psychological State, Turnover Intention, Hotel Employee

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

With the hotel industry's rapid worldwide growth and its high labor turnover rate of 73.8% (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019), attracting new employees and retaining existing ones have become more critical for companies than ever. Many factors contribute to the hotel industry's high turnover rate, including uncompetitive salaries, irregular work schedules, long working hours, working during holidays, poor working conditions, multiple shifts, and lack of career development opportunities. Meanwhile, the nature of the job itself plays a vital role in influencing the employee tenure decision-making process (Brien, Thomas, & Brown, 2017). However, few studies have explored hotel job characteristics, and none have investigated a relationship between those characteristics and the job turnover intentions of hotel employees. To address this research gap, the current study investigated how perceived hotel job characteristics affect turnover intentions through the job characteristics model. In addition, the present study used samples from the United States and China to provide additional insight regarding cultural differences. With the hotel industry booming worldwide, it is necessary to take cultural differences into account. Data was collected from the two countries to explore impacts of cultural differences on perceived hotel job characteristics and hotel employees' turnover intentions.

This study utilized a quantitative research approach with the Job Diagnostic Survey (J. R. Hackman & Oldham, 1975). The job diagnostic survey was designed to examine perceived job characteristics. This research investigated core hotel job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback),

employees' critical psychological states, and employees' turnover intentions. The questionnaires were distributed to hotel employees in China and the United States. The findings from this study provide insight into the perceptions that hotel employees have toward their jobs.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The hotel industry is one of the fastest-growing industries worldwide. According to the Workforce Vitality Report (2020), the leisure and hotel industry has consistently grown in employment and wages. However, the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic has negatively affected this industry. For instance, the total contribution of the travel and tourism GDP decreased from \$9.17 trillion to \$4.67 trillion in 2019 during the pandemic (Economic Impact Reports, 2021). Between 2014 and 2019, 1 in 4 net new jobs were created by travel & tourism; however, in 2020, only 1 in 11 jobs were created by travel & tourism.

The same report stated that full-time job holders in the hotel industry experienced a wage growth of 4.7% in 2017. Additionally, full-time employees who switched jobs within the hotel industry saw a 6.3% increase in wages—higher than the wage growth for people who changed jobs in any other industry (Workforce Vitality Report by Automatic Data Processing, Q4 2017). When it comes to hotels specifically, the global hotel industry's market size increased from \$466.57 billion in 2014 to \$570.18 billion in 2017, increasing 22% over those four years (Statista, 2019). The rapidly growing hotel industry calls for highly educated employees.

The U.S. travel and tourism industry generated over \$2.6 trillion in economic output in 2019—an increase of 73% from 2016, supporting 15.8 million U.S. jobs. The power of travel to create jobs is much greater than that of many other industries. Every \$1 million spent on travel goods and services directly generates eight jobs for the industry (U.S. Travel and Tourism Overview, 2019). Despite the travel and hospitality industry's importance to the U.S. economy, the industry's turnover rate remains in the top three in the U.S. The hotel industry's turnover rate topped 70% for the fourth consecutive year (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). The competition for attracting and retaining employees is becoming more critical.

In China, finding talent in the hospitality industry is even more challenging. China's hospitality industry experiences an imbalanced supply-and-demand relationship with hospitality management programs at colleges (Li & Li, 2013). There are 2,614 hospitality management college programs in China, with about 440,400 students enrolled (CNTA, 2017). However, the majority of these students choose not to work in the hospitality industry upon graduation. Yao (2007) found that 1.4 million Chinese hotel management program graduates decided not to work in the hotel industry; meanwhile, this industry has 3.2 million job vacancies. Compared to graduates from other majors, graduates of hotel management programs are thought to be more committed to developing a career in the hotel industry because of the narrowly specialized field. However, researchers found that many hotel graduates either never entered the industry or left the industry with no intention to return (Blomme et al., 2009; King, McKercher, & Waryszak, 2003; Stalcup & Pearson, 2001; Walsh & Taylor, 2007). Jiang and Tribe (2009) found that college students majoring in hotel management programs were less

committed to a career in the hotel industry. For instance, in 2013, only four students (5%) among 83 hotel management program graduates from the Zhejiang Gongshang University chose to pursue a career in the hotel industry. These graduates were attracted to the hotel industry when they chose a major for secondary education; however, the hotel industry failed to attract hotel management graduates to enter the industry and could not retain them in the industry.

This alarming phenomenon prompted the author to conduct current research. The high turnover issue in the hotel industry is critical. Many factors contribute to the hotel industry's high turnover; hotel job characteristics are one of them. Researchers have attempted to find attributes of high turnover in the hotel industry. For instance, hotel employees usually feel they lack job security and lack job variety. Additionally, they consider the job as part-time and as being part of the "smile industry." (Zhao, Ghiselli, Law, & Ma, 2016) Previous research has also probed how hotel employees experience a sense of seasonality and only range inside a young age profile (Allan, Brosnon, Horwitz, & Walsh, 2001; Brien, 2004; Lai & Baum, 2005; Nachmias & Walmsley, 2015; Williams, Harris, & Parker, 2008; Zhao & Ghiselli, 2016). The work condition is also perceived as relatively poor with long and unsocial working hours (Horner & Swarbrooke, 2004; Lashley, 2000). Hotel jobs are often perceived as having fewer career advancement opportunities, low quality, and no prospects (Brown, Thomas, & Bosselman, 2015). Moreover, the hotel industry jobs have been recognized as unskilled, unsuited to teamwork, undertrained (Horner & Swarbrooke, 2004). Meanwhile, some people think the hotel job displays a lack of team spirit, communication, and adequate supervision (Lashley, 2000; Wan, Wong, & Kong, 2014). In terms of social status, hotel

employees feel underappreciated, suppressed, and unpleasant within the work environment (Horner & Swarbrooke, 2004; Zhang & Wu, 2004) and the pay is relatively low with a slow increase (Bull, 1992; Horner and Swarbrooke, 2004; Lashley, 2000). In conclusion, hotel jobs are considered not so attractive to the public's eye.

The job characteristics explain the nature of the job. Through the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) by Hackman and Oldham (1976), researchers found that the job characteristics affect employees' overall satisfaction, motivation, and organizational commitment (Casey, 2018). (Iqbal, Ahmad, & Akhtar, 2017) studied the relationship between job characteristics and employees' intention to quit in a private commercial bank in Pakistan. The result indicated that job characteristics such as task variety, job variety, and job significance significantly affected employees' intention to leave. In detail, job variety had the most significant influence. The job characteristics also significantly impacted workers' intrinsic motivation, work performance, work satisfaction, absenteeism, and turnover intentions (Johari et al., 2009; Said and Munap, 2010). The job itself plays a vital role in the employees' decision to leave. Hotel employees perform repeatable tasks by job nature (Jung & Yoon, 2016).

Meanwhile, the hotel managers are dealing with a reduced perception of the significance of their job due to many entry employees joining the industry unwillingly (Ferreira, Martinez, Lamelas, & Rodrigues, 2017). Chang et al.'s (2013) research showed that task significance and task identity are linked to turnover intentions. The United States and China are the two biggest countries that represent western culture and oriental culture. This study conducted in these two countries gave us insight into the cultural difference in hotel job design.

None of these studies mentioned the relationship between the job characteristics and its relationship with turnover intentions in the hospitality industry. Therefore, this research investigated the impacts of hotel job characteristics on hotel employees' turnover intention.

1.3 Purpose of this study

This study aims to investigate hotel employees' perceptions of hotel jobs and their turnover intentions. Moreover, the cross-cultural research between China and the United States provided incremental knowledge about the cultural difference in hotel employees' perceptions of their jobs. Are perceptions among hotel employees in China and the United States the same, indicating an industrial deficit? Hackman and Oldham's JCM was used to investigate the research questions. JCM proposed a relationship between the job characteristics (five core characteristics: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) and the job outcomes through the critical psychological states (the meaningfulness of work, professional responsibility, and knowledge of results). This study is unique in terms of scale and depth; it provided valuable insights into theoretical and practical perspectives regarding the perceptions of hotel employees towards working in the industry. Hackman and Oldham's JCM has been tested multiple times in different fields (i.e., IT workers, blue-collar workers, music teachers). It is a well-accepted model to test the job characteristics. The research model of this study is diagramed in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Research Model

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions were investigated.

(1) How do hotel employees perceive their core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback)? Which of these characteristics have more substantial impacts on the intention to leave?

(2) How do hotel employees perceive their critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results)? What are the relationships between the five core job characteristics and the critical psychological states? Which psychological state has a strong influence over the intention to leave the hotel industry?

(3) Will the Chinese workers in the hotel industry perceive hotel job characteristics differently than Americans?

(4) Will job characteristics influence critical psychological states differently between Chinese and Americans?

(5) Is there any difference in the predicting power of job characteristics or critical psychological states over the turnover intention of hotel employees between China and the United States?

The thesis has consisted of five sections. The first section discusses the importance of the research questions and the significance of the current study. The second section includes a literature review on job characteristics model and applications of the model in the hotel industry. A detailed overview of the data collection, types of analysis, and measurements are discussed in section three. Section four shows the findings from the study. Finally, section five, the discussion section, discusses implications and conclusions for future research and practice.

1.5 Research Hypothesis

Based on our research questions for this study, we propose as below:

Hypothesis 1. Five Core Job Characteristics have a positive relationship with the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1_a: Skill variety has a positive relationship with the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1_b: Task identity has a positive influence on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1c. Task significance has a positive effect on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1d. Autonomy has a positive impact on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1e. Feedback has a positive influence on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 2. Five Core Job Characteristics have a positive relationship with outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2a. Skill variety has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2b. Task identity has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2c. Task significance has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2d. Autonomy has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2e. Feedback has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 3. Five Core Job Characteristics have a positive relationship with the knowledge of results.

Hypothesis 3a. Skill variety has a positive influence on knowledge of results.

Hypothesis 3_b. Task identity has a positive influence on knowledge of results.

Hypothesis 3_c. Task significance has a positive influence on knowledge of results.

Hypothesis 3_d. Autonomy has a positive influence on knowledge of results.

Hypothesis 3_e. Feedback has a positive influence on knowledge of results.

Hypothesis 4. The five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) are negatively related to hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4_a: Skill variety has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4_b: Task identity has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4_c: Task significance has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4_d: Autonomy has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 4_e: Feedback has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 5. The three critical psychological states (meaningfulness of work, outcome responsibility, and knowledge of results) are negatively related to hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 5_a: Meaningfulness of work has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 5_b: Outcome responsibility has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 5_c: Knowledge of results has a negative influence on the hotel employees' turnover intention.

Hypothesis 6. The content of the five core job characteristics is different between China and the United States.

Hypothesis 6_a: Skill variety is significantly different between China and the United States.

Hypothesis 6_b: Task identity is significantly different between China and the United States.

Hypothesis 6_c: Task significance is significantly different between China and the United States.

Hypothesis 6_d: Autonomy is significantly different between China and the United States.

Hypothesis 6_e: Feedback is significantly different between China and the United States.

Hypothesis 7. Hotel employee's core job characteristics or critical psychological states have a different influence of power over the intention to leave the hotel industry between China and the United States.

Hypothesis 7_a: The relationship between the hotel employees' core job characteristics and the critical psychological states is significantly moderated by country.

Hypothesis 7_b: The relationship between the hotel employees' core job characteristics and the hotel employees' turnover intention is significantly moderated by country.

Hypothesis 7_c: The relationship between the hotel employees' critical psychological states and the hotel employees' turnover intention is significantly moderated by country.

1.6 Significance of this study

This study examined Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model (JCM). JCM includes five core job characteristics, three critical psychological states, and employees' personal and work outcomes. The current research contributes to the existing knowledge pool of the JCM by testing a complete JCM using the hotel employees. Moreover, JCM was investigated cultural differences in China and the United States.

Several research studies have been conducted within the hotel industry using the JCM (Darren Lee-Ross, 2005; Reichel & Pizam, 1984). However, those studies examine only a partial model. For instance, in 2005, cross-cultural research of employees' work

attitude and work motivation in Australia and Mauritius was conducted using Hackman and Oldham's JCM. Ozturk, Hancer & Im (2014) studied job characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment for hotel workers in Turkey. The critical psychological states are the mediator between the five core job characteristics and the outcome variables. Few studies have examined the hypothesized mediating role of the critical psychological states in the model. Among more than 200 studies generated with JCM, only eight studies included the critical psychological states, and only three of those eight studies examined the critical psychological states as mediators (Arnold & House, 1980; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Wall, Clegg & Jackson, 1978). The mediating role of the critical psychological states is a significant part of the JCM. This study investigated the mediating effect of critical psychological states between the five core job characteristics and the hotel employees' turnover intention.

In general, this research expanded our knowledge of the Hackman and Oldman's Job Characteristics Model in a different industry setting, the hotel industry. Meanwhile, testing the relationships between job characteristics and turnover intentions, the psychological states with turnover intentions, helped us understand the antecedents of the hotel industry's high turnover rate and made contributions to the Job Characteristics Model. Moreover, conducting cross-cultural research in China and the US provided us an insight into the cultural differences of hotel jobs. The research findings guided the industry and higher education administrators in developing the hotel job to attract and retain more talented employees.

1.7 Definition of Terms

Job Characteristics Model proposes the interactive relationships between core job characteristics, critical psychological states, and personal/work outcomes.

Core Job Characteristics refer to the physical properties of skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback that contribute to work effectiveness and satisfaction of employees.

Critical psychological states refer to the experienced meaningfulness of work, experienced responsibility for work outcomes, and the knowledge of work results.

Personal Work/Outcomes refers to the personal, affective reactions or feelings a person obtains from performing a job.

Skill Variety is the degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work, which involves the use of several different skills and talents of the employee.

Task Identity is the degree to which the job requires the completion of a "whole" and identifiable piece of work (i.e., doing a job from beginning to end with visible outcomes).

Task Significance is the degree to which a job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people, whether in the immediate organization or the external environment.

Autonomy is the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling his or her work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying out the work.

Feedback refers to the degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job results in the employee obtaining information about the effectiveness of his or her performance.

Meaningfulness of work refers to the degree to which the employee experiences the job as one which is generally meaningful, valuable, and worthwhile.

Experienced Responsibility refers to the degree to which the employee feels accountable and responsible for the results of the work he or she does.

Knowledge of Results refers to the degree to which the employee knows and understands, continuously, how effectively he or she is performing his or her job.

Average Daily Rate (ADR) measures the average price paid per hotel room on a given day.

Occupancy Rate is the most critical and most straightforward measure of hotel performance. It can be calculated as the percentage of available rooms occupied over a specific period of time.

Revenue Per Available Room (RevPAR) accounts for the average daily room revenue generated per available room.

Turnover Rate refers to the percentage of employees leaving a hotel within a certain period of time.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

The literature review section consists of three sections. The first section presents a brief introduction of Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model (JCM) and discusses how job characteristics are measured through the job diagnostic survey (JDS). The second section reviews the previous applications of the JCM, especially in the hotel industry. The third section presents a discussion of the overall development of the hotel industry.

2.1 Job Characteristics Model

2.1.1 Job Characteristics Model

The concept of job characteristics was derived from the work of Turner and Lawrence (1965), who examined job objectives and employees' responses to their jobs. They created the Requisite Task Attributes (RTA) Index based on six job characteristics (skill variety, autonomy, the level of requirements and interaction for task accomplishment, the chance of social interaction, the required knowledge and skills for the job, and the level of job responsibility). The authors found that the more positive the characteristics were, the better an employee's work performance was. Their research was supported by Blood and Hulin (1968). Subsequently, Hackman and Lawler (1971) further confirmed that employees' work outcomes were positively correlated with core job characteristics.

Based on previous research on job design and motivation, Hackman and Oldham (1975) developed the JCM and the JDS to measure the characteristics of jobs. The authors' JCM represents a motivation theory, which recognizes internal work motivation,

psychological states, and job satisfaction as personal outcomes and job performance, turnover intention, and absenteeism as work outcomes (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). The model was designed to develop job features that create positive motivational incentives for employees (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

Figure 2. Hackman and Oldham's (1975) Job Characteristics Model

The JCM provided recommendations for enhancing job experiences in organizations and was designed in 1976 before being updated in 1980 (Hackman & Oldham, 1976, 1980). It has been widely used to study job characteristics and their relationships with employees' motivation and personal and work outcomes. Some researchers have tested the JCM partially in the hospitality industry. Most of the research has focused on the five dimensions of the core job characteristics and outcomes, while, at the same time, critical psychological states were rarely mentioned. The current study investigated the five core job characteristics in the hotel industry, job characteristics associated with hotel employees' critical psychological states, and turnover intentions

through a mediating effect analysis. This study examined the influence of hotel employees' critical psychological states to address the aforementioned research gap. In addition, a comparison study was conducted between China and the United States to explore the cultural differences in the given context.

2.1.2 Five Core Dimensions of Job Characteristics

In this section, the five core job characteristics are explained.

Skill Variety

Skill variety refers to “the degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities to carry out the work, which involves using several different skills and talents of the employee” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, pp.77–80). It challenges an employee's ability to provide more meaningful work. People crave various experiences that allow them to use different skills and engage in different levels of activity (Pinder, 1984). Skill variety is critical for employees to serve in a highly demanding society and economy (Fried et al., 2008; Howard, 1995; Morgeson & Campion, 2003). The higher demand for “soft skills” at work has received more attention along with increased cognitive complexity. The nature of the service job requires interpersonal interactions with customers and colleagues. However, the increases in the number of service jobs are expected to lead to increased interactions. Modern employees must rely on their cognitive and interpersonal skills to complete the assignments given to them. Further, employees are required to competently collaborate the workforce within flat organizational structures. Thus, the modern workplace requires employees to acquire and use more diverse skills to perform heavier workloads as compared to past years (Davis, 1995;

Fried, Hollenbeck, Slowik, Tiegs, & Ben-David, 1999; Fried et al., 2008; Grant & Parker, 2009).

Task Identity

Task identity is defined as “the degree to which the job requires completion of a ‘whole’ and identifiable piece of work—that is, doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, pp.77–80). Workers tend to find more value in their jobs when they can identify a complete and visible outcome that is achieved at the end of a work cycle. Task identity is one of the five core job characteristics in the JCM. Further, employee behavior is influenced by their attitude. An employee’s perception of their job identity is significant because it affects the employee’s behavior. As a service-based industry, interacting with guests is the primary job requirement in the hotel industry, especially for frontline employees. Customer expectations have also changed, and, thus, the hotel employees’ perceptions regarding task identity have also changed. Moreover, the demographics of the workforce have shifted as well. In 2010, for the first time, there were more women than men in the workforce of the United States (50.2%) (United States Census Bureau, 2012). In addition, the importance of women’s role in an organization is increasing. For instance, in 2009, women held over 50% of all management positions (51.4%) (United States Census Bureau, 1975, 2011) in the United States. In contrast, this figure was 16% in 1972. Glick, Wilk, and Perreault (1995) explored occupational gender type using a multidimensional approach and reported that gender type and prestige were two of the primary dimensions of professional images. This finding supports the study conducted by Gottfredson (1981), who stated that gender type and prestige are the most salient dimensions when people organize their perceptions

regarding their jobs. Job prestige is determined by the public's perception of job classifications. A hotel employee's job identity might contribute to change, as the demographic of hotel employees has changed. The research on task identity needs to be updated based on the changes in the associated demographics, technology, roles, and gender types.

With advanced technology, employees can multitask more efficiently (National Academy of Sciences, 1999; Van der Spiegel, 1995). In the hotel industry, most job profiles include a significant amount of customer interaction, and it is essential to learn what has changed in terms of the task identity of hotel employees. Additionally, the hotel industry grew significantly in the 20th century and acquired an essential role in the modern economy. This has led to dramatic changes in the task identity of hotel employees. Thus, it is important to investigate hotel employees' job identity in modern times.

Task Significance

Task significance is “the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people—whether in the immediate organization or the external environment” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, pp.77–80). The hotel industry is service-based and has a higher demand for more significant social interactions and work interdependence than other industries, which has resulted in a high task significance (Grant, 2008; Morgeson & Campion, 2003; Turban & Greening, 1997). Fried et al. (2008) proposed that the rise of the service economy would result in frequent contact between service providers and consumers, with employees becoming increasingly likely to experience the direct impact of their work on others. Consistent with this argument,

those who have more significant contact with the beneficiaries of their work (e.g., customers) (Grant, 2007) and increased interaction with others outside their organization (Morgeson & Humphrey, 2006) tend to report higher significance levels.

Hotel employees usually work in teams to provide a more active service experience. The interdependence associated with working on a team might also be expected to increase task significance perceptions. These studies imply that having a team, customers, and community generates intrinsic value for employees (Cummings, 1978; Hackman, 1987). Additionally, due to flat organizational structures, lower-level employees seem to have greater decision latitude and more authority in modern industry jobs, potentially creating the perception that one's work is more critical (Humphrey et al., 2007).

Autonomy

Autonomy is described as “the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling the work and determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, pp.77–80). Due to numerous economic (e.g., downsizing and doing more with less) and social changes (e.g., women's roles), employees have been working for more hours (Families and Work Institute, 2006), and there has been an increase in the number of dual-earner families (United States Census Bureau, 2011). Autonomy in the form of flexible work schedules has become increasingly important and practical with regard to helping employees manage dual roles (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000; Halpern, 2005; Hill, Hawkins, Ferris, & Weitzman, 2001), and they have been given more responsibilities than before (Matos & Galinsky, 2012). They also have a higher sense of

freedom when it comes to decision-making in the workplace. In addition to changes in terms of scheduling autonomy, it has been proposed that employees have experienced increased autonomy with regard to on-the-job decision-making in recent years (Fried et al., 1999; Howard, 1995). The decision-making authority is said to have become more diffused, with lower-level employees being granted a greater amount of control and responsibility than in previous decades (Cappelli, 1999; Howard, 1995).

Employees are likely to experience greater responsibility for their job if it is designed to allow them high autonomy, which is beneficial for both employees and employers. Autonomy is the most significant predictor of the psychological state of feeling responsible for one's work (Hackman & Oldham, 1980).

Feedback

Feedback refers to “the degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job results in the employee obtaining direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his or her performance” (Hackman & Oldham, 1980, pp.77–80). It directly influences how employees possess knowledge about the results of their work. The younger generation prefers constructive feedback. Thanks to advancements in technology, the feedback that employees receive is more accessible than before. Employers can review employees through numerous evaluation technologies, which allows them to provide immediate and cohesive feedback.

2.1.3 Critical Psychological States

Definition

Three critical psychological states are included in the JCM: (1) experienced meaningfulness of the work, (2) experienced outcomes responsibility at work, and (3) knowledge of the actual results of the work activities. Meaningfulness of work refers to “the degree to which the employee experiences the job as one which is generally meaningful, valuable and worthwhile.” Experienced outcome responsibility refers to “the degree to which the employee feels accountable and responsible for the results of the work he or she does” (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, 62). Knowledge of results refers to “the degree to which the employee knows and understands, continuously, how effectively he or she performs his or her job” (Hackman and Oldham, 1975, 86). These critical psychological states serve as mediators for the relationships between the job characteristics and the personal and work outcomes.

Relationship Between the Five Core Job Characteristics and the Critical Psychological States

According to the original design of the JCM, employees experience the critical psychological states if the five core job characteristics influence their personal and work outcomes. They need to acquire a higher level of skill variety, task identity, and task significance to experience the meaningfulness of work. Autonomy has a significant connection with the outcome of responsibility; high autonomy allows employees to feel as though they “own” the results of their work through a sense of responsibility, whereas low autonomy may create a tendency for them to attribute both their failures and their successes to others (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Further, feedback affects their

knowledge of the associated results and must be provided for them to acknowledge the outcomes of their work.

Relationship Between the Critical Psychological States and the Outcome

Variables

According to the theory, to achieve positive potential personal and work outcomes, the three psychological states must exist simultaneously. Hackman and Oldham (1976), in their original formulation of the model, found a difference in terms of status between the psychological states. They tested the model to predict employees' personal and work outcomes (internal work motivation, general job satisfaction, growth satisfaction, absenteeism, and rated work effectiveness) using the five job characteristics and the three psychological states. The predicting power of the job characteristics was maximized when all three psychological states were used as mediators versus when any of the possible pairings of the psychological states are used or when the psychological states were utilized individually. The results indicated that a single psychological state can significantly predict the outcomes and that a significant increase in predictive value (that is, an increase in R-squared) can only be achieved by further including a pair of states. Thus, the most effective predictive combination can be obtained by pairing any two of the three psychological states.

Existing Research Regarding the Critical Psychological States

Studies that support the predictions of the model include those carried out by Arnold and House (1980), Hackman and Oldham (1976), Kiggundu (1980, 1983), and Tyagi (1985). Arnold and House (1980) and Kiggundu (1980) noted a strong correlation

between the job characteristics of skill variety, task identity, task significance, and autonomy and the psychological state of knowing the actual results of work activities, which was not addressed in the original study by Hackman and Oldham (1976). The psychological state “experienced responsibilities for outcomes of work” was also affected by all five core characteristics. However, the effects were not always significant—even for its predicted relationship (Arnold & House, 1980; Kiggundu, 1980).

Arnold and House (1980) and Kiggundu (1980,1983) also found a positive relationship between autonomy and the experienced meaningfulness of work, which was not predicted by the original study conducted by Hackman and Oldham (1976). Only Arnold and House (1980) reported a significant relationship between the feedback received on the job and the experienced responsibility for the outcomes of the work. The supporting research demonstrated statistically significant positive relationships between the core job characteristics and the critical psychological states. However, these relationships did not appear to be as discriminating as the model suggests. This variation from the model may be tolerated, as the model stipulates that all the psychological states must be present to achieve the desired outcomes. In fact, their relationship with the core job characteristics has been adequately demonstrated through research findings.

The relationships between the job characteristics and the psychological states do not coincide fully with those specified by the model. According to the original JCM, only autonomy should be related to the experienced responsibility. However, the standardized regression coefficients for the other job characteristics (i.e., skill variety, task identity, task significance, and feedback) are as significant as (if not more extensive than) those for autonomy. Furthermore, autonomy and feedback, together with the posited

relationships, contribute to predicting variance in the experienced-meaningfulness-of-work variable (Becherer, Morgan, & Richard, 1982).

Renn (1989) tested the model in a longitudinal research design utilizing a structural equation methodology by drawing a sample of 90 employees that represented seven different job categories in an insurance company. The author found that autonomy predicted the experienced responsibility, and the feedback predicted knowledge of results. Skill variety, task identity, and task significance, however, did not indicate experienced meaningfulness. Thus, this study only partially validates the specified relationships between the job characteristics and the psychological states.

The meta-analysis (Fried & Ferris, 1987) showed that skill variety has the most substantial relationship with experienced meaningfulness and that task significance also has the strongest relationship with experienced meaningfulness, thus supporting the theory associated with the relationships between these two job characteristics and the considered psychological state. Task identity, however, presented the strongest relationship with experienced responsibility, while autonomy was found to have a similarly strong relationship with experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility. Finally, job feedback shared similar relationships with all three psychological states, thus conflicting with the theoretical statements regarding the specified relationships between the job characteristics and the psychological states.

The results also support the idea that the relationships between the psychological states and psychological (personal) outcomes are stronger than those between the core job characteristics and psychological outcomes. Specifically, the corrected correlational data reveal that each of the three psychological states exhibits a noticeably stronger correlation

with overall job satisfaction than with any of the core job dimensions. In addition, two out of the three psychological states (experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility) present noticeably more significant correlations with growth satisfaction and internal work motivation than with any of the individual job characteristics. Experienced meaningfulness also demonstrates stronger relationships with all of the above personal outcomes than the MPS, whereas experienced responsibility was found to have stronger relationships with overall job satisfaction and internal work motivation than the MPS.

In contrast to the model's prediction, however, the relationships between the critical psychological states and job performance appear to be negligible in comparison to the relationships between job characteristics and job performance. Thus, while task identity, job feedback, MPS, and the simple job summation present meaningful connections with work performance, experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility appear to have no relationships, and knowledge of outcomes indicates a very low association. The question of whether all three psychological states are necessary to maximize the prediction of outcomes was examined by only two studies (Arnold & House, 1980; Hackman & Oldham, 1976), and these reported contradictory results. More research is needed to resolve this issue. Meanwhile, task identity has not always been found to be strongly related to the experienced meaningfulness of work. Instead, it has been reported to have a negative relationship with this psychological state in the work of Miner (1980) and to not be associated with any of the critical psychological states by Fox and Feldman (1988) and Hackman and Oldham (1976). In the studies of Arnold and House (1980) and Fried and Ferris (1987), task identity was found to have a stronger

relationship with the knowledge-of-results state than the meaningfulness-of-results one. Further, autonomy has been shown to relate equally well to all three critical psychological states, while skill variety and task significance have been found to be significantly related to the experienced-meaningfulness-of-work state.

Presence of the Three Psychological States

Fried and Ferris (1987) favor reducing the number of psychological states from three to two by combining experienced meaningfulness and experienced responsibility into a single state. Their results also fail to support the intervening effect of the psychological states, especially on the job characteristics–work performance relationships. Renn and Vandenberg (1995) collected data from 188 subjects who performed a range of different jobs, which showed that not all three psychological states are necessary for maximizing the explanation of the outcome variance. However, their results indicated that the psychological states explain a significant amount of outcome variance beyond the job characteristics. This finding coincides with that of Johns, Xie, and Fang (1992).

Researchers have also consistently linked work meaningfulness to career variables that reflect dedication to one's career and a willingness to put in extra effort. For instance, the meaningfulness of work positively predicts career and organizational commitment and intrinsic work motivation (Steger et al., 2012). Employees who experience meaningful work were more likely to sacrifice time and pay in the short term for career development, and they hold their organizations to high standards (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). They also have fewer withdrawal intentions, lower absenteeism rates (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Steger et al., 2012), and higher levels of subjective and

objective job performance (Harris, Kacmar, & Zivnuska, 2007). In short, meaningful work appears to be relevant for both personal well-being and variables related to job performance. Task significance is also an important predictor of work meaningfulness above and beyond other personal and organizational variables (Schnell, Hoge, & Pollet, 2013). Further, meaningfulness mediates the relation between task significance and outcomes such as organizational commitment, internal motivation, and job satisfaction (Liden, Wayne, & Sparrowe, 2000; Renn & Vandenberg, 1995).

Despite the importance of the psychological states in the JCM, only a few studies have investigated the mediating impacts of the psychological states on the work outcomes. The JCM has inspired over 200 published empirical studies and at least three comprehensive reviews (e.g., Fried and Ferris (1987), Loher, Noe, Moeller, and Fitzgerald (1985), and Roberts and Glick (1981)). Fried and Ferris (1987) found that only eight studies had previously included the critical psychological states (CPSs), and only three of these studies examined the CPS mediation hypothesis (Arnold & House, 1980; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Wall, Clegg, & Jackson, 1978). Moreover, the mediating role of the CPSs in the JCM was examined in two studies. When using Baron and Kenny's (1986) approach for examining mediation hypotheses, the results supported the hypothesized linkages between the core job characteristics and the CPSs and between the CPSs and attitudinal outcomes. They also demonstrated that not all three CPSs must be experienced for internal work motivation, that the CPSs affect the outcome significantly beyond the core job characteristics, and that the CPSs are partial rather than complete mediator variables. The CPSs of employees must exist for internally motivated work behavior to develop. The presence of core job characteristics can create these states. The

experienced meaningfulness of work is primarily enhanced by skill variety, task identity, and task significance. In contrast, the experienced responsibility for work outcomes is linked to the presence of autonomy in a job, while the knowledge of the outcomes is increased when a job elicits a high level of job and agent feedback. According to the JCM, positive personal and work outcomes are the result of all three psychological states being engendered in the job incumbent due to a job containing a “necessary” number of core job dimensions. However, individual attributes determine how positively a worker will respond to a complex and challenging job (Fried and Ferris, 1987).

With regard to the role of the psychological states in the model, Wall and Martin (1987, p. 68) state that the “examination of this part of the model has confirmed neither the predicted differential pattern of relationships between the five job characteristics and the three psychological states nor that these intervening variables are required to account for the relationship between the core job dimensions on the one hand and the outcome variables on the other.” This study investigated the relationship between the five core job characteristics and the CPSs and their influences on hotel employees’ turnover intention.

Based on our research questions for this study, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. The five core job characteristics have a positive relationship with the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1a. Skill variety has a positive relationship with the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1b. Task identity has a positive influence on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1c. Task significance has a positive influence on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1d. Autonomy has a positive influence on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 1e. Feedback has a positive influence on the meaningfulness of work.

Hypothesis 2. The five core job characteristics have a positive relationship with the experienced of responsibility for work outcomes.

Hypothesis 2a. Skill variety has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2b. Task identity has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2c. Task significance has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2d. Autonomy has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 2e. Feedback has a positive influence on outcome responsibility.

Hypothesis 3. The five core job characteristics have a positive relationship with the knowledge of work outcomes.

Hypothesis 3a. Skill variety has a positive influence on the knowledge of work outcomes.

Hypothesis 3_b. Task identity has a positive influence on the knowledge of work outcomes.

Hypothesis 3_c. Task significance has a positive influence on the knowledge of work outcomes.

Hypothesis 3_d. Autonomy has a positive influence on the knowledge of work outcomes.

Hypothesis 3_e. Feedback has a positive influence on the knowledge of work outcomes.

2.2 Application of the JCM

2.2.1 Application of the JCM in General

Job Characteristics and Employee Outcomes

Job characteristics have been researched to determine their impacts on employees' performance at work. Kahya (2007) found that certain job characteristics (physical efforts and job grade) positively impacted task and contextual performance. Their finding indicated a relationship between job grades and task performance. Job autonomy was found to have a positive influence on job performance (Arfanda, 2011). However, task significance presented no relationship with job performance. Chantaraprab (2004) studied the perceived job characteristics related to the job performance of nurses and found that they (namely skill variety, task identity, task significance, and autonomy) presented a positive relationship with job performance. However, as for job feedback and perceived job characteristics, no relationship with job performance was found (Tungkiatsilp, 2013).

Huang (2011) examined the motivating working characteristics, job satisfaction, and turnover intention of knowledge and blue-collar workers. All the variables were tested through cross-cultural research between China and Japan. The relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction was supported as suggested by the JCM. The study conducted by Katsikea, Theodosiou, Perdakis, and Kehagias (2011) also reported that job autonomy, job variety, and job feedback have a strong positive influence on sales managers' job satisfaction using this model.

Perceptions regarding job characteristics and the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction were investigated among software professionals from the Indian software industry. The employees' perceptions were found to vary based on their job dimensions and demographics. Skill variety and job autonomy were demonstrated to have a direct impact on job satisfaction. Moreover, the findings emphasized the importance of the individual differences in work redesign (Reddy, Azash, & Azeem, 2011). This result confirmed the findings reported by Campion (1998) regarding individual demographic differences (Shirazi, GolestaniNia, MehrganRad, & Naghdali, 2012). Growth need strength was used as a moderator for teachers from the English language institutes in Mashhad, Iran. According to this research, the psychological states mediate personal/work outcomes, including job satisfaction and motivation.

2.2.2 Application of the JCM in the Hospitality Industry

Existing Research on JCM in the Hospitality Industry

While the JCM has been applied to many different industries, only a few studies in the hospitality industry have employed this model. Arie et al. (1984) showed that hospitality employees' work characteristics share a similar difficulty profile. Most hospitality employees reported not being satisfied with their job (Reichel & Pizam). Pizam and Neumann (1988) studied the role of task characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction and burnout in the hospitality industry and found that the task characteristics were powerful determinants of employees' satisfaction. Their research is considered to be pioneering in that it explored the major determinants of satisfaction and burnout associated with job characteristics in the hospitality industry. Further, Lee-Ross (1998) examined the reliability and rationale of Hackman and Oldham's JDS and JCM for seasonal hotel workers in the UK. The reliability scores obtained were comparable with those of Hackman and Oldham's job motivation theory. However, interestingly, it was revealed that seasonal hotel workers were satisfied with their job despite the poor working conditions. In 2005, a cross-cultural study was conducted on employees' work attitudes and work motivation in Australia and Mauritius, for which a convenient sample of 200 hotel employees was used. The findings of this study suggested that Hackman and Oldham's model was not entirely appropriate for use outside the Western culture (Lee-Ross, 2005).

Furthermore, Ozturk, Hancer, and Im (2014) studied job characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment for hotel workers in Turkey. For this study, questionnaires were distributed to 252 hotel employees in the country, and each job

characteristic's impact on an employee's affective commitment was analyzed. While task variety and task identity were found to have no significant relationship with affective commitment and job satisfaction, autonomy and feedback were found to be statistically significant. Another study examined the relationship between job characteristics and job satisfaction among fast-food outlet managers, and the five core job characteristics were found to impact these managers (Ali et al., 2014). Furthermore, the affection for meaningful work was analyzed by Jung and Yoon (2016) in South Korea, while Zhao, Ghiselli, Law, and Ma (2016) researched the motivation of frontline employees: the role of job characteristics in work and life satisfaction. Task identity and task significance were found to reduce job stress. In addition, feedback was found to increase job satisfaction, and task significance enhanced life satisfaction. However, skill variety was found to be negatively associated with job satisfaction but positively affect job stress.

The hospitality employees' perception regarding meaningful work and its influence on organizational commitment was examined by Jung and Yoon (2016) in South Korea. Their work revealed that employees' meaning of work positively influenced their job engagement and organizational commitment. In a job performance study, Williams (1998) contended that performance management must be employee-focused, with an explicit recognition and management of individuals' job context.

Ali et al. (2013) applied the JCM to the parameter of job satisfaction, using fast-food outlet managers as participants. While this study verified the JCM, it failed to identify the characteristics' influence over job satisfaction due to using a small sample size and the same subject group. A similar study was conducted by Lam and Zhang (2003) for Hong Kong's fast-food industry. The findings from this study indicated that

the five core job characteristics affected job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The study carried out by Slattery, Selvarajan, Anderson, and Sardessai (2010) with temporary workers also proved this positive relationship.

Recently, Grobelna (2019) examined the effects of individual and job-related characteristics on employees' work engagement and their influence on work performance. The author collected data from 222 hotel employees in northern Poland. The findings of the study revealed that job characteristics have a significant influence on hotel employees' work engagement, effectively impacting their work performance. Task significance was found to have the greatest effect on employees' work engagement.

Opportunity Area of the JCM in the Hotel Industry

As mentioned above, previous research has examined the relationship between the job characteristics and the employees' job satisfaction, job motivation, work engagement, work performance, and organizational commitment. However, the JCM has not been tested in the hotel industry, especially with respect to the relationship between the core job characteristics, the CPSs, and the hotel employees' turnover intention. As Ali et al. (2013) stated in their research, the small sample size considered failed to provide enough evidence to identify the influencing power of the job characteristics.

2.3 Hotel Industry

2.3.1 The Development of the Hotel Industry in General

A hotel is an establishment that provides paid lodging on a short-term basis. A hotel usually only offers essential guest services, such as rooms; but a large-scale hotel

can provide multiple guest services such as a restaurant, swimming pool, business center, daycare, conference and event space, fitness center, spa, shopping center, etc.

The hotel industry is currently a fast-growing field around the globe. It has continued to grow after the last industrial revolution, the 18th century, although it faced two major obstacles in the form of the two World Wars (1914–1918 and 1939–1945). It also faced another big obstacle during the global financial crisis from 2007–2008 (also known as “the financial crisis of 2008”). However, it recovered within a short time. This industry brings people from different parts of the world together, blurs the borders between countries, distance, race, religion, and caste, addresses people, and helps spread peace among people. In 2011, the travel and tourism industries accounted for 255 million jobs globally, contributing 9% of the world’s GDP while generating billions for host economies, which explains why this industry plays a significant role in foreign investments and the global economy.

The hotel industry is one of the world’s fastest-growing industries in the world. The middle class’s global growth has driven the rapid development of travel and tourism, which has, in turn, helped ensure the growth of the hotel industry. In 2019, international travel contributed \$9.2 trillion to global economic development, which accounted for up to 10.4% of the global GDP (World Travel & Tourism Council, 2019). As a primary component of global travel, the hotel industry has experienced considerable growth and accounted for 30% of the worldwide GDP growth. The global hotel industry reached over \$570 billion in terms of market size, with Marriott International and Hilton Worldwide being the highest contributors. The highest occupancy rate (72.8%) was found in the Asia Pacific region and the Middle East, and Africa presented the highest global average daily

rate and revenue per available room (Statista, 2018). Forecasts indicate that the hotel industry will continue its “record-breaking performance” through 2019 (STR, 2018).

2.3.2 The Development of the Hotel Industry in the United States

The total revenue of the hotel industry was about \$208 billion in 2017 (Statista, 2018). According to the CBRE (2019), operating hotels in the United States achieved the highest level since 1960, while the jobs in this sector contribute to 5.3% of the total number of employed individuals (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). There is a small labor market in the hotel industry, which is the same as other industries. The hourly compensation rate for the industry increased by 3.8% over 2017, which caused the total labor cost to increase by 1.8%.

In 2009, the US Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that there were 353,000 job openings across the leisure and hospitality sector. As of 2018, with the travel industry surging, this number swelled to 1,139,000 (US Travel and Hospitality Outlook, 2019).

2.3.3 The Development of the Hotel Industry in China

Since the Open-Door Reforms and the “opening” of the Chinese market to foreign firms in the late 1970s, numerous Western firms have sought to enter and establish their presence in the country as a market leader in their particular industry. According to China’s National Bureau of Statistics, in 1972, Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Xi’an, and Guilin were the top five cities in terms of attracting inbound tourists. The success of the international management of Beijing Jianguo Hotel proved to be a milestone in the industry’s development. Subsequently, many international management companies took note of the development opportunities available in the country and began to flock to the Chinese market. By the end of 2008, there were 432 five-star hotels in China, and, by

June 2018, this number had reached 862 according to the data from China's National Bureau of Statistics. With certain international hotel chains such as the Hilton entering the market, the evolution of high-end hotels improved China's ability to keep up with the international tourism market.

Travel and tourism in China are growing steadily. In 2017, the travel and tourism sector contributed 11% of the national GDP, which is more than the corresponding figure for the world (10.4%). The growth rate of the number of rooms has reached 10.2% (Media Research, 2019). Arne Sorenson, the former President and CEO of Marriott International (the most significant international hotel in the world), defined China as their most prominent, with 348 hotels already established. China's hotel industry has experienced meteoric growth, becoming a \$44 billion business with 2.5 million hotel rooms. Comparing China's hotel market to that of the United States, considering the hotel penetration rates in a mature market, the United States has 20 hotel rooms per 1,000 capita, while there are four rooms per 1,000 per capita in China. These statistics illustrate that there is still significant room for growth in the Chinese hotel industry. As Kearney (2019) forecasted, the hospitality industry could become a \$100 billion industry, with 6.3 million rooms, and reach eight rooms per 1,000 capita in China.

The hotel industry is a global one, and cultural differences play an important role in hotel management. For instance, in the work of Triandis and Bhawuk (1997), Chinese culture was considered to be similar to vertical collectivism, while American culture was considered individualistic. Accordingly, the differences in terms of culture and personalities between China and the United States influence employees' perception of

hotel jobs. This research will provide us with insight into the existence of such cultural differences.

2.3.4 Employee Turnover in the Hotel Industry

Labor cost is the most significant expense in the operation of a hotel. The payroll-related expenses averaged 42.8% of the turnover for hotels in the United States in 2015. The high employee turnover rate is the primary cause of the high labor cost in the hotel industry. There is also a notoriously high level of labor turnover in the industry, especially in the seasonal sector (Lee-Ross, 1992). Previous research related to turnover in the hotel industry has focused on skill level, low payment, supervisor support, human resource management strategies, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace, lack of proper training, unfair dismissals, and the negative perception of hotel work (Mohsin, Lengler, & Humar, 2013). Young employees and part-time employees are important components of the hotel industry. Their primary objective is to make money, and most of them are trying to decide which career path they would like to pursue in the future. This unstable workforce contributes to the high turnover rate in the hotel industry. With regard to salary, low pay is a significant issue in the hotel industry. Low payment directly causes most hotel employees to resign (Williams et al., 2008). Further, the frontline employees have to often work two jobs to support their family. The study conducted by Ogbonna and Harris (2002) confirmed that low pay is a critical issue in the hotel industry, especially in the housekeeping department. The authors also mentioned that housekeeping employees were often treated as or considered “second-class citizens.” Horner and Swarbrooke (2004) explored more factors that contribute to the high turnover rate in the hotel industry. According to their research, the hotel industry struggles with

attracting and retaining top-class staff due to the perception that the jobs entail low pay, long working hours, lack of career growth, and poor working conditions. In addition, employees are said to be discriminated against in the hotel industry on the grounds of sex and race. Many countries define the hotel employee's role as requiring a low skill level to justify the low salary that they are paid. In addition, servers working in a luxury hotel are paid the same wage as those working in a budget hotel even though they are expected to have a higher level of skill to work in a luxury hotel (Brien et al., 2017).

Influences of High Employee Turnover

Iqbal et al. (2017) studied the relationship between job characteristics and employees' intention to quit in a private commercial bank in Pakistan. Their results indicated that task variety, job variety, and job significance directly affect employees' intention to leave. According to the research of Barley (1996) and Cappelli (2000), managers often ignore job descriptions and organizational hierarchies, which reduces employees' job satisfaction and commitment, further affecting their turnover intentions (Griffeth et al., 2000). The five core job characteristics are expected to significantly impact the workers' intrinsic motivation, work performance, work satisfaction, absenteeism, and turnover intentions (Johari et al., 2009). These job characteristics significantly impact employees' job satisfaction (Said & Munap, 2010). Further, job satisfaction is negatively related to employees' turnover intentions (Freund, 2005), and the job itself plays an important role in the employees' decision to quit. Hotel employees perform repetitive tasks due to the nature of their work (Jung & Yoon, 2016). In addition, hotel managers deal with employees who have an inadequate perception of the significance of their job due to many of them joining the industry unwillingly (Ferreira et

al., 2017). The study conducted by Chang et al. (2013) has shown that task significance and task identity are linked to turnover intentions.

According to the JCM, job characteristics significantly influence job satisfaction and job performance, and research has shown that job characteristics influence employees' turnover intention. Positively perceived job characteristics will decrease employees' turnover intention in the IT industry (McKnight, Phillips, & Hardgrave, 2009). Ali (2015) conducted a study that revealed that job characteristics have a significant influence on employees' intention to leave an organization among cosmetic banks in Pakistan. However, only a few studies have investigated job characteristics within the hotel industry. None of the existing studies have analyzed the relationship between job characteristics or the CPSs and turnover intention. It is crucial that this research gap be filled. The five core job characteristics and the CPSs influence employees' work behavior. The existing studies do partially examine the job characteristics, CPSs, and turnover intentions in the hotel industry. This study will test the relationships between the five core job characteristics, the three CPSs, and turnover intentions. Therefore, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4. The five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) are negatively related to hotel employees' turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 5. The three CPSs (meaningfulness of work, outcome responsibility, and knowledge of work outcomes) are negatively related to hotel employees' turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 6. The content of the five core job characteristics is different for China and the United States.

Hypothesis 7. The core job characteristics or CPSs of hotel employees have different levels of influence over their intention to leave the hotel industry in China and the United States.

Chapter 3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the methodology used to investigate the research questions. The purpose of the study is briefly reviewed at the beginning, followed by the rationale of the research design. Finally, the demonstration of instrumentation development, including questionnaires, measurements, the opinion of Institution Review Board, pilot study, data collection, and analytics.

3.2 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the hotel job characteristics, hotel employees' psychological states, and its relationship with the employees' turnover intention in China and the United States. The following research questions were raised:

How do hotel employees perceive their core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback)?

How do hotel employees perceive their critical psychological states of experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results? What are the relationships between the core job characteristics and the critical psychological states?

Will the Chinese perceive hotel job characteristics differently than Americans?

Will job characteristics influence critical psychological states differently between Chinese and Americans?

Is there any difference in terms of the influence power of job characteristics or critical psychological states over the turnover intention of hotel employees between China and the United States?

3.3 Job Diagnostic Survey

Hackman and Oldham's Job Diagnostic Survey (1975) was developed as a measurement tool for investigating the tenets of the JCM and provides measures of core job dimensions, critical psychological states, results and outcomes, and growth need strength. The job diagnostic survey questionnaire consists of 87 randomly distributed questions and is divided into eight sections. The survey is the most widely used instrument in job diagnosis before their redesign, in research, and evaluating the effectiveness of the job.

There are two sections designed for measuring job characteristics. Sections one consists of single items for each job characteristic. A Seven-point response scale (1=low, 7= high) were used in this survey to ask the participant to respond in terms of their job perception. The participant needs to choose the number which best reflects their perceptions of their job. Two items were provided from each job dimension in section two, direct/positive and indirect/negative. The participant needs to indicate how accurate the statement is.

In section three and five, the critical psychological states (the experienced meaningfulness of work, experienced responsibility for work outcomes, and knowledge of results) were obtained. Participants agree or disagree with the statements provided about their work experience. Section five used the projective format to ask the participant to think of their colleagues' perceptions towards their job.

3.4 Research Design

The research model is based on Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model (1976). The whole model will be tested in the hotel industry in China and the United States. The hotel industry has been facing high turnover rate issues over the years. In this research, turnover intention was used for the outcome variable. To investigate the root cause of the high turnover rate.

Figure 3.4.1. Research Model

3.5 Instrumentation

3.5.1 Measurement

The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) questionnaire was used in this study. JDS was developed from Hackman & Oldham's Job Characteristics Model. The survey intends to diagnose existing jobs to determine if and how these might be redesigned to improve employee's motivation, satisfaction, and productivity and evaluate the effects.

JDS is a non-copyrighted instrument that can be administered without consent from the authors (Hackman and Oldham, 1980 P.275). JDS consists of 87 randomly distributed questions. The survey was modified to apply to the hotel industry. This survey's primary purpose was to measure employees' perception regarding the core job characteristics, critical psychological states, and hotel employees' turnover intention.

Core Job Characteristics

A seven-point response scale (1=low, 7= high) were used in this research to ask the participant to respond in terms of their job perception. The participant needs to choose the number which best reflects their perceptions of their job. Two items were provided from each job dimension in section II, direct/positive and indirect/negative items. The participant needs to indicate how accurate the statement is. There are three questions for skill variety, task identity, task significance, and autonomy, five questions for feedback. One sample question was, "The job requires me to use several complex or high-level skills.

In these sections and IV, the critical psychological states (the experienced meaningfulness of work, experienced responsibility for work outcomes, and knowledge of results) were obtained. Participants agree or disagree with the statements provided about their work experience. Section IV used the projective format to ask the participant to think of their colleagues' perceptions towards their job. The example question is presented below this:

Employee turnover intention is a critical indicator of the employee's overall satisfaction. In section V, the participant needs to choose the number which best reflects

their perceptions of their intention to leave the company. In section VI, eight demographic questions were asked, including job title, age, race, gender, marital status, education, employment, and household income.

3.5.2 Institutional Review Board

This study was reviewed by the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board since it involves human subjects. The Institutional Review Board granted permission to conduct this study.

3.5.3 Data Collection

3.5.3.1 Reliability test of measurement items

A pilot study was conducted to ensure the usability and clarity of directions in the questionnaire. A total of 20 hotel employees from Columbia, Missouri, USA, participated in the pilot study. The pilot study results were used to evaluate the internal consistency of the questionnaire constructs using Cronbach's alpha ($\alpha \geq 0.7$). The detailed data for each variable is presented in Table 3.1. As the detailed states below, critical psychological states have higher reliability scores than the five core job characteristics.

Table 3.1 Reliability test of measurement items

		<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
<i>Job Characteristics</i>	Skill Variety	0.63	3
	Task Identity	0.53	3
	Task Significance	0.56	3
	Autonomy	0.55	3
	Feedback	0.74	6
<i>Psychological States</i>	Experienced Meaningfulness of the work	0.77	4
	Experienced Responsibility for the work	0.63	6
	Knowledge of Results	0.69	4
<i>Turnover Intention</i>	Turnover Intention	0.71	2

3.5.3.2 Distribution

Total 1943 surveys were distributed with 436 valid response rates (valid response rate 22.44%). Our target participants are hotel employees currently working in the hotel industry in China and the United States. In the United States, the surveys were distributed through LinkedIn. 500 total surveys were distributed with a 78% effective response rate, 24.20% validate surveys, 55 surveys were distributed in person with 54.55% valid response rate. And 86 surveys were distributed through the mail with a 13.42% response rate, while the effective response rate was 24.42%. In China, the data was collected through Wenjuanxing and WeChat (87 total surveys, 60.68% response rate, effective response rate 48.28%) and in-person (1,215 total surveys, 93.32% response rate, effective response rate 18.27%).

Any incomplete survey was deleted. Meanwhile, the unqualified participants were ruled out by screening questions to ensure the response quality.

Screening question: Which industry are you working in?

*Agriculture *Computer Science * Hotel

*Finance/Insurance * Non-profit * Retail

Participants who are selected non-hotel industry will automatically be brought to the end of the survey.

As for the sample size, the G*Power 3.1.9.6 was used to calculate the minimum sample size. Cohen's f^2 effect size of the analysis was set up as 0.15, which, according to Cohan (1988), indicates medium strength of squared multiple correlations (r^2). Based on G*Power's result, to perform an F-test using the multiple linear regression with a total of 8 predictors (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, the meaningfulness of work, the experienced outcome responsibility, and the experienced knowledge of results), total 160 samples were needed (Table 3.2). In total, there are 464 valid surveys collected, 264 in China and 200 in the United States.

Table 3.2 Required Sample Size (G*Power)

<i>F tests-Linear multiple regression: Fixed model, R^2 deviation from zero</i>			
Input		Output	
Test Family	F-test	Numerator df	8
Effect size f^2	0.15	Denominator df	151
α	0.05	Actual power	0.9506385
Power (1- β err prob)	0.95	Total sample size	160
Number of predictors	8		
α : confidence level			

In the United States, the online survey was generated by Qualtrics. The “survey flow” function of the website was applied to screen out unqualified participants. By employing this function, participants were first directed to the screening questions, and only qualified participants were given the rest of the questionnaire and counted towards the total number collected. The website generated an anonymous survey link. It is a reusable link that can be pasted into emails or onto a website and is unable to track the identifying information of respondents. Identifying information such as names and email addresses will therefore remain anonymous. Also, the auto-prevent function, which prevented participants from taking the survey more than once, was employed. The generated survey link was distributed through LinkedIn posts and messages. Meanwhile, the link was posted on Facebook, Instagram, hotel industry chat groups. Approximately 500 survey invitations were sent out through LinkedIn and Facebook, with 186 responses received.

Besides online distribution, 55 surveys were distributed directly to the hotel employees with 30 responses; 86 surveys were distributed through the mail with 21 responses.

In China, the survey was generated through the top China market research tool, Wenjuanxing. Wenjuanxing is a platform that provides professional online questionnaire survey with sample quality control. After the link was generated, a QR code was created for the survey distribution. A survey team was hired to collect the survey in the hotel in Hangzhou, China. Five dollars incentive was provided for each survey. There are 517 hotel employees who started the survey, with 264 valid responses.

3.4.5 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, including percentages, means, standard deviations, and frequencies, were calculated to describe variables, respondents' demographic information, and hotel employees' critical psychological states and turnover intention.

Path analysis for predicting the three psychological states' outcome measures and the three psychological states taken together will be used to test the hypotheses.

Chapter 4. Results

4.1 Introduction

This section will describe the demographic characteristics of survey participants, the reliability of each variable, and the path analysis results related to five core job characteristics, three psychological states, and hotel employee's turnover intentions.

The survey responses were collected in China and the United States. In China, 87 surveys were distributed through WeChat, and 42 were collected, yielding a 48.28% response rate; 1215 surveys were distributed in person and 475 were returned, yielding a response rate of 18.27%. This results in a total of 264 valid surveys, with a 20.28% response rate in China. In the United States, 500 surveys were distributed using LinkedIn, and 186 surveys were collected, yielding a 29.80% response rate. Fifty-five surveys were distributed in person, and 30 surveys were collected, yielding a 54.55% response rate. Eighty-six surveys were distributed through mail, yielding a 24.42% response rate. This results in a total of 200 valid surveys, with a 31.20% response rate in the United States. Questionnaires that were incomplete, completed in less than 200 seconds, or missing a response to the screening question were removed. A total of 464 surveys were used for the final analysis, which resulted in a usable response rate of 23.89%.

4.2 Demographic Profile

This section presents the demographic profile of the survey participants, including age, gender, ethnicity, education level, marital status, occupation, employment status, and income level. The detailed data are shown in Table 4.2. The majority of participants were Asian ($n = 274$, 59.05%), followed by White ($n = 118$, 25.43%) and Black or African

American ($n=23$, 4.96%). More than 50% of the participants were married. About 79% of the participants were employed full time ($n = 368$).

Table 4.2 Demographic Profile of the Participants

<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>	US ($n=172$)		CN ($n=264$)		Total ($n=436$)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age						
18-24	56	32.56%	4	1.52%	60	12.93%
25-34	56	32.56%	114	43.18%	170	36.64%
35-44	31	18.02%	130	49.24%	161	34.70%
45-54	17	9.88%	14	5.30%	31	6.68%
55-64	12	6.98%	1	0.38%	13	2.80%
65-74			1	0.38%	1	0.22%
Gender						
Female	109	63.37%	176	66.67%	285	61.42%
Male	63	36.63%	88	33.33%	151	32.54%
Ethnicity						
White	118	68.60%			118	25.43%
Black or African-American	22	12.79%	1	0.38%	23	4.96%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.58%	2	0.76%	3	0.65%
Asian	29	16.86%	261	98.86%	274	59.05%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	2	1.16%			2	0.43%
Education						
Less than High school degree	1	0.58%	6	2.27%	7	1.51%
High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)	16	9.30%	35	13.26%	51	10.99%
Some college but no degree	47	27.33%	60	22.73%	107	23.06%
Associate degree	14	8.14%	10	3.79%	24	5.17%
Bachelor's degree	86	50.00%	140	53.03%	226	48.71%

Graduate degree	8	4.65%	13	4.92%	21	4.53%
Marriage Status						
Married	43	25.00%	193	73.11%	236	50.86%
Married with kids	5	2.91%			5	1.08%
Widowed	12	6.98%	5	1.89%	17	3.66%
Divorced	5	2.91%			5	1.08%
Separated	74	43.02%	66	25.00%	140	30.17%
Never married	33	19.19%			33	7.11%
Occupation						
Managerial	92	53.49%	190	71.97%	282	60.78%
Non-Managerial	80	46.51%	74	28.03%	154	33.19%
Employment Status						
Employed, working 1-39 hours per week	28	16.28%	40	15.15%	68	14.66%
Employed, working 40 or more hours per week	144	83.72%	224	84.85%	368	79.31%
Income						
\$0 – \$9,999	3	1.74%	15	5.68%	18	3.88%
\$10,000 – \$19,999	15	8.72%	33	12.50%	48	10.34%
\$20,000 – \$29,999	25	14.53%	83	31.44%	108	23.28%
\$30,000 – \$39,999	16	9.30%	76	28.79%	92	19.83%
\$40,000 – \$49,999	25	14.53%	57	21.59%	82	17.67%
\$50,000 – \$59,999	12	6.98%			12	2.59%
\$60,000 – \$69,999	17	9.88%			17	3.66%
\$70,000 – \$79,999	6	3.49%			6	1.29%
\$80,000 – \$89,999	9	5.23%			9	1.94%
\$90,000 – \$99,999	5	2.91%			5	1.08%
\$100,000 or more	39	22.67%			39	8.41%

The majority of respondents (60.78%) were female in both China ($n=173$, 65.53%) and the United States ($n=109$, 54.5%); however, female participation was higher in China.

Figure 4.2.1 Participants Gender

In terms of age, more than 60% of the participants were under 44. Hotel employees in the United States were younger (18–24 years old, $n = 56$, 28%).

Figure 4.2.2 Participants Age

More than 60% of the participants indicated that they have a bachelor's degree or higher. In China, more than half of the participants had bachelor's degrees; the United States had slightly fewer. The distribution of the participants from these two countries aligns with that of the overall sample.

Figure 4.2.3 Participants' Education Level

In terms of annual household income, 75% of the participants earned less than \$49,999, which is considered a low income. In the United States, the participants' income occupies every category. However, none of the participants reported an annual income of more than \$50,000. The annual income of participants from China was generally lower than that from the United States.

Figure 4.2.4 Participants' Income Level

In terms of the participants' occupations, more than 60% were managerial candidates. A higher number of candidates in managerial positions participated in China (71.97%) than in the United States (46%).

Figure 4.2.5 Participants' Occupation

A total of 79.31% of the participants were full-time employees who worked more than 40 hours per week. Slightly more participants in China worked full time than in the United States.

Figure 4.2.6 Participants' Employment Status

4.3 Reliability of Measurement Items

Cronbach's Alpha was used to test the consistency of the measurement items.

Table 4.3.2 Reliability of Measurement Items

		<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>N of Items</i>
Job Characteristics	Skill Variety	0.63	3
	Task Identity	0.53	3
	Task Significance	0.56	3
	Autonomy	0.55	3
	Feedback	0.74	6
Psychological States	Experienced Meaningfulness of the work	0.77	4
	Experienced Outcome Responsibility for the work	0.63	6
	Knowledge of Results	0.69	4
Turnover Intention	Turnover Intention	0.71	2

4.4 Descriptive Statistics

This section reports the descriptive statistics for the following attributes: the five job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback); the core psychological states (experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for outcome of the work, and knowledge of the results); and the turnover intention.

Table 4.4.1 The codes for each variable

Variable Name	Code
Skill Variety	SV
Task Identity	TI
Task Significance	TS
Autonomy	Au
Feedback	FB
Experienced Meaningfulness of the work	MW
Experienced Outcome Responsibility for the work	OR
The Knowledge of Result	KR
Employee's Turnover Intention	TOI

Table 4.4.2 Descriptive statistics for items in each variable

Items <i>n=436</i>		Mean	SD
SV	SV1	4.86	1.70
	SV2	4.72	1.57
	SV3	4.51	1.87
TI	TI1	4.70	1.51
	TI2	4.48	1.79
	TI3	5.33	1.40
TS	TS1	5.38	1.44
	TS2	5.72	1.34
	TS3	5.47	1.64
Au	A1	4.74	1.31
	A2	4.96	1.57
	A3	5.11	1.62
FB	FA1	4.95	1.40
	FA2	5.12	1.44
	FA3	5.55	1.59
	FJ1	4.98	1.50

	FJ2	5.27	1.32
	FJ3	5.28	1.63
MW	MW1	5.65	1.56
	MW2	5.62	1.48
	MW3	5.20	1.59
	MW4	5.11	1.42
OR	OR1	5.60	1.64
	OR2	5.97	1.18
	OR3	5.79	1.36
	OR4	5.92	1.10
	OR5	5.36	1.37
	OR6	5.23	1.43
KR	KR1	5.60	1.21
	KR2	5.36	1.52
	KR3	5.50	1.17
	KR4	5.10	1.49
TOI	TOI1	2.63	1.69
	TOI2	2.92	1.74

4.4.1 The Five Core Job Characteristic, Critical Psychological States and Turnover Intention in China and the United States.

In general, all five core job characteristics in the United States had higher rates in comparison to China. A simple *t*-test was conducted to test the impact of the country on each variable—skill variety is significantly different ($F = 20.62, p < .001$) between China (mean = 5.04 ± 1.30) and the United States (mean = 4.43 ± 1.27). Task identity was rated significantly higher ($F = 36.584, p < .001$) by the United States (mean = 5.90 ± 1.03) than China (mean = 5.28 ± 1.04). Meanwhile, the autonomy in the United States (mean = $5.48 \pm .97$) is significantly higher ($F = 83.978, p < .001$) than China (mean = 4.59 ± 1.01). No significant difference was found between China and the United States in terms of the meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for the outcome of the work, experienced knowledge of the results, and turnover intention.

Table 4.4.3 Simple t-test of the five core job characteristics between China and the United States.

	US	CN		
	(n=172)	(n=264)		
Items	Mean±SD	Mean±SD	F	Sig.
SV	5.04 ±1.30	4.43±1.27	20.620	<.001
TI	4.92±1.26	4.78±1.03	1.656	.199
TS	5.90±1.03	5.28±1.04	36.584	<.001
Au	5.48±.97	4.59±1.01	83.978	<.001
FB	5.18±1.12	5.20±1.12	.030	.863
MW	5.39±1.16	5.41±1.17	.0191	.890
OR	5.73±.77	5.59±.84	3.004	.084
KR	5.38±1.01	5.40±.95	.030	.864
TOI	2.90±1.67	2.67±1.38	2.487	.116

4.5 Path Analysis

4.5.1 Hypothesis Testing

The correlation analysis was conducted prior to the path analysis to examine how the variables correlated to each other. The details of the correlation matrix are shown in Table 4.5.1.

Table 4.5.1 The correlation matrix

	SV	TI	TS	Au	FB	MW	OR	KR
TI	.24***							
TS	.42***	.31***						
Au	.42***	.37***	.47***					
FB	.32***	.38***	.40***	.30***				
MW	.43***	.32***	.54***	.37***	.50***			
OR	.38***	.35***	.52***	.41***	.44***	.68***		
KR	.24***	.32***	.35***	.30***	.62***	.52***	.51***	
TOI	-.23***	-.24***	-.28***	-.18***	-.32***	-.50***	-.38***	-.34***

*** significant at .001

Old School Path Analysis was performed to examine the relationship between the independent variables (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback), the mediating variables (experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for the outcome, and knowledge of the results), and the dependent variable (turnover intention). Path analysis is a method developed by Sewall Wright, and it is used to determine whether a multivariate set of nonexperimental data fits well with a causal model (Pedhazur, 1982). This study used the Wald Test, named after Abraham Wald, which assesses constraints on statistical parameters based on the weighted distance between the unrestricted estimate and its hypothesized value under the null hypothesis, where the weight is the precision of the estimate. Statistically insignificant paths ($z < 1.96$, $p < .05$) were dropped, and the chi-square (χ^2) change was smaller than 3.84 ($\chi^2_{(0)} = 3.84$) (Kline, 2005). A path model used in predicting the hotel employees' turnover intention is shown below in Figure 4..5.1.

A post hoc power analysis was performed using G*power (a tool to compute statistical power analyses for different t -tests, F tests, χ^2 tests, Z tests. It can also be used

to compute effect sizes and to display the results of power analyses graphically to determine whether the path analysis conducted was powerful enough to detect any existing effect on turnover intention. The effect size was calculated using Cohen's f^2 ($f^2 = r^2 / (1 - r^2)$).

Figure 4.5.1 Path diagram

According to the results shown in Figure 4.7, skill variety ($\beta = .176, p < .001$), task significance ($\beta = .306, p < .001$), and the feedback ($\beta = .289, p < .001$), has a significant path to hotel employees' experienced meaningfulness of the work at 41.5% ($\text{adj. } R^2 = .415, p < .001$). The variance of the experienced meaningfulness of the work is explained by the core job characteristics: skill variety ($\beta = .112, p < .001$), task identity ($\beta = .108, p < .01$), task significance ($\beta = .306, p < .001$), autonomy ($\beta = .115, p < .01$), and feedback ($\beta = .208, p < .001$), which has a significant path to the experienced responsibility for outcome of the work. Meanwhile, 37.2% ($\text{adj. } R^2 = .372, p < .001$) of

the variance for the experienced responsibility for outcome of the work is explained by the core job characteristics of autonomy ($\beta = .091, p < .05$) and feedback ($\beta = .541, p < .001$), which has a significant path to the knowledge of the results. More than 20% (adj. $R^2 = .394, p < .001$) of the variance of the knowledge of the results is explained by the core job characteristics.

The hotel employees' task significance ($\beta = -.123, p < .01$) had a significantly negative path to turnover intention through the experienced meaningfulness of the work. At the same time, the turnover intention is negatively affected by the feedback ($\beta = -.152, p < .01$) through the outcome responsibility.

4.5.2 Path Analysis between China and the United States

A separate path analysis was conducted using data from China and the United States. Skill variety significantly predicted the experienced meaningfulness of the work and the experienced responsibility for outcome of the work in the United States; however, no such relationship was found in China. Task identity has a significant positive relationship with the experienced responsibility for outcome of the work in China; however, no such relationship was found in the United States. In terms of task significance, the experienced meaningfulness of the work and the experienced responsibility for outcome of the work were both significantly predicted by the task significance. In addition, task significance has a significantly direct effect on turnover intention, while no such relationship was found in other job characteristics. Autonomy significantly predicted the experienced outcome responsibility in both countries. In China, a significantly positive relationship was found between autonomy and the

experienced meaningfulness of the work. Feedback predicted the experienced meaningfulness of the work and the knowledge of the results in both China and the United States. The experienced responsibility for outcome of the work is also significantly related to the feedback in China. In terms of critical psychological states, the biggest difference between China and the United States was that knowledge of the results did not predict turnover intention in United States. Details are shown in Figures 4.5.2 and 4.5.3.

Figure 4.5.2 Path diagram in China

Figure 4.5.3 Path diagram in United States

4.6 Mediation Effect of the Critical Psychological States

The effect of the five core job characteristics on hotel employees' turnover intentions was fully mediated via their experienced meaningfulness of the work. As Table 4.7 illustrates, the regression coefficients were significant between each job characteristic and turnover intention, the regression coefficients between each job characteristic and the experienced meaningfulness of the work, and the regression coefficients between the experienced meaningfulness of the work and the turnover intention. The indirect effects were SV (-0.240^{***}), TI (-0.200^{***}), TS (-0.362^{***}), Au (-0.258^{***}), and FB (-0.344^{***}). Among the five core job characteristics, the direct effects of skill variety, task significance, and autonomy were insignificant, which means they were completely mediated by the experienced meaningfulness of the work.

The skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback were negatively significant predictors for the experienced meaningfulness of the work and the hotel employees' turnover intentions. Meanwhile, the experienced meaningfulness of the

work significantly predicted the turnover intention. More importantly, it explains a more significant variance in the turnover intention than the five job characteristics. The bootstrapping procedures were used to test the significance of the indirect effect. Unstandardized indirect effects were computed for each of the 1000 bootstrapped samples, and the 95% confidence interval was computed by determining the indirect effects at the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. For skill variety, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.240^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.314$ to $-.170$. For task identity, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.200^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.277$ to $-.140$. For task significance, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.362^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.461$ to $-.270$. For autonomy, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.258^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.346$ to $-.190$. For feedback, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.344^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.442$ to $-.250$.

Table 4.6.1 Mediation effect of the Experienced Meaningfulness of Work

Total Effect		Direct Effect		Indirect Effect				Effect Size
Path	β	Path	β	Path	β	Path	β	
SV→TOI	$-.264^{**}$	SV→TOI	$-.024$	SV→MW	$.382^{***}$	MW→TOI	$-.628^{***}$	$-.240^{***}$
TI→TOI	$-.321^{***}$	TI→TOI	$-.12^{*}$	TI→MW	$.331^{***}$	MW→TOI	$-.603^{***}$	$-.200^{***}$
TS→TOI	$-.389^{***}$	TS→TOI	$-.027$	TS→MW	$.578^{***}$	MW→TOI	$-.627^{***}$	$-.362^{***}$
Au→TOI	$-.247^{***}$	Au→TOI	$.011$	Au→MW	$.401^{***}$	MW→TOI	$-.644^{***}$	$-.258^{***}$
FB→TOI	$-.490^{***}$	FB→TOI	$-.145^{*}$	FB→MW	$.596^{***}$	MW→TOI	$-.578^{***}$	$.344^{***}$

The effects of the five core job characteristics on the hotel employees' turnover intentions were fully mediated via the experienced responsibility for outcome of the work. Table 4.8 illustrates the regression coefficients between each job characteristic and turnover intention, the regression coefficients between each job characteristic, and the experienced work outcome. The regression coefficients between the experienced outcome of work and turnover intention were significant. The indirect effects were SV (-.147^{***}), TI (-.156^{***}), TS (-.231^{***}), Au (-.206^{***}), and FB (-.196^{***}). Among the five core job characteristics, the total effect of autonomy on turnover intention was insignificant, which means they were completely mediated by the outcome of the work.

Skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback were negatively significant predictors for the experienced meaningfulness of the work and the hotel employees' turnover intentions. Meanwhile, the experienced meaningfulness of the work significantly predicted the turnover intention. More importantly, it explains a larger part of the turnover intention variance than the five job characteristics. The bootstrapping procedures were used to test the significance of the indirect effect. Unstandardized indirect effects were computed for each of the 1,000 bootstrapped samples, and the 95% confidence interval was computed by determining the indirect effects at the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. For skill variety, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was -.147^{***}, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from -.198 to -.100. For task identity, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was -.156^{***}, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from -.217 to -.100. For task significance, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was -.231^{***}, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from -.311 to -.150. For autonomy, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was

-.206^{***}, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from -.268 to -.140. For feedback, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was -.196^{***}, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from -.270 to -.120.

Table 4.6.2 Mediation effect of the Experienced Outcome of Responsibility

Total Effect		Direct Effect		Indirect Effect				Effect Size
Path	β	Path	β	Path	β	Path	β	
SV→TOI	-.264 ^{**}	SV→TOI	-.117 [*]	SV→OR	.237 ^{***}	OR→TOI	-.620 ^{***}	-.147 ^{***}
TI→TOI	-.321 ^{***}	TI→TOI	-.164 ^{**}	TI→OR	.256 ^{***}	OR→TOI	-.611 ^{***}	-.156 ^{***}
TS→TOI	-.389 ^{***}	TS→TOI	-.158 [*]	TS→OR	.397 ^{***}	OR→TOI	-.582 ^{***}	-.231 ^{***}
Au→TOI	-.247 ^{***}	Au→TOI	.041	Au→OR	.308 ^{***}	OR→TOI	-.670 ^{***}	-.206 ^{***}
FB→TOI	-.490 ^{***}	FB→TOI	-.293 ^{***}	FB→OR	.367 ^{***}	OR→TOI	-.535 ^{***}	.196 ^{***}

The effect of the five core job characteristics on the hotel employees' turnover intention were fully mediated via their knowledge of the results. As Table 4.9 illustrates, the regression coefficients between each job characteristic and the turnover intention, the regression coefficients between each job characteristic and knowledge of the results, and the regression coefficients between knowledge of the results and the turnover intention were significant. The indirect effects were SV (-.083^{***}), TI (-.126^{***}), TS (-.134^{***}), Au (-.133^{***}) and FB (-.218^{***}). Among the five core job characteristics, the direct effects of task identity, task significance, and autonomy were insignificant, which means that they were completely mediated by knowledge of the results.

Skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback were negatively significant predictors for the experienced meaningfulness of the work and the hotel employees' turnover intentions. Meanwhile, the experienced meaningfulness of the

work significantly predicted the turnover intention. More importantly, it explains a larger part of the turnover intention variance than the five job characteristics. The bootstrapping procedures were used to test the significance of the indirect effect. Unstandardized indirect effects were computed for each of the 1,000 bootstrapped samples, and the 95% confidence interval was computed by determining the indirect effects at the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles. For skill variety, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.083^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.124$ to $-.05$. For task identity, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.126^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from -0.185 to -0.08 . For task significance, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.134^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.187$ to $-.080$. For autonomy, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.133^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.195$ to $-.080$. For feedback, the bootstrapped unstandardized indirect effect was $-.218^{***}$, and the 95% confidence interval ranged from $-.198$ to $-.100$.

Table 4.6.3 Mediation effect of the Knowledge of Results

Total Effect		Direct Effect		Indirect Effect				Effect Size
Path	β	Path	β	Path	β	Path	β	
SV→TOI	$-.264^{**}$	SV→TOI	$-.181^{***}$	SV→KR	$.177^{***}$	KR→TOI	$-.470^{***}$	$-.083^{***}$
TI→TOI	$-.321^{***}$	TI→TOI	$-.195$	TI→KR	$.277^{***}$	KR→TOI	$-.455^{***}$	$-.126^{***}$
TS→TOI	$-.389^{***}$	TS→TOI	$-.255^{***}$	TS→KR	$.311^{***}$	KR→TOI	$-.430^{***}$	$-.134^{***}$
Au→TOI	$-.247^{***}$	Au→TOI	$-.114$	Au→KR	$.271^{***}$	KR→TOI	$-.490^{***}$	$-.133^{***}$
FB→TOI	$-.490^{***}$	FB→TOI	$-.272^{***}$	FB→KR	$.607^{***}$	KR→TOI	$-.359^{***}$	$.218^{***}$

4.7 Moderating Effect of Country

Regression tests were conducted to test the moderating impact of the country on the relationship between the five core job characteristics, critical psychological states, and hotel employees' turnover intentions.

Regarding the relationship between the five core job characteristics and the turnover intention, the five core job characteristics significantly predicted turnover intention in both countries. Still, they were not significantly different ($F = .654, p = .659$).

Table 4.7.1 Moderating effect of the country in the relationship between the five core job characteristics and the turnover intention

	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>
(Intercept)	6.619	.451	14.676	.000	6.741	.599	11.259	.000
SV	-.117	.059	-1.990	.047	-.115	.075	-1.534	.126
TI	-.127	.668	-1.900	.058	-.166	.096	-1.720	.086
TS	-.231	.076	-3.038	.003	-.294	.099	-2.973	.003
Au	-.048	.079	-.606	.545	.054	.100	.540	.589
FB	-.264	.079	-3.355	.001	-.281	.113	-2.484	.013
COUNTRYUS	.497	.152	3.264	.001	.360	.972	.371	.711
SV: CountryUS					.002	.123	.014	.989
TI: CountryUS					.085	.135	.634	.526
TS: CountryUS					.151	.157	.959	.338
Au: CountryUS					-.259	.164	-1.577	.116
FB: CountryUS					.036	.158	.227	.821
R ² (adj.R ²)	.167(.155)				.173(.152)			
F-statistic	14.330				8.080			
p-value	.000				.000			

Analysis of Variance

F-statistic	.654
Pr(>F)	.659

SE: standard error; adj.: adjusted;

There was no significant difference found in the relationship between the critical psychological states and the turnover intention ($F=.280, p=.840$).

Table 4.7.2 Moderating effect of the country in the relationship between the critical psychological states and the turnover intention

	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>
(Intercept)	6.905	.460	15.006	.000	6.796	.581	11.702	.000
MW	-.524	.076	-6.897	.000	-.541	.103	-5.240	.000
OR	-.097	.108	-.890	.374	-.023	.142	-.161	.872
KR	-.159	.077	-2.055	.040	-.198	.105	-1.890	.060
CountryUS	.234	.128	1.829	0.068	.599	.966	.621	.535
MW: CountryUS					.036	.153	.236	.813
OR: CountryUS					-.185	.222	-.832	.406
KR: CountryUS					.091	.156	.583	.560
R ² (adj.R ²)	.262(.255)				.264(.251)			
F-statistic	38.280				21.890			
p-value	.000				.000			

Analysis of Variance

F-statistic	.280
Pr(>F)	.840

SE: standard error; adj.: adjusted;

Regarding the relationship among the five core job characteristics, critical psychological states, and turnover intention, there was no significant difference between China and the United States ($F = .597, p = .780$).

4.7.3 Moderating effect of the country in the relationship among the five core job characteristics, the critical psychological states, and the turnover intention

	Model 1				Model 2			
	Estimate	SE	t	sig.	Estimate	SE	t	sig.
(Intercept)	7.144	.494	14.468	.000	7.068	.639	11.053	.000
SV	-.032	.057	-.570	.569	-.059	.072	-.815	.415
TI	-.095	.063	-1.503	.134	-.132	.093	-1.425	.155
TS	-.026	.077	-.342	.733	-.088	.101	-.871	.384
Au	.036	.075	.474	.636	.127	.095	1.334	.183
FB	-.042	.087	-.490	.624	-.011	.122	-.087	.931
MW	-.491	.083	-5.950	.000	-.499	.112	-4.465	.000
OR	-.063	.113	-.561	.575	.037	.015	.249	.803
KR	-.124	.088	-1.407	.160	-.199	.114	-1.744	.082
COUNTRYUS	.246	.147	1.678	.094	.746	1.065	.701	.484
SV: CountryUS					.086	.121	.709	.479
TI: CountryUS					.068	.129	.530	.596
TS: CountryUS					.134	.159	.842	.400
Au: CountryUS					-.239	.157	-1.516	.130
FB: CountryUS					-.102	.177	-.577	.564
MW: CountryUS					.030	.168	.178	.859
OR: CountryUS					-.261	.237	-1.103	.271
KR: CountryUS					.200	.183	1.094	.275
R ² (adj.R ²)	.269(.253)				.277(.247)			
F-statistic	17.370				9.408			
p-value	.000				.000			
Analysis of Variance								
F-statistic					.597			
Pr(>F)					.780			

SE: standard error; adj.: adjusted;

In terms of the relationship between the five core job characteristics and the critical psychological states, the relationship between the five core job characteristics and

the experienced responsibility for outcome of the work is significantly moderated by country ($F = 4.201, p < .001$).

4.7.4 Moderating effect of the country in the relationship between the five core job characteristics and the Experienced Outcome of Work

	Model 1				Model 2			
	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sig.</i>
(Intercept)	2.282	.210	10.840	.000	1.782	.274	6.508	.000
SV	.073	.027	2.667	.008	.018	.034	.519	.604
TI	.073	.031	2.339	.020	.145	.044	3.286	.001
TS	.244	.036	6.874	.000	.242	.045	5.362	.000
Au	.115	.037	3.114	.002	.090	.046	1.962	.050
FB	.158	.037	4.288	.000	.259	.052	5.014	.000
COUNTRYUS	-.163	.071	-2.299	.022	.840	.445	1.890	.059
SV* CountryUS					.133	.056	2.370	.018
TI* CountryUS					-.132	.062	-2.138	.033
TS*CountryUS					-.034	.072	-.468	.640
Au*CountryUS					.047	.075	.620	.536
FB* CountryUS					-.200	.072	-2.763	.006
R ² (adj.R ²)	.387(.379)				.416(.401)			
F-statistic	45.160				27.460			
p-value	.000				.000			
Analysis of Variance								
F-statistic	4.201							
Pr(>F)	.0009							

SE: standard error; adj.: adjusted;

Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

This study aimed to investigate hotel employees' perceptions of hotel jobs and their turnover intentions using Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics model (JCM). Moreover, it analyzed cultural differences between China and the United States, five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback), three critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for outcome of the work, and knowledge of the results), and hotel employees' turnover intentions. Also studied were the mediating effect of the critical psychological states between the core job characteristics and turnover intentions, and the moderating effect of the country (i.e., China, and the United States). The hypotheses test results are summarized in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Hypotheses test results

<i>Hypothesis</i>	<i>Path</i>	<i>Result</i>	<i>Hypothesis</i>	<i>Path</i>	<i>Result</i>
H1a	SV→MW	Approved	H4a	SV→TOI	Rejected
H1b	TI→MW	Rejected	H4b	TI→TOI	Approved
H1c	TS→MW	Approved	H4c	TS→TOI	Approved
H1d	Au→MW	Rejected	H4d	Au→TOI	Rejected
H1e	FB→MW	Approved	H4e	FB→TOI	Approved
H2a	SV→OR	Approved	H5a	MW→TOI	Approved
H2b	TI→OR	Approved	H5b	OR→TOI	Rejected
H2c	TS→OR	Approved	H5c	KR→TOI	Approved
H2d	Au→OR	Approved	H6a	SV	Approved
H2e	FB→OR	Approved	H6b	TI	Rejected
H3a	SV→KR	Rejected	H6c	TS	Approved
H3b	TI→KR	Rejected	H6d	Au	Approved
H3c	TS→KR	Rejected	H6e	FB	Rejected
H3d	Au→KR	Approved	H7a	SV, TI, TS, Au, FB → MW, OR, KR	Rejected
H3e	FB→KR	Approved	H7b	SV, TI, TS, Au, FB → TOI	Rejected

5.2 Discussion and Implications

5.2.1 Demographic profile

In China, a higher response rate was generated among married participants. On the contrary, unmarried participants made up most participants in the United States. In general, the divorce rate in the United States (14.9 divorces per 1,000 marriages) is higher than in China (3.36 divorces per 1,000 marriages). In terms of gender, most participants were female, with this proportion higher in China than in the United States. Therefore, the hotel industry should adjust accordingly to attract equal numbers of male and female candidates.

Hotels in both China and the United States have young employee profiles. More than 60% of the participants were under 44. Therefore, hotel recruitment strategies should be directed at younger candidates. However, an older age group candidate could be targeted if a hotel job was adjusted to fit their characteristics. The hotel industry could expand the candidate pool by making related adjustments.

More than half of the participants had bachelor's degrees or higher. This finding is surprisingly high, since the hotel industry belongs to the service industry. However, more than 75% of hotel employees reported a lower income level (less than \$49,999). The hotel industry should therefore aim to increase employees' wages and benefits to retain talented staff.

5.2.2 Research Model

This study aimed to investigate the characteristics of hotel jobs and their relationship with employees' critical psychological states and turnover intentions, as well as the influence of cultural differences between China and the United States.

Five Core job characteristics vs. critical psychological states

In Hackman and Oldham's JCM, skill variety, task identity, and task significance positively correlate with the meaningfulness of work. Autonomy has a positive relationship with outcome responsibility. Feedback is positively related to knowledge of results. In this research, five core job characteristics were tested against all three psychological states. The results indicated that skill variety has a positive relationship with the meaningfulness of work and outcome responsibility. Task identity has a positive influence on outcome responsibility. Task significance has a positive influence on the meaningfulness of work and outcome responsibility. Autonomy has a positive influence on the outcome of work and knowledge of work. Feedback is the only characteristic that has a positive relationship with all three critical psychological states.

Compared to the original Hackman and Oldham model, skill variety and task significance positively interact with meaningfulness of work and outcome responsibility. Task identity proved to have a positive relationship with outcome responsibility but not meaningfulness of work. Autonomy has a positive relationship with outcome responsibility and knowledge of results. Moreover, feedback positively interacts with all three critical psychological results, not only for knowledge of results. The cause of these differences is not investigated in this research and is worth exploring in future research.

Five core job characteristics vs. hotel employees' turnover intention

The findings of this research related to the relationship between the five core job characteristics and hotel employees' turnover intentions align with previous research. All five core job characteristics are significantly and negatively correlated with hotel employees' turnover intentions. All five core job characteristics scored higher in the United States in comparison to China. The ratings related to skill variety, task identity, and autonomy in the United States were significantly higher than in China. The difference can be explained by the labor cost difference between these two countries. China is known for its cheaper labor, which allows hotels to employ more employees than in the United States at the same cost. As the proportion of hotel employees is lower in the United States, they are required to be more skilled.

Country played an insignificant role in the relationship between the five core job characteristics and turnover intentions, and in the relationship between critical psychological states and turnover intentions. The only significant moderation effect of the country was found between the five core job characteristics and experienced responsibility for outcome of the work.

First, skill variety is significantly higher in United States. Which means hotel employees in the United States perceive that they are better at multitasking and have more diverse skills. This offers insights for the hotel industry in China, which may consider developing different skills among employees to increase their workability. Secondly, the task significance in the United States is significantly higher than it is in China. Hotel employees in the United States believe that their jobs have a substantial

impact on their lives or their customers. In contrast, hotel employees in China do not perceive their jobs as important; they perceive their social status as lower than those employed in other industries (Brien, et al., 2017). Autonomy shares the same pattern as task variety and task significance; however, the autonomy score is significantly lower in China. Hotel employees in China believe that they have less freedom and independence when carrying out daily work. More decision-making flexibility should be given to hotel employees in China to increase their autonomy.

Given that all five core characteristics are negatively significant in relation to hotel employees' turnover intentions, the hotel industry should increase these job characteristics in both countries. The hotel industry in China should focus on skill variety, task significance and autonomy, in particular.

Mediation effect of the critical psychological states

Most previous research has not considered the three critical psychological states (meaningfulness of work, outcome responsibility, and knowledge of results) while testing Hackman and Oldham's JCM. In this study, the complete model was tested, focusing on the mediating effects of critical psychological states on the relationship between core job characteristics and hotel employees' turnover intentions. The findings of this study revealed that all three critical psychological states are negatively related to hotel employees' turnover intentions. Meanwhile, the five core job characteristics and hotel employees' turnover intentions were fully mediated via their experienced meaningfulness of work, outcome responsibility, and knowledge of results. Skill variety, task identity, and autonomy were entirely mediated through the meaningfulness of work. Autonomy

significantly and negatively predicted hotel employees' turnover intentions through their outcome responsibility. Task identity and autonomy were completely mediated by knowledge of results, which negatively affected hotel employees' turnover intentions. Among the five core job characteristics, only autonomy was completely mediated by all three critical psychological states. This finding proves that it is crucial to include critical psychological states in the model when testing it in different industries.

Based on this study, critical psychological states should be included in research on job characteristics models. Critical psychological states create a strong linkage between the five core job characteristics and hotel employees' turnover intentions. As critical psychological states significantly explain turnover intentions, the hotel industry should remain aware of its employees' psychological states.

5.3 Limitation and Future Research

Due to different cultural backgrounds, sample sizes, and other factors, every study has limitations when the results are interpreted. Limitations are matters and occurrences that are out of a researcher's control. The following limitations were identified in this study. Additionally, this section also explains opportunities and areas for future research.

First, the sample was collected in the United States and China. There are additional cultural differences to consider when it comes to applying the JCM model. Also, a larger sample size will help to expand the application of the JCM in different contexts.

Second, this study considered the hotel industry overall; however, there are many kinds of hotels, for instance, motels, economy hotels, and luxury hotels. Therefore,

caution should be exercised when interpreting the results across different types of hotels. Future research should focus on a particular type of hotel.

Lastly, simple randomization was employed in the data collection; however, there are plenty of different occupations within the hotel industry. Specifying the occupation will provide further insights into how job characteristics and critical psychological states predict hotel employees' turnover intentions.

Reference

- Ali, F. (2015). The Effect of Job Characteristics on Managers' Intent to Leave the Organization: The Mediating Role of the Four Dimensions of Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10(6), 239-250.

- Ali, S. A. M., Said, N. A., Yunus, N. a. M., Kader, S. F. A., Latif, D. S. A., & Munap, R. (2014). *Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model to Job Satisfaction*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Innovation, Management and Technology Research, Malaysia.
- Allan, C., Brosnon, P., Horwitz, F., & Walsh, P. (2001). From standard to non-standard employment: Labour force change in Australia. *New Zealand and South Africa. International Journal of Manpower*, 22(7), 748-763.
- Brien, A. (2004). The New Zealand Hotel Industry-Vacancies Increase While Applicant Numbers and Caliber Decrease. *International journal of hospitality & tourism administration*, 5(1), 87-104.
- Brien, A., Thomas, N. J., & Brown, E. A. (2017). How hotel employee job-identity impacts the hotel industry: The uncomfortable truth. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 235-243.
- Brown, E. A., Thomas, N. J., & Bosselman, R. H. (2015). Are they leaving or staying: A qualitative analysis of turnover issues for Generation Y hospitality employees with a hospitality education. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 46, 130-137.
- Ferreira, A. I., Martinez, L. F., Lamelas, J. P., & Rodrigues, R. I. (2017). Mediation of job embeddedness and satisfaction in the relationship between task characteristics and turnover: A multilevel study in Portuguese hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 248-267.
- Fried, Y., & Ferris, G. R. (1987). The Validity of the Job Characteristics Model: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 287-322.
- Glick, P., Wilk, K., & Perreault, M. (1995). Images of Occupations: Components of Gender and Status in Occupational Stereotypes. *Sex Roles*, 32(9-10), 565-582.
- Gottfredson, L. (1981). Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations. *Journal of counseling Psychology Monograph*, 28, 545-579.

- Grobelna, A. (2019). Effects of individual and job characteristics on hotel contact employees' work engagement and their performance outcomes: A case study from Poland. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(1), 349-369.
- Hackman, J. R., & Lawler III, E. E. (1971). Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55(3), 259-286.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, D. R. (1975). The job diagnostic survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects. *Department of Administrative Sciences: Yale Univeristiy*.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Horner, S., & Swarbrooke, J. (2004). *International Cases in Tourism Management*. Elsevier Butter- worth-Heinemann: Oxford.
- Iqbal, Q., Ahmad, N. H., & Akhtar, S. (2017). The Mediating Role of Job Embeddedness Fit: Perceived Job Characteristics and Turnover Intention in the Services Sector. *The Lahore Journal of Business*, 6(1), 71-92.
- Jiang, B., & Tribe, J. (2009). 'Tourism jobs – short lived professions': Student attitudes towards tourism careers in China. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 8(1). doi:10.3794/johlste.81.168
- Jung, H. S., & Yoon, H. H. (2016). What does work meaning to hospitality employees? The effects of meaningful work on employees' organizational commitment: The mediating role of job engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 53, 59-68.
- Lai, P. C., & Baum, T. (2005). Just-in-time labour supply in the hotel sector – the role of agencies. *Employee Relations*, 27(1), 86-102.
- Lashley, C. (2000). *Hospitality Retail Management: A Unit Manager's Guide*. Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.

- Lee-Ross, D. (1998). The reliability and rationale of Hackman and Oldham's Job Diagnostic Survey and Job Characteristics Model among seasonal hotel workers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 17, 391-406.
- Lee-Ross, D. (2005). Perceived Job Characteristics and Internal Work Motivation: An exploratory cross-cultural analysis of the motivational antecedents of hotel workers in Mauritius and Australia. *The Journal of Management Development*, 24(3), 253-266.
- McKnight, D. H., Phillips, B., & Hardgrave, B. C. (2009). Which reduces IT turnover intention the most: Workplace characteristics or job characteristics? *Information & Management*, 46, 167-174.
- Mohsin, A., Lengler, J., & Humar, B. (2013). Exploring the antecedents of intentions to leave the job: The case of luxury hotel staff. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 35, 48-58.
- Nachmias, S., & Walmsley, A. (2015). Making career decisions in a changing graduate labour market: A Hospitality perspective. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 17, 50-58.
- Pizam, A., & Neumann, Y. (1988). The Effect of Task Characteristics on Hospitality Employees' Job Satisfaction and Burnout. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal*, 99-105.
- Reddy, T. N., Azash, S. M., & Azeem, B. A. (2011). *Perception Of Job Dimensions In Select It Companies In India: Application Of Hackman And Oldham's Job Characteristics Model*. Paper presented at the Asia Pacific Marketing and Management Conference 2011, Sarawak, Malaysia.
- Reichel, A., & Pizam, A. (1984). Job satisfaction, lifestyle and demographics of U.S. hospitality industry workers - versus others. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 3(3), 123-133.

- Shirazi, A., GolestaniNia, M., MehrganRad, M., & Naghdali, M. A. (2012). Examining Job Characteristics Model in an Oriental Culture. *The International Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(1), 42-50.
- Turner, A. N., & Lawrence, P. R. (1965). *Industrial Jobs and the Worker: An Investigation of Response to Task Attributes*: Harvard University, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Wan, Y. K. P., Wong, I. A., & Kong, W. H. (2014). Student career prospect and industry commitment: The roles of industry attitude, perceived social status, and salary expectations. *Tourism Management*, 40, 1-14.
- Williams, D., Harris, C., & Parker, J. (2008). I love you – goodbye: exit interviews and turnover in the New Zealand Hotel Industry. *New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations*, 33(3), 70-90.
- Workforce Vitality Report, A. (2020). Workforce Vitality Report. Retrieved from <https://workforcereport.adp.com/>
- Zhang, H. Q., & Wu, E. (2004). Human resources issues facing the hotel and travel industry in China. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(7), 424-428.
- Zhao, X. R., & Ghiselli, R. (2016). Why do you feel stressed in a “smile factory”? Hospitality job characteristics influence work–family conflict and job stress. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(2), 305-326. doi:org/10.1108/IJCHM-08-2014-0385
- Zhao, X. R., Ghiselli, R., Law, R., & Ma, J. (2016). Motivating frontline employees: Role of job characteristics in work and life satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 27, 27-38.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Survey in United States

Hotel Job Characteristics Survey

This questionnaire was developed as part of a University of Missouri study of hotel job characteristics and its relationships to turnover intentions. The questionnaire helps to determine how jobs can be better designed, by obtaining information about how hotel employees react to their jobs.

On the following pages you will find several different kinds of questions about your job. Specific instructions are given at the start of each section. Please read them carefully. It should take no more than 25 minutes to complete the entire questionnaire. Please move through it quickly.

The questions are designed to obtain **your perceptions** of your job and **your reactions** to it.

There are no “trick” questions. Your individual answers are anonymous. Please answer each item as honestly and frankly as possible.

Thank you for your participation.

For more information about this questionnaire and its use, please contact:

Tiantian Li
Hospitality Management
111 Eckles Hall, Columbia, MO 65201

Section I

This part of the questionnaire asks you to describe your job, as objectively as you can. Please do not use this part of the questionnaire to show how much you like or dislike your job. Questions about that will come later. Instead, try to make your descriptions as accurate and as objective as you possibly can.

A sample question is given below.

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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little; the job requires almost no contact with mechanical equipment of any kind.				Moderately		Very much; the job requires almost constant work with mechanical equipment.

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

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

If you do not understand these instructions, please ask for assistance. If you do understand them, you can begin answering the questions below.

1. To what extent does your job require you to work closely with other people (either hotel guests, or colleagues in your hotel)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little; dealing with other people is not at all necessary in doing the job.			Moderately; some dealing with others are necessary.			Very much; dealing with other people is an absolutely essential and crucial part of doing the job.

2. How much autonomy is there in your job? That is, to what extent does your job permit you to decide on your own how to go about doing the work?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼			▼			▼
Very little; the job gives me almost no personal “say” about how and when the work is done.			Moderate autonomy; many things are standardized and not under my control, but I can make some decisions about the work.			Very much; the job gives me almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is done.

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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼			▼			▼
My job is only a tiny part of the overall piece of work; the results of my activities cannot be seen in the final product or service.			My job is a moderate-sized “chunk” of the overall piece of work; my own contribution can be seen in the final outcome.			My job involves doing the whole piece of work, from start to finish; the final results of my activities are easily seen in the final product or service.

4. How much variety is there in your job? That is, to what extent does the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼			▼			▼
Very little; the job requires me to do the same routine things over and over again.			Moderate variety.			Very much; the job requires me to do many different things, using a number of different skills and talents.

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

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼			▼			▼
Not very significant; the outcomes of my work are not likely to have important effects on other people.			Moderately significant.			Highly significant; the outcomes of my work can affect other people in very important ways.

6. To what extent do managers or co-workers let you know how well you are doing on your job?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼			▼			▼
Very little; the job itself is set up so I could work forever without finding out how well I am doing.			Moderately; sometimes doing the job provides “feedback” to me sometimes it does not.			Very much; the job is set up so that I get almost constant “feedback” as I work about how well I am doing.

7. To what extent does doing the job itself provide you with information about your work performance? That is, does the actual work itself provide clues about how well you are doing—aside from any “feedback” co-workers or supervisors may provide?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼			▼			▼
Very little; the job itself is set up so I could work forever without finding out how well I am doing.			Moderately; sometimes doing the job provides ‘feedback’ to me; sometimes it does not.			Very much; the job is set up so that I get almost constant “feedback” as I work about how well I am doing.

Section II

Listed below are a number of statements which could be used to describe a job.

*You are to indicate whether each statement is an **accurate** or an **inaccurate** description of your job.*

Once again, please try to be as objective as you can in deciding how accurately each statement describes your job—regardless of whether you like or dislike your job.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

How accurate is the statement in describing your job?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Very Inaccurate	Mostly Inaccurate	Slightly Inaccurate	Uncertain	Slightly Accurate	Mostly Accurate	Very Accurate

The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

The job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job is quite simple and repetitive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job can be done adequately by a person working alone—without talking or checking with other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The supervisors and co-workers on this job almost never give me any “feedback” about how well I am doing in my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supervisors often let me know how well they think I am performing the job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section III

Now please indicate how you personally feel about your job.

Each of the statements below is something that a person might say about his or her job. You are to indicate your own, personal feelings about your job by marking how much you agree with each of the statements.

Write a number in the blank for each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

Please indicate the extent of agreement with the following statements on a 7-Likert scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

It's hard, on this job, for me to care very much about whether or not the work gets done right.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My opinion of myself goes up when I do this job well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most of the things I have to do on this job seem useless or trivial.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I usually know whether or not my work is satisfactory on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I feel a very high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I frequently think of quitting this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I feel bad and unhappy when I discover that I have performed poorly on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I often have trouble figuring out whether I'm doing well or poorly on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I feel I should personally take the credit or blame for the results of my work on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My own feelings generally are not affected much on way or the other by how well I do on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Whether or not this job gets done right is clearly my responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section IV

*Now please think of the **other people** in your organization who hold the same job you. If no one has exactly the same job as you, think of the job which is most similar to yours.*

Please think about how accurately each of the statements describes the feelings of those people about the job.

It is quite all right if your answers here are different from when you described your **own** reactions to the job. Often different people feel quite differently about the same job.

Once again, write a number in the blank for each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

Please indicate the extent of agreement with the following statements on a 7-Likert scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Most people on this job feel a great sense of personal satisfaction when they do the job well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job are very satisfied with the job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job feel that the work is useless or trivial.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job feel a great deal of personal responsibility for the work they do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job have a pretty good idea of how well they are performing their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Most people on this job find the work very meaningful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job feel that whether or not the job gets done right is clearly their own responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
People on this job often think of quitting.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job feel bad or unhappy when they find that they have performed the work poorly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job have trouble figuring out whether they are doing a good or a bad job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job are paid less than those in other industries.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job have long working hours.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job have irregular work schedules.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job often have to work on holidays.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most people on this job often have to work on multiple shifts.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The hospitality industry has a high turnover.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section V

Turnover Intention *refers to the percentage of employees leaving a hotel within a certain period of time. (Oliveira & Scherbaum, 2017)*

Once again, write a number in the blank for each statement, based on this scale:

How much do you agree with the statement?

Please indicate the extent of agreement with the following statements on a 7-Likert scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼	▼
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

I would turn down another job that offered quite a bit more pay in order to stay with this hotel.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Giving thought to my future career, I can see myself still working for my present employer in three years.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I plan to stay at this organization as long as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Under no circumstances will I voluntarily leave this organization before I retire.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I will resign from this organization at the earliest possible opportunity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am actively looking for alternative employment in hotel industry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think that I am poorly paid compared to my colleagues with similar job of mine.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think I am poorly paid compared to people working in the other industries.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The poor pay in hospitality industry make me consider work in another industry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I do not spend enough time with my family.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The irregular working hours is reason why I look for jobs outside of hotel industry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The long working hours is reason why I look for jobs outside of hospitality industry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have to work during holidays is reason why I look for jobs outside of hospitality industry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Multiple shifts are the reason why I look for jobs outside of hospitality industry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My current job is very stressful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I think fewer opportunities for promotion are provided to me by the organization where I am working.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The promotional process is not fair or transparent in my organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section VI: Demographic Data

What's your job title?

Age

Which category below includes your age?

- ☐ Under 18
- ☐ 18-24
- ☐ 25-34
- ☐ 35-44
- ☐ 45-54
- ☐ 55-64
- ☐ 65-74
- ☐ 75-84
- ☐ 85 or older

Race

Are you White, Black or African-American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or another Pacific Islander, or some other race?

- ☐ White
- ☐ Black or African-American
- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Native Hawaiian or another Pacific islander
- ☐ Other

Gender

What is your gender?

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Other (specify)

Marital status

Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Married with kids
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Never married

Education

What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- ☐ Less than high school degree
- ☐ High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)

- ☐ Some college but no degree
- ☐ Associate degree
- ☐ Bachelor's degree
- ☐ Graduate degree

Employment

Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?

- ☐ Employed, working 1-39 hours per week
- ☐ Employed, working 40 or more hours per week

Household income

How much total combined money did all members of your household earn in 2018?

- ☐ \$0 – \$9,999
- ☐ \$10,000 – \$19,999
- ☐ \$20,000 – \$29,999
- ☐ \$30,000 – \$39,999
- ☐ \$40,000 – \$49,999
- ☐ \$50,000 – \$59,999
- ☐ \$60,000 – \$69,999
- ☐ \$70,000 – \$79,999
- ☐ \$80,000 – \$89,999
- ☐ \$90,000 – \$99,999
- ☐ \$100,000 or more

Thank you for your participation!

Have a wonderful day 😊