COMMUNICATION FRAMES OF HOTEL MANAGERS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON JOB SATISFACTION, INTENT TO LEAVE, AND JOB REGRET

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

Doctor of Philosophy

by

JULIE A. BELLEMARE

Dr. Michael Kramer, Thesis Supervisor

MAY 2015
The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

COMMUNICATION FRAMES OF HOTEL MANAGERS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON JOB SATISFACTION, INTENT TO LEAVE, AND JOB REGRET

presented by Julie Bellemare,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

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

____________________________________
Professor Michael Kramer

____________________________________
Professor Debbie Dougherty

____________________________________
Professor Rebecca Meisenbach

____________________________________
Professor Guy Adams
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my advisor, Dr. Michael W. Kramer, who continued to work with me and continued and continued and continued and continued to provide guidance and encouragement. His guidance made all the difference. My husband, Shannon Bellemare, offered support and encouragement at the most crucial times. Last but not least, my sincerest thanks to my children Laura and Rich Hosmer who sacrificed time with Mom so I could continue my education. They were children when this process started and adults living on their own when this concluded.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .............................................................................................................. ii

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS ..................................................................................................... vii

ABSTRACT ............................................................................................................................... viii

Chapter 1 ................................................................................................................................. 1

Chapter 2 ................................................................................................................................. 8

Framing Theory ....................................................................................................................... 8

Framing as Culture ................................................................................................................. 13

Frame Strengths ..................................................................................................................... 15

Competing Frames ................................................................................................................. 17

Job Frames ............................................................................................................................... 20

Profession Frame .................................................................................................................. 20

Meaningful Frame ................................................................................................................. 27

Calling Frame ....................................................................................................................... 30

Dirty Work Frame ............................................................................................................... 32

Family Frame ....................................................................................................................... 36

Real Job Frame .................................................................................................................... 37

Frame of Flow ....................................................................................................................... 42

Summary of Frames ............................................................................................................. 43

Chapter 3: Phase I: Method and Results ........................................................................... 52
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Table 1 Communication Frame Categories ............................................. 61
Table 2 Participant Demographics .......................................................... 88
Table 3 Participants by Department ......................................................... 89
Table 4 Work Outcomes Factor Loading .................................................. 92
Table 5 Communication Frames Factor Loading ....................................... 94
Table 6 Correlations Between Work Outcomes and Communication Frames ...... 100
Table 7 Age and Job Satisfaction .............................................................. 102
Table 8 Demographic Variables and Communication Frames Significance ........ 103
Table 9 Employment Status and Hard Work Differences ............................. 104
Table 10 Dirty Work by Job Title ............................................................. 105
Table 11 Education Differences ............................................................... 106
Figure 1 Age Means Differences for Hard Work ........................................ 107
Figure 2 Age Means Differences for Real Job ............................................ 108
Figure 3 Pay Differences with Real Job .................................................... 109
Figure 4 Pay Differences and Hard Work ................................................ 110
Figure 5 Position Tenure Means Differences for Real Job ........................... 111
Table 12 Regression of Demographic Variables and Communication Frames with Work Outcomes
ABSTRACT

The hotel industry is plagued with turnover. This study uses Framing Theory to examine hotel turnover. This study consisted of two phases. Phase I used qualitative research methods to answer RQ1: What communication frames do hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel? Thirteen hotel managers were interviewed to discover the communication frames they use to describe their jobs. The nine communication frames of family, fun, team, manager as an advocate, autonomy, hard work, professional hotelier, comfortable, and communication style were revealed. The communication frames of professions, meaningful work, calling, dirty work, family, real jobs and work as flow were revealed through the literature review. The data from the literature review and Phase I was used to create a survey for Phase II. Phase II used quantitative research methods to answer RQ2: What is the relationship between the communication frames and job satisfaction, turnover intention and job commitment? Nine communication frames that formed valid and reliable scales were analyzed. Factor analysis revealed three work outcomes of job satisfaction, intent to leave and job regret. Several correlations between the communication variables and the work outcomes were revealed. Predictors of job satisfaction were fun and fulfillment. Predictors of intent to leave were fun, manager as an advocate, hard work, pay and real job. Predictors of job regret were fun, professional hotelier, and real job. This study expands the use of Framing Theory in organizations and expands previous research. This study also has application for managers wishing to reduce turnover. Limitations and ideas for future studies were stated.

Keywords: turnover, communication frames, job satisfaction, intent to leave, job regret
Chapter 1
The Costly Problem of Turnover

In 2009 the hospitality industry employed over 18.5 million workers and was expected to add nearly 2 million jobs by 2012 (Adams, 2006). Although the economic recession of 2008 – 2009 slowed growth in the hospitality industry, all job lost had been regained by 2010 and there has been steady growth since (Bureau of Labor, 2014). The Economics Daily (August 8, 2014) reported that the food and beverage segment alone accounted for one in every six jobs added during the recession recovery (Bureau of Labor, 2014). In the last quarter of 2014 alone, 150,000 jobs were added to the hospitality industry (Bureau of Labor, 2015). The National Employment Matrix (Bureau of Labor, 2008) for 2008 – 2018 predicts growth in most hospitality positions. Some positions have large growth predictions such as cooks (15.4% growth), hotel front desk clerks (13.8% growth), concierges (13.5% growth) and gaming managers (10.4% growth). Other positions have moderate growth such as wait staff (6.6% growth) and lodging managers (3.5% growth). This growth means the demand for hospitality employees is great.

However, behind the news of growth, lies the fact that the hospitality industry is plagued with high turnover. At the 2006 International Society of Hospitality Consultants (ISHC) Annual Conference, ISHC members participated in a series of roundtable discussions to identify the ISHC Top Ten Issues in the Hospitality Industry for 2007. The debate included in-depth discussions on over 100 different issues with 27 making the ballot for the final vote by the members. The problem that earned the distinction of the number one problem for hoteliers in 2007 was attracting and retaining qualified workers (American Hotel & Lodging Association [AHLA], 2006). In the last quarter of 2014, hospitality companies
reported 250,500 hires and 285,700 separations (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). It appears that turnover is a problem that has not been resolved since being identified as the number one problem over nine years ago.

Unwanted turnover is a costly problem for hospitality companies. Estimates of average annual hotel employees turnover range from nearly 60 percent to 300 percent, according to research conducted by the American Hotel and Lodging Association (AHLA). More specifically, according to a 1998 study reported in Hotel Magazine (March 2000) on the subject, the AHLA concludes that annual turnover for line-level employees is 158%, 136% for supervisors, and 129% for managers. Retention experts say hotels spend thousands every year for each new employee they must train to replace a seasoned worker who leaves. It is no longer a startling fact that the cost of losing an employee is between half and one-and-a-half times their annual salary (Mehta, 2005). Turnover in terms of both productivity and money is huge, a problem which almost every hotel shares (Salerno, 2006).

High turnover negatively affects the profitability of a hotel. It not only creates large expenses in recruiting and training, but productivity, teamwork, and ultimately customer service are negatively impacted. Nifi Network, a division of PricewaterhouseCoopers, and Roper Starch Worldwide conducted a joint study that examined the impact of employee turnover on customer satisfaction (TALX, 2001). The results showed a strong link between employee retention and quality of service as stated by the customer. Unfortunately though, managers only think about retention when they receive a resignation from an employee (Barbian, 2002). Barbian quoted Lynn Ware stating, “Most organizations don’t have a handle on the actual reasons why employees stay or the reasons why they depart. They’ll attempt to capture the causes of attrition through standard exit interviews. Unfortunately exit interviews
only scratch the surface” (para. 6). Most employees are not proxy to knowing when an employee is considering exiting the company and turnover often catches them by surprise.

This costly problem is compounded by the lagging wages and an industry reputation for short-term, temporary jobs (AHLA, 2006). Nearly 70 percent of minimum wage employees in the United States work in the hospitality industry (Worcester, 1999). The federal government set the minimum wage in July, 2009 at $7.25 per hour (Department of Labor [DOL], 2011). In 1991, the minimum wage was $4.25 per hour with a tip credit of 50%, which made $2.13 per hour the minimum wage for tipped employees (DOL, 2009). Although the federal minimum wage has increased five times since 1991, the minimum tipped wage for hospitality workers has remained at $2.13 per hour. Although July 2009 was the last increase mandated by the federal government, 17 states have higher state minimum wages (DOL, 2011) but still allow a considerable tip credit or have allowed the $2.13 tip wage to remain. Nine states have minimum wages lower than the federal government or no minimum wage at all (DOL, 2011).

Many hospitality jobs have an image problem. “There was a time not too long ago when people joined the hospitality industry for its glamour” (AHLA, 2006). However, today, if a poll was taken of all job seekers, the hospitality industry would not emerge as one of the top five industries of choice according to Taroon Kapor, Professor of Collins School of Hospitality Management (personal communication, November 14, 2004). The hospitality industry has not done enough to earn a reputation as a top career choice for college graduates (AHLA, 2006). Jobs in the hospitality industry are often seen as temporary and not “a real job” (Woods, 1997).
Overall, the literature on turnover can be quite overwhelming. As of 1981, there were over 1000 studies on turnover examining over 50 different variables (Steers & Mowday, 1981). Thirty-four years later, a word search for employee turnover in the electronic database ABI/Inform revealed 9,902 articles on January 26, 2015. A word search for employee turnover in the electronic database, Academic Search Premier, on the same day revealed 1,804 articles from scholarly publications on the same topic. Studies have been conducted on the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover (e.g., Holdsworth & Cartwright, 2003; Oshagbemi & Hickson, 2003), the relationship between the employee and the immediate supervisor and its effect on turnover (e.g., Graen, Dansereau & Minami, 1972; Graen & Scandura, 1987; Sias & Jablin, 1995), the relationship between culture and turnover (e.g., Lund, 2003; Sheridan, 1992), rewards and turnover (e.g., Hansen, Smith, & Hansen, 2002), work tasks and turnover (Frank, Finnegan & Taylor, 2004; Milman, 2002), and of course, pay and its effect on turnover (e.g., Beilock & Capelle, 1990; Butt, 2008; Rodriguez and Griffin, 1990).

In addition to turnover, studies regarding retention have been conducted. The studies examine why employees remain at their job. The same factors mentioned in the previous paragraph that affect turnover have surfaced in the studies of retention. Hula and Weinberg (2003) examined organizational structure, communication, training, and manager span of control. Kay and Jordon-Evans (2002) correlated retention with job satisfaction, career growth, work environments, and rewards. Although many of the same factors that lead to turnover can also lead to retention, retention is not simply the inverse of turnover (Waldman & Arora, 2004). Increasing levels of job satisfaction or pay increases have had little effect on
turnover (Grossberg & Sicilian, 2004). Intent to stay and job commitment do not always lead to retention (Feeley, 2000).

Missing from the above lists is an explanation of the reputation that hospitality jobs are not real jobs and the effect this reputation has on turnover. “When are you going to get a real job?” is a common question asked of hospitality workers. The concept of a “real job” is a communicatively constructed perception. “The rhetorical or communicative creation of the meaning of work and the social organization of labor adds to the determination of what counts as valuable work as well as why we work the way we do” (Clair, 1996, p. 4).

Framing Theory may offer an explanation as to why jobs are not constructed with equal value. Some jobs are framed as more valuable and more desirable than other jobs (Smith, 1994; Tsetsura, 2011). Framing Theory is widely used in examining perceptions created by mass media and political communication. The premise of Framing Theory is that an issue can be viewed from a variety of perspectives and be construed as having implications for multiple values or considerations. It is the process by which people develop “a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue” (Chong & Druckman, 2007a, p. 104). Although the importance of framing has been examined as an important leadership tool in organizations (Entman, 1993; Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996), the focus has been on framing in culture, creating vision, and avoiding mixed messages rather than the framing the work itself. Studies using Framing Theory to examine the value of jobs have not been conducted.

There is one hospitality company who believes it has valuable, real jobs and the low turnover rate of the company reflects that the employees may believe this too. Drury Hotels’ annual turnover rate for all hotels combined is in the single digits for managers and less than
25% for hourly employees. According to the CEO of the company (personal communication March, 2010) their managers are expected to identify and develop career-minded employees to become the future leaders of the company. This means managers must communicate to employees about the company and the real jobs that translate into career opportunities. Communication between managers and employees is very important to the CEO of the company. He credits the company’s financial success and low turnover rate directly to the communication that occurs between the managers and the employees.

The role of communication and its effects on turnover are at the center of this study. This study has two purposes. First it examines communication strategies hotel managers use with applicants and current employees to describe their jobs. This part of the study, Phase I, uses a qualitative methodology. Hotel general managers whose hotels have low turnover were interviewed to determine communication strategies they use to identify, develop and retain career-minded employees. Data from Phase I as well as information from previous studies was used to create a survey for Phase II of the study. Phase II examined the communication strategies to see if they were associated with job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover intention. This part used a quantitative methodology. Hourly hotel employees were surveyed after gaining permission from the hotel managers. This approach allowed the examination of the relationship between framed messages about valued, real jobs and job satisfaction, job commitment, and retention within the hotel industry. This study has both practical and theoretical implications. Practical implications may be information for managers that help them overcome the poor image of their jobs and retain career-minded employees. This helps a business meet growth demands and increases the potential for a business to be run more efficiently. Theoretical implications are advancing Framing Theory
beyond political and mass media communication and revealing an additional applications for framing in organizational communication beyond culture (Entman, 1993) and vision (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996).

The next chapter of this study reviews Framing Theory in more detail and examines how work and jobs have been framed in previous studies. Chapter Three explains the methodology and results of Phase I of the study. Chapters Four explains the methodology and results of Phase II of the study. Chapter Five contains a discussion of the findings, limitations of the study and recommendations for future studies.
Chapter 2

McJob: A low-paying job that requires little skill and provides little opportunity for advancement. This definition first appeared in the Merriam-Webster dictionary in 2003 spawning McDonald’s CEO to write a letter of protest to the publisher. It was McDonald’s itself, however, that first used the term in promoting jobs to people with disabilities (MacArthur, 2007). It was meant as a term to represent career opportunities. However, when Amitai Etzioni (1986) used the term in his Washington Post article, The fast food factories: McJobs are bad for kids, the term was associated with jobs that offered no skills, had poor supervision, and interfered with school. “A sound economy cannot be built on flipping hamburgers; good jobs, the kind that offer a decent wage and a real chance for opportunity [are needed]” (Dine, 1991, p. 1D). House Majority Leader Richard Gephardt spoke of the loss of good jobs and the explosion of dead-end ones in this same article (Dine, 1991). Unfortunately, a term meant to represent jobs with opportunities was communicatively framed in the media as a term for dead-end and undesirable jobs. Sadly, McDonald’s is not the only company with McJobs. The hospitality industry as a whole is plagued with jobs stigmatized as McJobs.

Framing Theory

“In the complex and chaotic environments in which most of us work, there is considerable maneuverability with respect to the facts…what is real is often what we say is real” (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 4). Tsetsura (2011) stated that a career field’s identity is negotiated through social construction of reality. Framing theory offers an explanation for how jobs can be viewed multiple ways and may offer a possibility of reconstructing the perceptions of hotel jobs.
The major premise of Framing Theory is that an issue can be viewed from a variety of perspectives and be construed as having implications for multiple values or considerations. It is the process by which people develop “a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue” (Chong & Druckman, 2007a, p. 104). Frames help people organize what they see in everyday life. Gamson and Modigliani (1989) define a frame as a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events, suggesting what is at the issue. Frames influence opinions, perceptions, attitudes and behaviors (Chong & Druckman, 2007a; Fairhurst, 1993; Mercurio & Filak, 2010). Meaning is managed in framing “because we assert that our interpretations should be taken as real over other possible interpretations” (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 3).

“Framing consistently offers a way to describe the power of a communicating text” (Entman, 1993, p. 51). Frames construct particular meanings by their patterns of emphasis, interpretation, and exclusion (Carragee & Roefs, 2004). Entman (1993) states:

To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and or treatment recommendation for the item described. (p. 52)

Communicators make conscious or unconscious framing judgments in deciding what to say, guided by frames that organize their belief systems. It is chiefly through discourse that a point of reference is created, meaning is assigned, and action becomes possible (Entman, 1993). Framing occurs with every communication (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996). Frames not only exert their power by what they highlight but also through what they do not highlight. “In framing, when we create a bias towards one interpretation, we exclude other aspects,
including those that may produce opposite or alternate interpretations” (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 4).

Scholars generally use the term “frame” in two ways. A frame in communication refers to the “words, images, phrases, and presentation styles that a speaker uses when relaying information about an issue or event to an audience” (Chong & Druckman, 2007b, p. 100). “In choosing words that members accept as representations of actions and events, they become social constructs that members define as real” (Fairhurst, 1993, p. 333). These frames directly impact behavior. Frames in communication is also referred to as sociological framing (Borah, 2011). The second use of the term “frame” refers to an individual’s cognitive understanding of a given situation. “Unlike frames in communication, which reflect a speaker’s emphasis, frames in thought refer to what an audience member believes to be the most salient aspect of an issue” (Chong & Druckman, 2007b, p. 101). Borah (2011) refers to this as psychological framing.

Entman (1993) writes that frames have at least four locations in the communication process: communicators, text, receiver, and culture. The communicators select the messages, texts, and symbols to send. Fairhurst (2011) advises managers that it is “better to think of communication as the creation of meaning, or more accurately as the co-creation of meaning” (p. 43). She continues to say that framing involves the ability to shape meaning. When managers frame the situation, they create reality. Communicators can consciously choose their frame. For example, Putnam and Holmer (1992) revealed that success in negotiations increases when communicators focus on a frame that highlights gains rather than perceived losses. In one negotiation instance, a shift from the frame of female coaches being paid less than male counterparts to the frame of improving female sports created a win-win
opportunity for both parties rather than a compromise that resulted in a loss-loss attitude.

There are numerous studies that reveal journalists and politicians consciously select the frames of reference for their audience (Brewer, 2003; De Vreese, 2004; Scheufele & Tewsbury, 2007). These examples give hope that as communicators, hotel managers can consciously create and shape meaning about the value of their jobs changing the perception of hotel jobs from unvalued jobs to valued jobs. Hotel managers can engage in framing activities.

A text contains the frames that thematically reinforce thoughts, facts, or judgments. “Texts can make bits of information more salient by placement, repetition or by associating them with culturally familiar symbols” (Entman, 1993, p. 53). Fairhurst (1993) states this about text:

Just as an artist works from a palate of colors to paint a picture, the leader who manages meaning works from a vocabulary of words and symbols to paint an image in the mind of the member. In choosing words that members accept as representations of actions and events, they become social facts that members define as real. Consequently, these representations or “frames” directly impact behavior. A common unifying theme in all of them is that chiefly through discourse, a new point of reference is created, meaning is assigned, and action becomes possible. (P. 333-334)

Words form beliefs which become frames that get acted upon. When texts make bits of information or beliefs more salient, the information becomes more important for the receiver. Salient information is more believable, more likely to be recalled during the decision making
process, and more likely to be acted on. This suggests that hotel managers should create a company frame or lexicon that creates a reference for and reinforces the value of their jobs.

The receiver is the audience. The audience processes the text in accordance with their existing beliefs, experiences and knowledge. The receiver may or may not reflect the communicator’s frame. Fairhurst (2011) recognizes the audience’s role when she talks about vision statements. She reports that the best visions are the “products of multiple and evolving conversations that win buy-in” (p. 46). Here she is saying that leaders set forth a vision but the audience reacts to it, through conversation or behavior. The audiences’ responses in turn reshape the vision. Scheufele (1999) states that people’s information processing and interpretation are influenced by preexisting meaning structures or schemas, in other words, frames. These frames are a version of reality built from personal experience. When new information is presented, individuals may seek out additional sources of information based on the assumption that the information given was incomplete, slanted or colored by the intentions of the communicator. The audience may talk to others or reflect in their own mind to more fully understand what they have learned in relation to their pre-existing frames. Or people may ignore the information and deem it as irrelevant or uninteresting.

Culture, as stated by Entman (1993), is “the stock of commonly invoked frames. Culture might be defined as the empirically demonstrable set of common frames exhibited in the discourse and thinking of most people in a social group” (p. 53). Neuman, Just, and Crigler (1992) stated that communicators consciously select a frame for a story taking into account their organizational and modality constraints which is part of the culture. Fairhurst and Sarr (1996) report that organizations use frames that shape and perpetuate the organization’s culture through stories and myths, traditions, rituals and ceremonies, slogans,
and artifacts. Through the frames expressed in myths, ceremonies, and slogans the culture is reinforced.

Stories, myths, slogans, and artifacts only work in creating culture when the audience members participate in repeating them and keeping them alive. In that regard, the audience becomes the communicator. Scheufele (1999) describes the effect of a news wave. In terms of media reporting, a news wave begins when a small number of journalists report a story framed in a certain way and then many more journalists report the story using the same frame. The repetition and frequency of the frame begin to make that particular frame more salient. News waves occur because the audience becomes the communicator to additional audiences. In organizations, the process is similar: a few individuals, leaders or manager frame an aspect of the organization in a certain way. When the audience becomes the communicator and repeats a text, they create or reinforce the culture of the organization. This suggests that through stories, myths, traditions, rituals, ceremonies, slogans, and artifacts hotel managers may be able to create a culture where their jobs are valued.

Framing as Culture

“Frames are a central part of a culture and are institutionalized in various ways” (Goffman as cited in Van Gorp, 2007). Frames exist in cultures that are independent from individuals (Van Gorp, 2007). There are six premises to Van Gorp’s (2007) thoughts. First is that the culture contains more frames than a receiver considers. There are always alternatives that the media or other audience members can use to see the same event and make different sense of it. Second, the actual frame is not encompassed in media content. The text and the frame must be seen as independent from each other. This allows a sender to choose a frame that may resonate with a particular receiver. Third, because frames are related to cultural
phenomena, their use seems natural and the process of social construction is not noticed. The frames often go unnoticed. Schein states that employees are aware of the assumptions they make about work and work’s culture but the beliefs “are held in our unconscious and surface only when there has been a cultural rule violation” (as cited in Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 83).

Fourth, framing in culture adds a macrostructure to the framing process. Personal schemata changes with new knowledge and experiences. Frames in the culture stay relatively stable and constitute broader interpretative definitions of social reality. The fifth premise states that frames change gradually over time. Meanings that change constantly are not frames in the strict sense. A frame can be discarded and a new frame applied but the frames themselves stay relatively unchanged. The final premise is that “the essence of framing is in social interaction” (p. 64). Framing involves the interaction that occurs between the text, the schemata of the audience, the communicator and communicator’s discourse, and the frames that are available in a given culture.

These six items give hotel managers cause for concern but also hope. The first premise reminds hotel managers that multiple frames will always exist and the manager cannot control them all. The second premise states that not all frames will resonate with all employees equally. These premises make the challenge of creating valued jobs difficult. Fortunately, when a frame becomes part of the culture, it seems natural and changes slowly. Once the job or an aspect of a job is deemed as valuable that perception is likely to remain. Through social interaction the frames are reinforced. The hotel environment gives plenty of opportunity for social interaction to occur. Wisely chosen messages consistently delivered can create a change in how hotel jobs are viewed. This is the essence of frame packages.
A frame package is a cluster of “organized devices” that functions as identity for a frame (Van Gorp, 2007). A frame package consists of three parts. The first part, the manifest devices, consists of word choices, metaphors, descriptions, arguments, and visual images. The second part of a frame package is the reasoning devices. Reasoning devices are the explicit or implicit statements that deal with justifications, causes, moral evaluations, and problem definitions. The third part of frame packaging is the culture that displays the package as a whole. Interpretation occurs when manifest devices (messages) are sifted with reasoning devices. Culture adds a metacommunication level. This level of framing specifies the relationship between interpretations of multiple issues. “This notion of metacommunication implies that the meaning readers assign to a text is not determined merely by the concrete information that the text contains but also by implicit aspects of the framing process” (Van Gorp, 2007, p. 65). This leads to a belief that hotel managers who consistently communicate the value of jobs and the justification for the jobs being real jobs may have a chance to change the perception of their jobs to valued, real jobs.

**Frame Strengths**

Some frames are strong and some are weak. Strong frames are influential and effective in gaining buy-in from an audience. Weak frames are not as persuasive. There are three characteristics that make a frame strong or weak, effective or ineffective, influential or not influential. In order for a frame to be effective, all three conditions must be met (Chong & Druckman, 2007b 7, Borah, 2011). The first of the three characteristics is availability. Availability means that a set of beliefs are stored in a person’s memory and available for recall, the meaning of the set of beliefs is understood and the significance of the beliefs are understood. The second characteristic is accessibility. Accessibility refers to the likelihood
that an available consideration will be activated, or recalled from memory, for use in
decision-making. The third characteristic is applicability or appropriateness. This means that
the subject must find the set of beliefs relevant to the situation. Fairhurst and Sarr (1996)
state that the more a frame is used and connected to situations, the stronger it becomes. The
more linkages a frame has to various situations, the more likely it is to be accessible,
available, and recalled.

Chong and Druckman (2007b) would likely agree with Fairhurst and Sarr (1996).
They state that strong frames are created when a set of beliefs are available, accessible, and
applicable. Repetition and chronic use of a concept strengthens accessibility thereby
strengthening a frame using the particular concept. Conscious perceptions of relevance
increases applicability and strengthen frames. The more applicable a belief is judged to be,
the more influential the frame will be. Sometimes individuals base their opinions on available
and accessible considerations without conscious deliberation (Higgins, 1996). Without an
understanding of a concept (availability) or the ability to recall it during a deliberation,
framing is weakened. Frames are also weakened or strengthened by an individual’s
motivation to form an accurate attitude, knowledge of a subject, and attention to the
appropriateness of a situation (i.e., level of critical thinking) (Chong & Druckman, 2007b).

In explaining why some frames are favored over others, Druckman (2001) introduced
emphasis framing. The emphasis approach to framing demonstrates that accentuating certain
considerations in a message can influence individuals to focus on those particular
considerations. Emphasis can be on a particular situation or a subset of a situation. By
emphasizing a subset of potential relevant considerations, individuals are led to focus on
these considerations in the decision-making process. Other possible frames are not made available to the audience.

Frame strengthening provides hope to managers for changing the framing of hotel jobs. Managers can create new perceptions about the value of their jobs by creating deliberately framed messages and making them accessible, repeating them frequently enough so they are available, and taking advantage of situations that shows the message frame’s relevance. Strong frames emphasizing hotel jobs as valued jobs could add credibility to the jobs, increase employee retention and increase employee commitment to the job and/or company.

**Competing Frames**

Competing frames are multiple frames about a situation, concept, action or object. One-sided frames present just one side or one point of view of a concept or belief. Sniderman and Theriault (2004) argue that people are not exposed to just one frame of an issue or problem. When confronted with multiple frames and differing views, people choose the alternative that is consistent with their values or principles. However, only 3.2% of studies on framing published in peer-reviewed journals from 1997 – 2007 examined multiple frames (Borah, 2011) “[Most prior experimental studies of framing have gauged the effects of one-sided communications and have all but ignored the more common and theoretically interesting cases involving political competition between frames]” (Chong & Druckman, 2007b). The authors continued to state:

We need to study further whether competing frames cancel one another and reinforce existing values, push people in conflicting directions, or motivate a more careful evaluation of the applicability of competing alternatives. Our own experimental
analysis of competitive contexts found that individual preferences are a function of prior values and the relative strengths of the competing frames. In competitive contexts, the strength of the opposition frame determines the distance one is pulled away from his or her values even when the frame that is congruent with those values is represented in the debate. (p. 113)

Although there is a lack of research about competitive frames, Chong and Druckman (2007b) hypothesize two possibilities for determining the dominant frame when competing frames exist. The first supposition states the dominant frame will be the loudest frame. “The ideological faction that expends sufficient resources on propaganda and manipulation, and that sends sufficiently loud signals, can always prevail in defining the terms of debate” (p. 1042). Zaller, quoted by Chong and Druckman (2007b), states that citizens are blown about by whatever current of information manages to develop with the greatest intensity.

In contrast to the loudest frame is the second conjecture of the strongest frame. The greatest influence on an individual’s opinion, regardless of repetition will be dominant. Frames increase in strength when it comes from a credible source, resonates with consensus values, and does not contradict strongly held prior beliefs. Chong and Druckman (2007b) states:

To date we are uncertain how these hypotheses compare. There has yet to be an explicit test of strength against repetition. We have little theoretical insight into the conditions when either factor will matter or which frame will prevail in various competitive situations. (p. 105)

Fairhurst and Sarr (1996) state “when the meaning we manage complement and reinforce one another, they create a clear and consistent image (p. 127). They continue on to
say, “Conversely, when the meaning we manage diverge and contradict one another, they create a fragmented view. The psychological discomfort caused by the contradictory signals often causes confusion, inertia or behaviors opposite to those anticipated” (p. 127).

This psychological discomfort was expressed by participants in Clair’s (1996) study of the colloquialism real job. Participants reported feeling conflicted when they felt they had a real job yet others, often friends and family whom they respected, told them their job was not a real job. One participant reported she “became very tired of defending herself and apologizing for the work she did. The pressure eventually led her to get a real job (by societal standards)” (p. 259). Clair describes another participant who defended her job working with disabled children. “She found the pressure of holding a marginal, alternative view of a real job to be stressful and depressing” (Clair, 1996, p. 258). These participants had framed their jobs as real jobs but became conflicted when presented with alternative frames for their jobs. These participants felt pressured to leave their job for a job that was framed as more real.

Fairhurst and Sarr (1996) explain that competing frames and mixed messages create a fragmented view. It is in this fragmentation that new meaning can be created. “By treating the mixed message as a subject for framing, we create opportunities to influence its interpretation” (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 140). This is good news for the hotel industry. Mixed messages may create room for managers to create positive perceptions of their jobs. Hotel managers continually have an opportunity to influence interpretation and reinforce the frame of hospitality jobs being valued jobs. Unfortunately, it is likely that there will always be mixed messages about the value of hotel jobs sent to hotel employees.
**Job Frames**

The literature has revealed jobs framed as professions, meaningful work, a calling, dirty work, family, real jobs and work as flow. Each work frame is explored here.

**Profession Frame**

The concept of a profession has changed over time. Abbott (1988) states that early definitions focused on the professions of law and medicine and it wasn’t until the rise in social science in the 1800’s that other professions were considered. Adam Smith (1994) in the late 1700’s stated that medicine and law were the only true professions because of the specific education needed, the difficulty of completing the schooling and earning a living from the work, and the value their service provided to society. Other scholars argued that dominance, autonomy, and monopolies were trademarks of professions (Freidson, Berlant, and Lawson as cited in Abbott, 1988). These groups emphasized status and power. Work not worthy of high status could not be considered as a profession. Abbott (1988), who is not a scholar of this school of thought, hypothesizes that scholars do not want to consider automobile mechanics, social work, or nurses professions simply because they do not want to accord it the dignity and status that comes with being a profession.

Using this early school of thought, it seems the hotel industry will not be viewed as a profession. Although there are schools that teach hotel management, in contrast to law school or medical school, they are not difficult to gain admittance or complete and not all members of the workforce are required to complete formal schooling. The jobs lack status and power in society compared to law and medicine.

In the 1800’s, new professions emerged (Heaton, 1934). A growing body of knowledge and new societal demands created this change. Careers evolved in architecture,
dentistry, engineering, mining, accounting, secretarial work, public administration, teaching and more. Heaton (1934) stated that clients entrusted their life, health, reputation, or property to the old professions (that being medicine and law) and the new professions were relied on for public safety, efficient public service and administration, the advancement or application of science, and “any other services which called for a skilled technician” (p 680). In 1933, Saunders and Wilson published an article called The Professions. In this article they challenged the old regime’s power and status concept of professions. Although not called a definition of a profession, Saunders and Wilson (1933) lay out a formula that can be used to define a profession. They state that in a profession, practitioners get together to study their common problems, advance their craft, protect the community and themselves from those unqualified, and limit competition by codes governing professional conduct. Additionally, the government recognizes, regulates and aids the profession by demanding that practitioners be registered, that only those of proved competence be admitted to the roll, and that some or all of the professional functions be reserved for those that are registered.

Similarly, Richardson (1924) published the following definition in The Accountant. He stated that the “definition of a profession is the occupation of certain persons who, after long study, earn their living by placing the mental skill and knowledge acquired through study and experience at the service of the public.” Those in the profession are connected by a common object and common interests. He continues to qualify a profession stating that those in the profession exchange ideas and work to further the interests of their profession. They work to prevent incompetent people from practicing in the profession so as not to discredit the profession or harm the public. Membership into the profession can only be obtained on
certain terms and only the members of the profession can practice the art or skill of the profession.

Abbott (1988) states that American scholars reshaped professions in the 1960 in a similar fashion to what Saunders described. Professions consisted of experts. This expertise “required the client to trust the professional and the professional to respect both client and colleagues. These relations were guaranteed by various associations, licensures, and ethics codes” (Abbott, 1988, p. 5).

Heaton (1934), in justifying adding union workers to the rolls of professional, makes a claim for a simple conceptualization of a profession. It is simply working for salaries or collecting fees for services rendered, meeting a demand for workers whose vocation is “based on a knowledge of some department of learning or science and who apply that knowledge to the affairs of others or to the practice of an art” (p. 681). We can extract from this that members of a profession have knowledge that others do not possess and they are paid for providing services using this knowledge to others who cannot do the work themselves.

More recent conceptualizations of a profession includes Johnson’s 1972 definition where he states that a profession is merely a means of organizing and controlling an occupation rather than a career defined by inherent characteristics (as cited in Muzio, Brock and Suddaby, 2013). Those in the profession are able to “leverage their superior technical, political, and organizational resources to retain control over their own markets, including the social and economic methods of organizing the performance of their work” while excluding others and limiting opportunities to those who are excluded (Muzio, Brock and Suddaby, 2013, p. 699). Faulconbridge and Muzio (2007) state this view of professionalization is a
temporally and spatially contingent process rooted in power struggles between distinctive
groups within a broader political economic order. Muzio, Brock and Suddaby (2013)
eventually conclude that professionalization is a subset of the broader category of
institutionalization insofar as it represents one of several ways to give order, structure, and
meaning to a distinctive area of social and economic life.

Viewing a profession through this more modern conceptualization, it is possible that
the hotel industry may be considered a profession and its employees considered
professionals. The hotel industry provides a service to the public; has professional
organizations that define appropriate behavior, share best practices, connect with academia
for research to further the industry; the government recognizes the industry and regulates its
various parts; and members of the industry work to refine their craft of customer service.
Members of the industry are paid for providing services that the general public cannot
provide. However, the industry does not control membership into the profession. It does not
have a licensing or certification process to ensure only those with a certain level of
knowledge are admitted into the profession. There is not a code of ethics that members of the
industry uphold. Still, the hotel industry meets a significant number of the definitions of this
new era’s conceptualization of profession that employees in the industry may consider
themselves a professional.

Abbott (1988) paraphrases a 1964 article by Wilensky describing the birth of a
profession. He states:

Professions begin when people start doing full time the thing that needs doing. But
then the issue of training arises, pushed by recruits or clients. Schools are created.
The new schools, if not begun within universities, immediately seek affiliation with
them. Inevitably, there then develop higher standards, longer training, earlier commitment to the profession, and a group of full time teachers. Then the teaching professionals, along with their first graduates, combine to promote and create a professional association. The more active professional life enabled by this association leads to self-reflection, to possible change of name, and to an explicit attempt to separate competent from incompetent. Reflection about central tasks leads to the profession to delegate routine work to paraprofessional. At the same time the attempt to separate competent from incompetent leads to internal conflict between the officially trained younger generation and their on-the-job-trained elders, as well as to increasingly violent confrontations with outsiders. This period also contains efforts to secure state protection, although this does not always occur and is not peculiar to professions in any case. Finally the rules that these events have generated, rules eliminating internal competition and charlatanry and establishing client protection, coalesce in a formal ethics code. p. 10

This description reveals how a demand for work or a service transforms into a formalized process for becoming a professional.

The hospitality industry mirrors Wilensky’s path but it is fairly young in this process. As long as mankind has traveled, the hospitality industry has existed. Only fairly recently have training programs began at universities. Cornell University claims to be the first program of the 140 hospitality management programs in the United States. Cornell University’s program began in 1922 at a request for formal education by hoteliers (http://www.hotelschool.cornell.edu/about/history.html, Jan, 2014). The debate continues as to where hospitality programs should exists at universities. Some programs stand alone as
colleges or schools; other programs are embedded in business colleges, human science colleges, nutrition programs and other places. Professional associations have been formed. The American Hotel & Lodging Association, started as the American Hotel & Motel Association, is the oldest with just over 100 years to its credit. Its professional training programs began in 1953. Most of the training that occurs through the associations is for management or management trainees. About 50% of managers in the hospitality field possess college degrees. The debate over the balance of formal education versus on-the-job education continues. There has not been an attempt beyond some local levels to separate competent from incompetent members or develop paraprofessional although some semblance to this is seen in hotel reservations and sales and meeting planning. The hotel industry works hard to secure state protection mostly in the form of shaping laws that affect various segments of the industry. Using Wilensky’s formation narrative, it seems the hospitality industry is in the process of becoming a profession. Therefore, it is possible that some of its members may consider themselves a member of a profession.

Bartol (1979) conducted a study to examine the relationship between professionalism and organizational commitment, role conflict, role ambiguity, turnover, and turnover expectancy. She surveyed 159 members of a computer science professional association. One year later she surveyed the participants again to analyze turnover data. Bartol had 130 respondents for the second questionnaire. In this study, professionalism was conceptualized as having a high degree of autonomy, collegial maintenance of standards (fellow professionals enforce the standards of the profession), regulated by a code of ethics, has professional commitment, and identifies as a professional. Using multiple regression, the data reflected a statistically significant positive relationship between professionalism and
organizational commitment. When each of the five subparts of professionalism were analyzed, a significant positive relationship remained for autonomy, ethics, and professional commitment. There was a significant negative relationship for collegial maintenance of standards. The authors did not attempt to explain this. There was no statistically significant relationship between professional identification and organizational commitment.

Additionally, the data reflected a statistically significant positive relationship between turnover expectancy and professionalism with professional commitment being the strongest factor of professionalism. There was no statistically significant relationship between professionalism and role conflict, role ambiguity or actual turnover.

Bartol (1979) also measured the amount of rewards companies gave employees for being professionals. Participants weighted the importance their organization placed on factors such as the ability to work without much guidance, high concern for clients’ interests, high quality of work, participation in professional organizations, and remaining current with the latest developments. She named this factor Professionalism Rewards. This factor had a statistically significant relationship with all five dependent variables. The relationship was positively related to organizational commitment and negatively related to role conflict, role ambiguity, turnover and turnover expectancy. It seems the business practices of the organization may influence these factors more than the individual’s perceived status as a professional.

To summarize the profession frame, more occupations are framed as professions today than prior to the industrial revolution. What has remained consistent through this change is an expectation for education or skill, behavioral expectations set by others in the profession, and organization for the purposes of sharing ideas and resources as well as
political purposes. Those who consider themselves professionals may have higher organizational commitment, lower turnover and less role ambiguity. However, it seems the organization’s frames or emphasis on being a professional may mediate the amount of influence being a professional has on these factors. When assessing the hotel industry, it seems this industry may be in the early stages of becoming a profession. Some hotels workers may frame their jobs as being a profession.

**Meaningful Frame**

Work is an important context to engage individuals and to provide meaning for them (VanZyl, Deacon, & Rothmann, 2010). Meaningful work is as important as pay and employees expect to find meaning within the workplace (Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009). Employees are not only concerned with fair labor relations but also the meaningfulness of work itself (Roessler, 2012).

Although scholars have determined that meaningfulness at work is important, the conceptualization of meaningful work varies. Fairlie (2011) points out that early scholars considered meaningfulness. Maslow described self-actualization; McGregor described work that expresses imagination, ingenuity, and creativity. Locke argued that job satisfaction is a function of doing what is personally valued and Hackman and Oldham included meaningfulness in their job characteristics model. Still, today, there is not a single, agreed upon definition of meaningful work. Pavlish and Hunt (2012) point out two main definitions. They state that meaningful work is the “value of work goals judged in relation to an individual’s own ideals and passions” and “work gives essence to what we do and brings fulfillment to our lives” (p. 114). Lips-Wiersma and Morris (2009) stated that meaningfulness is the “value of a work goal or purposes, judged to the individual’s own
ideals or standards” (p. 492). They also based their work on the idea that meaningfulness “refers to the degree to which life makes emotional sense and that the demands confronted by them are perceived as being worthy of energy investment and commitment” (p. 492).

VanZyl, Deacon, and Rothmann (2010) state that meaningfulness in work is a psychological state. Employees who participate in activities that are congruent with their values and/or strengths are more likely to experience meaningfulness in work. Fairlie (2011) stated that meaningful work is defined as job and other workplace characteristics that facilitate the attainment or maintenance of one or more dimensions of meaning.

Bowie’s framework states six conditions that must exist for work to be meaningful (as cited in Pavlish & Hunt, 2012). Work must be entered into freely, it must give the worker autonomy, it must contain the development of rational capacity, it must offer a sufficient wage for physical well-being, it must offer support for moral development, and it must give the employee the opportunity to define their own happiness. Roessler (2012) states that employees experience meaningful work when they have an influence on the process of production or the arrangement of the work. This makes it possible for the worker to feel a part of the process and the product. The work is not totally external to the individual. He can see his work and the product as an “expression of his own individuality, his own talents and abilities” (p. 86). Kidder (2006) quotes Blaunher when he states that when individuals lack control over the work process or do not have a sense of purposeful connection to the work process, there is a depersonalized detachment rather than an involvement or engrossment in the job task.

Neither jobs nor organizations are inherently meaningful in themselves (Pratt, Pradics, & Lepisto, 2013). Individuals interpret what is meaningful through their own
identities and values. Adams (2012) states that this is a subjective experience and unique to each individual. This may offer an explanation for why some jobs are meaningful to an individual and some jobs are not. Some jobs considered meaningful to society may not seem meaningful to an individual and yet “meaningless jobs, including cleaning, catering and dirty work can be experienced as meaningful” (Beadle & Knight, 2012, p. 441). Meaningful work is not simply a function of the tasks being done but also a reflection of an individual’s values and attitudes toward those tasks.

Hotel workers may see their job as meaningful. Providing customer service, cleaning a hotel room, or serving a meal all allow the individual to have an influence on and feel part of the process. Serving others may be a job that aligns with some people’s personal values.

Meaningful work has been linked to job satisfaction, retention, work engagement, and worker productivity (Fairlie, 2011; Pavlish & Hunt, 2012; Steger, Littman-Ovadia, Miller, Menger & Rothman, 2013). Fairlie (2011) examined the relationship between employee engagement, work exhaustion, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover with 574 participants of various jobs in various companies selected through a web-based program. Meaningful work had the strongest correlation with every factor except exhaustion. Of the six recommendations made by Fairlie in this study, five of them were advising managers on reframing their communication or behavior to make jobs more meaningful. One recommendation suggested that managers support employees in changing their mindsets about their jobs. Although Fairlie (2011) does not use the words framing, helping employees change their mindsets is synonymous with saying help employees reframe their jobs.

Tummers and Knies (2013) examined the role leaders have in making work meaningful. The authors examined work meaningfulness as a potential mediator between
LMX (Leader Member Exchange) and the three outcomes of work effort, organizational commitment and work-family enrichment. Meaningful work was a mediator between leadership and all three outcomes. The authors concluded that leaders play a significant part in making work more meaningful which has a positive influence on employee job outcomes. They stated that when employees and managers have a good relationship, this positively affects employee’s perceptions of making a difference in their work and seeing the relationship in their work to the larger organization.

In summary, although there is not a commonly used definition of meaningful work, multiple scholars agree that meaningful work brings a level of fulfillment to an individual, it is a venue for employees to feel like they are making a contribution, and it fits their personal values. Just like in the professional frame, it seems the leader may have an influence in creating a frame that changes the level of meaningfulness the job possesses.

**Calling Frame**

A job may be framed as a calling. A calling is traditionally referred to in a religious context where people are called by a higher power to a particular type of work. Adams (2012) describes it as a “sense of purpose emanating from God that leads one to undertake a personally fulfilling or social significant role” (p. 66). Bunderson and Thompson (2009) state that a calling is that “place in the world that one was created, designed or destined to fill by virtue of God-given gifts and talents and the opportunities presented by one’s station in life” (p. 33).

A secular definition also exists. It differs from the religious view in that a secular calling is more likely to serve self or a community rather than God, the calling comes from within rather than from God, and the meaning of the calling is more a sense of personal
satisfaction rather than fulfilling God’s plan (Adams, 2012). This conceptualization includes a sense of what one was meant to do or a perfect fit for the job (Duffy, Allan, Autin & Bott, 2013). Both definitions include a sense of destiny or a sense of “this is what I was meant to do.”

Hirschi (2012) states that “people with a sense of calling in their careers experience a deep sense of meaning, dedication and personal involvement in their work” (p. 479). Callings also entail a great passion toward work and a sense of fulfilling life’s purpose in work. Those who experience a career calling tend to endorse higher levels of career commitment, work meaning, job satisfaction, life meaning, zest, and life satisfaction (Duffy, Allan, Autin & Bott, 2013).

Although similar, a calling is distinct from meaningful work. Work is meaningful if it offers fulfillment or holds personal value for the employee. A calling in either the secular or non-secular conceptualization is about a work that one is destined to do. Work can be meaningful but not be one’s purpose in life (Hirschi, 2012).

Duffy, Allan, Autin and Bott (2013) wished to see if there was a distinction between having a calling and working in your calling. They surveyed 553 adult workers in the U.S. They discovered that people who perceive themselves as having a calling have higher levels of job satisfaction. However, living a calling moderates the relationship between having a calling and job satisfaction. Those who are living out their calling had significantly higher levels of career commitment and work meaningfulness which was significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction and life meaning. Hirschi (2012) concluded that the presence of a calling in work is related to increased work engagement but is mediated by work meaningfulness, occupational identity and occupational self-efficacy.
It may be possible that a hotel worker believes their career is what they were called to do or that their job is a perfect fit for them. They may frame their job as a calling.

In summary, a calling, either the religious connotation or the secular interpretation, includes a sense of destiny or fulfilling one’s life purpose. A calling differs from meaningful work. Although work that is a calling is assumed to be meaningful, work can be meaningful without being a person’s calling. Those who work in the field of their calling have higher levels of job satisfaction and life satisfaction.

**Dirty Work Frame**

According to Rogelberg (2006), Hughes is credited as the first scholar to use the term dirty work. Hughes points out that every occupation is made up of several activities. Some of the activities are discursively constructed as dirty work. He states that some of the tasks may be physically disgusting, some may wound one’s dignity, and others may be morally problematic. These tasks, he states, are physically, socially and morally beneath the dignity of the profession. Those in the profession often look to delegate the dirty work tasks. Although dirty work may be seen as a necessary evil and society acknowledges a need for dirty work, it carries a stigma for the person who does these tasks (Rogelberg, 2006). As individuals generally define themselves (and are defined by others) at least partly by what they do, individuals who perform the tasks of dirty work come to be seen as and may identify themselves as dirty workers (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Rogelberg, 2006).

Kidder (2006) wrote about his experience in dirty work as a bike messenger. He states that a bike messenger is dirty work because the work is physically dirty, physically demanding, dangerous, has poor working conditions and low status. As many couriers regularly disregard traffic rules, many people find the job morally unacceptable. Kidder
(2006) states “for people with no formal education, criminal records, drug addictions, or undocumented work status, messengering is often the best job option” (p. 42). Here Kidder (2006) is stating that bike messenger is a good dirty job for dirty workers, those tainted by society for reasons beyond their job.

As a desire for positive social identities, those who do dirty jobs often reframe their jobs or deny that the job is dirty work. Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) state three ways that dirty workers discursively seek to white wash their jobs: reframing, recalibrating and refocusing. These techniques simultaneously negate negative attributions and create positive ones. Reframing jobs is discursively altering the meaning of their job. One way of reframing is renaming. Job titles can change the stigma for the worker (Rogelberg, 2006). Strippers use the name exotic entertainers or dancers as the title dancer has less of a stigma than stripper (Kidder, 2006). Hotel workers once called maids are now called housekeepers, a title with a less subservient connotation. Another way workers reframe their jobs is through infusing or injecting positive values into the job or neutralizing and deflecting the negative value of the job (Ashforth & Kriener, 1999; Rogelberg, 2006). Bike messengers looked at the job as an avenue to stay in shape (Kidder, 2006). Public defenders are protecting the constitutional rights for a fair trial by helping wrong doers beat the system and funeral directors are helping families cope with grief as opposed to processing dead bodies (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). These are examples of injecting positive values. Kidder (2006) references a 1979 study by Burawoy that revealed factory workers turned their piece meal work into a game. Striving for a quota in order to win a game was much more enjoyable and contained less stigma than trying to meet a company’s quota. This is an example of reframing by deflecting the negative aspects.
Second, dirty workers white wash their jobs by recalibrating them. To recalibrate a job is to increase or decrease the importance of some aspects of the job (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Emphasizing the importance of the job to the organization or to society is an example of injecting positive values. Knowing that the organization cannot complete its mission without this dirty job brings credibility to the job and a degree of status. Hospital cleaning staff stated the importance of their role in preventing patients from getting sick (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Bike messengers knew they could deliver packages faster than any courier that used vehicles. Businesses needed their services. Disregarding traffic laws was their way of showing society the importance of their task (Kidder, 2006).

The third way of white washing jobs is by refocusing. Dirty workers refocus their job by ignoring the stigmatized functions or shifting attention to the non-stigmatized aspect of the job. The two previous ways of reframing and recalibrating change perceptions of the job. Refocusing ignores the stigmatized aspects of the job and shifts attention to the non-stigmatized features of the job (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Rogelberg, 2006). Public defenders focus on winning the case rather than focusing on guilt or innocence of their client. Exotic dancers focus on the pay. Kidder (2006) states that exotic dancers make more money than workers in less stigmatized jobs. Additionally, if the money they make is then used for a higher, non-stigmatized purpose such as going to school, the stigma can be ignored. Since the purpose of the dirty work is to improve the person’s life and propel them to a more prestigious job, the dirty work is justified. In refocusing, workers may ignore or condemn those who stigmatize the job (Kidder, 2006; Rogelberg, 2006). “By pointing out flaws or shortcomings of those who criticize them, the dirty worker lessens the impact of the criticism” (Rogelberg, 2006, p. 154). Workers may also give additional weight to the
opinions and praises of those who support the worker such as friends and family. Additionally, subcultures formed within organizations where members may form an “us versus them” attitude to cope with the stigma and reinforce positive evaluations of themselves (Rogelberg, 2006).

Ashforth and Kreiner expanded this list in 2007 when they studied managers of dirty workers (Ashforth, Kreiner, Clark & Fugate, 2007). The managers used reframing, recalibrating and refocusing but they also used three other techniques. One was titled social buffers. This is when managers expressed talking to peer groups, such as members of the career’s professional association, to protect and reinforce their work identity. The second technique was confronting the public that held the stigmatized perception. Managers may attempt to change a person’s perception by stating the value of their work, acting contrary to the occupational stereotype, using language that appeals to the public, and humor. Stating the value of the work points out how the job helps the public. Acting counter to the stereotype sets the manager apart from the dirty work. Using language that appeals to the public softens the perception or reduces the amount of dirt in the dirty work. Using humor plays along with the public but softens the sting of the stigma. An example of humor that softens the sting is a personal injury lawyer being called an ambulance chaser. He replied that he doesn’t chase ambulances; he has the ambulance drivers drop them off at his door. By playing along and offering humor, the lawyer points out the stigma to the joke teller, confronts it, and softens the effect of the stigma.

The third additional technique consists of defensive tactics such as avoiding the most offensive tasks, offering vague descriptions of the job (stating you work in women’s healthcare as opposed to an abortion clinic), using dark humor to laugh off the dirtiest parts
of the job (humor that embraces the blood and gore of the hospital), accepting the dirt of the work, and comparisons to groups that are worse off (at least we are not as bad as those workers).

If dirty workers are able to white wash their jobs through these techniques, the jobs can be conceptualized as meaningful to the workers. Workers who cannot accept the taint of their jobs may have higher turnover (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). New members who have not previously held jobs with taint may have an especially hard time coping (Lopina, Rogelberg & Howell, 2012). Managers of those who do dirty work are often faced with the challenges of motivating these workers as well as motivating themselves to deal with the stigma (Ashforth, Kreiner, Clark & Fugate, 2007).

In summary, dirty work is work that is regarded as physically, emotionally, or morally stigmatized. Dirty work is generally the tasks of a profession that are least desirable. Those who do dirty work often acquire the stigma of the job. This forces the workers to use coping mechanism to maintain their position. Hospitality workers may see their jobs as dirty work. Much of it involves cleaning, serving others which may appear as being subservient, and trying to meet the demands of others as is required in a customer service environment. The old adage, the customer is always right, puts the service provider in a position of disadvantage.

Family Frame

Unlike other frames discussed so far, this frame does not describe the job and its tasks. The family frame describes the organizational culture. The analogy of family used to describe an organization’s culture is not unusual, especially in small businesses (Haugh & McKee, 2003; Rokeach, 1973). Kets de Vries (1993) in speaking of family owned businesses
stated the family analogy exists when the values of the family owners express a common purpose for employees and help to establish a sense of identification and commitment. The term family culture is a “complex, negotiated phenomenon which refers to an ideology of the family wherein trust between workers and management is encouraged, and alignment between the goals of managers and employees is promoted” (Ram and Holliday as cited in Haugh & McKee, 2003). Commonly repeated values in a family culture are commitment; trust; communication access to all layers of management but especially top management; an understanding of human relationships between family, customers and communities; independence and autonomy; respect; honesty; and a sense of belonging or attachment to the company or the work team (Barnes & Hershon, 1976; Haugh & McKee, 2003; Kets de Vries, 1993). The family culture also promotes continuity and stability of the workforce, promotes self-reliance and diligence among the employees, creates a commitment to survival of the company, and adds a sense of security for the employees (Haugh & McKee, 2003).

Rokeach (1973) expressed that the values that guide employer and employee behavior are socially constructed. Therefore, family culture is not simply a byproduct of a family owned business. A family culture can be constructed in any organization. Haugh and McKee (2003) reported that the family culture is prevalent in small businesses. The hotel industry has over 52,000 hotels in the United States (http://www.ahla.com/information). Over half of them are family-owned, small businesses. It is possible that hotel workers may say they experience a family culture.

**Real Job Frame**

To explore this concept of “real jobs” Clair (1996), in her study of the colloquialism real job asked 34 college students to define “a real job.” Every student understood the phrase
and had reported hearing it or using it. This led Clair to conclude that “get a real job” is a common phrase. Participants were asked to define the elements of the colloquialism real job.

Pay was the variable most commonly associated with a real job. Of the 34 students who participated in the study, 18 participants stated pay or fair compensation characterized a real job. Many students stated a six-figure income was appropriate pay. Students also stated that a real job utilized their education \( (n = 8) \), was enjoyable \( (n = 8) \), had a standard 40-hour work week \( (n = 7) \), offered room for advancement \( (n = 5) \), and was part of a reputable company \( (n = 4) \). Other variables that fewer than four participants mentioned related to paying taxes, benefits such as medical insurance and vacation, autonomy in decision-making, doing God’s will, making a difference, and having status.

When asked what a real job was not, participants mentioned that volunteer organizations and organizations with lower prestige did not offer real jobs. Additionally, participants mentioned working for poor management \( (n = 3) \) or abusive managers \( (n = 4) \), enjoyable work \( (n = 3) \), part-time or seasonal \( (n = 2) \), work while being a student \( (n = 1) \), dealing with rude clientele \( (n = 1) \), and outdoor work \( (n = 1) \) were not real jobs. Clair did not explore why enjoyable was on both lists of real jobs and not real jobs. Adam Smith (1994) in his book *The Wealth of Nations* first published in 1776 provides some of the earliest observations of how our society places value on work. Smith (1994) stated that jobs in which others do for enjoyment are less valued. One of Clair’s (1996) respondents reported that his friends told him that his job as a ski instructor was not a real job because it was perceived as play rather than work. He felt his job as a ski instructor was a real job.

Tsetsura (2011) explains some of this tension with a quote from Lukmann. “Identity is, of course, a key element of subjective reality, and like all subjective reality, stands in a
dialectical relationship with society” (p. 3). She is saying that society plays a role in defining what a real job is. Clair also explains that as our place in society changes, our perceptions of a real job changes.

Clair (1996) reported that individual’s ideas about real jobs were dynamic and changed over time. Real jobs changed with age (paper boy was a real job at 12 but not in college), with education, and with experience. As students were closer to obtaining a college degree, jobs that would have been acceptable to them at one point were no longer considered a real job. One student reported being careful who he spoke around. He wanted to continue going to college to get a real job but he realized that some coworkers believed their job to be a real job. Here this participant is stating that as he advanced in his schooling, he identified with the job differently. This leads one to believe that jobs are framed as real jobs or appropriate jobs for the skills and abilities of an individual. As the abilities of the individual changed, he reframed the job. What was once an appropriate, real job is no longer a real job. This is different than a competing frame where an employee may believe one frame but feel compelled to switch to another frame. Here, the employee changed frames on his own as his circumstances changed.

Additionally, students who expressed dissatisfaction with their current job were more likely to express needing to get a real job. Clair concluded that the colloquialism real job may be a coping mechanism to resist unpleasant working conditions. “The expression reflects one’s desire to acquire a more satisfying position and, thus, encourage people to explore other work alternatives” (Clair, 1996, p. 262). This is similar to the last example. A job that is not appropriate to have is framed as not a real job. This job is not appropriate because of the unpleasant working conditions.
Tsetsura (2011) conducted a study on the social construction of the profession of public relations in Russia. Twenty-five female public relations (PR) professionals were interviewed. The PR professionals said that their jobs were real jobs but the jobs were often perceived by the public as not real jobs. The jobs were real jobs because the work was hard, the hours were demanding, it utilized the PR professional to the fullest, the trust from the client was high and it gave the women financial independence. The jobs were perceived as not real jobs because the public thought the job was easy and unskillful, could not help a person realize their full potential, was for young, stupid, pretty girls who circulated at parties, and was not a primary means of support. Additionally the PR profession was not seen as an essential part of business activities but only needed in times of crisis.

The PR professionals recognized the competing frames. They coped with the competing frames by reinforcing the real job frame for each other. The research participants all worked for a very successful PR firm. This size and financial success of the firm legitimized the job. Seeing results of their work and celebrating when they accomplished their goals solidified the job as real. The participants also discounted the public’s opinion by stating that the general public did not really understand what the professionals did.

These reasons for viewing PR as not real jobs are very similar to the factors that Smith (1994) identified as devaluing jobs. To summarize Adam Smith’s (1994) writing, jobs are less valued if they are easy, the working conditions are cleaner and do not require brutal tasks, the job is done by others for recreation, becoming skilled at the job is not difficult nor expensive, there is consistent and predictable work, there is more competition for the job, requires little trust or confidence from customers and employers, and the probability of being successful is great. Additionally, they will command lower wages if the job is in an
established industry, is not in its natural state or state of high demand, and if the job is not done as primary support but as supplemental income.

When reviewing this list and applying it to the jobs typically found in hotels, it is not too difficult to see how jobs in hotels may not be valued and may not be considered real jobs. Most jobs in the hotel industry have a clean environment with no brutal tasks. Many jobs require employees to be friendly and interact with guests who often are in an entertaining or vacationing situation. When providing a service the employee is part of the experience. They are often expected to be or expected to appear to be enjoying their time with the customer. According to the 2012 Bureau of Labor Occupational Outlook Handbook, a high school diploma or equivalent is needed to be a hotel manager although it states that those with a college degree are expected to have the best opportunities. The work is year round, there are many people willing to do the jobs, and most people can be successful at their job. Hotel jobs also meet the requirement for lower wages in that the hotel industry is well established, many jobs are seasonal so the jobs are sometimes in its natural state and sometimes not, and many employees are part-time employees supplementing their primary job or school. Additionally, many hourly employees are supervised by those in entry-level management positions. It is possible that those young managers are learning how to manage. Those who worked in an environment with a poor manager were likely to call their jobs not a real job. It is likely that a person in their first management job will make the most mistakes and be perceived as a poor manager. Those who have made a career in hotels may have found ways to legitimize the job as a real job.
Frame of Flow

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) coined the concept of flow. He defines it as “joy, creativity, the process of total involvement with life” (p. xi). “Flow is the way people describe their state of mind when consciousness is harmoniously ordered, and they want to pursue whatever they are doing for its own sake” (p. 6). As part of his Ph.D. research, Csikszentmihalyi studied artists. They expressed that when painting, they often lost track of time and hours seemed only like minutes. They would disregard their need for food, water, even sleep. The artists were fully immersed in their work, so much so that work could not be distinguished from play.

In terms of our work life, Csikszentmihalyi (1990) admits that work has acquired a rather poor reputation. “However” he states, “it does not seem to be true that work necessarily need to be unpleasant. There is ample evidence that work can be enjoyable, and that indeed, it is often the most enjoyable part of life” (p. 145). Work offers intrinsic goals. It is these intrinsic goals that Csikszentmihalyi claims produces flow.

Csikszentmihalyi (1990) pieced together multiple conditions that create flow. To have flow in work, there must be challenges and complexities present in the work and a worker’s skill must match the challenges and complexity of the job. Feedback is almost immediate. Workers who experience flow recognize opportunities for action, developed skills, focused on the activity at hand and allowed themselves to be lost in the interaction so that their selves could emerge stronger. The author states, “The more a job inherently resembles a game – with variety, appropriate and flexible challenges, clear goals and immediate feedback - the more enjoyable it will be regardless of the worker’s level of development” (p. 152). However, he recognizes the flaw in thinking that everyone would enjoy their jobs if they
were constructed like games. “Even the most favorable external conditions do not guarantee that a person will be in flow” (p. 154). As already stated, it is the intrinsic goals resulting from these work conditions that produce flow.

Hotel workers may find the conditions present at their work for experiencing flow. They may find joy and creativity in their work to the point that hours seem only like minutes. The intrinsic rewards of a hotel job may be such that an employee’s job seems more like play than work. Their skills may be challenged throughout their work. Many jobs offer immediate feedback so employees are able to see that their skills can overcome the challenges.

**Summary of Frames**

Seven frames for work have been reviewed in this chapter. The first was the profession frame. This frame was once narrowly defined encompassing only the legal and medical professions. In more recent years, this frame has been conceptualized to include more occupations. A modern profession includes an expectation for advanced education or skill, behavioral expectations set by others in the profession, and organization for the purposes of sharing ideas and resources as well as political purposes. Using the more modern conceptualization of a profession, the hotel industry may be in the process of becoming a profession. Some hotel employees may think of themselves as professionals.

The second frame was meaningful. Meaningful jobs match the individual employee’s values and bring fulfillment to the employee. It is similar to the third frame, calling. A calling is a meaningful job but with an additional dimension of the sense of destiny. Those working in a calling have a sense that the job is what they were meant to do. As both of these frames are personal to an individual, it is possible that hotels workers may construct their job as meaningful and even as their calling.
The fourth frame was dirty work. Dirty work carries a physical, social or moral stigma that carries over to the person doing the job. Those employed in dirty work find ways of coping with the stigma or they are likely to leave the job. Hotel employees whose task often involve cleaning and being subservient may perceive their jobs as dirty work. Some hotel employees may frame their work as dirty work.

The fifth frame reviewed was family. The family frame uses the analogy of family to describe a company’s culture. The family frame is prevalent in small businesses. Over half of all hotels in the United States are small, family businesses; therefore, some hotel workers may describe their environment as family.

The sixth frame reviewed is the real job. It seems some people perceive certain jobs as not appropriate for their age, education, or status. Jobs may be constructed as not real if they are beneath a person perceived skill level, a temporary job, or a job that does not afford a person the lifestyle they wish to have. Employees who are disgruntled in their jobs or employees who perceive they work for poor management may also call their jobs “not a real job.” As many hotels jobs do not require a large degree of skill or education, many first line managers are unseasoned managers, and many jobs are paid minimum wage, some hotel workers may consider their jobs as not real jobs.

The final frame is flow. Flow is the concept that employees enjoy their work so much that their work seems like leisure. Often those in the flow lose track of time and forget to do basic activities such as eating. It may be possible that some hotel employees describe their work as flow.

This discussion of seven different work frames indicate that there are a variety of ways that jobs in hotels may be framed. As this literature review may not have revealed all
the ways hotel employees frame their jobs, the first research question seeks to determine other discursive frames used to describe hotel jobs. As pointed out by Tummers and Knies (2013) and Fairhurst and Sarr (1996), leaders set forth the vision for the company with creating and reinforcing frames. Leaders also mediated the strength of the frames communicated in organizations. Hence the first research question is:

**RQ1:** What frames do hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel?

A review of the literature revealed that multiple frames had a relationship with various job outcomes. For instance, those who consider themselves professionals may have higher organizational commitment, lower turnover and less role ambiguity (Bartol, 1979; McCann, Granter, Hyde & Hassard, 2013). Both the meaningful jobs and calling frames were at positively related to turnover, job commitment, and job satisfaction (Fairlie, 2011; Pavlish & Hunt, 2012; Steger, Littman-Ovadia, Miller, Menger & Rothman, 2013). Dirty work is positively correlated with turnover (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Kidder, 2006). There is a positive correlation between the perception of not having a real job and turnover (Clair, 1996). Given the high turnover rate in the hospitality industry, this study examines three outcomes potentially related to job frames: job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover intention.

Turnover in hotels is problematic. Previously conducted studies on turnover consistently show a negative correlation between turnover and job satisfaction (Kay and Jordon-Evans, 2002; Min, 2007; Sigler, 1999) and job commitment (Feeley, 2000; Hausknecht, Rodda & Howard, 2008; Maurer & Lippstreu, 2008; Raabe & Beehr, 2003). Hence, the second research question is:
RQ2: What is the relationship between the communication frames and job satisfaction, turnover intention and job commitment?

**Job Satisfaction**

Job Satisfaction is commonly studied when examining turnover. “With few exceptions, attitudinal studies of turnover have focused on the construct of job satisfaction has a predictor of tenure (Porter, Steers, & Mowday, 1974, p. 603). However, few scholars have taken the opportunity to define this construct. It seems most scholars work from the notion that job satisfaction is simply satisfaction with the job. Job satisfaction is rarely defined. Porter, Steers, and Mowday (1974) acknowledged individual components of job satisfaction being “satisfaction with pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers and the work itself” (p. 604). This is a broad holistic definition of job, one that some may refer to as work rather than job. In the creation of the job diagnostic survey, a common tool for measuring job satisfaction, Hackman and Oldham (1974) considered a broad perspective of the term job and occasionally referred to it as work. In a review of the literature, only one study defined job satisfaction. The authors distinguished job satisfaction from organizational commitment by stating that job satisfaction “represents a relatively unstable, transitory, immediate orientation to job features, and is concerned with the degree to which employees like their work” (Park, Henkin, & Egley, 2005, p. 464). The term satisfaction seems to be used in a manner consistent with the common definition of the word. It seems apparent that job satisfaction has something to do with how one is satisfied by their job but the reader is left to decide if satisfaction is simply “liking” or if there are other dimensions. The reader is also left to decide if the term job is simply the tasks to be completed or if the work environment, work team, or other dimensions of a job are included in the measurement.
Short of a clear definition for job satisfaction, many scholars have used it in their studies related to turnover. Many authors work from the assumption that there is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover and the turnover problem could be solved if employers would focus on improving job satisfaction. Scholars have written, “Job satisfaction equates to less employee turnover” (Min, 2007, p. 379), “Retaining talented employees may also be accomplished through improving their job satisfaction” (Sigler, 1999, p. 4), and “…Increasing employee (agent) retention, which is in turn obtained by increasing agent job satisfaction” (Whitt, 2006, p. 235).

The correlation between many variables and job satisfaction has been studied. The variable of pay and job satisfaction has yielded mixed results. Min (2007) discovered a positive correlation; Milman (2002) discovered a near significant positive correlation; Bhatnagar (2007) discovered that only the perception of fair pay had a positive correlation; and Kemelgor and Meek (2008) discovered that after a certain baseline of pay had been reached, pay had no correlation to job satisfaction.

Studies of job satisfaction and person-organization fit show a positive correlation between the two (Autry & Daugherty, 2003; McCulloch & Turban, 2007; Natoli, 2004). Job satisfaction and career opportunities were positively associated (Kim, 2005). Job security was positively correlated with job satisfaction (Min, 2007). The role of the leader and leader-employee relationship studies showed that leaders impact job satisfaction as significantly as they affect turnover (Marckettii & Kozar, 2007; Natoli, 2004). Job design to include autonomy and problem solving showed the same positive effects on job satisfaction as they did on turnover (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). Burnout was negatively associated with
job satisfaction (Sand & Miyazaki, 2000). Training and training opportunities were positively associated with job satisfaction (Sigler, 1999).

Studies have shown that job satisfaction may vary by gender (King, Mattimore, King, and Adams, 1995), culture (Mallom, Holtom & Lee, 2007) and generational differences (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007) especially when employees are trying to balance work and family. Mayrhofer, Meyer, Schiffinger, and Schmidt (2008) revealed that job satisfaction changes as the family changes and it changes differently for men than it does for women. As the family grew in size and/or family pressures increase, job satisfaction decreased for women. No statistically significant correlation was found for men.

The variables that have been studied in relation to job satisfaction form a long list. Missing from the list is a study of how jobs are framed and how that communication impacts job satisfaction. Communication specifically about the job has not been widely studied.

**Job Commitment**

Job commitment is defined as “one's attitude towards one's profession or vocation” (Blau, 1985, p. 278). Career commitment has been positively influenced by the degree to which an employee identifies with his or her job and organization. Verquer, Beehr and Wagner (2003) stated that organizational commitment increased when there was congruence between an employee’s characteristics and the organization’s culture.

Blau (1985) reports that other variables such as age and tenure have been positively related to job commitment. In this study, he concluded that marital status (being unmarried), having more work experience, and perceiving the environment to be well structured by the supervisor (low ambiguity) increased job commitment. Hausknecht, Rodda and Howard (2008) reported that job commitment increased as a person’s level within the organization
increased, along with job satisfaction and other intrinsic rewards. In comparison, extrinsic rewards, not intrinsic rewards, increased among those at the lower levels of the organization. Maurer and Lippstreu (2008) discovered that in general, employees who reported higher supervisor support were more likely to have greater commitment toward their organization. In another study, supervisor incivility predicted low commitment (Spence Laschinger, Leiter, Day, & Gilin, 2009). However, Raabe and Beehr (2003) found that the relationship with the supervisor did not have an effect on job commitment.

Like job satisfaction, the list of variables studied with job commitment is also lengthy but void of job frames. Studies about the effects of framing jobs and commitment levels are missing.

**Intent to Leave**

Turnover intention is the willfulness to leave the organization. It is marked by thinking of quitting and searching for alternative employment (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Several variables and their effect on turnover intention have been studied. As with job satisfaction, studies had mixed results. Pay was found to reduce turnover intent (Beilock & Capelle, 1990; Butt, 2008; Rodriguez & Griffin, 1990). However, in a comparison of committed employees and employees who intended to leave within a year, pay was found to be the least important factor in retaining employees of the 50 factors studied (Prewitt, 1999). Min’s (2007) study revealed that there was no significant relationship between pay and employee turnover. Overall the research on the relationship between pay and turnover is not conclusive. Inconclusive results are also seen with studies correlating turnover intention with benefits, training, organizational culture, job alternatives, personal growth, and coworker relationships. However, some variables were only associated with increasing turnover
intention such as worker exhaustion (Ducharme, Knudsen, & Roman, 2008; Kim, 2005; Sand & Miyazaki, 2000).

Morgan (2008) stated that the number one reason employees leave an organization is the leadership failure of the key managers. Communication between the supervisor and the employee explained the most variance in intent to among government employees (Scott, et al, 1999). There was a positive correlation between intent to leave and communication factors such as job information received, pay/benefits information received, agency information received, coworker relations and supervisor relations. This mixed method study revealed that a lack of communication contributed to an increase of intent to leave. A study of child welfare workers showed that supervisor support can decrease a worker’s risk of exiting by 42% (Dickinson & Painter, 2009). A study of 612 Canadians nurses examined supervisor incivility and coworker incivility along with empowerment and burnout as they related to organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover (Spence, Laschinger, Leiter, Day, & Gilin, 2009). Supervisor incivility most strongly predicted job dissatisfaction, low commitment, and turnover. Coworker incivility was not a statistically significant predictor of any of the three outcome factors.

It is apparent that communication affects turnover intentions. However, communication that frames the job has not been studied. Little is known about how job frames affect turnover intentions.

Turnover in hotels is problematic. Previously conducted studies on turnover consistently show a negative correlation between turnover and job satisfaction (Kay and Jordon-Evans, 2002; Min, 2007; Sigler, 1999) and job commitment (Feeley, 2000;
Hausknecht, Rodda & Howard, 2008; Maurer & Lippstreu, 2008; Raabe & Beehr, 2003).

Hence, the second research question is:

RQ2: What is the relationship between the communication frames and job satisfaction, turnover intention and job commitment?

This chapter has examined Framing Theory and reviewed previous research that examined how jobs are discursively framed. The next chapter will explain the methodology and results for answering RQ1: What frames do hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel. Chapter Four with explain the methodology and results for answering RQ2: What is the relationship between the communication frames and job satisfaction, turnover intention and job commitment. Chapter Five includes a discussion of both phases of the research.
Chapter 3: Phase I: Method and Results

The hotel industry has high turnover and hotels are often not an employer of choice. One purpose of this study was to increase understanding of how hotel managers discursively frame hotel jobs. The first phase of the research used a qualitative methodology to answer the first research question: What frames do hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel? This chapter discusses the method and results of Phase I.

Phase I: Qualitative Interviews

Method justification. As little research has been conducted on framing jobs, especially in the hotel industry, the first phase employs qualitative research methods. Qualitative methods are suitable for conducting initial exploration and exploring areas for which little is known. This method illuminates the experience and interpretation of events and concepts (Sofaer, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Qualitative methods are appropriate for this particular part of the study as a comprehensive list of job frames was not uncovered. No research could be found that attempted to identify multiple job frames. Therefore, this is a necessary step to take prior to a quantitative study examining a correlation between job frames and work outcomes.

Participant selection. Managers of hotels with low turnover were sought. Since the goal of the study is to identify communication frames that may aid retention and reduce turnover, it seems logical to interview managers who have low turnover. Participants were recruited through a combination of convenience sampling and snowball sampling. The primary researcher attended a meeting of the Hotel and Lodging Association in Daytona, Florida, an area close to her residence. She announced her research, the criteria of having low turnover, and asked qualified participants to volunteer. Although two vendors found the
study interesting and wanted to discuss it further, no hotel managers stepped forward to volunteer. The Executive Director of the association then recommended hotels to contact. The primary researcher contacted the General Managers of the hotels. Most of the managers contacted in this manner agreed to participate. Those managers were asked for names of other hotel managers whose hotels may have low turnover. Two additional managers were recruited through personal contact. Those managers, located in St. Louis, Missouri, were the only managers not in the Daytona, FL area.

**Participants.** Thirteen managers at nine hotels were interviewed. No new information came from the last two interviews and so it was determined that the point of saturation had been met (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Five managers interviewed held the position of general manager, one was the director of operations, three were front desk managers, two were housekeeping managers, and one manager had just recently moved from being the front desk manager to being the housekeeping manager. She referenced both positions in the interview. One manager was a sales manager.

Twelve managers were female and one manager was a male. Although age was not specifically asked, from appearance and interview context one manager was in her late 20’s, four were in their 30’s, four were in their 40’s, three were in their 50’s and one was in her 60’s. All of the managers had considerable tenure with their hotel and their hotel company. The least tenured was the manager was in her late 20’s who had four years tenure with her company. The most tenured was a general manager who had been at her hotel for over 20 years. The Director of Operations had been employed for over twelve years at her property and her front desk manager had eleven years tenure at this hotel. Only two managers had not
been hotel hourly employees at one time. Eight managers had been hourly employees at the hotel where they currently work.

All the managers described their turnover as low during the recruitment phase. To determine their actual turnover rate, the managers were asked two questions. The first question asked was “How many employees are employed at the hotel?” The follow up question was, “How many employees have you hired in the past year?” Four managers struggled to remember so they were asked the question, “How many employees have you hired in the past six months?” All four managers could confidently answer this question. The responses to these questions determined the turnover rate. One hotel had only been open for two months so the turnover rate at this hotel was projected. The turnover rates at the hotels in the study were 5%, 8%, 17%, 22%, 25%, 31%, 56%, 70%, and a projected 216%. One manager had been the general manager at her hotel for three years and had hired only 6 employees in the three years (8% turnover). Even more impressive was the hotel who had replaced just one employee in the previous year (5% turnover). That hotel had a staff of 20 personnel and the manager had been with this hotel for over 20 years. Because of the tenure of the staff at this hotel, there were no other managers. The hotel with 31% turnover is part of a large hotel chain that surveys its employees on a variety of work satisfaction measures every 18 months. Survey results were released just prior to the interview and this hotel ranked #2 of over 500 hotels in their chain (personal conversation with the Director of Human Resources, St. Louis, November, 13, 2013).

Three hotels reported low turnover during the recruitment phase but revealed their turnover was actually much higher. One manager who considered her turnover as low had 70% turnover. She believed her turnover was low for two reasons. First, by hotel industry
standards, 70% is better than the industry average. Second, she had retained 70% of her employees for over two years. She categorized her employees into two groups: housekeeping and all the others. In the past year, she had only hired two employees in all the others. However, in housekeeping, a department with ten positions, she had hired eight employees. The eight personnel she had hired were to fill the same four positions. Six housekeepers were long-term employees but she could not find four additional employees to hold the position long term. When asked if her turnover was low, she confidently answered yes because her retention rate was high. This interview remained part of this study for three reasons. First, it was obvious at the lodging association meeting that this manager’s opinion was valued by her peers. After each major decision or discussion, they asked for her opinion. It appeared that they were using her to validate their decisions. Second, the retention rate at the hotel was high. Third, operations at the hotel were very good. At the time the interview was scheduled, this hotel was ranked #1 of 110 hotels for the Daytona area on Trip Advisor.

The hotel that reported a moderate 56% turnover remained part of the study even though 56% is not particularly low. It remained part of the study for two reasons. First, the front desk manager participated in the study and the turnover rate at the front desk was very low. The front desk had only hired one person in over a year. Her interview responses were similar to managers at low-turnover hotels. The Director of Operations from this hotel was also interviewed. She had interview answers similar to the hotel manager whose turnover was projected at 216%. Interestingly, both of these high-turnover managers expressed the same topics as the managers of low-turnover hotels but from a different perspective. These managers answered several questions in the interview nearly opposite managers with low
turnover. This offered an interesting contrast for the study and is the second reason this hotel remained in the study.

The highest turnover was reported from a manager of a new hotel. The hotel had been open for two months at the time of the interview. The manager initially hired 25 employees and nine of those employees had quit at the time of the interview. If this rate continued for a year, this manager’s turnover rate would be 216%. This interview remained part of this study for reasons expressed above. This manager stated several of the same topics as low-turnover hotels but from a nearly opposite perspective. For example, three managers from low-turnover hotels explicitly stated, “I am not a babysitter” when talking about expectations from hourly employees. The manager of this hotel when asked how he described his job replied, “A glorified babysitter.”

**Interviews.** IRB approval was obtained prior to beginning interviews. Eleven interviews were conducted in person by the primary researcher. Interviews were conducted at a location selected by the manager. Two interviews occurred in the hotel restaurant at a time when there were no customers. One interview occurred in the hotel lobby at a time when there were no customers. Eight interviews occurred in the General Manager’s office at the hotel and two interviews were conducted via telephone. All interviews were audio recorded with the participants’ permission and later transcribed resulting in 54 pages of single-spaced print. Notes were also taken during the interview. Interviews lasted between 9 minutes and 29 minutes. The mean length of time for the interviews was 15.94 minutes (15 minutes, 56 seconds) with a standard deviation of 5.2 minutes. During two interviews, the conversation was interrupted by issues requiring the managers’ assistance. Both interruptions lasted approximately 5 minutes. The interruption time is not counted in the length of the interview.
A semi-structured interview guide was used in the interviews (See Appendix A). A semi-structured interview guide allowed the questions to be planned prior to the interview. The interview guide consisted of 15 pre-planned questions. Some questions were designed to determine turnover (How many employees work here? How many employees have you hired in the past year?). Some questions were designed to explore how managers describe the jobs and the climate at their hotel to employees and applicants (Thinking about the interview with your most recent hire, how did you describe working here to the applicant?). Some questions were designed to explore the communication frames managers use when communicating to employees about the employee’s job, tasks, and career opportunities as well as the communication frames managers uses to describe their own job (How do you describe your job to friends? Describe a time when an employee approached you about becoming a manager. What did you say to him or her?)

Probing questions were used to clarify concepts (Kvale, 1996). For instance, when asked, “To what do you contribute your low turnover” one manager replied, “It’s like a family here.” The researcher then asked the probing question, “What does that mean; what does family mean?” This manager then explained the concept further so the researcher did not have to assume what was meant by the term family.

**Method of analysis.** The interview transcripts were analyzed to identify communication frames through the processes of data condensation, open coding and axial coding. Data condensation is the process of reducing the amount of data used in the study (Miles & Huberman, 2014). Not all parts of the interview conversations pertained to the purpose of this study. Conversations about the hotel’s history, current job openings, and
storytelling about unique hotel experiences such as hurricanes and finding illegal drugs in the rooms were not included in the data analysis.

Open coding is “the analytic process through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 101). Open coding allowed the primary researcher to identify the concepts used by hotel managers in describing their job and their workplace. In this process passages of text were written on note cards. This allowed the researcher to label, separate and organize the data. Then through the process of constant comparison the communication frames were identified and defined. Constant comparison is the process of comparing each passage of text to the others in order to decide in which category it belongs (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). The categories emerged from the data rather than the passages being put into pre-existing categories. As the categories developed, they were named and defined creating distinct borders for each categories. A coding framework was created stating the names of the categories, a clear conceptualization of the categories, and example passages for each category. Conceptualizations of the categories included the definition of the category and a description of how similar categories were distinct from one another.

In addition to open coding and constant comparison, axial coding was used to more fully understand the communication concepts that evolved. Axial coding looks at how categories link and relate to each other (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Axial coding uses “codes that make connections between categories and thus result in the creation of either new categories or a theme that spans many categories” (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 220). Axial coding revealed that some communication frames regarded the job (hard work), some communication frames regarded the environment (family), some revealed an appropriate type
of worker (honest), and others described the manager or owner (advocate). The process of axial coding allowed some communication frames to become more meaningful for the study. For instance, the coding process revealed managers describing employees as honest, proud of where they work, taking pride in what they do, being detail-oriented, giving their best effort, doing quality work, and being empathetic to the guest. The process of axial coding combined these concepts into a category labeled professional hotelier.

This process of comparing and coding was not linear but fluctuated back and forth between open and axial coding. Throughout this process, categories were revised, removed, and created as new themes emerged from the data until unique and non-overlapping categories accounted for all the data. Transcripts were read and re-read in order to ensure that changes in the categories did not distort or change the context of the interview data. As these categories evolved, the coding framework was revised to ensure the conceptualization of each category was captured.

Nine categories emerged from the coding process. They are captured in Table 1; Communication Frame Categories. To check reliability, all of the note cards created during the coding process were sorted a second time by the primary researcher into the nine final categories with an additional category of other. Eighty-one percent of the cards remained labeled as the same category with 19% of the cards being reshuffled to another category. For example, the card with the statement “I’m not a manager without them (employees)” was moved from advocate to team. The final list of categories with their descriptions was then shown and discussed with a graduate student in an MBA program. The graduate student examined each note card within the ten categories (nine categories plus other) to determine if they fit the description of the category or if they fit better in a different category. The
Table 1

*Communication Frame Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Descriptive Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>A description of the work environment or culture. An identifiable group of people who interact in a similar fashion as family members interact.</td>
<td>Family oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It’s not easy to find a match for your family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>The work environment is enjoyable.</td>
<td>My job is fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It’s fun. People think I don't work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>A description of the employees who work there. An identifiable group whose members recognize their work is interdependent with others’ work.</td>
<td>[The job] revolves around all of us, not just one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It's how you treat your teammates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager as an advocate</td>
<td>The manager supports and defends the team members and their work.</td>
<td>I'm always on your side as long as you don't lie or steal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have a good team behind me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>The empowerment of employees to make decisions relating to the accomplishment of their tasks, serving guests and the mission of the company.</td>
<td>Trusts your employees [to make decision.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Train employees at the beginning, the right way, then turn them loose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>The job tasks are physically demanding. The nature of the work is stressful and demanding. The variety of tasks adds to stress.</td>
<td>Harder than it looks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Its hands and knees and bruises.                                                                      (physically demanding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Hotelier</td>
<td>Describes qualities of a successful employee.</td>
<td>You have to appreciate what you do and take pride in it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Honest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are here to do a job and do it to the best of our ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>Describes the employee’s ability to meet the expectations of the job.</td>
<td>The job is comfortable but not so comfortable I don't want to go…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It's comfortable here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Style</td>
<td>The medium used by managers to communicate expectations. Managers of hotels with low turnover used more active methods of communication versus passive methods.</td>
<td>Tell them upfront, face to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't just leave a note, tell them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
graduate student identified nine notecards that he felt were misplaced. The graduate student and primary researcher discussed the context of each card and came to an agreement on each card’s proper category.

**Communication Frames.** The first research question seeks to determine discursive frames used to describe hotel jobs.

RQ1: What frames do hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel? The interview data revealed nine communication frames used by hotel managers to describe working in a hotel.

**Family.** This was the most commonly mentioned communication frame. Nine managers reported having a family environment. In this study, family is conceptualized as a description of the work environment or culture; an identifiable group of people who interact in a similar fashion as family members interact, a group of people who have formed a close bond. The response of family or family environment was a common response to the question “To what do you contribute your low turnover?” When asked this question one general manager stated, “A family atmosphere, respect them, and don’t ask them to do anything that I wouldn’t do myself” (participant C3). A housekeeping manager stated, “Well actually it’s not a bad place to work at and uh, we try to get along, you know, like one big family in housekeeping” (participant C6). A front desk manager stated, “We just create a bond. We are more family oriented here” (participant C5). These participants, like six others, specifically mention the label family as the descriptor. The family theme was also stated by multiple participants as part of the answer to the questions, how did you describe working here to the most recent applicant you hired, what are the good reasons for working for this hotel chain, and the final summary question, is there anything else you would like to tell me about
working at this hotel or retaining employees? A housekeeping manager stated, “A lot of us have been around each other for a long time so we’re like a family and everybody will help each other out just, you know, any new people, they get welcomed here like they’ve been here forever” (participant C2). This statement reflects familiarity between the members of the group, a bonding between the group, and the awareness of incorporating new members into the group. A front desk manager expressed similar concepts when asked what the good reasons were for working at her hotel. “Well, I’ve worked here for so long, it’s like my family and you’re proud of where you work.” When asked if she had any final pieces of advice on retaining employees she stated, “To get a good one is not as easy as you think. You can have 50 applicants and one, be, you know, what you feel would be the match for your family, you know what I mean” (participant C4). This member is expressing a bond between employees and the importance of adding new employees who enable the bond to be maintained.

This is congruent with the literature. Kets de Vries (1993) stated the family analogy exists when there is a common purpose for the employees with an established sense of identification, commitment, trust, and communication with each other. The quotes above reflect identification with the group and a commitment to each other. In four interviews, participants specifically mentioned open door policy in conjunction with family environment (participants A1, C1, C2, C5). This reflects a level of open communication. The sales manager captured all of Ket De Vries descriptors when asked how she described the job to the most recent applicant she hired. She stated:

Family environment with an open door policy where if there was any type of issues or questions or anything managers and supervisors are always available. There is always
opportunity to learn, um, where everybody is committed to do the best job they can to serve the guest at the hotel. (participant A1)

Here the manager specifically named family, spoke of open communication, spoke of commitment to the employee by the managers and supervisors always being there for the employee, and spoke of the commitment the employees have to their job and the guests.

Family was also communicated in terms of home. When a housekeeping manager was asked what the good reasons were for working for her hotel she replied, “Actually, they kind of make you feel like you’re at home, you know.” A general manager told a story of an employee who quit to go work at another hotel. “I get a call one day. Hey (manager’s name) what’s up? I said you want to come home don’t you?” (participant C1). Here the manager was letting the employee know he was still part of the work family by calling the hotel his home.

Oddly enough, the four managers from hotels with the highest turnover percentage (56%, 70%, and projected 216%) did not mention a family environment. Each manager talked about respecting employees but did not mention family. When asked if the manager had anything they wanted to add about retaining employees, the director of operations (56% turnover) stated, “Um, with employees, I think employees will respect you if you respect them and it helps with the morale and overall in general, and just try to keep a nice atmosphere and leave drama at the door” (participant C7). This manager is stating a connection between respect and the impact on morale in a similar manner as the managers did with family. One general manager with 25% turnover put family and respect together. When asked to what she attributed her low turnover she replied, “Family atmosphere.
Respect employees. Don’t ask them to do anything you wouldn’t do yourself.” She was the only manager of low turnover hotels to mention respect.

**Fun.** Another category that emerged from the data is fun. “We have a lot of fun” (participant C1). Fun is conceptualized in this study as the work environment is enjoyable. Five managers referred to their work as fun. The turnover rate at the hotels where these five managers work were all under 31%. When asked how she described her job to her friends, a front desk managers stated:

> It’s fun, um, people think I don’t work and (laughter) don’t get me wrong I do have bad days. If you’ve been here during bike week (laughter) it’s a whole other story, when computers don’t wanna work right. For the most part, I do I love this job. I just have a really, really good time. (participant C5)

This participant was expressing that she enjoyed her job even though there were bad moments. She referred to her job as fun and a good time. A general manager gave a similar answer to the question of how do you describe your job to your friends. “It’s fun. I laugh a lot at work. A lot of people don’t do that but that’s a necessary thing for me” (participant C3). This manager is stating that her job is fun and she believes she needs fun in her job. This same manager stated in a different part of the interview “if you don’t have a sense of humor you won’t last here (in the hotel industry).” It seems this manager pushes fun into the work place for her employees.

The hotel manager with a projected 216% turnover stated how he really loved his job but he came short of calling it fun. “I love (this hotel chain). It was my very first general manager’s job. I enjoyed it. Was there for 18 years and I really enjoyed it. I loved it.” Later in the interview he stated:
I really enjoy (managing a hotel). I know the hours, the pay, it all sucks but I enjoy doing it, I really enjoy doing it. And perhaps this is going to sound boastful but if I wasn't successful in what I did or if I hadn't been able to reach certain levels of success I probably wouldn't enjoy it. (participant D4)

The hotel manager with 70% turnover also stated she enjoys her job because she is pretty good at it but never referred to it as fun. Additionally, the manager with the highest turnover referred to his customers as having fun and thought his hotel should be viewed as a fun hotel. He told a story of a customer’s son riding his bicycle through the hotel’s water park.

I just had to go watch because he was having so much fun and it was so original that he's combining the two pleasures and just enjoying himself and I wanted to get pictures to post on our website and I think that if we were able to do that, capture that joy that that kid was having, you know, someone sees that on the website, they’re going to say wow that is a, a fun place. That kid is having some serious fun. So, um you know, it’s one of those things. That what keeps customers coming back.

(participant D4)

This manager recognized the value of fun for his hotel but he did not view his job or the work environment as fun. No manager from the three hotels with the highest turnover referred to their job as fun.

The flow job frame identified in the literature review states that employees enjoy their work so much that their work seems like leisure. Participant C5, who stated people do not think she works, went on to explain how she loves working at vacation properties. She stated, “you’re always, like you’re on vacation. It’s almost like it’s not even coming to work.” This statement is an expression about the amount of fun she has at work and that her work can
seem like vacation leisure. The concept of flow in a job also states that there are challenges, immediate feedback, opportunities for action, and opportunities to get lost in the transaction. Participant A1 stated, “It’s demanding but if you love it, I, I would have a hard time picturing myself doing something else right now.” Later in the interview she stated:

I do have a passion for hotel operations so for me it’s exciting to go every day just knowing that we start with a contract or a reservation and what it evolves into its not only a number on a piece of paper but is the whole experience. It can be challenging but rewarding when you make someone happy or you bring revenue to your hotel. (participant A1)

This manager is articulating the challenges, the opportunities for action and the feedback of customer satisfaction or an increased revenue line. However, she does not express full immersion in her job and losing track of time or the disregard for needs such as food or sleep. No participant reported a full sense of flow and being fully immersed in their work.

**Hard work.** Hard work was the second most commonly mentioned theme. The theme hard work was conceptualized as the job tasks are physically demanding and the nature of the work is stressful and demanding. Eight managers from seven different hotels reported that their job or the jobs in their hotel are hard, challenging, demanding, or stressful. “It’s just a lot of hands and knees and bumps and bruises” (participant C2). This housekeeping manager was stating that the job was physically demanding. A general manager explained why the housekeeping jobs at her hotel were particularly hard work.

The housekeeping position especially in an exterior property is a very difficult job. I could not do it personally. Um, it's, it's physically demanding, um, not only in regards to the heat and cold with just the elements but it's also, we have very high standards.
We're a platinum hotel property and until the day before yesterday we were number one out of all the hotels in Daytona Beach. So we're very, you know, we expect our rooms to be cleaned and we of course have cost constraints that it has to be cleaned within a certain period of time. (participant D56)

This manager is explaining that the job is physically demanding, there is the stress caused by the demands of the high standards, and there is the added stress of being pushed to clean each room in a short period of time. These factors make this job physically and emotionally hard. A manager summed up her job as “It’s a lot harder than it looks” (participant C4). One manager talked about the emotional challenges of a job he had prior to becoming a manager. He said:

I didn’t like being in maintenance and going through spring break and watching everything get destroyed and the next day you fix it and then it’s destroyed again the next day and I got out and that’s when I went and worked construction. (participant D4)

The emotional toil of this job caused him to quit his hotel job. This manager further explained:

Even though the hours, you know, putting up with rude people, getting yelled at and all that kind of stuff sometimes wears on you but at the same time there is bright spots. There are more bright spots than negative spots.

Although this manager says his job has some emotionally trying times, there are times that are not difficult that counter these times.

Many managers countered hard work with a positive. Often hard work was connected to fun. “It’s demanding but it’s fun” (participant C3). “It’s fun. Sometimes stressful, never
dull” (participant D13). “It can be fun but it’s challenging” (participant A1). “It’s challenging, it’s motivating, it’s rewarding” (participant D56). Each of these managers are stating that although their work is hard, it is also enjoyable and rewarding. This seems consistent with the dirty work frame revealed in the literature review. Dirty work is tasks that are physically, socially, or morally tainted. Hotel managers expressed that their work can be physically and emotionally challenging but they seemed to balance it with bright spots.

None of the managers expressed that their jobs consisted of dirty work. However, when asked if anyone has ever told the manager that their job was beneath them or asked them when they were going to get a real job, only the three housekeeping managers stated yes. The other hotel managers stated “absolutely not” (participant D56), “No, never” (participant C1), “No but I see it with some other people. I see it with some of the housekeeping staff” (participant C3). It may be that the housekeeping department of a hotel is seen as having the dirty work.

**Team.** Another category revealed from the data was team. Team is a description of the employees who work there. A team is an identifiable group whose members recognize their work is interdependent with others' work. Managers often used the word team in describing their employees. “The opportunity to share my experiences with my team” (participant D56), “I can’t do it without them; I have a good team behind me and I succeed because of them” (participant C1), and “be honest with the team” (participant C3).

Managers also expressed the interconnectedness of the team. “One thing that they have to be is a team player here because it revolves around all of us, not just one” (participant C2). This housekeeping manager was stressing the interdependence of the department and
the hotel. She went on to say that when interviewing she looks for how you treat your
teammates. A general manager stated in hiring she looks for people who fit with the team.

Managers also expressed an effort to develop their employees into teams. One general
manager explained her effort in building a team:

We have a morning huddle every single morning. We’ll get together and this morning
we stacked cups and we just do little teambuilding games and things like that.
Sometimes I'll read a story. I have, um, exceptional customer service building books
and I’ll read little stories out of those and things like that. Every manager has a
different day so it's not just me up there but we do something different every day.
(participant C1).

This manager also stated “We work together. We play together.” This manager is
showing how she makes a deliberate effort to build her staff into a team. She includes
her other managers as well so multiple people take responsibility for making the staff
a team.

All of these comments were from managers of low-turnover hotels. The managers at
the hotels with high turnover expressed how staff members are affected by other staff
members, both positively and negatively, but did not use the word team. The director of
operations (56% turnover) when asked what the good reasons are for working at her hotel
responded, “a lot of it is the employees. We’re pretty good, um, if we need time off
somebody will cover.” This manager is saying that the employees help each other meet the
company requirements. The manager of the highest turnover hotel stated:
Some people try to take advantage of things. I can see how it affects the other members of the staff too and if they feel they are getting away with it, then it just gets to be a bad situation. (participant D4)

Here the manager is explaining how the staff is interconnected and how an employee’s actions can upset the others. However, this manager did not use the word team in describing his staff. In fact, his manager separated his staff into the good employees and the others.

“You know essentially the ones that have left, um, weren’t working out for us, so, the good ones we’ve been able to keep” and “I generally have a good a relationship with my valued employees.” Unlike the managers at the low turnover hotel who spoke about hiring employees that fit with the team, he spoke about hiring employees that fit with him.

I learned that some time ago that if I have people that fit with me, we can get a lot done and we're like minded so they kind of know what to expect, the same work ethic and so forth. We've had some people come in with all kinds of qualifications but if they don't really fit with me then well, um you know, sometimes we can get along there for a while as long as they produce. (participant D4)

The manager doesn’t speak about the employee getting along with coworkers. He expressed the importance of getting along with him or the employee having a good individual record of performance.

Manager as an advocate. Another category managers expressed was their support of the employees. The manager as an advocate was defined as the manager supports and defends the team members and their work. One manager was advocating for a new position in the sales department. She had to convince her owner to add the position. She stated:
I told her what I saw in her. I told her the things I would like to challenge her with so that I could go to my owner and say this is what, this is how I see her…this is what [employee] can do for us and I gave her a challenge and this is how she has stepped up. (participant C5)

Here the manager has an employee who she believes is capable of doing more. She is advocating a new position for her. A general manager stated, “I will be always on your side as long as you don’t lie to me or steal” (participant C5). The statement “always on your side” expresses how the manager supports her team members. This manager also expressed that she had talked to other hotels when she had an employee ready to be a manager but there were no vacancies at her hotel. She is showing that her support of this employee is more important to her than retaining a good employee for her own hotel, which is contrary to the goals of running a successful business. Another manager talked about supporting the employees who work hard. “I got a guy right now, they’re trying to cut his hours. But he’s a superstar and why take your prime player out of the game so we’re getting him work to do ‘cause he’s a super star” (participant D4). Here the manager is stating that the corporate office has placed limits on the number of hours allocated for this person’s position. Since the employee is such a good worker, the manager is using him in multiple positions rather than reducing his hours.

Several managers talked about an open door policy and being available to listen to the employees and address their needs. “We have an open door policy. Come to us if you have an issue and we are more than willing to talk it over” (participant C5). Another manager stated:
[Corporate office] has an open door policy. I have an open door policy and I tell my employees if ever I’m not meeting their needs, feel free to go to my boss. I don’t worry about that. Keeps me on my toes, that I should be doing what I’m supposed to be doing. (participant C1)

Participant C1 is stating here that she has a responsibility to support her employees.

One manager with low turnover stated, “I try to be a mentor as much as I can. I teach people as much as I can” (participant C3). The manager with 70% turnover expressed the value of employees learning but fell short of mentoring.

Everybody that gets hired, especially the front desk, if my housekeeping department would come and asked me I would do it too, but it’s offered. I give them the title of general manager and so they have access to all the (company) education that I do and that’s free education and I consider that a big benefit. So as much as they want to learn, I mean they have guidelines, my front desk does, of things that they are required to learn, but what they do with all the rest is up to them. (participant D56)

Here she is stating that she makes education available to the front desk employees but they must use their own initiative to learn and she would make this education available to housekeepers if they asked. This manager is creating a system for the employees to employees to get more education. She sees this as supporting her employees. This is a passive way of being an advocate of employees as the employee has to make nearly all the initiative. The front desk employees who have access to a computer as part of their job can take advantage of this opportunity much more easily than a housekeeper who has to ask for the opportunity and then find time to do the training. The housekeeper does not have job duties that require them to use a computer.
Autonomy. A common communication frame among the low turnover hotels was trust and autonomy. Autonomy in this study is defined as the empowerment of employees to make decisions relating to the accomplishment of their tasks, serving guests and the mission of the company. One manager stated:

I’m very big on empowering my employees to make their decisions and right or wrong we’ll live with them. Especially in customer service, my philosophy is if you’re standing at the front desk and you’ve got a guest and he’s complaining at you da da da da da da da, for every little thing they use to - I have to get the manager; I have to ask the manager. The manager is not the one standing there talking to the guest. You are. Empower yourself. Make a decision. You don’t want the guest to have to wait. Whether it’s right or wrong. We’ll go over if afterward. There is not a wrong decision. You’re making that effort to take care of the guest. So one of my big things coming was getting them out of that mindset that every little thing had to be approved and you have to trust your employees. You have to trust them. It boils down to trust. I’m not a babysitter. I’m a boss. I expect everyone to come in and do their job. (participant C1)

This manager is explaining that in order to effectively take care of the guest, the employee has to make decisions when they are interacting with the guest rather than getting the manager to make the decisions. This manager trusts that the employees will make decisions and act in a way that does not hurt the hotel. She expects employees to make decisions without her. She also states that when something does go wrong, she is supportive of the employee and they will discuss it so the employee can make a better decision next time. She continues to trust the employee to make future decisions.
Another manager echoed this manager using the same analogy. “It’s not like they’re little kids where I have to babysit them, you know.” A housekeeping manager credited the hotel’s training program for empowering employees. “So once they train them that’s about it. We turn them loose and that’s it. When they’re trained they’re trained properly from A to Z, you know, so they know what to do once they get on the floors” (participant C6). This manager believed that after training, employees knew their job so well that they didn’t need to be micromanaged. The employees knew the hotel’s expectations and were trusted to do their job.

Two managers talked about how being empowered when they were hourly employees made an impact on them being managers today. When asked how she decided to become a manager, a housekeeping manager explained:

When the (housekeeping manager) was leaving I picked up more responsibility. It wasn’t something that I chose to do; it was something that needed to be done to keep the hotel going. It was like if she wasn’t here then I knew I had to be here to do it. When she left the property and it was like, ok well, there’s nobody else here doing it so I have to do it. It was kind of like get it done or it’s not gonna get done.

(participant C2)
This employee was stating that she took it upon herself to do tasks that she saw needed to be done even though it was beyond her current job. She was empowered to make decisions on her own. She was trusted to do managerial duties as an hourly employee.

Another manager explained his history:

While I was going to school certain opportunities to use my education sort of fell on my lap, and um, you know, I just did it, thinking it as an exercise to use what I
learned in school. It just so happened that the building that we opened up had some severe construction problems and ultimately there were some somewhat technical stuff that had to be done daily at the hotel to prove that this problem existed and I was able to do that for them by writing reports. I mean I had a reports writing class. I had an assignment and I thought I can kill two birds at one time so I used it and um I think, and they noticed. (participant D4)

He then explained how some of his reports were used in a court case against the builder of this hotel.

So they decided that, you know, we can give him more responsibility based on what he’s been doing and capable of doing. I did it freely, I didn’t do it, you know, I’m not getting paid to do it, that kind of stuff. I just did it for my own self. (participant D4)

This manager is explaining how he was empowered and trusted to do tasks outside of his normal job description. So he was given more responsibility and eventually promoted to a management position. Interestingly enough though, this general manager does not trust his employees as much as he was trusted as an hourly employee. When asked how he describes his job to his friends, he quickly replied:

Manager: A glorified babysitter.

Interviewer: Really?

Manager: Yeah (laughter) yeah, that’s basically it.

This manager is saying that he has to supervise his employees as if he were babysitting them rather than empowering them to work with little supervision. Managers who stressed the importance of empowering and trusting employees specifically stated that they were not babysitters.
**Professional hotelier.** Throughout the interviews managers described characteristics about successful or preferred employees. Words like honest, integrity, well-spoken, detail oriented, do a quality job, do the best job they can, take pride in their work, and be proud of where they work were repeated by multiple managers. These descriptors were categorized together and titled professional hotelier. A housekeeping manager stated to be a good housekeeper you have to “really appreciate what you do and take pride in it.” She went on to say that a successful housekeeper is “detailed oriented and takes their job seriously.” A general manager gave examples of what she considered were two good employees. One employee was always doing something he saw needed to be done and finding ways to interact with the guests. The manager described these two employees:

He ingratiates himself with the guests. And I have another person at breakfast who is, god, everyone knows her. She’s just, she’s that extra person that in this business makes you shine, even with construction, we still manage to be ok because of some of these people. (participant C3)

Here this manager was describing employees who take their job seriously. They both stayed focused on the guests. Guests consistently commented on the employees’ good performances. Both employees were perceived as doing their tasks well. The manager credits the business being successful because of this type of employee.

**Comfortable.** Five managers referred to being comfortable on the job. Comfortable, in this study, describes the employee's perception of their ability to meet the expectations of the job. One manager expressed this concept this way:

I feel comfortable in this position. I know exactly, you know, I’ve been here for so long that I’m comfortable with what I’m doing, so it’s not like, you know, I know
exactly, I don’t ever have new challenges except for if something changes. For the most part I’m comfortable with what I’m doing. I know what I’m doing here.

(participant C8)

This front office manager was stating that she is comfortable with her level of competence. This feeling of comfort deters her from seeking a new position. She ended her answer with, “So like going to like a new job you have so much more to learn and this and that so.” She was stating that she prefers staying where she is comfortable rather than going to a new position that she does not know and would need to learn.

A housekeeping manager stated that she has no reason to look for another job. “I’m not too comfortable, where I’m comfortable enough that I just come in and do what I’m supposed to do and go on” (participant C2). This manager is saying that she is comfortable with her job duties but not so comfortable that she is complacent. Another manager, when seeking out her replacement, stated she spoke to a supervisor. “She has all of the knowledge to do the work and so it was more about gaining confidence and …just making sure she is comfortable with the duties if she would hold the position” (participant B1). A general manager spoke about approaching an employee who she thought had potential for promotion. “I asked if she is interested in more responsibility and she had to think about it because you know there’s a certain amount of comfort in not being responsible and just being a team” (participant C3). Each of these managers used the term comfortable to describe confidence in their ability to be successful on the job. They did not express that they had mastered the job. They did not express that their jobs were without stress. They simply expressed that they were good at their job to the level of being comfortable.
Communication style. Although communication style is not a communication frame per se, it was a pattern that emerged among the managers. The managers of hotels with turnover rates at 25% or below used verbal communication as the primary means of communicating with their employees. Most of these managers used verbal, face-to-face communication exclusively. When asked how the manager communicated her expectations to her employees, the general manager stated, “Pretty much one on one, just talking. Very seldom do I put stuff in writing. Unfortunately I probably should do that more often (laughter)” (participant D13). Another general manager responded to the same question this way, “I’m pretty upfront. I’m very, um very upfront. We have reviews and stuff and I don’t wait until review time. If I have an issue I address it you know” (participant C1). This manager went on to stress the importance of talking to employees. Although they have a process for writing expectations, she considers that much less effective than verbally talking to her employees. The housekeeping manager at this property replied:

Well, you have to have meetings and you have to let them know what is expected of them, what is needed of them. When [the GM] gives me something that I need to follow like a standards change or if something comes like in a letter or email and it’s for me to gather them together and let them know this is what we need to do, this is the direction we need to go. (participant C2)

Here the manager is stating the importance of face-to-face communication. She believes that when she gets something in writing, it is her responsibility to tell the housekeeping department what the changes are in a meeting. She does not simply pass along the letter or email.
The managers at the hotel with 31% -70% turnover preferred communicating to their employees verbally and backing it up with their messages in writing such as memos. A housekeeping manager explained (31%):

Researcher: How do you communicate your expectations to your employees?
Housekeeping manager: Usually these are written in an SOP or standard operating procedures, where my expectations are written clearly and then I’ll discuss it with them but I like to put it on paper as well just in case it doesn’t happen, in the future there is documentation we had a discussion and that we can refer to it later.
Researcher: Which method do you prefer, having it written or discussion?
Housekeeping manager: Honestly both together. I personally prefer to have things written for me, um, just so that I can refer to them later, but I think if you just give people written things they won’t read them necessarily I mean some people will and some people won’t so it’s good to have the both the kinds covered. This manager is stating that she prefers passing along expectations in writing. Verbal communication is a secondary method of communicating used only because she believes employees will not give enough attention to written communication.

The managers of the hotels with 56% and 70% turnover preferred a more passive way of communicating with employees such as using shift logs and memos. The front office manager (56% turnover) stated that she communicates expectations verbally.

I usually talk to that specific agent about something um if not probably through email or memos, front desk memos. We also have a log book that we write in. Any kind of problems or any kind of things that other agents should know we always write it down in the daily log book. (participant C8)
The director of operations at this same property stated, “It’s so hard to tell everyone ‘cause some people are off so that way (writing in the log book) if we talk about something and somebody’s not here they can refer back to that.” In this property, if there is something that needs to be communicated to an individual, it is stated verbally or through email or a memo. If it needs to be communicated to the group, it is written in the log book.

The manager with the projected turnover of 216% stated he preferred verbal communication. When asked how he communicates his expectations to his employees he stated:

I just tell them you know. This is what I need done. They've never been afraid to come talk to me about anything no matter how minor. Sometimes it, it occupies a lot of my time but at the same time um they kind of know what I'm thinking because of the conversations we have….Sometimes I know they're not going to like what I have to say but I just tell it to them. I try not to have anything come as a surprise to them so if there is an issue there gonna know about it early on or I'm gonna talk to them about it. (participant D4)

Here the manager is saying that by taking the time to talk to the employees, he benefits by his employees better understanding his expectations so they can act appropriately. He tries to keep his employees informed about upcoming events. Unlike the managers in the hotels with the lowest turnover, the manager never mentioned structured communication times such as meetings.

In addition to communicating verbally, the two managers with the highest turnover talked about poor communication. The general manager with the highest projected turnover stated, “You sort of have to start barking orders at times but I think people that work well
with me, they don’t get offended by it.” The general manager is acknowledging that his communication can be offensive. He seems to justify his barking orders by stating the good employees are not offended. This implies that the employees who are offended are not his good employees. This rationalization seems to shift the source of offensiveness from the manager’s communication to the quality of the employee.

The general manager at the hotel with 70% turnover stated:

Sometimes I'm not as successful as I, I have to go back and say I could have done that differently and then I have to go back and apologize and, and let them know, you know I could have said this differently so that it could've come across better but, um this is what I meant. (participant D56)

This general manager is stating that she reflects on her communication and approaches employees to improve her message to them. She is taking responsibility for her communication. No other manager talked about times when they did not communicate effectively.

**A Holistic Approach.** It is interesting to note that although managers were asked about their jobs, they answered the questions in much broader terms than just the tasks of the job. Managers talked about the work environment, the employees, the customers, the facilities and technology, the properties’ histories, and the tasks of their particular jobs. Rarely did a manager only speak of one of these areas. The answers were holistic in nature. It seems managers do not view their jobs only in terms of the tasks but also consider the employees, customers, facilities, and work environment external to the job. Each aspect of work was woven together and expressed through the communication frames.
Summary

RQ1, what frames do hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel, sought to determine discursive frames hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel. Thirteen managers from nine hotels were interviewed. Nine communication frames were identified from the interview data. The family frame is conceptualized as a description of the work environment whereby an identifiable group of people interact in a similar fashion as family members interact. The second frame, the fun frame, also describes the work environment. The fun frame is conceptualized as an environment that is fun and enjoyable. Third, the team frame is conceptualized as an identifiable group whose members recognize that their work is interdependent with others' work. The fourth identified communication frame, the manager as the advocate for the team, discursively frames the manager as supporting and defending the team members and their work. Fifth, the autonomy frame depicts the empowerment of employees to make decisions relating to the accomplishment of their tasks, serving guests and the mission of the company. A sixth communication frame uncovered was hard work. The hard work frame discursively colors the job tasks as physically demanding and stressful with the variety of tasks adding to the stress. The seventh communication frame identified, the professional hotelier frame, describes the qualities of a successful employee. Eighth, the communication frame labeled comfortable describes the employee’s perceived ability to meet the expectations of the job. The final communication frame labeled communication style reflects the way managers choose to communicate. Managers of low-turnover hotels used more active methods of communication versus passive methods.
The three communication frames of family, dirty work, and flow identified in the literature review were revealed in the interviews. The family frame is congruent with previous research. The family frame in hotels referred to an environment that reflects an established sense of identification and a close bond between employees, commitment, trust, and communication with each other. The communication frame of hard work had some similarities to dirty work. Eight (62%) managers reported that their job or the jobs in their hotel are physically hard, emotionally challenging, demanding, or stressful. However, it was only the three housekeeping managers who reported that others had inferred that their job was beneath them or not a desirable job. The communication frame of fun had some similarities to the flow frame identified in the literature review. Managers reported enjoying work so much that it seemed like leisure rather than work. They stated the work had challenges, opportunities for action and immediate feedback. However, no manager reported being fully immersed in their work so only part of the flow concept was experienced.

The frames of profession, meaningful work, and calling were identified in the literature review but not revealed in the interviews. The communication frame of real job was specifically asked as part of the interview guide. No manager reported feeling that their job was not a real job. Only two managers reported having someone tell them that they did not have a real job. They denied the claims that their jobs were not real.

The data from these interviews as well as the literature review was used to create a survey for hotel employees. The method and results of this next phase of research is explained in Chapter Four. The final chapter is a discussion of the results of both phases of this research.
Chapter 4: Phase II: Method and Results

Phase I of this study revealed communication frames hotel managers used to describe their hotel jobs. Phase II of this study measured hotel employees exposure to these frames as well as examining the relationship between job frames, those identified in phase I and in the literature review, and three work outcomes that have been previously correlated to turnover. The second phase used quantitative research methods to answer RQ2: What is the relationship between the communication frames and job satisfaction, turnover intention and job commitment?

Phase II: Method

Participants

Participants were hourly hotel employees or entry level managers. Hourly employees and entry level managers were a group distinct from the managers who were interviewed in Phase I. This group was selected because they are the ones most often exposed to the communication frames used by managers like those interviewed in Phase I.

Participants were recruited through convenience sampling and snowball sampling. The primary researcher contacted the general manager of hotels in Daytona Beach, FL, and Orlando, FL, and sought permission to survey employees. When the general manager agreed to allow employees to be surveyed, the primary researcher went to the hotel and offered paper surveys to employees who entered the employee break room. Surveys were completed and returned immediately to the researcher. At other hotels, surveys were given to employees along with an envelope. The employee then completed the survey at their leisure, sealed it in the envelope, and returned it to a designated location. This location was an envelope or drawer near the front desk where employees could deposit their survey anonymously. The
primary researcher returned to the hotel the following day to pick up the sealed envelopes. This method prevented the survey from interfering with the employee’s work requirements and allowed the employee to participate voluntarily and anonymously.

The survey was also offered online. The primary researcher reached out to personal contacts for referrals. Those referred were directed to a survey monkey website where they completed the survey. Participants who took the online survey were from seven different states. Information about the hotels where employees worked was not collected in order to assist in maintaining anonymity.

Participants who completed or attempted to complete the survey received a $5 gift card. Participants who completed or attempted to complete the survey in the employee break room received the gift card immediately upon returning the survey to the primary researcher. Employees who completed the survey and sealed it in the envelope received their gift card in the envelope with the survey. Participants who completed the survey online were asked for their address (without names) at the conclusion of the survey and a gift card was then mailed to them. This final question asking for an address was the only difference between the paper survey and the online survey. Addresses were not collected from the survey site so they remained separate from the rest of the data.

A total of 151 surveys were completed. Seventy-four participants from eight different hotels completed a paper survey of which 67 were used in the study. Seven surveys were significantly incomplete with only a few statements answered and so those surveys were eliminated from the study. Seventy-seven hotel employees from six different states took the survey online. Three online surveys were eliminated from the study as the participants were executive level managers; therefore, they did not represent the desired population of hourly
employees or entry level managers. The number of hotels represented by the online survey was not collected. Overall, 141 surveys from hotel employees in six states were used in this study.

Twenty-five percent of participants \((n = 35)\) were male and 75\% \((n = 104)\) were female. Forty-nine percent of participants \((n = 69)\) were single, nearly 18\% \((n = 25)\) were married and 31\% of participants \((n = 44)\) lived with a significant other. Three percent of employees \((n = 4)\) had graduate degrees, 31\% of employees \((n = 44)\) had bachelor’s degrees, 33\% of employees \((n = 47)\) had some college, 24\% of employees \((n = 34)\) held a high school diploma or GED, and 6\% employees \((n = 8)\) had less than a high school diploma. As reflected in Table 2; Participant Demographics, the ages of the participants ranged from 18-69. The mean age was 33.4 years with a standard deviation of 12.65. The median age was 30 years. There were 82 participants below the mean age and 56 participants above the mean age reflecting a young work force. Participants’ pay ranged from $3.48 per hour plus tips to $33.00 per hour with the median pay being $10.00 per hour and the mean wage at $10.81 per hour. Only four participants made less than minimum wage (tipped employees). Fifty percent of participants \((n = 53)\) made $7.50 - $10.00 per hour. An additional 40\% of participants \((n = 43)\) made $10.20 – $16.00 per hour. Only eight participants reported making more than $16.00 per hour. Fifty percent of the participants had been with the company for 18 months or less and 50\% of the employees had been in their current position for less than one year. Ninety-five percent of participants \((n = 126)\) reported that their hotel job was their primary job. Of those, 74\% \((n= 98)\) reported working full time and 21\% reported working part-time. The remaining 5\% \((n = 6)\) worked at the hotel as their second job. Of these six participants, only one participant worked full time; the other five participants worked part-time. Most
Table 2

*Participant Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>12.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Tenure</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tenure in years*

participants were hourly employees (80%, n = 109). Nearly 9% of participants (n = 12) were supervisors and 11% (n = 15) were entry level managers. Table 3; Participants by Department, depicts the number of participants by department.

**Survey**

The survey consisted of two sections. The first section collected the demographic information explained above. The second part of the survey consisted of 62 statements measured on a 7-point Likert-type scale. These items attempted to measure the three work outcomes of job satisfaction, job commitment, and intent to leave as well as the nine communication frames identified in Phase I of the study and the five additional frames identified in the literature review that were not identified in Phase I of this study. Initially the survey had 74 items. The survey was pretested with a group of undergraduate students studying hospitality management at a local college. Students took the survey and then participated in a discussion about the survey with the primary researcher. This discussion resulted in the identification of statements needing more clarity and a suggestion
Table 3

Participants by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Desk</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Masseur, spa, activities coord.)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 136

to shorten the survey. The revised survey was then offered to another group of students and colleagues. Discussions with these test participants resulted in three more statements being rewritten and two more statements being deleted. No additional tests were conducted after the second set of adjustments were made to the survey. The survey is included as Appendix B.

Job satisfaction was measured using the three items that make up the affective, general satisfaction section of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) developed by Hackman and Oldham (1974). The three-item scale had an internal reliability of .76 in their 1974 study. The intent to leave scale consisted of three items and had an internal reliability measure of
.75 in previous research (Colarelli, 1984). One item, “I frequently think of quitting my job” was part of both the job satisfaction scale (Hackman and Oldham, 1974) and Colarelli’s intent to leave scale (1984). Therefore, the statement, “I do not like my job” (reverse coded) was added to the job satisfaction scale. “I do not like my job” seemed more in line with job satisfaction and “I frequently think of quitting my job” seemed to be more aligned with quitting intentions. The job commitment scale was adapted from an 8-item scale created by Blau (1985). For brevity of the survey, only the five items from his scale that loaded on the factor at .63 and above in Blau’s study (1985) were included in this study.

The nine communication frames identified in Phase I of this study were family, fun, team, manager as an advocate, autonomy, hard work, professional hotelier, comfortable, and active communication. Items on the study were statements from the participants that the primary researcher thought best described the communication frame. Family, fun, and team each had three items with one item reverse coded for each concept. Manager as an advocate included five statements with two items reverse coded. Both professional hotelier and hard work were represented with six items with one item reverse coded. Autonomy had four items with one item reverse coded. Comfortable had two items on the survey. Active communication was represented with five items with one item reverse coded.

The five communication frames identified in the literature review but not revealed in Phase I of this study were flow, calling, dirty work, meaningfulness, and real job. The items selected to represent these communication frames were items used in previous studies or were core characteristics of the concept as identified by the concept’s author. The survey included three items for flow, four items for calling, three items for dirty work with one item
being reversed coded, two items for meaningfulness with one item being reversed coded, and two items for real job with one item reverse coded.

**Factor Analysis**

All 17 scales were analyzed to ensure sufficient loading of items using either Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) or Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Items were considered for inclusion in the scale if they loaded at .500 or higher, had a differential of .300 or higher if it loaded on multiple factors, and inclusion increased the reliability of the scale. When factor analysis revealed multiple factors, varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization was used to determine factor loading. Scales with a reliability of $\alpha = .650$ or higher were considered for use in this study.

The survey contained four items to measure job satisfaction. As the item “I frequently think of quitting my job” was part of both the job satisfaction scale and the intent to leave scale, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted with the six items that made up both scales. EFA revealed two factors. Two items from the job satisfaction scale, “I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job” and “Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job” loaded as one factor and the other four items loaded as a second factor.

As job satisfaction, intent to leave and job commitment have been correlated in previous research, the decision was made to conduct factor analysis on job commitment prior to confirming the job satisfaction and intent to leave scales. CFA was conducted on the five items that comprised the job commitment scale. CFA revealed that the five items split into two factors with three items loading on one factor and two items on the second factor. Therefore, EFA was conducted using all 11 items that comprised the three work outcome scales. Nine of the 11 items loaded on three factors and two items double loaded on two
factors. The two items that double loaded were dropped. Four items loaded on factor 1 above .500; two items loaded on factor 2 above .500 and three items loaded on factor 3 above .500.

Table 4; Work Outcomes Factor Loading reflects the items that loaded on each factor.

Table 4

*Work Outcomes Factor Loading*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had all the money I needed, I would still work in this position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an ideal job, too good to give up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have my way, I will be working for another company one year from now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could do it all over, I would not choose this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am disappointed I ever took this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take a different job if it paid the same.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently think of quitting my job.</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td></td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reverse Coded*

Reliability for each of the three work outcome factors were tested. Cronbach’s Alpha is the standard method for testing reliability of scales. Factor 1 had a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = .737$, a mean of 5.06 with a standard deviation of 1.15. This 4-item scale maintained the title of job satisfaction. Factor 2 was just two items so reliability and correlation were calculated. Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha = .825$. The two items had a statistically significant, positive correlation of $r = .671$ ($p < .001$). The mean for Factor 2 was 3.46 with a standard deviation of
1.92. This scale remain titled intent to leave. Factor three’s Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha = .827$. Factor 3 consisted of three items from the job commitment scale. However, when reviewing these items, they did not capture of essence of commitment to a job. Therefore, this scale was titled job regret as it better reflected the crux of the three items.

A series of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) were used to test each of the 14 communication frames separately. EFA is the best type of factor analysis as no pre-existing scales for the communication frames existed prior to this study. Table 5; Communication Frames Factor Loading, reflects the items that met the decision criteria for each communication frame factor that became a scale used in this study.

The survey contained three statements for the family frame. EFA revealed the three items loaded on one factor all above .500, had an Eigenvalue of 1.77 and explained 58.9% of the variance. Reliability analysis showed Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha = .647$. Therefore, all three items were retained and the scale remained titled family. The scale’s mean was $M = 4.89$ and standard deviation was $sd = 1.35$.

The survey contained three statements for fun. EFA revealed the three items loaded on one factor all above .500, had an Eigenvalue of 2.03 and explained 67.8% of the variance. Reliability analysis showed Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha = .758$. All three items were retained and the title of the scale remained fun. The scale’s mean was $M = 5.49$ and standard deviation was $sd = 1.12$.

Team was represented on the survey with three items. EFA revealed that the three items factored into two components. Two items loaded on one component (loading factors of .821 and .807) and a third item loaded on a second component (.970). Factor analysis and correlation was then conducted on the two items that loaded on the same factor. These two
Table 5

*Communication Frames Factor Loading*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is like a family in my department.</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company treats us like family.</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not a close knit group.*</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have fun at my work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good time at work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working here is not fun.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is on my side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager treats me like I matter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager never praises my work.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is something I need to know for my job, my manager will tell me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager solves my problems to make my job better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an honest employee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always do my job to the best of my ability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job provides me with purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a perfect fit for this job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is what I was meant to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I view my work as contributing to my personal growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have found a meaningful job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I do here is hard work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is stressful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is harder than it looks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is hard because of the variety of the tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is not hard.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are constant demands in this job which makes the job hard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is demeaning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is physically demanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reverse Coded*
items explained 66.5% of the variance, had an Eigenvalue of 1.33, and were correlated at $r = .330$, $p < .001$. The scale’s mean was $M = 5.66$ and standard deviation was $sd = 1.79$. However, a test for Cronbach’s alpha revealed a low reliability ($\alpha = .485$). Therefore, a team scale was not used in this study.

The survey included six statements for manager as an advocate. EFA revealed all six items loaded on one factor. One item did not meet the decision criteria so it was deleted. The remaining five items explained 60% of the variance, had an Eigenvalue of 3.0, and had strong reliability ($\alpha = .830$), $M = 5.42$ and $sd = 1.2$. All five items were maintained and the scale’s name was shortened to Advocacy.

Professional hotelier was measured using six items. Exploratory factor analysis revealed that all six items loaded on one factor; however, three of them did not meet the decision criteria. The remaining three items formed a scale with a reliability of $\alpha = .764$, explaining 56.3% of variance, and an Eigenvalue of 2.10. The scale was used in this study and labeled professional hotelier. Its mean was $M = 6.5$ with an $sd = .66$.

The survey included four items to measure autonomy. Factor analysis revealed the four items loaded on two factors. Two items loaded on one factor and the other two items double loaded on both factors. Factor analysis on the two items revealed they explained 71.8% of the variance and had an Eigenvalue of 1.4. Correlation was $r = .436$ ($p < .001$). However, reliability was below the criteria ($\alpha = .565$) so this scale was not used in the study.

Comfortable was measured using two items. EFA showed that both items loaded as one factor but at only .484 each, below the decision criteria. The scale had an Eigenvalue of 1.2 and explained just 23.4% of the variance. The Cronbach’s alpha was only $\alpha = .367$. Therefore, the scale of comfortable was not used in this study.
Active communication was represented with five items. EFA revealed that these items did not make a cohesive factor. When reviewing the items, it became clear that the items represented both oral communication and written communication. EFA was used to examine only the oral communication items. The items loaded onto two factors with two items loading on each factor. The reliability was below the decision criteria for each factor ($\alpha = .396$ and $\alpha = .541$). Therefore active communication was not used as a scale in this study.

The survey contained three items to measure flow. EFA exposed that all three items loaded on a single factor but two items were below the decision criteria. As no strong factor existed among the three items the scale of flow was not used in this study.

Four items on the survey measured calling. EFA revealed that all four items loaded on one factor but only three items loaded onto the factor at levels above the decision criteria. The three-item scale explained 46.57% of the variance, had an Eigenvalue of 1.88 and a reliability of $\alpha = .679$. As calling is a concept that, although distinct, is closely related to meaningful work more analysis was conducted.

Meaningful work was measured using two items. The two items formed a single factor loading at .736 each. The amount of variance explained was 54.1% with an Eigenvalue of 1.08. However, reliability was low ($\alpha = .151$) and correlation was only .082 ($p = .372$). Therefore EFA was conducted on all six items that represented the calling and meaningful work frames. EFA revealed that the six items split into two factors with one item on one factor and five items on the other factor. The five factors explained 53% of variance, had an Eigenvalue of 2.65, $\alpha = .768$, $M = 5.22$ and $sd = 1.08$. Therefore, these five items became the scale used in the study. The scale was titled fulfillment. No separate scale for calling or meaningful work was used in this study.
As hard work may be closely related to dirty work, items for both concepts were analyzed separately and then together to confirm the scales. Hard work was measured using six items on the survey. EFA showed that all six items loaded as a single factor at strengths above the decision criteria. Together they explained 51.2% of the variance, the Eigenvalue was 3.5 and Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha = .86$.

Dirty work was represented by three items. Factor analysis showed that the items loaded as one factor (.828, .749, and .517), explained 50.2% of the variance, and had an Eigenvalue of 1.52. However, the reliability was only $\alpha = .502$. The item that loaded at .517 was dropped and EFA was conducted on the remaining two items. This increased the amount of variance explained to 70.67% but lowered the Eigenvalue to 1.41 and only slightly increased the reliability ($\alpha = .584$). The two items were correlated at .413 ($p < .001$).

EFA was then conducted with the nine items that made up the hard work and dirty work scales. Factor analysis revealed two distinct factors. One factor consisted of the six items that made up the scale of hard work and the second factor consisted of the three items that formed dirty work. This confirmed that dirty work was distinct from hard work. Therefore, the six items that measured hard work remained as one scale. The scale’s mean was $M = 4.58$ with a standard deviation of $sd = 1.38$. As dirty work is a concept that is widely studied and often associated with hotel jobs, the decision was made to use this scale in the study although the scale’s reliability was lower than the decision criteria. The final scale for dirty work consisted of two items. The mean was $M = 3.64$, $sd = 1.27$, and Pearson’s correlation was $r = .413$ ($p < .001$).

Real job was measured by two statements on the survey. CFA revealed that the two items loaded on one factor above the decision criteria. Variance explained was 63.1%,
Eigenvalue was 1.26, but reliability was low \((r = .405)\). Therefore, this 2-item scale was not used in this study. However, as hospitality jobs have a common reputation of not being real jobs, the single statement “I’m only doing this until I get a real job” was used in this study. As this is a one-item scale and pre-test/post-test of this statement was conducted to determine if people answer this question consistently. Twenty people responded to the single item real job scale. Two weeks later they responded again. All participants (100%) reported the same answer. The test-retest process revealed a reliable question.

This concluded the analysis on the work outcomes and the communication frames. As several communication frames did not form solid scales, EFA was conducted on those items that were not part of a scale. One possible scale emerged from this analysis. The items and their loadings were “I am trusted to do my job with little supervision” (.635), “I am not trusted to make decisions about my work” (.925), and “I do not feel part of a team working here (.798). However, the reliability was low \((\alpha = .565)\) and the three items do not seem to reflect the same topic. No other viable scale emerged.

**Summary of Factor Analysis**

Three work outcome variables were examined along with 14 communication frames. The three work outcome scales were changed slightly and labeled job satisfaction, intent to leave, and job regret. The job satisfaction scale consisted of two items from the JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) and two items that were initially part of the job commitment scale. Two items from Colorelli’s (1984) intent to leave scale created the intent to leave scale used in this study. The job commitment scale was renamed job regret as that title more closely represented the essence of the three items used from Blau’s (1985) scale.
Factor analysis revealed seven communication frames that met the decision criteria of factor loading and reliability. These frames were family, fun, advocacy, professional hotelier, hard work, dirty work, and fulfillment. Fulfillment was a new scale created from the combining of the items from calling and meaningful work. Additionally, a single item scale of real job was used in this study. The communication frames that did not have scales with sufficient loading or reliability were team, autonomy, comfortable, active communication, and flow.

**Correlations**

Each of the three work outcomes were analyzed for correlation with each of the eight communication frames that had sufficiently strong scales. Table 6; Correlations between Work Outcomes and Communication Frames, depicts the results of the analysis. Every communication frame had a statistically significant correlation with job satisfaction. There was statistically significant, positive correlation at the \( p < .01 \) level between job satisfaction and the communication frames of family, fun, advocacy, professional hotelier, and fulfillment. There was a statistically significant, negative correlation at the \( p < .01 \) level between job satisfaction and real job. There was a statistically significant, negative correlation at the \( p < .05 \) level between job satisfaction and hard work, and dirty work.

Seven of the eight communication frames had statistically significant correlations with intent to leave. There was statistically significant, positive correlation at the \( p < .01 \) level between intent to leave and the communication frame of real job. There was a statistically significant, positive correlation at the \( p < .05 \) level between intent to leave and dirty work. There was statistically significant, negative correlation at the \( p < .01 \) level between intent to leave and the communication frames of family, fun, advocacy, and
Table 6

Correlations between Work Outcomes and Communication Frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Leave</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Regret</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-.453**</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>-.395**</td>
<td>-.481**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.463**</td>
<td>-.507**</td>
<td>-.642**</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>-.387**</td>
<td>-.448**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Hotelier</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>-.305*</td>
<td>-.317**</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.229*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.752**</td>
<td>-.318**</td>
<td>-.444**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.232*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-.206*</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-.201*</td>
<td>-.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty Work</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-.219*</td>
<td>.225*</td>
<td>.251*</td>
<td>-.291**</td>
<td>-.282**</td>
<td>-.382**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Job</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>- .471**</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.438**</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>-.337**</td>
<td>-.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01 level (2-tailed)  *p < .05 level (2-tailed)
fulfillment. There was a statistically significant, negative correlation at the \( p < .05 \) level between intent to leave and professional hotelier. There was no statistically significant correlation between intent to leave and hard work.

Very similar to intent to leave, there was statistically significant, positive correlation at the \( p < .01 \) level between job regret and the communication frame of real job and a statistically significant, positive correlation at the \( p < .05 \) level between job regret and dirty work. There was a statistically significant, negative correlation at the \( p < .01 \) level with the communication frames of family, fun, advocacy, professional hotelier, and fulfillment. There was no statistically significant correlation between job regret and hard work.

**Demographic Variables Analysis**

The demographic information collected was then analyzed to determine if any of the work outcomes were influenced by gender, age, marital status, pay, education, full-time or part-time status, position tenure, or company tenure. ANOVA was used to test the demographic variables that were categorical data and linear regression was used to test the demographic variables that were continual data. The only statistically significant difference between any of the demographic variables and the three work outcomes was age and job satisfaction \( (p < .05) \). The trend was the higher the level of job satisfaction, the higher the mean age. However, those who reported being the most dissatisfied had the highest mean age. Additionally, each level of job satisfaction had a similar range of ages. A larger sample size may result in a different level of significance. Table 7; Age and job satisfaction, reports the mean age and range for each level of job satisfaction reported.

The demographic variables were then compared to the eight communication frames using the same statistical tests as the comparison with the work outcomes above. There were seven
Table 7

*Age and Job Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Satisfied</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23-65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: No participants reported being very dissatisfied.*

statistically significant differences uncovered and an additional three nearly significant differences. Table 8; Demographic Variables and Communication Frames Significance, displays these differences. There were no statistically significant differences between the demographic variables and the communication frames of family, fun, or professional hotelier. There were no statistically significant differences between the demographic variables of gender and company tenure with any of the communication frames.

The communication frame of advocacy had a near statistically significant difference ($p < .1$) with marital status. For this statistical test, those who reported living with a significant other were grouped with those that reported being married. The single participants reported slightly higher levels of advocacy ($M = 5.7, sd = .89$) than those who reported being married or living with a significant other ($M = 5.14, sd = 1.39$). This was the only statistically
Table 8

Demographic Variables and Communication Frames Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Fun</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Hotelier</th>
<th>Fulfillment</th>
<th>Hard Work</th>
<th>Dirty Work</th>
<th>Real Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time, Full-time Status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.00***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Tenure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* near significant, **p<.01, ***p<.001

significant difference for the communication frame of advocacy as well as the demographic variable of marital status.

The demographic variable of working full-time or part-time had a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) with both fulfillment and hard work. Those who worked full-time reported higher levels of fulfillment than those who worked part-time. Additionally, those who reported their hotel job as their primary job reported higher levels of fulfillment than those who reported their hotel job as their second job. The same is true for hard work. Those who worked full-time reported higher levels of hard work than those who worked part-
time. Those who whose job was their primary job reported higher levels of hard work than those who reported their job being their second job. Table 9; Employment Status and hard work, depicts the results of this analysis.

Table 9

*Employment Status and Hard Work Differences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Fulfillment Mean</th>
<th>Hard Work Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time, Primary</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time, Primary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time, Second job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time, Second job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demographic variable of job title had statistically significant differences for the communication frame of dirty work ($p < .001$). The highest level of dirty work was reported from housekeeping supervisors ($M = 5.44$). Others who slightly agreed that their job was dirty work were housekeepers ($M = 4.71$), servers ($M = 4.74$), others ($M = 4.67$), laundry supervisors ($M = 4.33$) and F&B supervisors ($M = 4.00$). The lowest amount of dirty work came from accounting positions ($M = 1.33$) and the administrative assistant ($M = 1.33$). Other positions that reported a low amount of dirty work was the cook ($M = 2.67$), sales ($M = 2.97$), front desk clerks ($M = 3.20$), engineering ($M = 3.67$), reservations ($M = 3.67$), front desk supervisors ($M = 3.73$) and laundry ($M = 3.91$). It is interesting to note that with the exception of F&B, all the supervisor positions had higher means of dirty work than the employees they supervise. Table 10; Dirty Work by Job Title, details the means for the positions.
Table 10

Dirty Work by Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Desk</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Desk Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;B Supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education had a statistically significant difference with only one communication frame, hard work \((p < .01)\). Participants with a high school diploma or GED \((M =4.8)\), some college \((M =4.6)\), and college degrees \((M =4.7)\) reported similar levels of hard work. Their
reported levels of hard work were significantly higher than those without a high school
diploma (M = 3.3) and those with a graduate degree (M = 2.4). It seems reasonable that
education would be related to job title and therefore job title and hard work would be
statistically different. However, there was no significant difference between job title and hard
work (p = .173). A higher level of education was not a reflection of a higher position in the
organization in this sample. Table 11; Education Differences, depicts the results of this
analysis.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than H.S., no GED</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad/GED</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age had statistically significant differences with hard work (p < .05) and real job (p <
.01). In order to make the data for age more manageable, initially age was grouped into six
groups based on the first digit of the participant’s age (i.e., group 1 = 18-19, group 2 = 20 –
29, group 3 = 30 - 39). This analysis did not reflect a pattern that was consistent with the
pattern created with each age plotted in the chart. Therefore, the data were resorted into six
groups of equal size. This analysis reflected a pattern more consistent with the overall results. The ages of the groups were 18-22, 23-25, 26-30, 31-37, 38-49, and 50-69. As depicted in Figure 1; Age means differences for hard work, participants age 38-49 reported the lowest levels of hard work ($M = 3.54$) slightly disagreeing that their jobs were hard. The age group of 26-30 reported the highest mean score of $M = 5.17$. Age was also statistically different with real job ($p < .01$). Employees between the ages of 26 - 30 had the lowest mean ($M = 2.33$) followed by the oldest employees with a mean score of $M = 2.55$. Participants between the ages of 23 - 25 had the highest mean ($M = 3.8$) followed closely by those 18 - 22 years old ($M = 3.76$). Although these mean were the highest, they are still in the slightly disagree range reflecting that every age group felt their job was a real job. Figure 2 reflects the mean scores of all age ranges.

Figure 1. Age means differences for hard work.
Pay rate was a demographic variable that had statistically significant differences with real job \((p < .001)\) and near significant differences with hard work \((p = .063)\). To better analyze pay, the variable was divided into ten groups based on percentiles. The first group captured the first 10% which were the lowest paid employees. This group included wages from $3.48 to $7.99. The second group, the 10-20 percentile, captured wages from $8.00 - $8.48. The third group contained participants whose wages were $8.49 - $8.71. The fourth group represented participants whose wages were $8.72 - $9.15. The next group’s wages were $9.16 to $9.99 followed by the sixth group at $10.00 to $10.50. The seventh group represented participants whose wages were $10.51 to $11.99 followed by the next group at $12.00 to $12.54. The ninth group contained the wages $12.55 to $15.71 and the final group representing the top tenth percentile consisted of participants whose wages were $15.72 and above.

The group of employees making $8.49 - $8.71 reported the highest level of “I’m only doing this until I get a real job” \((M = 5.55)\). This was the only group whose mean score
reflected agreement with the statement. The group making $8.00 – $8.48 had an average mean of 4.08 reflecting neither agree nor disagree with the statement. All the other groups’ mean scores reflected disagreement with the statement essentially reporting that they had a real job. The group making $12.55 - $15.71 reported the lowest level of “I’m only doing this job until I get a real job” (\(M = 2.45\)). Figure 3 depicts these findings.

![Figure 3. Pay differences with real job.](image)

Pay had a near significant difference with hard work \((p = .063)\). Those making $12.00 - $12.54 reported the highest level of hard work \((M = 5.19)\). Those making $8.72 - $9.15 reported the lowest amount of hard work \((M = 3.11)\). Six groups reported that they neither agree nor disagree that their jobs are hard. Figure 4 depicts the pay differences in hard work.
A comparison of figures 3 and 4 seem to indicate that those making the lowest wages were more likely to report that their job was hard if they felt their job was not a real job. The higher the mean for “I’m only doing this until I get a real job” the higher the mean for hard work. Those in the three highest paying groups had a different pattern. Those who reported their job as a real job also reported it as a hard job. The mean for real job was low and the mean for hard work was higher.

The final difference was a near significant difference with the demographic variable position tenure with real job ($p = .78$). Position tenure did not seem to have a linear relationship with real job. As revealed in Figure 5, there were spikes along the position tenure continuum. Those reporting agreement that they are only doing their job until they get a real job had held their position for ten to eleven months ($M = 6.0$) and nine years ($M = 5.0$). Most employees disagreed with the statement. Twenty-four of the 35 timeframes reported mean scores below $M = 4.0$ signifying disagreement with the statement.
Summary of Demographic Analysis

In this last section, the demographic variables were analyzed to determine any influence on the work outcomes. The only statistically significant difference between any of the demographic variables and the three work outcomes was age and job satisfaction ($p < .05$). No demographic variable had significantly different means for intent to leave or job regret.

The demographic variables were then analyzed to determine mean differences with the communication frames. This analysis revealed seven statistically significant differences and three near statistically significant differences. Of the seven significant differences two were full-time/part-time status (fulfillment and hard work), one was job titles (dirty work), one was education (hard work), two were age (hard work and real job) and one was pay real job). The three near significant differences were with marital status (advocacy), pay (hard job) and position tenure (real job).
Regression Analysis

The final set of statistical tests was regression analysis to determine if any of the communication frames may predict any of the three work outcomes. A two-step regression analysis conducted. The demographic variables were entered as step 1, enter method, and the communication frames added as step 2, stepwise method. Table 12; Regression of Demographic Variables and Communication Frames with Work Outcomes, reflects the result of the two-step regression analysis. For this analysis, the demographic nominal variables were converted into dichotomous variables. Although the survey had a response for three categories of gender (male, female and other), all participants who reported their gender reported only male or female making this variable naturally dichotomous. Marital status was divided into single and not-single. Not-single included the categories of married and significant other. The variables of position tenure and company tenure were split into two groups at the 50th percentile. Full-time/Part-time was split into two dichotomous variables. One variable was full-time/part-time. The other variable was primary job/secondary job. Job title was divided into the categories of management and non-management. Finally, education was divided into college degree and non-college degree with the category of some college considered as non-college degree.

First, regression analysis for job satisfaction was conducted with the demographic variables entered as step one, enter method, and the communication frames entered as step 2, stepwise method. The communication frames of fun and fulfillment were significant predictors of job satisfaction. The model was $R^2 = .620$, adjusted $R^2 = .532$, $F (12, 52) = 7.07$, $p < .001$. Both of these variables had a positive relationship indicating that the more fun and fulfillment the
Table 12

*Regression of Demographic Variables and Communication Frames with Work Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Intent to Leave</th>
<th>Job Regret</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>p&lt;</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT/PT Status</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Second Status</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position Tenure</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Tenure</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Hotelier</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Work</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty Work</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Job</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
employee experiences, the more satisfied the employee will likely be with their job. No demographic variables were predictors of job satisfaction.

Next, regression analysis was conducted to determine if any of the variables predicted intent to leave using the same two step method as used to analyze job satisfaction. Five variables emerged as predictors. The variables of fun, advocacy, and hard work were predictors with a negative direction indicating that the absence of fun, the absence of the manager being an advocate, and the absence of hard work were predictors of intent to leave. Real job had a positive relationship as a predictor of intent to leave meaning those who considered their job as not a real job, rather those who reported only doing their job until they got a real job, were more likely to express intent to leave. The demographic variable of pay was also a significant predictor with a positive relationship meaning higher the pay rate, the higher the level of intent to leave. The regression model with these factors produced $R^2 = .520$, adjusted $R^2 = .382$, $F (14, 49) = 3.78$, $p < .001$.

Finally, regression analysis was conducted to determine if any of the communication frames predicted job regret. The same two step regression analysis used in job satisfaction and intent to leave was used for job regret. Three variables emerged as predictors of job regret. The communication frames of fun and professional hotelier had statistically negative relationships with job regret indicating the absence of fun and the absence of the traits that make one a professional hotelier were predictors of job regret. As with intent to leave, real job had a positive relationship as a predictor of job regret meaning those who considered their job as not a real job were more likely to express job regret.
**Summary of Regression Analysis**

The predictors of job satisfaction was fun and fulfillment. The predictors of intent to leave were lack of fun, lack of advocacy, lack of hard work, a perception that the job is not a real job, and pay. The predictors of job regret were lack of fun, lack of being a professional hotelier, and the perception that the job is not a real job.

**Summary**

This chapter discussed the survey and results used to answer RQ 2: What is the relationship between the communication frames and job satisfaction, job commitment and turnover intention? Due to the outcomes of factor analysis, job commitment was retitled to job regret as this title more accurately reflected the essence of the scale’s items. One hundred and forty-one hourly hotel employees and entry level managers completed usable surveys. Of the communication frames revealed in the qualitative part of this study and the literature review, eight were used in this part of the study. The results revealed several correlations between the communication frames and the work outcomes. Although there were not many differences in means between the demographic variables and the work outcomes, there were several differences between the demographic variables and the communication frames. The final statistical tests were to determine predictors of the three work outcomes. Job satisfaction seemed to be predicted by the presence of fulfillment and fun. Intent to leave was predicted by the presence of the attitude of the job not being a real job and the absence of fun and advocacy. Pay was also a predictor of intent to leave. Job regret was predicted by the absence of fun and being a professional hotelier.

The next and final chapter discusses the results of both Phase I and Phase II of this study. It also recommends topics for future studies.
Chapter 5

The hospitality industry is plagued with high turnover. Unwanted turnover is a costly problem for hospitality companies. Hotel employee turnover ranges from nearly 60 percent to 300 percent, according to research conducted by the American Hotel and Lodging Association (AHLA). High turnover negatively affects profits in terms of recruiting and training expenses but also in terms of productivity and negative customer service experiences (Talx, 2001). Turnover is compounded by low wages and an industry reputation for short-term, temporary jobs. Additionally, the hospitality industry has an image problem. Service jobs are no longer glamorous. They are not the preferred job anymore.

Some jobs are framed as more valuable and more desirable than other jobs. The Merriam-Webster dictionary and the Washington Post framed the value of certain jobs when they solidified the term McJob. McDonald’s first used this term to promote jobs as career opportunities (MacArthur, 2007). The Merriam-Webster dictionary added the word McJob in 2003 defining it as “a low paying job that requires little skill and provides little opportunity for advancement. (Merriam-Webster, 2014). Regardless of whether McDonald’s has valuable jobs, “there is considerable maneuverability with respect to the facts...what is real is often what we say is real (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 4). Hence, McJob has been communicatively constructed as a low paying job rather than its initial conceptualization.

Framing Theory may offer an explanation as to why jobs are not constructed with equal value. The premise of Framing Theory is that an issue can be viewed from a variety of perspectives and can be construed as having implications for multiple values. Although Framing Theory has been used in organizational communication, the focus has been on framing culture and creating organizational vision. Framing Theory has not been used to
examine specific jobs. This study is unique in that is used Framing Theory to examine how different communication frames describing hotel jobs affect employees attitudes toward three specific work outcomes.

**Framing Theory**

Framing theory offers an explanation for how jobs can be viewed multiple ways and may offer a possibility of reconstructing the perceptions of hotel jobs. The major premise of Framing Theory is that an issue can be viewed from a variety of perspectives and be construed as having implications for multiple values or considerations. It is the process by which people develop “a particular conceptualization of an issue or reorient their thinking about an issue” (Chong & Druckman, 2007a, p. 104). Frames help people organize what they see in everyday life. “We assert that our interpretations should be taken as real over other possible interpretations” (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 3). In framing, when we create a bias towards one interpretation, we exclude other aspects, including those that may produce opposite or alternate interpretations” (Fairhurst & Sarr, 1996, p. 4). It is chiefly through discourse that a point of reference is created and meaning is assigned (Entman, 1993). Tsetura (2011) stated that a career field’s identity is negotiated through social construction of reality. The same may be true for a particular job.

**Phase I: Interviews**

This phase of the research sought to answer the first research question:

RQ1: What frames do hotel managers use when describing the jobs at their hotel?

A review of previous research revealed seven frames that described jobs. Jobs were framed as a profession, meaningful work, a calling, dirty work, family environment, a real job, and flow. As the literature review may not have revealed all the frames used to describe jobs,
interviews with hotel managers were conducted. Thirteen hotel managers at nine hotels were interviewed using a semi-structured interview guide in order to determine communication frames they used to describe their jobs at their hotel. As the goal of the study was to identify communication frames that may aid retention and reduce turnover, the managers interviewed were those who reported having low turnover. Managers were recruited at a local chapter meeting of Hotel and Lodging Association and through personal contacts. Eleven interviews were conducted in person and two were conducted telephonically. Interviews lasted between 9 minutes and 29 minutes with a mean length of time near 16 minutes.

In qualifying the participants, an interesting finding emerged. Some managers measured turnover by the number of employees who left the hotel. Other managers evaluated their turnover by the employees that remained with the company. This second group of managers was using retention as a measure of turnover. Three managers felt they had low turnover when in fact their turnover was fairly high. However, their retention was also high. These hotels simultaneously had high retention and high turnover. Research on turnover has not typically considered a scenario where an organization has both high turnover and high retention. This is an area for future study as this perplexing condition has not been explained. The causes and effects of turnover may be different in hotels that also have high retention.

An analysis of the interviews, through the process of open coding, constant comparison and axial coding, revealed nine communication frames that managers used to describe the tasks of the job, the work environment, the employees, and their manager. The nine communication frames were family, fun, team, manager as an advocate, autonomy, hard work, professional hotelier, comfortable, and active communication. It is important to note that managers, in answering questions about their jobs, expressed their answers in terms of a
much broader concept of work. In their answers, they did not separate the tasks from the environment, the employees, the customers, the facilities or the technology. This holistic approach to work hints that scholars should consider more holistic approach to studying factors that affect turnover or retention. As variables in the workplace are continually interacting, the interactions among them should be studied.

**Phase II: The Survey**

Based on the review of literature and the findings of Phase I, a survey was conducted to answer the second research question:

RQ2: What is the relationship between the communication frames and job satisfaction, job commitment and turnover intention?

The first section of the survey collected information on nine demographic variables such as age, gender and pay. The second section of the survey contained 62 statements measuring three work outcomes and 14 communication frames using a 7-point Likert-type scale. At some hotels, the primary researcher offered paper surveys to employees in the employee break room. Surveys were completed and returned immediately to the researcher. At other hotels, the primary researcher gave surveys to employees along with an envelope. The employee then completed the survey at their leisure, sealed it in the envelope, and returned it to a designated location. The primary researcher returned to the hotel the following day to pick up the sealed envelopes. The survey was also offered online. Seventy-four participants completed a paper survey and 77 participants completed the online survey for a total of 151 completed surveys. Ten surveys were eliminated from the study after screening for completeness and eligibility requirements. A total of 141 surveys were used in the study. Each participant who completed a survey received a $5 gift card.
Through the process of factor analysis, the three work outcomes realized were titled job satisfaction, intent to leave and job regret. These titles more closely matched the essence of the items that loaded on the scales rather than the original titles. Valid scales emerged for eight frames identified in the literature review and interviews. Family, fun, manager as an advocate, professional hotelier, hard work, and dirty work were valid scales used in the study although the scale for dirty work had a lower reliability than desired ($\alpha = .584$). The decision to use a one-item scale for real job was made as this is a common dialectic descriptor for hospitality jobs. A new scale emerged from the combination of items from meaningful work and calling. The new scale was titled fulfillment. The frames of flow, team, autonomy, comfortable, and active communication did not form sufficiently valid or reliable scales. The study confirmed that communication frames can be predictors of job satisfaction, intent to leave, and job regret. Several other interesting findings were also noted.

**Discussion**

In answering RQ1, what frames do managers use to describe their job, this study revealed that there are common communication frames that managers with low turnover used. The study also revealed that managers of high-turnover hotels may not communicate about these frames in the same manner as managers of low-turnover hotels. Although it was not the purpose of this study to contrast managers of low turnover hotels and high turnover hotels, and the sample size of this study was small, the communication patterns that emerged hints to the claim that a manager’s communication with his/her employees may influence turnover and other work outcomes.

RQ2 sought to examine the relationship between the communication frames and the three work outcomes of job satisfaction, intent to leave and job regret. Several discoveries
were uncovered that furthers the use of Framing Theory as well as offering insight for managers on communication that affects work outcomes.

**Work Outcomes**

*Job Satisfaction.* All eight communication frames had statistically significant correlations with job satisfaction. The two variables of fun and fulfillment emerged as significant positive predictors of job satisfaction. None of the demographic variables emerged as predictors. Employees experienced job satisfaction when their job was perceived as meaningful and fun. It is important to note that fun had statistically significant, negative correlations with hard work, dirty work and real job. Fulfillment was significantly correlated with professional hotelier and advocate. This correlation analysis hints that employees who experience fun and fulfillment are more willing to tolerate the perceived non-pleasantries of their job, conduct themselves in a professional manner, seek to be on the same team as their manager, and consider their job a real job. These are all desirable qualities for hotel employees to have. These findings on fulfillment are consistent with previous studies (Fairlie, 2011; Pavlish & Hunt, 2012; Tummers and Knies, 2013).

These findings also advance previous studies. Hirschi (2012) concluded that work engagement was mediated by meaningfulness, occupational identity and occupational self-efficacy. In this study, as reported in Table 9, employees who worked at the hotel as their primary job reported mean scores that reflected a perception of a basic level of fulfillment. Employees who worked at the hotel as a second job reported mean scores that reflected a perceived lack of fulfillment. This group also reflected lower levels of hard work. This may reflect that those whose hotel job is their primary job engages in their work at different levels than those whose hotel job is their second job. Those whose hotel job is their second job may
have a lack of work engagement. It may be that work engagement or fulfillment may not be the motivation for a second job. It is also possible that a perceived lack of fulfillment or engagement at the hotel job may be the reason the employee chooses to keep their other job as their primary job. The differences between employees who work in hotels as their primary job and those whose hotel job as their second job should be explored in future studies.

The other difference with fulfillment is between employees who work full-time and employees who work part-time. Part-time employees reported a perception of less fulfillment than full-time employees. This was true for both employees whose hotel job was their primary job and those who worked as the hotel as a second job. Again, it is not surprising that work engagement may be less for those who work part-time as opposed to those who work more hours. It is also plausible that part-time employees are not present at the hotel enough to see how their efforts matter, hence not see the results of their work. Another explanation for the decrease in fulfillment is that part-time employees may seek fulfillment in the other activities of their life rather than work. However, this study revealed that even those who work part-time can experience a perception of a sense of fulfillment. The mean score for those who worked part-time and the hotel job is their primary job was $M = 4.4$ reflecting a perception of a slight degree of fulfillment. Future studies should continue to explore fulfillment and part-time employees as it appears that framing jobs as meaningful and creating perceptions of meaningful work at hotels affects job satisfaction positively.

Theoretically, this opens new avenues for a business application of Framing Theory. Framing Theory may reach beyond its current uses, which are primarily at the strategic level in organizations. Framing Theory may be used to frame jobs and hence affect perceptions that affect business outcomes.
There are also implications for application. These results reflect that managers can increase job satisfaction and hence retention through their communication that increases perceptions of fulfillment and fun. In an industry that often employs part-time workers, it is important to note that extra effort may be required to create a perception of fulfillment with part-time employees and employees for whom the hotel job is their second job.

**Intent to Leave.** Seven of the communication frames were correlated with intent to leave. Hard work was the only variable not significantly correlated to intent to leave. Five variables were significant predictors. Like job satisfaction, fun was a predictor of intent to leave along with advocacy, hard work, and real job. Additionally, the demographic variable pay emerged as a predictor. Pay was the only demographic variable to surface as a predictor of any of the work outcomes.

The variables of fun and advocate were predictors with a negative direction meaning that a perception of a fun environment and the perception of a manager who advocates for the employee reduced an employee’s intent to leave. In application, these results state that managers should make an attempt to create a fun environment if they want to retain their employees. As the variable fun was a predictor of job satisfaction, a fun environment will retain satisfied employees. Managers should also attempt to create relationships with employees so that the employee perceives the manager is their advocate, a member of their team, treats them like they matter, and praises their work.

This is similar to the work of Tummers and Knies (2013) who reported that managers have a role in making work meaningful. They concluded that meaningful work was a mediator between leadership and the work outcomes of work effort, organizational commitment and work-family enrichment. This study adds to this in that managers can create
the perception that employees are meaningful as well as the jobs. This study reveals that meaningful jobs lead to job satisfaction and employees who feel valued (meaningful) lead to reduced turnover intentions.

The variable real job was a predictor with a positive direction meaning those who reported only holding their job until they get a real job had intentions to leave their job. This may reflect that the colloquialism real job is simply an expression of dissatisfaction with the job. This may explain what Clair (1996) reported. She stated that over time the perception of what makes a real job changes. It also may explain why some employed in a job consider it a real job and others employed in the same job do not. Framing jobs as a real jobs may be a matter of increasing job satisfaction for an employee rather than changing the perception others have about the job.

The variable hard work was a negative, significant predictor meaning a lack of hard work increased intent to leave. This seems rather counter-intuitive. It seems hotel employees prefer their work to be hard. Eight of the 13 managers reported that the work was hard. It is important to note that hard work was not correlated with intent to leave yet emerged as a predictor. Hard work may be a suppressor variable. A suppressor variable has a close to zero correlation with the dependent variable but leads to improvement in prediction in regression analysis (Pedhazur, 1997). A suppressor variable allows for a more concise estimate of the predictor-criterion relationship (Lancaster, 1999). Hard work was not correlated with intent to leave \( (r = .049) \). However, hard work appears to be suppressing irrelevant variance in other predictor variables even though it directly predicts very little of intent to leave’s variance. As the correlations were strong between fun, real job and intent to leave, it is most
likely that hard work is suppressing variables within fun and/or real job that increases the relationship between these variables and intent to leave.

Pay was a predictor with a positive direction meaning the higher the pay, the higher the intent to leave. This is also a rather counter-intuitive finding and contradicts some previous research (e.g., Beilock & Capelle, 1990; Butt, 2008). Reflecting on this anomaly, it may be explained that those who were making more money were likely to be the supervisors, sales staff, and administrative employees. These are employees who often desire to move into management positions. Multiple hotel managers in the interview phase of the research expressed that management turnover was so low that those who wish to become managers must often leave the hotel. This observation may be reflecting those wishing to be promoted and preparing to find a different job opening either within the hotel or at another hotel.

A second explanation may be that those who are the highest paid employees consider themselves more marketable and see more job opportunities than those who are employed in entry level jobs. Previous research has documented that those who perceive themselves as more marketable were more willing to leave their company (Berdahl & Moore, 2004).

In addition to these findings, there was an interesting pattern between pay, hard work, and real job. Employees in the lower pay categories who reported experiencing hard work, agreed with the statement that they were only doing their job until they got a real job. Those who were part of the top three wage categories who reported experiencing hard work, disagreed with the statement that they were only doing their job until they got a real job. This phenomenon has not been explained in previous research. The relationship between these three variables may be reflecting employees’ perception of the equity of their job. Those making the most money may have expectations that their job is supposed to be hard. The
presence of hard work and the increased pay may feed the perception of a real job.

Employees who experience hard work and receive low wages may be perceiving a lack of equity and are expressing dissatisfaction with their job. The colloquialism real job may simply be an expression of (dis)satisfaction in their job and not a communication frame about the job itself.

This explanation holds a degree of credibility as the variable hard work was a negative predictor reflecting the absence of hard work increased intent to leave. One reason for this counter-intuitive discovery may be that those who apply to work in a hotel expect the job to be hard work as many of the tasks require manual labor. Without the element of hard work, the job may be boring and dissatisfying. This may relate to the variable of fulfillment. Table 9 reflects that those who reported less hard work also reported lower levels of fulfillment. The mean scores for hard work and the mean scores for fulfillment were parallel. The perception of hard work may not create a perception of fulfillment but a lack of hard work may bring a level of dissatisfaction negatively affecting fulfillment. The presence of hard work in a job may be an indicator that the job is perceived as meaningful work.

Although fulfillment was not a predictor of intent to leave, it had a strong negative correlation ($r = -.318; p < .01$). Hence, the perception of the absence of hard work decreased the level of fulfillment and increased intent to leave. These conjectures should be tested in future studies.

If these conjectures regarding intent to leave are true, this offers more support for expanding the use of Framing Theory in organizations beyond its traditional use. As discussed with job satisfaction above, communication frames can influence perceptions of jobs that affect work outcomes. Framing Theory may be used to explain how the value of a
job is created and how individuals view the same job differently. Within the same
department, some employees may perceive their job as equitable and others may not. This
may help explain why one hotel was able to keep eight housekeepers for over two years but
had to hire 10 employees to keep the other four positions filled.

For managers, seeking an applicant’s perception of equity during the interview phase
may allow a manager to select a person who will experience a lower level of intent to leave
once they begin working. Hard work may not be problematic for hotel employees. The
perceived equity of the job may be more important than the tasks themselves.

**Job Regret.** Job regret is a new work outcome. The items comprising the scale of job
regret reflect that the employee regrets ever taking the job and would consider leaving their
job if a better job came along. Job regret is different than intent to leave. Employees
expressing job regret may not be actively seeking a job. They may choose to remain in their
job although they wish they had a different job. Job regret does not necessarily reflect a lack
of job satisfaction. An employee may like elements of their job but still regret accepting the
job and may still wish for a different job.

Job regret, as it relates to turnover, has not been examined in previous literature. This
is an area for future study. The items for the scale of job regret in this study were part of a
larger scale for job commitment. This study offers some justification for job regret being a
variable that should be examined independently of job commitment to determine its effects
on employees and a workforce. The causes and implications of job regret have not examined.

In this study, seven communication frames were correlated with job regret. Hard
work was the only variable not correlated with job regret. There were three predictors of job
regret: fun, professional hotelier, and real job. Fun was a negative predictor of job regret
indicating a perception of a lack of fun predicts a greater level of job regret. Even though an employee wishes they had a different job, a perception of a fun environment may make the job tolerable and deter the employee from seeking another job. Future studies on job regret and fun should explore this more.

The second predictor of job regret was professional hotelier. Professional hotelier had a statistically significant, negative relationship with job regret. The more professional the employee reported being, the less job regret the employee experienced. These findings are similar to Bartol’s (1979) study. In this study she reported that those who consider themselves professionals had higher levels of organizational commitment, less role ambiguity and lower levels of turnover. Bartol also reported that the organization’s communication (frames) of the value of being a professional may mediate the amount of influence being a professional has on these factors. This indicates that managers can increase organizational commitment and perhaps decrease job regret through their communication supporting professionalism and creating expectations of what it means to be a professional.

This again offers more uses for Framing Theory. As discussed in the literature review, the hotel industry seems to be in the process of becoming a profession. The current focus is on members of management being the professionals. It seems that the hotel industry may want to also focus on hourly employees if it wants to change the image of its jobs and reduce turnover. If hotel managers, as well as the industry’s professional association, the Hotel and Lodging Association, framed hourly jobs as positions needing to be filled by professionals, it may reduce the stigma associated with hotel jobs. Framing Theory may offer a platform on which to communicatively frame this industry’s jobs.
As with intent to leave, real job had a positive relationship as a predictor of job regret meaning those who reported only doing their job until they found a real job were more likely to express job regret. As mentioned twice above, this hints that the colloquialism real job is only a phrase that expresses a level of dissatisfaction with the job. Only employees who were dissatisfied and wanted a different job expressed the perception that their job was not a real job. Clair (1996) concluded that the colloquialism real job may be a coping mechanism to resist unpleasant working conditions. This study expands that. The colloquialism real job seems to mean the employee has a perception of dissatisfaction with their job holistically, not just the working conditions. Managers may need to exert extra effort into reframing an employee’s job for them if the employee is not considering his job a real job. Future research should be conducted on a population of those who regret having their job, may be dissatisfied in their job, yet choose to remain in their job.

**Summary of Work Outcomes**

Several interesting findings were revealed in answering the research question that asked about the relationship between the communication frames and the three work outcomes. First, communication frames affect perceptions that affect work outcomes. This offers a new use for Framing Theory in organizational communication. Framing Theory has been applied at the strategic level of organizations and this study finds its value at the operational, day-to-day level of the organization as well as framing particular jobs. This study also offers application to managers. Managers can consciously frame their messages in a way that affects their employees’ perceptions of fulfillment, equity in their jobs, professional behavior, and perception of their job being a real job. A manager’s communication can affect employees’ job satisfaction, intent to leave, and job regret. This
supports Fairhurst (1993) who stated, “In choosing words that members accept as representations of actions and events, they become social constructs that members define as real” (p. 333). These frames directly impact behavior. Managers should consciously select messages and communicate in a way that elevates fun, promotes fulfillment, advocates for the employees and makes employees feel valued, and reflects the value of their jobs.

These results also show that multiple variables predict each work outcome. As seen in the analysis of the interaction between the variables of pay, hard work and real job, viewing variables working together reveal a different conclusion than when viewing variables independently. Pay had only a near significant correlation ($p = .06$) with hard work which was not correlated with intent to leave. Pay had a statistically significant correlation with real job but pay alone did not create the perception of whether a job was a real job or not. It was only in seeing the variables working together that revealed a difference among pay categories and real job. Most previous studies isolate a variable to analyze its effect on turnover or job satisfaction (e.g., Butt, 2008, Hansen, Smith, & Hansen, 2002, Holdsworth & Cartwright, 2003; Oshagbemi & Hickson, 2003, Rodriguez and Griffin, 1990). In order to more fully understand influences of turnover or retention, more studies are needed that examine the interaction of variables when bonded together rather than examining them individually.

Finally, the hotel industry has a reputation of not having real jobs. This study shows that the perception of a real job may not be a public construct for managers to counter. What makes a real job may not be the perception of skills needed or promotion opportunities. The colloquialism real job may be an expression of dissatisfaction with a job rather than any expression about the job itself.
Communication Frames

In addition to the findings revealed in examining the work outcomes, several additional findings were discovered when examining the communication frames.

**Fun.** The study of the communication frame of fun has three additional important findings. First, the communication variable of fun did not emerge in the literature review. It did not emerge in a review of job frames nor in a review of previous research about turnover. It was identified by managers in Phase I of the study and only by managers whose turnover was 31% or less. This offers strong evidence that fun is an important and overlooked variable for low turnover. A simple Google search on December 15, 2015 for “fun in the workplace” yielded 68.7 million results. There are many articles from practitioners on incorporating fun into the workplace but more scholarly research on fun as a communication variable could be beneficial.

Second, the communication frame of fun was the only variable that was a predictor of all three work outcomes. This speaks to the strength of the type of environment and interactions that hotel employees expect to have. Van Gorp’s (2007) sixth premise for institutionalizing frames states that social interaction is the essence for creating frames. However, Van Gorp does not state any particular type of interaction that best promotes framing. As this study revealed a connection between the communication frame of fun and low turnover, there may be a connection between fun interactions and successful framing. Studies should be conducted to determine if a fun environment is more conducive to institutionalizing communication frames than other environments.

Third, in Phase I, managers always mentioned the variable fun in conjunction with another variable. Fun was used to counter negatives such as hard work and the stress of the
environment. Fun was also used to enhance positive qualities of the work environment such as team and family. As described above, examining the interaction between pay, hard work and real job revealed different results than examining each variable in isolation. This hints at an important way to study turnover. As already stated, many studies have examined individual variables and their effect on work outcomes. This may not yield the most complete or accurate picture of how variables influence work outcomes. Thousands of studies have been conducted on turnover yet the hotel industry is still plagued with this problem. More studies are needed to examine the interactions of multiple variables whose confluence affect turnover.

Additionally, Framing Theory acknowledges competing frames, multiple frames about a situation or concept. People are not exposed to just one frame of an issue or problem (Sniderman and Theriault, 2004). Few studies have been conducted on competing frames. “Competing frames need to be studied further to learn if frames cancel one another and reinforce existing values, push people in conflicting directions, or motivate a more careful evaluation of the applicability of competing alternatives” (Chong and Druckman, 2007b, p. 113). This study suggests that not only are there competing frames, but there may be multiplying frames that should be studied. Competing frames are messages about the same topic from different sources creating multiple meanings for the frame. Multiplying frames are frames whose presence affect the meaning of other frames. For instance, hard work may be framed in one way but fun, hard work may create different perceptions. This study revealed that hard work may be framed differently for a high-paid employee than it is for a low-paid employee. This strengthens the argument that in order to fully understand the problem of turnover and develop solutions which may assist hotels, variables and communication frames
should not be studied in isolation. Multiple variables and their interactions should be studied collectively.

**Family.** Of the nine communication frames revealed in the interviews, family was the most mentioned communication frame. Managers with low turnover seemed to recognize an atmosphere that represented a collective emotional closeness among and between the employees. The manager was included as a member of this group. They called their employees family and referred to the hotel as a home. The survey revealed that a sense of family was significantly correlated with all three work outcomes. An increased sense of family was correlated with a higher level of job satisfaction, a lower level of intent to leave, and a lower level of job regret. This aligns with previous studies that report the value of family in organizations helps to establish a sense of identification and commitment, trust and a sense of attachment to the team (Kets de Vries, 1993).

However, regression analysis revealed that family was not a significant predictor of any of the work outcomes in conjunction with the other variables. This is worthy of further study as the family frame was a communication frame expressed by every manager of low-turnover hotels but not any of the managers of hotels that had higher turnover. The managers of high turnover hotels spoke of respecting employees but expressed more emotional distance between themselves and their employees.

The literature review also stated that communication access to managers is a core value of the family frame. Two interesting findings about communication access to managers communicating were observed. First, managers of the low-turnover hotels had much more active communication philosophies than managers of the hotels with higher turnover. The most prevalent difference between the two groups of managers was who the managers
believed bore the responsibility for communication. Managers of low-turnover hotels felt it was their responsibility to ensure messages were communicated to employees. The five managers with the lowest turnover preferred verbal, face-to-face communication. They each emphasized the importance of planned, structured communication events such as meetings. These managers reported being much more direct in their communication with employees. They did not rely on written communication to pass along information. In this group, the manager reported being responsible for communicating the message.

The managers whose turnover rates were 31% - 70% preferred using both verbal and written communication. The reason given for using written communication channels was to pass the same message to employees who may not be working at the time of the communication or to have a historical record of the communication. These managers felt it was their responsibility to state their message but more emphasis was placed on the employee being responsible for receiving the information. In this group, the manager believed the employee bore the burden of the message. One manager emphasized that writing was preferred so there could be follow up in case the employee was not following the communication or stated they were never told the information. Information in writing relieved the manager from their responsibility of the communication and put it back on the employee. Another manager preferred to write information so all employees would have access to it. Writing was best when employees worked different shifts and different days. Putting the communication in writing meant the manager had completed her responsibility in passing along the information and the employee was now responsible for getting the information. This style of communication does not reinforce the family value of access to communication with the managers reported in the literature.
The manager who had the projected 216% turnover also preferred verbal face-to-face meetings; however, he did not conduct planned, structured communication events. He preferred spontaneous verbal communication with individuals. It is likely that the spontaneous communication was not deliberately framed with a particular work outcome in mind. It was simply responsive to the situation at hand. This style of communication ensured only the one receiver heard the message.

The second interesting observation was that managers who planned deliberate communication events, those with the lowest turnover, were other-focused in their communication rather than self-focused. They described the goal for others in their communication. The purpose of their communication was to assist, enable, empower, improve, or inform others. The focus was on the other person. These managers seemed to manage the business through guiding the actions of their employees.

Managers who were self-focused described communicating messages in order to inform employees. Passing information was a task they needed to do so they could then return to doing their own job. They seemed to manage the business by doing the tasks of their job rather than guiding others who were doing tasks. The manager with 56% turnover as well as the manager with a projected 216% turnover spoke of the amount of time they are in their office doing tasks associated with their job. No other manager spoke of office work. The manager with 56% turnover reported that she worked from home once or twice a week. She reported that she could accomplish more when she avoided the disruptions of employees seeking her attention. This manager creates emotional distance from her employees as well as physical distance.
It seems communication access to managers may have an effect on retention or turnover. The perceived closeness created by the deliberate communication events, verbal communication, and the manager believing that they are responsible for their communication may have a positive effect on turnover.

Active communication is supported by Framing Theory. Deliberate communication is necessary to create strong communication frames. Chong and Druckman (2007b) stated that in order to create strong frames, the frame needs to be understood by the receiver, accessible or memorable by the receiver, and relevant to the situation. Managers can accentuate certain parts of a message to strengthen a frame. A manager that uses active communication that includes verbal and non-verbal communication, two-way communication, and group interaction is much more likely to be successful in ensuring a frame is understood, recalled to memory, and made relevant than managers who rely on employees to read passive, written communication. The manager cannot be assured that the employee will recall appropriate information about the frame or understand its relevance. Zaller stated that people are blown about by whatever current of information manages to develop with the greatest intensity (as cited in Chong and Druckman, 2007b). There will be competing frames for employees to use to frame their jobs (Sniderman and Theriault, 2004; Van Gorp, 2007). The more salient the information, the more believable it is, the more likely it is to be recalled, and the more likely it is to be acted upon (Entmann, 1993). Managers who deliberately frame their message and deliver it in a manner that makes it accessible, available, and applicable is more likely to create a communication frame that influences turnover or retention.

As active and passive communication did not form valid and reliable scales in the survey, this concept was not explored in Phase II. The active-passive communication style
and the family frame should be explored in future studies. Although this study had a small sample size, there was a distinct patterns between managers of low-turnover hotels and managers of hotels with higher turnover.

These findings advance Framing Theory. Fairhurst and Sarr’s (1996) work and advice about creating reinforcing vision frames may also hold true for creating and reinforcing job frames that impact work outcomes. Van Gorp (2007) stated that framing involves the interaction that occurs between the text, the schemata of the audience, the communicator and communicator’s discourse. Although further studies are needed, this study hints that the when the communicator bores responsibility for delivering the communication frame as opposed to the receiver bearing the responsibility for receiving the communication frame, stronger communication frames can be created. It also suggests that active communication is more effective at creating communication frames than passive communication. In application, managers may use communication frames to affect work outcomes but the communication frames used must be deliberately created and delivered. Van Gorp’s (2007) six premises stated in the literature review remind hotel managers that wisely chosen messages consistently delivered can create a change.

Additionally, much of the research about the family frame is conducted using small, family businesses. If the communication frame of family is representative of the closeness between managers and employees and related to a communication style, more research should be conducted to examine the concept of family in large corporations.

Dirty Work. The dirty work frame had two interesting findings. First, several tasks in a hotel are commonly referred to as dirty work by those outside the industry. However, only housekeeping supervisors reported a mean score that reflected they perceived their job as
dirty work ($M = 5.44$). Housekeepers ($M = 4.71$) and servers ($M = 4.74$) had mean scores that reflected a slight agreement that they perceived their jobs as dirty work. No other position reflected a perception of dirty work. This study did not explore reasons why jobs were or were not considered dirty work. However, the literature review may offer an explanation for housekeepers and servers reporting only a slight degree of dirty work. Ashforth and Kreiner (1999) explain that renaming jobs is a way that those who do dirty work find ways to accept their work and reduce the stigma associated with it. Framing Theory supports this. Those who cleaned the rooms were once called maids. Industry wide, the title of this job was changed to housekeeper in order to reduce the stigma of the position being subservient. Waitress and waiter was are commonly called server for the same reason. Another way of reducing the perception of the dirty work stigma is recalibrating, focusing on the importance of the job to the operation. The housekeeping department is commonly known as the important job in the hotel. It is easy to see how a server can view themselves as a key ingredient in a restaurant. The industry’s efforts in reframing these positions through renaming and recalibrating the jobs may have reduced the amount of stigma otherwise expected in these positions. It is also a possibility that the perception of hotel jobs being dirty work is incorrect.

The most interesting finding associated with dirty work was that the supervisors, with the exception of the food and beverage supervisor, reported higher levels of dirty work than the employees in their department (see Table 10). This was true for housekeeping, laundry, and front desk. The tasks for these supervisor positions are less physical than the tasks for the employees they supervise and are likely perceived as less demeaning. Supervising is generally not thought of as tasks that are physically, socially or morally tainted. A supervisor
position comes with more status than stigma, especially when compared to the employees they supervise. These means scores seem to reflect that the tasks associated with managing employees are unpleasant for supervisors. This may have merit as many supervisors are promoted from within and find themselves managing their former peers. This study did not capture how long the supervisors had been in a supervisory position, but in general, supervisors are often the least experienced members of the management team. While learning to manage, they may find the supervisory tasks or increased responsibility unpleasant. It is also likely that supervisors do not have the same level of decision-making authority as managers and are limited in the actions they can take. Not having full decision-making authority may create unpleasant situations or dilemmas.

These results expands on previous studies as managing people has not been thought of as dirty work. It is a new concept that tasks associated with managing people may be perceived as dirty work. Although not completely fitting the conceptualization of physically, socially, or morally tainted, it is possible that the responsibility of managing people are tasks that are considered not desired or unpleasant. This should be pursued in future studies.

**Hard Work.** An analysis of the communication frame hard work revealed an interesting discovery when examining education levels. Those who reported having less than a high school diploma and those who reported having graduate degrees reported the lowest levels of hard work (see Table 11). Those who held administrative jobs possessed graduate degrees. It is understandable why participants in these jobs would report a perception of lower levels of hard work. Their jobs are less physically demanding and the have fewer demands driven by the pace of the customer check-in/check-out process. However, those without high school diplomas held jobs that required much manual labor yet they reported
significantly lower levels of hard work than did those with a high school diploma, some college or a college degree. As with the discussion of pay and hard work, this may be a matter of a perception of equity. A perception has been socially created that those without a good education should expect to hold more physically demanding jobs. The literature on real jobs lends some credibility to this as well. Students felt some jobs were suitable when they did not have an education but once they advanced in their schooling, their perceptions of what made an appropriate job changed (Clair, 1996). It may be that hard work is perceived as acceptable by those who do not possess a higher level of education.

These results also hint that communication frames about jobs may be influenced by larger societal and cultural norms or expectations. Framing theory states that frames organize a belief system. Individuals act on the frames that are most salient. Cultural frames are institutionalized and so salient that they are acted on almost unconsciously (Van Gorp, 2007). The frame of The American Dream contains a belief that if you work hard, you will have a better life. A lack of education leads to low paying jobs consisting of manual labor. The above results about education may be reflecting a psychological frame (Borah, 2011) about work that is embedded in a larger or higher-order cultural frame. Frames embedded within a frame were not revealed in a review of the literature. This is a possible area for future studies that may advance Framing Theory. Frame construction may be limited by the constraints or boundaries of a higher-order frame. Psychological frames may be multiplying frames for communication frames. It seems that to be successful in creating frames, the frames must be congruent with higher-order frames. As it is common for the hotel industry to employee workers from other countries and other cultures, the hotel industry may be challenged to create a common communication frame about their jobs that resonates with the various
cultures present among the workforce. When hiring employees, managers may want to seek
information about an employee’s cultural beliefs in terms of hard work or beliefs toward
service to see if employees are likely to adopt and act upon the hotel’s communication
frames.

**Summary of Communication Frames**

Several interesting findings were discovered when examining the communication
frames. The communication frame of fun should be given more scholarly attention. It was a
predictor of all three work outcomes and was frequently mentioned by managers of low-
turnover hotels. This may be an indication of the kind of environment hotel employees
prefer. It also may indicate an environment that is conducive to successful framing. The
communication frame of fun was always mentioned in conjunction with another variable
such as hard work or family. This suggests that studies to determine ways of reducing
turnover should examine multiple variables and their interactions rather than isolating
variables to determine their influence on turnover. It also offers a new way of viewing
competing frames. Multiplying frames, frames whose presence change other frames, should
be studied to determine their effect on turnover.

The communication frame of family was not a predictor of any of the work outcomes
but should be explored further as it was a communication frame used only by managers of
low-turnover hotels. The family frame expressed the level of closeness between managers
and employees. The literature states that communication access to managers is important in a
family culture (Haugh & McKee, 2003; Kets de Vries, 1993). This study revealed that
managers of hotels took one of two communication approaches. Some managers made
deliberate attempts to create communication events such as meetings and to ensure all
employees received their communication. Other managers felt it was their responsibility to communicate any necessary information but the employee held the majority of the responsibility for receiving and understanding the messages. The first group of managers had much lower turnover than did the second group of managers. Successful framing requires deliberate communication that reinforces a communication frame’s availability, accessibility, and relevance. The managers who created deliberate communication events were much more likely to retain their employees and call themselves a family.

The interesting discovery in examining the communication frame of dirty work was that supervisors reported higher levels of dirty work than did the hourly employees they supervised. Previous studies have not identified the tasks associated with managing employees as the undesirable tasks. Promotions to supervisor and management position are regularly framed as status rather than stigma. This is an area that should be explored further.

An examination of the communication frame of hard work revealed that hotel employees are not discouraged by hard work. A communication frame of hard work may not influence work outcomes but may influence other perceptions that influence work outcomes. As identified earlier in the discussion with fun, an examination of hard work revealed that variables should be studied not is isolation but in conjunction with other variables in order to grasp a better understanding of the causes of turnover. The other discovery is that education level seemed to affect the employees’ perception of hard work. Those with graduate degrees and those who had less than a high school diploma reported significantly lower levels of hard work. This may be a reflection higher-order cultural frames influencing job frames.
Limitations

This study had some limitations. The sample size in both Phase I and Phase II were minimally adequate. Phase I participants were geographically concentrated. A larger, more diverse sample may potentially yield different results. A larger, more diverse sample size in Phase II would also allow the study to be more generalizable.

The survey created two limitations. All information on the survey was self-reported. Self-reported information contain multiple biases. Statements like “I am an honest employee” may have skewed results. Second, the survey was an English-only survey. Several hotel employees in the Daytona area had Haitian speaking employees and the primary researcher was unprepared for this. The influence of a multi-cultural workforce was not captured in this study.

Another limitation was that previously established scales were not available for many of the communication frames. Hence some communication frames that were emphasized in Phase I such as family and autonomy were not considered as part of Phase II as valid and reliable scales did not emerge from the survey. Future studies should attempt to create valid and reliable scales for these communication frames as well as confirm the scales that did emerge. The scale of dirty work was used even though its reliability was lower than preferred.

Future Studies

Throughout Chapter 5 multiple suggestions were made for future studies. One important recommendation for future studies is to study multiple variables and their interactions as opposed to isolating variables. During the interviews the managers did not separate the various aspects of working in a hotel. They did not speak solely of the tasks, or
the employees, the customers, their owner or manager, or the environment. They often spoke holistically and bonded communication frames together in order to capture the multiple parts of the job as if the communication frames were bonded and worked together. When variables were examined together, the results were different than when examining the variables individually.

This study introduces multiplying communication frames. Multiplying frames are communication frames whose presence affect the meaning of other frames. This is a different concept that competing frames. Multiplying frames also require studies that examine their effect on each other as well as work outcomes.

This study revealed that some hotels simultaneously have high retention and high turnover. Studies have not been conducted using companies who experience this unique situation. This phenomenon should be explored. The cause of turnover and the effects of turnover may be different for a company that simultaneously experiences high retention and high turnover.

The work outcome of job regret has not been studied. Future studies should explore this new concept to determine its impact on the work environment and the work force. The causes and implications of job regret should be examined.

Finally, there were differences in the communication patterns of managers of low-turnover hotels and managers of high-turnover hotels. This study was not meant to be a comparison between these two groups of hotel managers. Nonetheless, enough interesting differences emerged that warrants further look into the topic at a later time.
Conclusion

This study revealed that there are common communication frames managers of low-turnover hotels use to describe their jobs. These communication frames influence the work outcomes of job satisfaction, intent to leave and job regret. Second, this study advances the use of Framing Theory in organizations. Framing Theory has been used at the strategic level in organizations in regards to culture and vision. This study reveals that Framing Theory also has uses in the day-to-day operations of hotels. This study also offers guidance to practitioners in the hotel industry as well. Managers can use the concepts of Framing Theory to communicatively frame the jobs at their hotels and affect work outcomes that lead to turnover. By communicating deliberate messages, employees’ perceptions of their job can be positively affected resulting in more dedicated employees.
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APPENDIX A
Structured Interview Guide

1. To what do you contribute your low turnover and high promotion rate?

2. Thinking about the interview with your most recent hire, how did you decide to hire him or her? How did you describe working at your hotel to the applicant?

3. Thinking about an interview with an applicant that you did not hire, why did you decide not to hire him or her?

4. Describe a time when a valued employee you wanted to keep came to you and was thinking about quitting or perhaps you heard he/she was thinking about quitting. What did you say to him/her to try to convince them to stay? Did he/she quit or stay?

5. Describe a time when an employee approached you inquiring about becoming a manager. What did you say to him or her?

6. Describe a time when you approached an employee about the possibility of that employee becoming a manager. What did you say to him or her to get them interested in becoming a manager?

7. How do you communicate your expectations to your employees?

8. Do many of your employees have a second job? How do you keep the job at your hotel their primary job?

9. How did you decide to become a hotel manager?

10. How do you describe your job to your friends?

11. Has anyone ever told you that your job was beneath you or that you should have a better job? (If yes, what did you say to that person about your job?)

12. Overall, what are the good reasons for working for this hotel chain?
13. Is there anything else, you’d like to add about working here or about recruiting and retaining employees here?
APPENDIX B

Survey

General Information

Please indicate your gender: ____________________________________________

Please indicate your marital status: □ Single □ Married/Living as married □ Significant Other

Please indicate your age: ________ years

Please indicate your current work status: □ Full-time, primary job □ Part-time, primary job □ Full-time, second job □ Part-time, second job

Job Title: __________________________________________________________

How long have you had this position? _________________________________

How long have you worked for this company? __________________________

Please indicate your highest level of education attained: □ Less than high school; no GED □ High School Grad/GED

□ Some College □ Bachelors Degree □ Graduate degree
Give your opinion about the following statements using this 7-point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am trusted to do my job with little supervision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to make it great for the guest's stay.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is physically demanding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager treats me like I matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I do here is hard work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would take a different job if it paid the same.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This company treats us like family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job revolves around all of us, not just one person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is stressful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is more important for my manager to hire new employees that get along with the team than to hire employees who have experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is not hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not a close knit group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings are used to keep us informed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is not one of us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a trustworthy employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I have my way, I will be working for another company one year from now.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is more likely to state his/her expectations in writing than tell us verbally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the skills to match the demands of this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working here is not fun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is demeaning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job provides me with purpose.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I frequently think of quitting this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a perfect fit for this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I see something that needs to be done, I do it even if it is not part of my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is what I was meant to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager never praises my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good time at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is like a family in my department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ok if my work is not of good quality all the time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is more likely to state his/her expectations verbally than put them in writing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not trusted to make decisions about my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I view my work as contributing to my personal growth.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could do it all over, I would not choose this job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am empowered to make decisions affecting my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are constant demands in this job which makes the job hard.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager is on my side.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can immediately see results of my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel part of a team working here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an ideal job, too good to give up.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have found a meaningful job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is harder than it looks.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm only doing this job until I get a real job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had all the money I needed, I would still work in this position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job requires me to do tasks that I am not comfortable doing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My feelings generally are not affected much one way or the other by how well I do on this job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am disappointed I ever took this job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive most of the information about my job verbally.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My goals at work are clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My manager solves problems to make my job better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable in my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is something I need to know for my job, my manager will tell me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an honest employee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of job I have is valued by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not like my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am planning to search for a new job during the next 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is hard because of the variety of tasks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job is desirable to most people I know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have fun at my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always do my job to the best of my ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITA

Julie Bellemare was born in Warfordsburg, PA. After graduation she attended Clarion University where she received her Bachelor degree in Speech Communication and Theater and was commissioned a 2LT in the U.S. Army. Julie then worked full time for the National Guard as a training officer and logistician for the next eight years. After receiving her Masters of Arts degree in Human Resources from Webster University in St. Louis, Julie began working for Taco Bell as a restaurant manager and then a staffing manager for the St. Louis area. She then worked for the Adam’s Mark hotel in St. Louis, Missouri where she became the Director of Personnel. In 2001, Julie left the hotel to teach at the University of Missouri in the Hotel and Restaurant Management Program, later renamed the Hospitality Management program. She taught at Mizzou until 2013. While at the University of Missouri Julie developed the Event Planning Management and Sports Venue Management tracks along with several other courses. Julie left Mizzou to teach at the Army War College. Colonel Julie Bellemare is retiring from the Army Reserves on 1 August, 2015 after having completed 26 years in the National Guard and 6 years in the Army Reserves. Julie is married to Mr. Shannon Bellemare and together they have 5 children, Laura, Richard, Ella, Mark, and Abigale, a daughter-in-law Schanel, and two grandchildren Audree and Leo.