

DETERMINANT FACTORS OF LABOR TURNOVER IN THE
INSTITUTIONAL FOOD SERVICE INDUSTRY

by

Suzanne Paula Schultz

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Human Nutrition and Foods

APPROVED:

M. E. Quam, Chairman

M. J. Sporakowski

T. W. Bonham

April, 1974

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to her committee members, especially _____, for their encouragement, counseling, and patience during the course of this research project.

Acknowledgement is also given to _____ of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Personnel Department and _____ for their guidance in the development of the questionnaire. A special thanks to _____ for allowing the employees of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Food Service to participate in the pilot study.

Grateful appreciation is given to those members of the National Association of College and University Food Services for their participation in this study.

Finally, a very special thanks to _____ and _____ for their assistance in developing the computerized analysis of the data.

"Just as the high reading on a clinical thermometer is a sign to the physician that something is seriously wrong with the human organism, so is a high index of turnover a warning to management that something is wrong with the health of the organization. But, just as the clinical thermometer merely indicates that something is wrong - so does the turnover rate merely warn, not diagnose. A high temperature may mean pneumonia, measles, or mumps. A high turnover rate may mean poor personnel practices, poor supervisory practices, or poor company policy. Nor should we forget that too low a rate of turnover, like a below normal reading on the thermometer, can also be a danger signal."

F. J. Gaudet, 1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
Methods for Analyzing Turnover Rates	4
Calculation of Costs	5
Studies Investigating Turnover	7
Motivation Theory	10
Studies Supporting Motivation Theory	12
Techniques for Surveying Attitudes	21
MATERIALS AND METHODS	23
Situation	23
The Questionnaire	26
Analysis	28
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	30
Determination of Significant Variables by Chi-Square	30
Regression Analysis Results	38
Satisfaction Levels by Category	45
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	59
LITERATURE CITED	64
APPENDICES	67
A. Definition of Terms	68
B. Sample Population Sources	71
C. Questionnaires and Cover Letters	72
D. Part II Questions, Breakdown by Area	90
VITA	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Chi-Square Analysis Results	31
2. Regression Analysis Results	39
3. Satisfaction Levels by Current or Past Status	46
4. Satisfaction Levels by Sex	47
5. Satisfaction Levels by How They Were Paid	48
6. Satisfaction Levels by the Number of Previous Jobs	49
7. Satisfaction Levels According to Breadwinner Status	50
8. Satisfaction Levels According to Having Worked in Food Service Before	51
9. Satisfaction Levels According to Age	53
10. Satisfaction Levels According to Length of Service	54
11. Satisfaction Levels According to the Most Important Factor	55
12. Satisfaction Levels According to How They Applied	56
13. Satisfaction Levels According to Marital Status	57
14. Satisfaction Levels According to Position	58

INTRODUCTION

The food service industry is the fourth largest industry in the United States in terms of sales-dollars and is first among the country's service industries in terms of the number of persons served (2). This industry is continually facing shortages of skilled and unskilled personnel at both the management and non-management levels. The National Restaurant Association estimates 225 thousand new non-management workers must enter the industry each year in order to keep pace with the growing demand for meals away from home (3). Despite the acknowledgement of the need for personnel, and the opportunities available in this area, the industry has been deficient in attracting employable persons into the field.

The food service industry has developed a poor employment image due to a traditional lack of attention to a means by which non-management employees may become efficient and thus progress up a career ladder. Food service also has traditionally offered a low remuneration rate. Because of this poor image, many potential employees may be lost to the field and many already in the industry may leave (2).

The turnover rate for the food service industry has been high when compared to other United States industries. Knowledge concerning the reasons given by employees for leaving and for remaining in a food service non-management position could be of benefit to management. If known, training programs might be better designed, management styles and working conditions improved and employee satisfaction increased.

The purpose of this investigation was to compare the reasons given by employees separated from a university food service operation with the reasons given by employees remaining in a university food service organization. The relationship between the employee satisfaction rating and the position the employee held at the time of data collection may have had an effect upon the reported satisfaction and eventually the decision to remain or leave. Specific objectives in the study were:

1. To compare the satisfaction rating between current and former employees of institutional food services.
2. To compare the reasons cited in an institutional food service with those cited in other industries.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Considerable research has been published in various professions and industries examining employee satisfaction in job situations and other related turnover problems. The majority of these studies have been conducted in non-food service industries. Until the Study of Career Ladders and Manpower Development of Non-Management Personnel in the Food Service Industry, reported by Fisher and Gournier (2), there was no corresponding body of research and little documentation on one of the major factors which can assist or inhibit the industry's growth in the future--namely, food service manpower. The manpower shortage seems to arise from management's neglect of the non-management employee and a low remuneration rate offered by the industry. This has resulted in an employment stigma which may be the reason many potential workers are lost and many employees eventually leave.

The national food service turnover statistics reflect this problem showing a voluntary quit rate in April 1968 of seven per cent which is three times the average United States industry rate (4). Sources indicate some food service rates as high as three hundred per cent annually (3). In addition, the productivity rates of food services are also low when compared to manufacturing industries. Operation at full capacity is considered one-hundred per cent productive; food services average 43 per cent while manufacturing industries reach 80 per cent. A low productivity rate is considered an indicator of future turnover (1, 5). These statistics indicate a need to investigate food service employees and the reasons they fail to stay for a long period of time.

Methods for Analyzing Turnover Rates

The realization that labor turnover is an economic as well as an employment drain on any industry should induce management to investigate the determinants of labor turnover in their organizations. A monthly turnover report can indicate problem areas to both the management and department heads involved. Prior to such an investigation, management must decide which method to use in calculating turnover rates, how often to calculate them, and what effect these calculations will have.

Various formulae are presented in the literature designed to calculate turnover rates. Those cited include the "British Wastage Rate" (1) determined as follows:

$$W = L/N \times 100$$

W = wastage

L = the number of leavers in a three month period

N = the number of survivors from the previous three month period

Another formula more frequently cited (1, 6) was the difference in the number of employees at the beginning and the end of a time period.

For example:

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{(F + L)/2}{S} \times 100$$

F = the number of employees on the first day of the period

L = the number of employees on the last day of the period

S = the number of separations during the period

A labor turnover rate is considered to be one of the best indicators of a good or poor personnel program. As defined by the United States

Department of Labor, labor turnover is the percentage of the total employees hired in a month; or the percentage of total employees leaving in a month, whichever percentage is smaller is the net turnover rate.

To determine the net turnover rate the following data must be secured:

1. The number of employees at the beginning of the month.
2. The number of employees at the end of the month.
3. The number of quits.*
4. The number of discharges.*
5. The number of layoffs.*
6. The number of total separations (sum of 3, 4, & 5).*
7. The number of accessions.*

The average number of employees is determined by summing the number of employees at the beginning and end of the month, divided by two. The percentage of employees leaving in a month is found by dividing the total separations by the average number of employees; likewise, the percentage of employees hired is the number of accessions divided by the average number of employees. Monthly turnover rates may be corrected for the number of days in a month through the "equivalent annual rate" formula. For example, an annual turnover rate of 120 per cent would occur if a ten per cent monthly rate were projected (6).

Calculation of Costs

No sound decision can be made until the full cost of losing an employee can be compared to the full cost of keeping an employee. A cost analysis should be done if the turnover rate is high in relation to a pre-determined standard. A one to one and one-half per cent rate or the industry's national average found in the U. S. Department of

* See Appendix A for definitions.

Labor's Handbook of Labor Statistics are considered sound standards for measuring the satisfactory turnover rate for an individual organization (3, 4).

Several methods for calculating the costs of turnover have been reviewed by Hall (7). These methods include the : 1) "Worker Value Unit Approach," 2) "Separations and Replacement Method," and 3) "Profit Foregone Approach." All of the above methods fail to allocate money for non-measurable costs, such as employee morale.

The Separations and Replacement Method is most frequently cited in the literature as a means to estimate the cost of turnover (7-10). Canfield (9) considered and defined the variables in determining the cost of employee turnover in manufacturing industries. The variables defined were: 1) Employment Costs, 2) Break-in Costs, 3) Breaking-in Costs, 4) Separation Costs, 5) Formal Training Costs, 6) Lost Production and Extra Burden Costs, 7) Extra Social Security Tax, and 8) Extra Unemployment Insurance Costs. The average cost computed from these variables per employee leaving the organization was \$453.12.

Lundberg (6) estimated the total turnover costs in a restaurant ranged from a minimum of \$5.00 for reinducted helpers to several hundred dollars for top executives with respect to the size of the organization. A more recent guideline encompassing the variations in costs associated with each turnover estimates the charge to the food service operator as the equivalent of one month's pay for the lost employee (5).

Studies Investigating Turnover

Once rates and costs of turnover have been established, the manager of a firm may be encouraged to investigate the factors influencing his rates and costs, if they are high. Based upon the premise that one cannot reduce turnover until one has adequately diagnosed its cause, Gaudet advanced three variables as precursors of turnover to indicate when an investigation is desirable. The variables (1) were:

1. A high incidence of accidents.
2. A low productivity level.
3. Frequent absenteeism.

The National Restaurant Association added the following variables (5):

1. Most vacancies in the organization above the lowest level jobs are filled from outside the organization.
2. Employees do not move upward within the organization or do so slowly.
3. Employee attitudes are poor and morale is low.
4. Customers are dissatisfied.

Gaudet (1) compiled a set of pre-1960 studies investigating turnover. Pay was most frequently associated with a turnover decision. Promotional opportunities and working conditions were less frequently mentioned. The least frequently mentioned factors were job security and friction with co-workers. Statistics relating turnover to sex and age were found unreliable. A definite trend was reported in one study indicating turnover was highest among males younger than 35 while another study observed a trend indicating turnover decreased after the age of 25. Because no one has been able to establish any particular cause or combination of causes that satisfactorily explain turnover, the industry's expectations lie in the continuing research on a higher level of scientific sophistication.

Brissenden (11) published an analysis of data gathered by the U. S. Department of Labor in which he described turnover as "... a phenomenon observable in a particularly intensified form in times of prosperity, but found in only slightly less serious form even in periods of depression." He suggested that management should know the nature and extent of the current labor market instability and the factors which are likely to increase or diminish its volume. In addition management should be familiar with the employment methods that have been or can be devised to reduce mobility to the extent that maximum production may be obtained at a minimal cost to the mutual advantage of the employer and the employee.

Dissatisfaction with wages was the largest single reason advanced for voluntary separation in six metal trade establishments. Other job related reasons mentioned in the study included the nature of the work, monotony, and "dissatisfied." Those classified as dissatisfied had no one specific reason. During this period of time managers believed turnover was due to an "inherent instability and these people are unable to assign any specific or logical reason for their desire to change (11)."

A sample was taken from industrial payrolls in several large American cities (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Columbus, Ohio; and Springfield, Ohio) by Palmer (12). She focused on work attachment and aspirations as related to turnover. An open-ended question series in an interview situation was used to determine the individual's attachment to the job. The measures

of attachment were:

- Satisfaction with the job.
- Identification with the company.
- The ratings of the company as a place to work.
- The employee's opinion as to whether the decision to work for the company was a good one.
- Whether the employee would stay with the company under a variety of circumstances.

The employees were asked to list the three most important characteristics of their jobs. High ratings of importance were listed for wages, safety, and supervision. When these job characteristics ratings were compared to the employee satisfaction ratings between companies with and without pension plans, there was no evidence that the pension occupied a prominent position in the employee's mind. Palmer concluded this indicated, along with other data collected, the employee's concern lay more with economic security (12).

Stark's (13) study in the life insurance industry supported the economic security concept. In his introductory statement, Stark indicated that employees tend to give reasons for separation which are limited to "socially acceptable" reasons and those acceptable to the leavers own ego. He summarized the standard shopping list of reasons given for separation as:

- Dissatisfaction with pay and/or fringe benefits
- Dissatisfaction with promotional opportunities
- Dissatisfaction with supervision
- Dissatisfaction with the work itself
- Military service, illness, etc.

Stark encouraged the interested executive to examine the factors related to the job or organizational side of the man/job relationship. In this instance, pay, since this factor is most firmly under the control of the executive.

In his examination of 495 life insurance companies, turnover increased as pay decreased. The sales forces were classified by remuneration as high, medium, and low paying jobs. The sales force classified under the high paying classification retained one to two more employees than the other classifications in the first and second years. Highest

losses occurred in the low paying classification. This study indicated a trend supporting the factor of pay making a difference in turnover rates (13).

Motivation Theory

The studies to this point have not noted reasons for separation to a great extent as per the motivational theories developed since the mid-fifties. Industrial organizations often produce material goods in mass, but offer few opportunities for the satisfaction of the ego needs of the employee. Good wages, good working conditions, and fringe benefits do not appear to increase employee productivity. The problem perhaps lies in a need for organizations to provide outlets for the employee, not only in terms of satisfaction of the physiological and safety needs, but also in terms of the satisfaction of the higher level needs (6).

Theory of motivation is basic to any explanation of individual behavior. Maslow's (14) theory of motivation describes five broad classes or levels of needs arranged in hierarchical plateaus of prepotency. When one level is satisfied, the next higher level is activated. The levels are: 1) physiological needs, 2) security or safety needs, 3) social, belonging or membership needs, 4) esteem needs, and 5) self-actualization or self-fulfillment needs. Empirical evidence exists in support of his model but does not support the model in its entirety. The model is considered difficult to test (15). Maslow presented his model as a framework for future research. The Lawler (16) study correlated satisfaction of managers' needs, except physiological, with rankings of their performance by superiors and peers.

A second frequently mentioned motivational model is that proposed by Herzberg. Analysis of semi-structured interviews in which respondents recall incidents which resulted in improved or reduced satisfaction, suggested that certain job characteristics led to job satisfaction, while different job characteristics led to job dissatisfaction. For example, job achievement was related to satisfaction while working conditions were related to dissatisfaction. Thus, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not simple opposites. Herzberg (17) suggested that a two-factor theory of satisfaction is needed. These two factors were the motivators, those which produce satisfaction in the individual, such as the need for self actualization at work, and the job characteristics or hygiene factors, which produce dissatisfaction in the individual, such as physiological and safety needs at work. Herzberg presented a ten step plan toward job enrichment. This plan was developed in light of his two factor theory and the "eternal triangle" which he proposed will motivate employees.

Vroom defined motivation as a decision among choices of alternative forms of voluntary activity. The choice of first level outcomes, performance, is determined by the expected relationship to the second level outcomes or rewards. The concepts of valence, the strength of an individual's desire for a particular reward, and instrumentality, the individual's perception of the probability of the first level outcome resulting in the second level outcomes, were presented (15).

Valence was measured through the rank assigned to important individual goals on a Likert-type scale. Instrumentality was measured by rating the individual perceived differences in the direction and

strength of the first and second level outcomes. An additional concept emerges in Vroom's theory — expectancy. Expectancy is the probability that the individual can meet the first level performance (15).

Lawler (16) defined rewards as extrinsic, a part of the job situation which is given by others, and intrinsic, stemming directly from the individual and the performance itself. He related rewards to motivation as:

Individual Motivation = Reward Value X Effort Reward Probability.
If either reward value or effort reward probability is low or non-existent, motivation will not be present, nor will individual satisfaction exist.

The provisions of differential extrinsic rewards are a function of three factors: 1) the organization's ability to discriminate among individual differences in performance, 2) the organization's capability to give rewards, and 3) the organization's willingness to give rewards (18).

Studies Supporting Motivation Theory

Research studies appear to support the theory that the factors which lead to satisfaction or dissatisfaction are different. The relationship between an attitude and the behavior of the employee has been a topic of research since these concepts were introduced. This research is important because of the increased knowledge that may be obtained and further applied to the organization, hence improving effectiveness. The purpose of such research is to obtain a general picture of the level of morale in a given organization and more subtly, it makes the employees feel that management is interested in them and their opinions about the operation of the organization.

Levoy (19) suggested that if something beyond good wages and fringe benefits and working conditions are added, people problems can be avoided. Little things, for example, complimenting appearance or performance, are of value in human relations, not as a substitute for salary or fringe benefits, but as a supplement to them. This was substantiated in the U. S. Department of Commerce survey of management and employee attitudes toward employee priorities in job satisfaction. Management indicated that the employee, in their opinion, was most concerned with good pay, job security, promotion and growth. However, the employees rated full appreciation of work performed and feeling "in" on things, highest, followed by sympathetic help on personal problems, job security, and good pay. This reinforces Levoy's statement that today's employer should be placing increased emphasis on psychological factors such as feelings of recognition, appreciation, and self-expression. This requires --E. O. S.-- employee oriented supervision, a sensitivity to individual needs and ambitions. In his survey of literature, Levoy found that the main cause of low staff morale was not usually a lack of concern, but rather the failure of management to communicate its concern to the employee.

Imberman (20) directed his attention to employee and management relations concentrating on the executive traits which appear to cause labor trouble. These traits are the lack of E. O. S. as defined by Levoy. If an executive in a key decision making position with regard to employees seems to possess some of these traits, there is a likelihood of trouble, no matter what the monetary situation is.

Sheridan (21), in a study concerning absenteeism of auto production workers, indicated that pay and fringe benefits were vital, but not the

complete story. When asked why they worked only four days a week, the production workers responded that they could not make a living by working only three days a week. Offered as possible cause and effect factors influencing this attitude were:

1. The rising affluence of the production worker.
2. Increasing disenchantment with assembly line tasks and other repetitious, unchallenging jobs - a dissatisfaction fostered by the rising educational level of the work force.
3. A breakdown of the "work ethic" and work compulsion...that is the economic necessity of working.
4. A younger work force with fewer family responsibilities.

Sheridan noted that absenteeism is a withdrawal from an unfulfilling experience, a physical rather than a psychological withdrawal and is only a symptom. Poor communication and placing men in positions vacated by co-worker absenteeism can have a negative effect on job satisfaction, which in turn can create even more absenteeism.

Behaviorists have suggested that the workers stay home because they do not like their jobs and do not believe they make an important contribution to their work situation. Simple and routine jobs with little variation in subsequent days or years offer little hope for the future, or motivation to improve. Enrichment and redesigned jobs, shorter work weeks, three-twelve hour shifts or four-ten hour shifts have been a few methods suggested to improve worker satisfaction. In practice, the above mentioned methods reduced absenteeism at the expense of the increased stress on the worker. Doing meaningless jobs three or four days a week was still an empty experience; a poorly motivated work force still exists (21).

Three-hundred and fifty female clerical workers employed by a large firm in Montreal completed a job satisfaction questionnaire. The

responses were analyzed at specific intervals over a period of one year. After five months, twenty-six subjects who had completed the questionnaire had quit. Less satisfaction with their jobs had been reported by these subjects than was reported by the remaining three-hundred and nineteen. At the end of one year, the job satisfaction scores of the subjects continued to exhibit a significant relationship to the turnover. Subjects who had terminated had significantly lower job satisfaction scores at the time the questionnaire was administered than those who remained with the company (22).

Ross and Zander (23), in a study concerning the relationship between need satisfaction and employee turnover, suggested that the degree of satisfaction of certain personal needs supplied by employment had a direct relationship to the worker continuing to work in that situation. The authors attempted to determine the degree that the five personal needs affect the cohesiveness of the organization; that is, the result of those forces acting on all members in the direction of remaining in the organization. The hypothesis used was that those who resigned were less satisfied. The employees participating in the study were categorized according to the type of employment; for example, single-tentative or careerist. Those who resigned were matched with two remaining employees, one in a higher and one in a lower class within the category. A comparison between the matched employees' satisfaction as reported on the questionnaire was then made.

The personal needs (23) were defined as:

1. The need for personal recognition
2. Autonomy - personal independence or freedom
3. The feeling of doing work that is important

4. Evaluation by fair standards
5. Knowing important people in the organization

They theorized that anxiety may develop when the need for autonomy and evaluation by fair standards are not met in the job. The extent to which the job interferes with the family and community also may influence turnover. Financial independence was not measured as a direct influence, but it was thought that it may decrease the tolerance of each personal need satisfaction of the job and vice versa.

The questionnaire was composed of paired questions as to how much of a characteristic was present in the employee's estimation and how important that characteristic was to the employee. The difference between the importance question and the amount perceived question was used to determine the overall satisfaction with the job.

The level of significance was measured by a one-tailed test. The results of the comparisons showed recognition had a significantly higher rating from the remaining employee. Those who had resigned rated all the personal needs lower, but not significantly. Ross and Zander (23) found that satisfaction related to higher order needs and performance more closely than lower order needs. The difference in the relationships was not great. They concluded that those whose needs were met on the job were likely to remain with the firm.

Turnover in the nursing profession was studied by Salek. He reported that while considerable research has been done concerning the major factors affecting organizational functions and personnel management, not every variable had been investigated in every situation or with relevant populations. Hence he distributed an anonymous questionnaire

made up of objective questions and write-in questions, to the Boston area nurses. These were returned to an outside agency (24).

Since women dominate the nursing profession, Salek hypothesized that job related factors were at work with a conflict between the wife and mother role and the career role. This is a conflict which is shared by many working women. Characteristically the nursing service has an added conflict in the working hours and rotating shifts. The less unique factors which may have an impact on turnover are: status differentials, wages, supervision, and communications. However, wages were cited as a universal problem in the nursing profession. Two-thirds of the turnover reported was classified as personal reasons, due to pregnancy or marriage. Other factors involved in turnover were poor communications with other professionals on the staff and the vague definition of nursing duties. Factors thought to have bearing on turnover such as social relations, wages and fatigue were not discriminatory between stayers and leavers. Recently graduated nurses frequently noted the differences between their expectations and the on the job situation. If this difference was strong, the nurse was likely to resign as shown from the survey results (24).

Job expectancy was found to be an important factor in turnover in a study by Scott. Prospective employees were found to have preconceived ideas of the roles they would have in their jobs. If these ideas were not met, the result was frustration, disillusionment, and frequently, early termination. This evidence indicated that a realistic description of what was expected in the work situation must be given to the prospective employee. This practice could save the employer training time and money as well as avoiding employee demoralization (25).

These studies have concentrated mainly on the reasons employees have left organizations. Flowers and Hughes (26) indicated that the reasons employees stay are equally or more important than the reasons employees leave, in maintaining a motivated productive work force. They found in some cases that the employees of Texas Instruments stayed for reasons totally unrelated to the job situation and were considered lacking in motivation on the job. Other employees were found leaving for non-work related reasons although highly motivated in their work situation. This employee movement was defined as inertia. Inertia was divided into internal factors, satisfaction within the company environment, and external factors, satisfaction outside the company. Examples of these factors were as follows:

Internal	External
Achievement	Outside job opportunities
Recognition	Community relations
Responsibility	Financial obligations
Growth	Family ties
Individual Motivation	Friendships

The undesirable types of employees were 1) the "turn-overs" who were dissatisfied with their jobs and had few environmental pressures to keep them, and 2) the "turn-offs" who are dissatisfied and remain mainly because of external or environmental factors. The desirable types of employees were 1) the "turn-ons" who are highly motivated and remain because of job satisfaction and 2) the "turn-on-plus" who are most highly motivated and have environmental factors keeping them on the job.

To reduce turnover and attain a work force of the desirable types of employees, employee inertia should be weakened by means of the company

providing conditions which are compatible with the employee's values for working and living. Flowers and Hughes (26) suggested this was best accomplished by doing unto others as they would have you do unto them.

One major study has been done directly with the food service industry. Fisher and Gaurnier (2) scanned the needs of eighteen various types of food service organizations. These researchers' goal was to develop a model of career progression, since career progression was thought to be one of the major problems related to turnover in the industry. It was hoped that this model would result in optimal horizontal and vertical advancement for non-management personnel consistent with reducing the human and financial costs presently associated with high turnover rates.

Personal interviews were conducted and questionnaires were distributed to three hundred employees among eighteen organizations. The areas investigated included information concerning educational background, previous employment, length of employment, and attitudes toward the effectiveness of the training received, perception of the working conditions, and perceptions of upward and horizontal intra-organizational promotional potential (2).

The findings of this study were similar to those which had been reported in other industries. Primarily, food service turnover rates were inflated by including part-time employees who had predetermined plans for termination. Other findings (2) indicated the greatest frequency of turnover was during the first three months of employment. Unstructured

and invisible promotional opportunities, and unsatisfactory psychological and physical working environments were discouraging to non-management personnel. Furthermore, the food service industry is easily entered and easily left due to a questionable image, relatively low wages and benefits, absence of uniform standards, substandard training, and a lack of an upward orientation.

The recommendations (2) arising from the findings of this study spelled out the corrective measures needed. Corrective suggestions included rectifying deplorable physical working conditions, development of a human relations and a training program, development of a career "ladder" for non-management personnel and a means of measuring the investment in human resources.

Fournies (27) summarized the reasons people quit, supporting the findings of all of the above studies as:

1. Lack of recognition -- no one takes the time to tell him he (the employee) is important.
2. Lacking the advancement opportunities -- stemming from an emphasis on outside recruitment.
3. Too many bosses, ambiguous lines of responsibility and authority.
4. Personality conflict through informal group castration or boss picks on, embarrasses or insults the employee.
5. Overqualification, results in boredom.

By knowing the causes and minimizing them, turnover can be reduced.

According to Snelling (28), the following practices will help reduce turnover.

1. An increased emphasis on careful selection and placement of employees.
2. Recognition of ambitions, and giving recognition and added responsibility accordingly.
3. Giving enough work at or above the ability of the employee, check work loads and train for challenging assignments.

4. Equal remuneration for burden and responsibility.
5. Point out advantages of changes or new systems.
6. Employers must point out the advantages of extended service if restlessness occurs.

Techniques for Surveying Attitudes

The National Institute of Industrial Psychology compared the non-directive interview method with the self-completed questionnaire. The questionnaire was carefully designed in light of past surveys. Two sample groups of different sizes, from the same company, comparable in terms of department, grade, age, and length of service, were used. The questionnaire, excluding design but including analysis and reporting, was faster than the interview. Quality of the information was found to be similar although non-response was higher for the questionnaire method. In many instances the information gathered by the two methods was identical. Questionnaire results emerged more clearly and recommendations could be made with greater confidence. From these data the questionnaire was found to be a useful alternative to the interview (29).

Speed and cheapness are advantages occurring from use of self-completed questionnaires as compared with any form of interview. In addition, there appears to be less possibility of the interviewer bias-coloring the material collected in conjunction with obtaining information on matters which the subject may find personal or embarrassing to discuss face to face with a stranger.

The self-completed questionnaire also has disadvantages. For example, they are normally considered suitable only when the questions are clear and straight forward enough to be understood without any explanation other than printed instructions and definitions. A great deal of

skill is needed to design a questionnaire so that it will be acceptable and valid; it will restrict the range of information gained and does not provide any opportunity to clarify ambiguous answers. There is no way to ensure a maximum response to all questions or to assess the importance or sincerity of a response in the light of the manner in which it was made. Questionnaires may be inappropriate when it is important to obtain a spontaneous response without the opportunity to discuss the questions with others. Finally, response rates may be low and can affect the validity and reliability of the results obtained (29).

Many of the studies used the questionnaire method to obtain their data. Levine (30) surveyed the retail operations with an objective of validating the anonymous questionnaire method for reliability of responses. Unannounced interviews with persons who had filled out a questionnaire showed a perfect correlation between the reasons given for separation on the questionnaire and the interview. Similarly, a low correlation was observed between the official company exit interview files and the interviewed responses. Therefore the questionnaire method is considered a feasible method with validity for surveying employees, provided the subjects' confidence is secured.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Situation

Thirteen member institutions of the National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS) operating in the State of Virginia were invited to participate in this study. Membership in NACUFS requires the food service to be operated within the college or university system as opposed to a contracted operation. The institutions invited to participate were described in their respective 1972 college catalogues and the 1973 World Almanac as follows:

Randolph-Macon College is a small (800 students) co-ed liberal arts school located in the Ashland residential community approximately fifteen miles from downtown Richmond.

Sweetbriar College is a women's (750 students) college with a highly religious and ethical atmosphere located in the Blue Ridge Mountains, approximately twenty-five miles from Lynchburg.

Mary Baldwin College is a small college (700 students) of Presbyterian origins located approximately thirty-six miles from Charlottesville.

Ferrum Jr. College is a two year co-ed college (1000 students) located in the Roanoke Valley, approximately forty minutes from Roanoke.

Hampton Institute is a fairly large college (2000+ students) located in Hampton, Virginia, approximately fifteen miles from Newport News.

Lynchburg College is located in Lynchburg and has a student enrollment of 1600.

Madison College is an arts and science college (4500 students) located in Harrisonburg, Virginia near Interstate Route 81.

Virginia Union University has a religious background and a student enrollment approaching 1400. It is located in Richmond, Virginia.

Sullins College is a two year liberal arts college (300 students) located in Bristol, Virginia near Interstate Route 81.

Old Dominion University is located in Norfolk, Virginia with a student population approaching 10,000.

Eastern Mennonite is located in Harrisonburg, Virginia and has a student population of 926.

Roanoke College is located in Roanoke, Virginia with a student enrollment of 1,200.

University of Virginia is located in Charlottesville, Virginia and has a student population of 12,300.

The institutions employ a range of 20 to 100 food service employees in positions which have primary responsibilities in the following areas: serving customers, preparing food, pre-preparing food, and clean-up. Examples of position titles for each category are "counter server," "cooks, bakers, and helpers," "vegetable preparation and pre-portioning," and "dishwash and potwash," as well as administrative positions.

The wage earning employee in these institutions is paid by the hour with wages ranging from \$1.65 to \$3.55 depending upon the position and which institution they worked for. If salaries were computed on an hourly basis, the employees on salary earned from \$1.90 to \$6.25 per hour for positions according to responsibility associated with the position.

Fringe benefits for the wage earning employee were limited to free meals while on duty in most institutions. Salaried workers enjoyed benefits such as vacation, holiday, and sick leave with pay, physical examinations paid for by the food service operation, hospitalization and life insurance options paid for by the employee, but at group rates, retirement programs and remission of tuition up to 80 per cent for the employee and/or children of employees as well as guaranteed twelve month employment. This information was obtained from a fact sheet sent to each director of the institutions participating. However, only five returned them, and some were not complete as far as the fringe benefits offered to the employees.

The average educational level of the wage earner in food service was the seventh grade as estimated by the director of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Food Service and the director of the Virginia

Polytechnic Institute and State University Personnel Department. This was expected to affect the rate of returns and was considered in the development of the questionnaires.

An initial letter of introduction was sent to each director by Mr. H. King, Jr. of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Food Service asking for their cooperation in this study. Through correspondence with the directors, the original methodology in which the questionnaires were mailed directly to each employee's home address, had to be changed as several of the universities prohibited the release of the employee addresses.

Sufficient questionnaires, stamped self-addressed envelopes, blank stamped envelopes, and a letter of instructions were mailed to the directors of each institution's food service operation. Each current employee was to receive one current employee questionnaire and a stamped self-addressed envelope to return the questionnaire to the author, care of the Department of Human Nutrition and Foods. The directors were requested to mail a copy of the past employee questionnaire plus a return envelope to their employees that had terminated within the past year in the blank envelope provided. It was hoped that the employees would answer sincerely and honestly because their responses were mailed directly to the author, hence their employer would not see their responses. The questionnaires were not marked in any way; identification of the source university was intended to be determined through the post mark on the return envelope. Unfortunately, a lack of legible post marks caused difficulty in identifying the source university for many of the returned questionnaires.

The Questionnaire

Two self completion questionnaires were developed, one for the current employee and one for the past employee. This was necessary to avoid wording confusion in responding to the questions. Samples of the Questionnaires may be found in Appendix C. Factors identified in the literature as possible sources of satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the job were: wages and fringe benefits, career opportunities, supervision characteristics, job characteristics, and facilities and social characteristics. Questions were developed in these areas. The number of questions developed was determined by the frequency of mentions which the areas received in the literature as influencing turnover. The questions were presented in a paired format as in the following example using a Likert-type scale.

How much pleasure do you get from doing your job?

1	2	3	4	5
none	a little	some	quite a bit	very much

How important is it to you to get pleasure from doing your job?

1	2	3	4	5
none	a little	some	quite a bit	very much

The respondents were asked to circle one number which best described their opinion. Each question was worded, with the aid of the Education Department and the Personnel Department of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, so that a person with a seventh grade education would be able to understand them. The questions were chosen so that they would apply to the majority of the wage earning employees. As

expected, some questions did not apply, as in the case of the head baker at one of the food services. He noted that because he was the head of the department, promotional opportunity questions were difficult to answer for him.

A pre-test of the questionnaires showed a completion time range of ten to twenty-six minutes. It was conducted during the summer with Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Food Service employees. The employees ranged from a high school degree or equivalency degree to a sixth grade education. These pre-test results also indicated those words with which the employees had trouble. These words were replaced with simpler words or phrases for the pilot test. The employees were asked to circle those words they did not understand as they completed the questionnaire.

The pilot study questionnaire was mailed, with a stamped self-addressed envelope, to the current and former employees of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Food Service. The returned questionnaires were computer analyzed. The resulting changes included a restructuring of the format and wording of some of the questions on part one of the questionnaire to clarify these questions. The part two questions themselves were not changed. However, the method of analysis was changed to a weighted rather than a summed technique. The weighted technique is further explained in the succeeding description of the analysis of the questionnaire.

Analysis

After data were collected from both groups of subjects the returned questionnaires were coded and key-punched for analysis by use of the computer. A chi-square test of independence was used for comparison of the fact sheet data with the current or past status of the employee. The decision level for significance was set at 0.05. A multiple regression test of independence was used to determine the significance of the relationships between the independent variables and the designated dependent variable. The program allowed the dependent variable to be changed. A summed weighted average of the employee responses was used to determine the overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction rating of the individual employees for each area of questions. A break-down of the questions for each area is presented in Appendix D. These weighted averages were analyzed for the average of current and past employees as per their responses to the fact sheet questions. The weighted averages for each employee were determined by the following formula contained in the chi-square program.

$$\text{Weighted Average} = \frac{(R_1 \times W_1) + (R_2 \times W_2) + (R_3 \times W_3) \dots + (R_n \times W_n)}{W_1 + W_2 + W_3 \dots + W_n}$$

where R = response to the how much
perceived question

W = response to the how
important question

This technique offers a more concise quantitative representation of the individual thought process or satisfaction experienced by the employee.

The variables found to be significant at the 0.05 level by the chi-square and regression tests of independence were looked at in relation to the employees' overall rating of their satisfaction.

The hypothesis tested was that employees who had separated from their respective college food service operation, experienced less satisfaction per characteristic than the employees who remained in a food service operation. Characteristics tested are listed on page 26. Demographic variables, such as sex, found in Part I of the questionnaire, were tested for significance to determine if any of the variables consistently related to the current or past status as reported by the participants. The demographic variables were also used in the comparison of the mean satisfaction levels to see if trends could be observed which identified vital or social statistics of employees who were satisfied with a food service job.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The primary objective of this study was to investigate, through use of a questionnaire, the factors which affect turnover in a college or university food service operation.

Caution must be emphasized before drawing conclusions from these data. A total of 297 questionnaires were sent to past employees and 694 questionnaires were sent to current employees of the participating Virginia member institutions of the National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS). Twenty-one completed questionnaires, or seven per cent, were returned from the former employees and 149, or 21 per cent, were returned from the current employees. The low return may be partially attributed to an overestimation for each institution. Those directors who returned the institution fact sheet indicated turnover rates much lower than the national average for food service operations. Four of the schools decided not to participate in the study after the questionnaires had been distributed to the food service directors (see Appendix B) and were eliminated from the sample and analysis. The revised percentages resulting from these eliminations were 34.5 per cent return for current employees and 9.9 per cent return for past employees.

Determination of Significant Variables by Chi-Square

Table I presents the results of the chi-square test of independence. The chi-square test computed test statistics for the Part I questions as independent variables, and the current or past status of the employee

TABLE I
Chi-Square Analysis
Sex

	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Male	41	27.7	8	38.1
Female	107	72.3	13	61.9

$\chi^2 = 0.526$; 1 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 3.84$; n.s.

	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Younger than 26	17	11.5	8	38.1
26 - 35	32	21.6	2	9.5
36 - 45	30	20.3	4	19.1
Older than 45	69	46.6	7	33.3

$\chi^2 = 8.635$; 3 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 7.81$; s.

TABLE I (continued)

Number of Previous Jobs

	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Less than 4	142	95.3	20	95.2
4 - 5	6	4.0	1	4.8
More than 5	1	0.7	0	0.0

$\chi^2 = 0.000$; 2 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 3.84$; n.s.

Length of Service

	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
1 - 3 months	8	5.4	1	4.8
4 - 6 months	10	6.7	0	0.0
7 months - 1 yr	3	2.0	1	4.8
over 1 year	128	85.9	19	90.5

$\chi^2 = 1.148$; 3 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 7.81$; n.s.

TABLE I (continued)

	Education			
	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Elementary	44	29.5	6	28.6
High School	67	45.0	11	52.4
College +	14	9.4	3	14.3
Trade School	24	16.1	1	4.8

$\chi^2 = 2.145$; 3 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 7.81$; n.s.

	Method of Pay			
	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Wage	125	83.9	13	61.9
Salary	24	16.1	8	38.1

$\chi^2 = 4.474$; 1 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 3.84$; s.

TABLE I (continued)

	Breadwinner			
	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Yes	76	51.0	8	38.1
No	73	49.0	13	61.9

$\chi^2 = 0.765$; 1 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 3.84$; n.s.

	How They Applied			
	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Just applied	37	24.8	9	42.9
Heard about it from a friend or relative	99	66.4	10	47.6
Saw an ad	5	3.4	0	0.0
Applied through an agency	8	5.4	2	9.5

$\chi^2 = 3.584$; 3 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 3.36$; s.

TABLE I (continued)

	Worked in Food Service Before			
	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Yes	93	62.4	10	47.6
No	56	37.6	11	52.4

$\chi^2 = 1.125$; 1 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 3.84$; n.s.

	Position			
	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Serving Customers	30	20.1	6	28.6
Preparing food	49	32.9	7	33.3
Other	23	15.4	6	28.6
Pre-preparing food	15	10.1	1	4.8
Clean-up	32	21.5	1	4.8

$\chi^2 = 5.347$; 4 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 9.49$; n.s.

TABLE I (continued)

	Current		Past	
	Observed	Per cent of sample	Observed	Per cent of sample
Recognition	28	18.8	7	33.3
Promotion	6	4.0	0	0.0
Social	61	40.9	6	28.6
Remuneration	49	32.9	8	38.1
Other	5	3.4	0	0.0

$\chi^2 = 2.908$; 4 d.f.; $P \leq (0.05) = 9.49$; n.s.

as the dependent variable. The variables of age, method of pay, and how the employees applied for the job were significant at the 0.05 level. However, chi-square comparisons had some cells with frequencies of less than five causing the researcher to question the validity of the findings. A significant chi-square statistic indicates that the discrepancies between the observed and the expected frequencies were too great to be attributed to chance. This means for the variable of age, the distribution of employees which concentrated in the older age groups was not due to chance.

Examining the sample distribution by per cent, Table I, shows more clearly that the majority of the current employees (46.6 per cent) were older than 46 whereas the past employees concentrated in the younger than 25 age group (38.1 per cent) and in the older than 46 age group (33.3 per cent). The same situation occurs in the method of pay variable in that the current (83.9 per cent) and the former (61.9 per cent) employees were paid by the hour. Significance for the variable of how the employee applied for the job shows that most employees, both current and past, heard about their jobs from a friend or a relative. These data indicate that the food service operations tend to employ older persons, pay them by the hour, and rely on word of mouth for attracting persons to the institution.

Table I also contains the per cent of the sample which responded to each of the answers of the questions on Part I. A composite picture may be sketched by combining the characteristics possessed by the majority of the employees as per the percentages. Accordingly the current employee described by these data was female, over 46, and had less than three jobs

in the past three years. The current employees may further be described as having worked for their respective food service more than one year and as having a high school education. Paid by the hour, she considers her earnings as supplemental income, and heard about the job from a friend or a relative. This employee had worked in food service before this job, and holds a position in food preparation. Finally, the most important consideration in a job was liking co-workers and supervision personnel.

The past employee possessed similar characteristics except she was, in most cases, younger than 26 years. Having no previous experience in food service before this job, the past employee considers being paid well the most important consideration in a job. This may be considered an indicator of a successful or unsuccessful employee which, with further validation, food service operators may wish to consider in their hiring practices. If the food service operator found this description unsatisfactory, he may be encouraged to change the food service image according to the findings of Fisher and Gaurnier (2) as reported in the review of literature.

Regression Analysis

The regression analysis results are presented in Table II. The decision level for significance was set at 0.05. The independent variables explained 20 per cent of the variation of the dependent variable.

When current or past status was the dependent variable, the only significant variable was sex (-2.17). According to these data, women

TABLE II

Regression Analysis Results

At the 0.05 level, $\pm 1.645^*$

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables**			Number of Previous Jobs	Most Important Factor
	Current or Past Status	Method of Pay	Pay		
Age	-0.49		0.05	3.07*	-1.47
Sex	-2.17*		-1.19	-0.77	0.87
Number of Previous Jobs	0.26		-0.37		-1.43
Length of Service	0.68		-0.19	-9.43*	-0.99
Education	-0.14		0.73	0.81	0.48
Method of Pay	0.61			-0.63	0.45
Breadwinner	-0.04		-1.89*	-3.53*	0.41
How They Applied	-0.46		1.97*	-0.81	0.27
Marital Status	-0.94		0.24	-1.20	0.54
Position	-1.29		0.06	0.25	-1.29
Worked in Food Service Before	1.49		-1.02	0.27	-2.03*
Most Important Factor	-0.21		1.27	-1.43	
Career Opportunities	0.43		1.63	-0.63	0.64
Wages & Fringe Benefits	0.57		1.75*	-1.03	0.69
Supervision Characteristics	-1.39		0.95	-0.08	0.27
Job Characteristics	-0.98		-1.06	0.29	-1.02
Facilities & Social Characteristics	-0.56		-0.93	0.07	-2.39*
Importance of Having a Job	0.15		0.69	0.52	2.42*
Current or Past Status			0.13	0.24	-0.21

* A significant relationship observed with these variables.

** Reported as the computed t-value.

TABLE II (continued)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables**			
	Career Opportunities	Wages & Fringe Benefits	Supervision Characteristics	Job Characteristics
Age	-0.64	-0.01	0.89	0.83
Sex	-1.01	1.25	1.05	-0.77
Number of Previous Jobs	-0.64	-1.03	-0.08	0.29
Length of Service	-1.42	-0.56	-0.81	2.11*
Education	-1.38	-0.86	0.21	0.66
Method of Pay	1.29	1.75*	0.93	-0.58
Breadwinner	-2.74*	-0.50	-0.73	0.96
How They Applied	-2.03*	-0.73	1.17	-0.20
Marital Status	-1.17	-0.43	-0.07	-0.35
Position	-0.49	1.69*	-1.34	0.46
Worked in Food Service Before	0.38	-1.05	1.69*	-0.26
Most Important Factor	0.64	0.69	0.27	-1.02
Career Opportunities	2.54*	2.54*	1.56	3.90*
Wages & Fringe Benefits	1.56	1.99*	1.99*	1.02
Supervision Characteristics	3.90*	1.02	3.59*	3.59*
Job Characteristics	-1.12	-0.09	4.24*	2.84*
Facilities & Social Characteristics	-0.83	-0.83	-0.24	1.61
Importance of Having a Job	0.37	0.43	-1.35	1.02
Current or Past Status				

* A significant relationship observed with these variables.

** Reported as computed t-values.

TABLE II (continued)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables**	
	Facilities & Social Characteristics	Education
Age	-2.83*	-3.31*
Sex	1.52	-0.60
Number of Previous Jobs	0.07	0.81
Length of Service	-0.22	-0.65
Education	-0.68	
Method of Pay	-0.88	0.31
Breadwinner	0.31	-1.25
How They Applied	-0.76	-0.85
Marital Status	1.25	0.67
Position	0.08	-0.13
Worked in Food Service Before	-1.36	-0.52
Most Important Factor	-2.39*	0.48
Career Opportunities	-1.12	-1.38
Wages & Fringe Benefits	-0.09	-0.85
Supervision Characteristics	4.24*	0.21
Job Characteristics	2.84*	0.66
Facilities & Social Characteristics		-0.68
Importance of Having a Job	1.19	-0.32
Current or Past Status	-0.49	0.08

* A significant relationship observed with these variables.

** Reported as computed t-values.

constitute a larger portion of the current employees. This concentration contradicts the findings of the Fisher and Gaurnier (2) study whose findings in commercial restaurants indicated a predominance of male employees. This concentration of women in these college food services may well be the result of the industry's image, i.e., these jobs being women oriented.

Designating the method by which the employee was paid as the dependent variable, the variables of breadwinner (-1.89), how they applied for the job (1.97), and wages and fringe benefits (1.75) were significant. This relationship may indicate that the employees considered the earnings as supplemental income, that they applied for the job after hearing about it from a friend or a relative, and were satisfied with the wages and fringe benefits offered by their employer.

Assigning the number of jobs in the past three years as the dependent variable, significance was observed with the variables of age (3.07), length of service (-9.43), and breadwinner status (-3.53). Younger employees were related to having more jobs than older employees in the past three years. The strong relationship observed with the length of service variable indicates that the employees with one year or more of service had less than three jobs in the past three years. Likewise, employees with less than three months on the job related to having more than six jobs in the past three years. The breadwinner relationship between the employee with less than three months of service indicated this employee was not the breadwinner of the family. Likewise, the employee with more than one year of service was the breadwinner of the family, according to these data.

The most important factor, listed in Table I, showed a relationship with the variables of having worked in food service before (-2.03), satisfaction with facilities and social characteristics (-2.39), and the rating for the importance of having a job (2.42). Those persons who had worked in food service before gave greater weight to remuneration and social characteristics. Those persons who had not worked before gave greater weight to recognition. The relationship with the satisfaction ratings for facilities and social characteristics indicated a relationship to the social characteristics and remuneration as the most important factor in a job. Finally, a high rating of importance of having a job was related to remuneration as the most important factor in a job.

Assigning career opportunities as the dependent variable showed a significant relationship with the variables of breadwinner status (-2.74), how the employee applied (-2.03), the attitude towards wages and fringe benefits (2.54), and job characteristics satisfaction ratings (3.90). Persons who were reported as breadwinners of the family indicated a great deal of satisfaction with the career opportunities. Similarly the employee who just applied or applied after hearing about the job from a friend or a relative exhibited greater satisfaction with the career opportunities. Satisfaction ratings of the dependent variable showed a positive relationship to the ratings for the independent variables of job characteristics and wages and fringe benefits.

When wages and fringe benefits were designated as the dependent variable, the method of remuneration (1.75), the position the employee occupied (1.69), career opportunities (2.54), and supervision

characteristics (1.99) were significant. A positive relationship was observed between the dependent variables' satisfaction ratings for supervision and career opportunities. The relationship with the position the employee occupied, listed in Table I, associated the highest ratings of satisfaction to the positions of preparation and serving customers. The lower satisfaction ratings related to the positions of pre-preparation and clean-up. Wage earning employees related to a lower satisfaction rating.

Considering supervision characteristics as the dependent variable, having worked before (1.69), wages and fringe benefits (1.99), job characteristics (3.59), and facilities and social characteristics (4.24) were significant.

Job characteristics, as the dependent variable, related positively with the variables of career opportunities (3.90), supervision characteristics (3.59), and facilities and social characteristics (2.84). Length of service (2.11) was also significant, indicating employees with one year and over were most satisfied.

Designating facilities and social characteristics as the dependent variable, age (-2.83), the most important factor (-2.39), supervision characteristics (4.24), and job characteristics (2.84) were significant.

Finally, education level as the dependent variable related significantly with age (-3.31). The relationship indicated the older persons were likely to have had an elementary education while the younger personnel were inclined to have attended trade school.

Satisfaction Levels by Category

Tables III through XIV present the comparison of reported mean satisfaction levels according to employee responses to the demographic variables of Part I of the questionnaire. The past employees reported higher ratings of satisfaction for wages and fringe benefits in 41 per cent of the descriptive variables. Similar findings were reported by Ross and Zander (23) for the variables mutually tested. Most differences between the mean satisfaction ratings reported by current and past employees were small.

Examining the satisfaction levels, reported in Table IV, the male employee tended to rate his satisfaction with the characteristics tested higher than did the female in both the current and past employee categories. Table V indicates that the current salaried employee rated the characteristics higher except for job and facilities and social characteristics. Past wage employees rated all of the characteristics lower than past salaried employees except wages and fringe benefits and the importance of having a job. Examining the employees' ratings according to the number of previous jobs (Table VI), current employee satisfaction tended to decrease or remain the same as the number of previous jobs held increased, except for the variables of supervision and importance of having a job which increased.

Current employees (Table VII) reported slightly higher satisfaction than the past employees regardless of breadwinner status. If the current employee had worked in food service before this job, he tended to be more satisfied with the characteristics than was the current employee who had not worked in food service before (Table VIII).

TABLE III

Satisfaction Levels by Current or Past Status

	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.71	2.36
Wages & Fringe Benefits	3.05	3.10
Supervision Characteristics	5.22	4.46
Job Characteristics	3.80	3.49
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.11	3.75
Importance of Having a Job	4.81	4.59

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE IV

Satisfaction Levels by Sex

	Males		Females	
	Current	Past	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.68	2.13	2.56	2.58
Wages & Fringe Benefits	3.02	3.42	3.07	2.78
Supervision Characteristics	5.36	4.37	5.07	4.55
Job Characteristics	3.84	3.37	3.75	3.61
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.31	3.86	3.91	3.64
Importance of having a Job	4.83	4.63	4.79	4.54

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE V

Satisfaction Levels by How They Were Paid

	Wages		Salary	
	Current	Past	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.50	2.12	3.03	2.87
Wages & Fringe Benefits	2.93	2.95	3.65	3.15
Supervision Characteristics	5.13	4.11	5.29	5.08
Job Characteristics	3.79	3.28	3.74	3.91
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.05	3.52	3.88	4.06
Importance of Having a Job	4.78	4.92	4.92	4.00

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE VI
 Satisfaction Levels According to
 the Number of Previous Jobs
 (Past Three Years)

	Less Than 3		4 - 5		More Than 6	
	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past*
Career Opportunities	2.59	2.39	2.69	2.82	2.25	0.00
Wages & Fringe Benefits	3.06	3.03	2.94	2.89	1.33	0.00
Supervision Character- istics	5.18	4.49	4.39	4.29	6.49	0.00
Job Characteristics	3.79	3.56	3.51	2.69	3.80	0.00
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.03	3.77	3.84	2.80	4.00	0.00
Importance of having a job	4.80	4.55	4.83	5.00	5.00	0.00

* No employees responded in this category.

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE VII

Satisfaction Levels According to
Breadwinner Status

	Yes		No	
	Current	Past	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.84	2.65	2.32	2.26
Wages & Fringe Benefits	3.16	2.95	2.92	3.07
Supervision Characteristics	5.24	4.79	5.08	4.92
Job Characteristics	3.78	3.80	3.78	3.35
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.07	3.73	3.97	3.73
Importance of having a job	4.80	4.50	4.97	4.62

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE VIII

Satisfaction Levels According to Having
Worked in Food Service Before

	Yes		No	
	Current	Past	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.59	2.20	2.58	2.59
Wages & Fringe Benefits	3.13	3.03	2.90	3.02
Supervision Characteristics	5.15	4.25	5.17	4.69
Job Characteristics	3.78	3.57	3.78	3.47
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.05	3.72	3.97	3.73
Importance of having a job	4.80	4.70	4.80	4.45

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

Consideration of the factor of age (Table IX) indicates current employees in the decade 36 to 45 years were generally more satisfied in their jobs. Employees with less than three months of service (Table X) were considered transient, however, they reported higher satisfaction than those employees with three to six months of service. Satisfaction after six months tended to increase as length of service increased.

No trends could be observed when the satisfaction levels were examined according to the most important factor (Table XI) reported by the employees. However, employees who responded that recognition was the most important factor rated supervision characteristics highest, since the supervisor is the source of recognition. Similarly, no pattern emerged when the satisfaction levels were examined according to how they applied for the job (Table XII) other than a slightly higher satisfaction rating from the current employees.

Table XIII shows that currently employed widow(er)s appeared to be the most satisfied based on the characteristics tested. Those employees currently occupying a position described as "other" (Table XIV) were the most satisfied of all the position categories.

TABLE IX

Satisfaction Levels According to Age

	Younger than 26		26 - 35		36 - 45		Older than 45	
	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.40	2.42	2.69	3.00	2.87	1.75	2.46	2.60
Wages & Fringe Benefits	2.78	2.89	2.91	3.42	3.14	2.17	3.14	3.55
Supervision Characteristics	4.80	4.57	5.00	4.64	5.30	3.37	5.26	4.97
Job Characteristics	3.63	3.75	3.79	3.00	3.71	3.30	3.82	3.53
Facilities & Social Characteristics	3.82	3.68	3.85	3.09	3.96	3.44	4.17	4.12
Importance of having a job	4.71	4.50	4.78	5.00	4.93	5.00	4.77	4.29

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE X
Satisfaction Levels According to
Length of Service

	1 - 3 mo.		4 - 6 mo.		7 mo. - 1 yr.		Over 1 year	
	Current	Past	Current	Past*	Current	Past	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.80	2.82	2.64	0.00	2.68	1.00	2.57	2.46
Wages & Fringe Benefits	2.86	2.89	3.12	0.00	3.71	3.89	3.03	3.01
Supervision Characteristics	5.37	4.29	4.83	0.00	4.75	3.59	5.18	4.45
Job Character- istics	3.62	2.69	3.54	0.00	3.85	1.21	3.81	3.69
Facilities & Social Characteristics	3.96	2.80	3.81	0.00	3.88	4.13	4.04	3.75
Importance of having a job	4.88	5.00	4.60	0.00	5.00	5.00	4.80	4.53

* No employees responded in this category.

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE XI

Satisfaction Levels According to the Most Important Factor

	Recognition		Promotion		Social		Remuneration		Other	
	Current	Past	Current	Past*	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past*
Career Opportunities	2.41	2.77	2.60	0.00	2.71	1.95	2.56	2.43	2.31	0.00
Wages & Fringe Benefits	2.88	3.18	2.57	0.00	3.08	3.37	3.16	2.63	3.00	0.00
Supervision Characteristics	5.26	4.97	4.75	0.00	5.17	4.28	5.13	4.20	5.28	0.00
Job Characteristics	3.86	3.91	3.96	0.00	3.77	3.38	3.75	3.28	3.45	0.00
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.27	4.28	3.95	0.00	4.06	3.53	3.84	3.39	3.95	0.00
Importance of having a job	4.86	3.71	4.50	0.00	4.74	5.00	4.86	5.00	5.00	0.00

* No employee responded in this category.

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE XII
Satisfaction Levels According to How They Applied

	Just Applied		Heard from Friend		Saw an Ad		Through an Agency	
	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past*	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.95	2.51	2.49	2.37	2.82	0.00	2.05	2.13
Wages & Fringe Benefits	3.14	3.25	3.00	2.95	4.04	0.00	2.53	2.42
Supervision Characteristics	5.33	4.85	5.05	4.21	5.82	0.00	5.33	4.19
Job Characteristics	3.95	3.77	3.71	3.36	4.21	0.00	3.63	3.20
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.12	3.88	3.99	3.58	4.69	0.00	3.50	3.78
Importance of having a job	4.86	4.78	4.76	4.30	5.00	0.00	4.88	5.00

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE XIII

Satisfaction Levels According to Marital Status

	Married		Single		Widow(er)		Separated		Divorced	
	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past*	Current	Past*	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.58	2.29	2.49	2.75	2.88	0.00	2.94	0.00	2.22	1.50
Wages & Fringe Benefits	3.08	3.00	2.92	3.29	2.92	0.00	3.22	0.00	3.04	1.67
Supervision Characteristics	5.13	4.25	5.32	4.95	5.35	0.00	4.89	0.00	5.12	4.26
Job Characteristics	3.82	3.27	3.75	3.91	3.81	0.00	3.72	0.00	3.62	4.04
Facilities & Social Characteristics	4.01	3.48	3.80	4.25	4.29	0.00	4.02	0.00	4.27	3.27
Importance of having a job	4.78	4.77	4.70	4.14	4.92	0.00	4.85	0.00	4.93	5.00

57

* No employee responded in this category.

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

TABLE XIV

Satisfaction Levels According to Position

	Serving Customers		Preparation		Other		Clean-Up		Pre-preparation	
	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past
Career Opportunities	2.64	2.51	2.61	2.84	2.82	1.94	2.44	1.00	2.40	3.00
Wages & Fringe Benefits	2.95	2.68	2.91	3.07	3.49	3.32	2.98	3.00	3.13	3.00
Supervision Characteristics	4.95	4.64	5.37	4.94	5.36	3.97	4.99	4.31	4.93	3.56
Job Characteristics	3.69	3.56	3.75	4.13	4.07	3.00	3.69	2.62	3.79	3.00
Facilities & Social Characteristics	3.80	3.81	3.99	3.79	4.33	3.72	4.16	3.57	3.79	3.00
Importance of having a job	4.60	4.67	4.88	4.00	4.78	5.00	4.84	5.00	4.87	5.00

58

* No employee responded in this category.

Mean scores as reported by employees in each category.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this investigation was to determine, through use of a questionnaire, whether the current employees reported higher satisfaction ratings than the former employees for the variables tested and whether the food service employees were affected by the same factors influencing turnover as found in other studies. The hypothesis tested was that the employees who had separated from their respective college food service operations experienced less satisfaction per characteristic than the employees who remained in the food service operations. The characteristics tested were: career opportunities, wages and fringe benefits, supervision characteristics, job characteristics, and facilities and social characteristics. Demographic variables, such as age, were analyzed by chi-square to determine if any variable consistently related to the current or past status of the employees. The demographic variables were also used in the comparison of mean reported satisfaction levels to determine if trends could be observed which identified vital or social statistics of employees who were satisfied with a food service job.

The subjects were current and former employees of food service operations operating in Virginia and holding membership in the National Association of College and University Food Services. Data from these subjects was collected through two questionnaires, one for former and one for current employees, which were distributed by the participating directors of the food services. The questionnaires were mailed to the author in an envelope provided to the employees.

In the chi-square analysis of Part I of the questionnaire, the current or past status of the employees was the dependent variable. Those variables found significant at the 0.05 level were: age of the employees, how the employees applied for the job, and if the employees were paid by the hour or on salary. Although each of these variables had some expected frequencies that were less than five, which may invalidate the test, it was expected that the variation was greater than could be attributed to chance. These data agree with the Fisher and Gaurnier (2) study in that their findings indicated most of the food service employees were over 45 years of age. However, they found a greater concentration of males in their study, possibly due to their sample being taken from commercial restaurants. They did not investigate how the employee had applied for the job or how they were paid. The data from this study showed the majority of the employees applied for the job after hearing about it from a friend or a relative. This may indicate the college food services' tendency to rely on word of mouth recruiting to attract employees. The food service operator may be encouraged to employ other methods of recruitment and selection to assure an efficient, productive, and stable work force. The third significant variable indicated that employees, regardless of current or past status, were paid by the hour. If further research were to statistically indicate a salaried work force was more desirable, food service operators may be encouraged to increase the number of salaried positions.

The composite picture of the food service current employee derived from the concentrations of employees per demographic variable response may be described as a female over 45 years of age who has had less than

three jobs in the past three years. The employee had worked for the respective food service for more than one year, had a high school education and considered earnings as supplemental income. Further, the employee was likely to have heard about the job through a friend or a relative and had worked in a food service before the current job. The greatest response was from those who held a position in food preparation and who considered liking co-workers and supervision personnel the most important aspect of a job. Demographic data for the past employees were similar to that for the current employees. However, the past employees were: most likely to be younger than 25, had not worked in food service before the job in question, and considered being paid well the most important aspect of a job. Fisher and Gaurnier (2), because of similar findings, indicated a need to attract and hold a younger work force in order that the industry could keep up with the growing demands placed on commercial food service operations. This also seems to be the case for the college and university food services. The employees surveyed by the U. S. Department of Commerce found recognition to be the most important factor in a job situation and pay the least important. No published data was found which considered the past employees' ratings for important factors in a job. If the college food service operator finds this description of current employees unsatisfactory, he may wish to consult the Fisher and Gaurnier (2) study recommendations for improvement of the industry's image conducive to improving the work force.

Age was the only significant variable of the regression analysis when current or past status was the dependent variable. When characteristics that were found to influence turnover in other industries,

ascertained from the literature search, were employed as dependent variables, regression analysis indicated a positive relation among these variables and rating for satisfaction reported. These characteristics were: career opportunities, wages and fringe benefits, supervision characteristics, job characteristics, and facilities and social characteristics. Regression analysis also indicated that the employees may consider their earnings as supplemental income and that persons who were breadwinners tended to have worked for a longer period of time in their respective food service operation. These two factors may indicate increased family responsibility which, in turn, may add stability to the work force and could be considered when hiring employees.

In a comparison of satisfaction levels reported by current and past employees according to responses to demographic questions, the former employee generally was less satisfied with the characteristics tested. Former employees reported more satisfaction with wages and fringe benefits in 41 per cent of the descriptive variables.

Data from this study was not sufficient to conclude that the characteristics tested influenced the employees decision to terminate employment. Further research is needed to determine the influences of these factors on a termination decision. It is also feasible that the variables tested may not be the factors which influence a food service employee's decision to terminate. Perhaps more reliable factors may be external to the job as found by Flowers and Hughes (26).

Some difficulties encountered in this study that may have had an effect upon the results include a low response rate and an imbalance in

current employee and former employee returns. The returns showed a concentration of employees in the categories: female, over one year of service, and over 45 years of age. If these data are a representative sample of the college and university food service employees, then turnover may not be a problem in these college and university food service operations.

It is recommended that future studies relating turnover to satisfaction levels of food service employees survey a larger population and use an interview or other method which insures a higher response. The investigation should include factors external to the job and, finally, the pre-test should provide for rating the desirability of responses if regression analysis is to be used.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Gaudet, F.J. Labor Turnover: Calculation and Costs. New York: American Management Association, 1960.
2. Fisher, W.P., and P.L. Gaurnier. A Study of Career Ladders and Manpower Development for Non-Management Personnel in the Food Service Industry. Cornell University, School of Hotel Administration, 1970. Distributed by the National Technical Information Service, U. S. Department of Commerce.
3. Magill, D.A. Results in the commercial restaurant area, In The Society for the Advancement of Food Service Research, proceedings of the 26th conference. Texas, 1972.
4. Handbook of Labor Statistics. U. S. Department of Labor, 1973.
5. Kech, S. How to attract and keep career-oriented employees. Fast Food. 72: 99, 1973.
6. Lundberg, D.E., and J.P. Armatas. The Management of People in Hotels, Restaurants, and Clubs. Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1964.
7. Hall, J. Labor turnover: an effective tool for management. Cost and Management. 43: 37, 1969.
8. Gaudet, F.J. Turnover, it costs you more than you think. Supervisory Management. 4: 11, 1959.
9. Canfield, G.W. How to compute your labor turnover costs. Personnel Journal. 37: 413, 1959.
10. West, B., L. Wood, and V. Harger. Food Service in Institutions, 4th ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.
11. Brissenden, P.F. Labor Turnover in Industry, A Statistical Analysis. New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.
12. Palmer, G. The Reluctant Job Changer, Studies in Work Attachments and Aspirations. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962.
13. Stark, M.J. Turnover: pay does make a difference. Conference Board Review. 8: 48, 1971.

14. Maslow, A.H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954, Chapter 2.
15. Hunt, J.G., and J.W. Hill. A new look in motivation theory for organizational research. Human Organization. 28: 100, 1969.
16. Lawler, E.E., III. Why job design changes affect performance. Personnel Psychology. 22: 426, 1969.
17. Herzberg, F. One more time: how do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review. 46: 53, 1968.
18. Porter, L.W., and E.E. Lawler, III. Managerial Attitudes and Performance. Illinois: Richard D. Erwin, Inc., 1968.
19. Levoy, R.P. How to keep staff morale and motivation in high gear. Personnel Journal. 51: 913, 1972.
20. Imberman, A.A. What kinds of executives cause labor trouble? Bests Review. 72: 10, 1971.
21. Sheridan, J.H. Who didn't show up for work today? Industry Work. 174: 30, 1972.
22. Hullins, C. Job satisfaction and turnover in a female clerical population. Journal of Applied Psychology. 52: 280, 1960.
23. Ross, I.C., and A. Zander. Need satisfaction and employee turnover. Personnel Psychology. 10: 327, 1957.
24. Salek, S.D., and R.J. Lee, and E.P. Prein. Why nurses leave their jobs. Personnel Administration. 28: 25, 1965.
25. Scott, R.D. Job expectancy - an important factor in labor turnover. Personnel Journal. 51: 360, 1972.
26. Flowers, V.S., and C.L. Hughes. Why employees stay. Harvard Business Review. 51: 49, 1973.
27. Fournies, F.F. Real reasons people quit. Supervisory Management. 15: 32, 1970.
28. Snelling, R.O., Sr. Tackling the turnover problem. Supervisory Management. 16: 37, 1971.

29. Keohane, J. Methods for surveying employee attitudes. Occupational Psychology. 45: 217, 1971.
30. Levine, J. Labor turnover. Personnel Administration. 33: 32, 1970.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Definition of Terms

Turnover

is defined by the number of accessions and separations in a given period of time.

Accessions

are the hiring of new or rehiring of former employees.

Separations

are the terminations of employment, subdivided as follows:

Quit

a separation initiated by the employee. Employees who are absent without authorization for seven (plus or minus) days are also considered a quit.

Lay-off

a termination of employment (expected to last more than seven days) initiated by the employer because the job is being eliminated or because of reduction in the work force due to insufficient demand for the product.

Discharge

a termination initiated by the employer because the employer is dissatisfied with the performance or conduct of an employee.

Death or Retirement

(self explanatory) (10).

Morale

is the complete feeling which accompany and influence an act.

The needs of workers:

It can be assumed that man is a wanting animal who strives constantly to satisfy his needs. His needs are hierarchical in nature and can be described as follows:

Ego Needs:

At the highest level are the egoistic needs which do not emerge as motivators until the lower needs are satisfied. They fall into two kinds:

Needs relative to one's self-esteem--needs for self-respect, confidence, independence, achievement, competence, and knowledge.

Needs relative to one's reputation--needs for status, recognition, appreciation, and respect from others.

Man's egoistic needs rarely are completely satisfied. Man constantly seeks their fulfillment.

They are what drive him toward individuality, creativity, responsibility, and self-fulfillment (6).

Physiological and Safety Needs: These are man's most basic and necessary needs. When bread is not available, man lives for bread alone. When he is tired, he needs sleep more than anything else. When his physiological needs are satisfied, they no longer are important to him. These needs help man exist, but they do not motivate him except on a primitive level. The next highest order of needs is safety needs such as the need for protection against danger, threat, and deprivation. Man is dependent and he fears threat to himself. He therefore is motivated to protect himself. On the job, threats of firing employees, discrimination, and recrimination are powerful motivators. He will work hard to protect himself from such threats, especially if he is not certain of finding another job quickly.

Social Needs: Once a man's physiological needs are satisfied and he does not fear for his physical welfare, his social needs take over as motivators of his behavior. He seeks the giving and receiving of friendships, acceptance, belonging, and love. Man intuitively seeks "groups." Management knows of these needs; frequently, however, management tries to discourage groups and to dictate against their formation.

APPENDIX B

Sample Population Sources

College or University	No. Past Employees Sent	Returned	No. Current Employees Sent	Returned
Randolph-Macon	25	2	50	30
Lynchburg College	10	0	35	20
Roanoke College	10	8	35	30
Sweetbrier College ¹	20	0	55	0
Mary Baldwin College	5	2	24	12
Ferrum Jr. College ²	5	0	20	0
Hampton Institute ³	30	0	75	35
Madison College ¹	40	0	100	0
University of Virginia	50	5	100	8
Virginia Union University ⁴	20	2	50	3
Sullins College	17	2	50	5
Old Dominion College ⁵	40	0	75	0
Eastern Mennonite	10	0	25	7
	—	—	—	—
TOTALS ⁶	297		694	
Corrected totals	212		444	
RETURNS		21		149

¹Directors declined to participate upon receiving the questionnaires.

²Director was "short-handed" no one to distribute the questionnaires.

³Employees were on strike at time of collection of data.

⁴Director reported no employee interest.

⁵Change of Directors, questionnaire packet was lost, remailed, no response.

⁶Estimates of number of employees from Mr. H. King.

APPENDIX C

Questionnaires & Cover Letters

Dear Friend,

As part of my graduate work, I am trying to find out the reasons why people leave food service jobs for other employment. I have often seen this problem in my work in food service and plan to work in food service as a career. Therefore your help in this project will help me to be a better food service manager. The best way to get this information is through people like yourself who have or are now working in food service.

I am interested only in your answers. Please DO NOT sign your name to these sheets. Your present or past employer WILL NOT be shown your answers to these questions. The numbers on the top of the sheet are to tell me which university you work for.

Therefore, I would greatly appreciate your help by you taking a few minutes of your time to give serious thought to the enclosed questionnaire. After you have answered all of the questions, please return them in the enclosed, stamped envelope within two weeks of the day you received it. If you lose the envelope, my address is at the bottom of this page.

Thank you for your cooperation. With your help we hope to make food service jobs more rewarding.

Sincerely yours, ,

Suzanne Schultz
c/o Wallace Hall, Room 318
VPI&SU
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

SECTION I

Please fill in or check the answer that best describes you.

1. Sex Male Female
2. Age _____
3. How many jobs have you had in the last three years? _____
4. I have worked for this food service for ___ years/months _____
5. The highest grade I finished in school was _____
6. I attended trade school yes no
7. I am paid by the hour on salary
8. I am the main "bread winner" in my family yes no
9. When I applied for the job, I just applied
 heard about it from a friend or relative
 saw an advertisement
 applied through an agency
10. I am married separated
 single divorced
 widowed
11. My job is: Serving customers Clean-up
 Preparing food Pre-preparing food
 Other, write in _____
12. Have you worked in food service before this job? yes no
13. Which of these is most important to you in your job? If more than one is important, number them with 1 being the most important, and so on down to 4 being told when I do a good job
 being promoted
 liking the people and the boss I work with
 being paid well for the work I do
 other

SECTION II

In this section there are questions about your job. There are NO right or wrong answers. The BEST answer is how you feel about the question concerning your job. Please answer each question by circling the number on the scale following the question, which best describes how you feel. Please do not skip any questions. Circle only one number for each question. Feel free to write in your comments near the question it concerns.

REMEMBER, your employer will not see your answers.

EXAMPLE:

1. How much pleasure do you get from doing your job?

1	2	3	4	5
none	a little	some	quite a bit	very much

2. How important is it to you to get pleasure from doing your job?

1	2	3	4	5
none	a little	some	quite a bit	very much

The person who answered question one and two felt that he got "a little" pleasure doing his job. He also felt that it was very important to him to get a lot of pleasure from his job.

To make it easy for you, I have repeated the scale with the matched words and numbers at the top of each page.

SCALE: 1 2 3 4 5
 none a some quite very
 little a bit much

11. How much chance is there to be friends during the work day with your fellow workers?

1 2 3 4 5

12. How important is it to you to have a chance to be friends with your fellow workers?

1 2 3 4 5

13. How much feeling of being pushed is there in your job?

1 2 3 4 5

14. How important is it to you to not have a feeling of being pushed?

1 2 3 4 5

15. How much chance is there to be on friendly terms with your boss during the work day?

1 2 3 4 5

16. How important is it to you to be on friendly terms with your boss during the work day?

1 2 3 4 5

17. How much chance is there to be trained for your job or another job in this food service?

1 2 3 4 5

18. How important is it to you to have the chance to be trained for your job or another job in food service?

1 2 3 4 5

19. How much feeling of being told how well you are doing is there in your job?

1 2 3 4 5

- 3 -

C

- | SCALE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|------|-------------|------|----------------|--------------|
| | none | a
little | some | quite
a bit | very
much |
| 20. How important is it to you to be told how well you are doing in your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. How nice a place does this employer provide you for your breaks (rest and lunch) and personal belongings? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. How important is it to you to have a nice place for you to take your breaks? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. How well were you told who to go to if you had problems with your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. How important is it to you to know who to go to with problems in your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. Is information given to you telling you how to go about being promoted from your job to a better job in the food service? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. How important is it to you to be told how to go about being promoted? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. How much chance is there to help other people with their work in your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. How important is it to you to be able to help others in your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. How much chance is there for you to help decide the best way to do your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | SCALE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--------|------|-------------|------|----------------|--------------|
| | none | a
little | some | quite
a bit | very
much |
-
30. How important is it to you to help decide the best way to do your job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
31. How much chance is there for you to know important people in the organization?
- 1 2 3 4 5
32. How important is it to you to know important people in the operation?
- 1 2 3 4 5
33. Do you feel the pay you receive is equal to the work you do?
- 1 2 3 4 5
34. How important is it to you to feel your pay is equal to the work you do?
- 1 2 3 4 5
35. How much respect is given you in your job by your friends and relatives?
- 1 2 3 4 5
36. How important is it to you to have your friends and relatives respect your job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
37. When an opening becomes available, are you told about them so that you may have a chance to have the job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
38. How important is it to you to be told when a job is open so that you may have a chance at the job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
39. How much feeling do you have that your job is important to your boss?
- 1 2 3 4 5

- 5 -

C

SCALE: 1 2 3 4 5
 none a some quite very
 little a bit much

40. How important is it to you to know your job is important to your boss?

1 2 3 4 5

41. How much feeling of security (your job is there as long as you want it) is there in your job?

1 2 3 4 5

42. How important is it to you to feel secure in your job?

1 2 3 4 5

43. Are you told what must be done in order to get a pay raise?

1 2 3 4 5

44. How important is it to you to know what must be done to get a pay raise?

1 2 3 4 5

45. How important is it to you to have a job?

1 2 3 4 5

If you have any other comments about your job not covered here, please write them below. For example: working conditions (heat or lighting, danger), hours of work, problems getting to work.

Dear Friend,

As part of my graduate work, I am trying to find out the reasons why people leave food service jobs for other employment. I have often seen this problem in my work in food service and plan to work in food service as a career. Therefore your help in this project will help me to be a better food service manager. The best way to get this information is through people like yourself who have or are now working in food service.

I am interested only in your answers. Please DO NOT sign your name to these sheets. Your present or past employer WILL NOT be shown your answers to these questions. The numbers on the top of the sheet are to tell me which university you work for.

Therefore, I would greatly appreciate your help by you taking a few minutes of your time to give serious thought to the enclosed questionnaire. After you have answered all of the questions, please return them in the enclosed, stamped envelope within two weeks of the day you received it. If you lose the envelope, my address is at the bottom of this page.

Thank you for your cooperation. With your help we hope to make food service jobs more rewarding.

Sincerely yours,

Suzanne Schultz
c/o Wallace Hall, Room 318
V P I & S U
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

SECTION I

Please fill in or check the answer that best describes you in your job in food service.

1. Sex Male Female
2. Age _____
3. How many jobs have you had in the last three years? _____
4. I worked in this food service for _____ years/months _____
5. The highest grade I finished in school was _____
6. I attended trade school yes no
7. I was paid by the hour on salary
8. I am the "main bread winner" for my family yes no
9. When I applied for the job, I just applied
 heard about it from a friend or relative
 saw an advertisement
 applied through an agency
10. I am married separated
 single divorced
 widowed
11. My job was: Serving customers Clean-up
 Preparing food Pre-
 Other, write in _____ preparing food
12. Have you worked in food service before this job? yes no
13. Which of these is most important to you in a job? If more than one is important, number them 1 being the most important and so on down to 4.
 being told when I do a good job
 being promoted
 liking the people and the boss I work with
 being paid well for the work I do
 other

14. In what area is your job now? Food Service Government
 Education Construction
 Sales Unemployed
 Industry Other

SECTION II

In this section there are questions about your job. There are NO right or wrong answers. The BEST answer is how you feel about the question concerning your job. Please answer each question by circling the number on the scale following the question, which best describes how you feel. Please do not skip any questions. Circle only one number for each question. Feel free to write in your comments near the question it concerns.

REMEMBER, your employer will not see your answers.

EXAMPLE:

1. How much pleasure do you get from doing your job?

1	2	3	4	5
none	a	some	quite	very
	little		a bit	much

2. How important is it to you to get pleasure from doing your job?

1	2	3	4	5
none	a	some	quite	very
	little		a bit	much

The person who answered question one and two felt that he got "a little" pleasure doing his job. He also felt that it was very important to him to get a lot of pleasure from his job.

To make it easy for you, I have repeated the scale with the matched words and numbers at the top of each page.

SCALE: 1 2 3 4 5
 none a some quite very
 little a bit much

1. How much respect was there for my job from my fellow workers?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
2. How important is it to you to have your fellow workers think your job is important?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
3. How much chance was there for your own thinking and action in your job?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
4. How important is it to you to have a chance for your own thinking and action in your job?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
5. How much chance was there of being promoted in this food service?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
6. How important is it to you to have a chance to be promoted?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
7. I knew exactly what was expected of me in my job.

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
8. How important is it to you to know exactly what is expected of you in your job?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
9. How much over your actual take-home pay did this food service offer you? (for example: free meals on duty, sick days, vacation time)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---
10. How important is it to you to have these "extras" offered you?

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

- 2 -

P

SCALE: 1 2 3 4 5
 none a some quite very
 little a bit much

11. How much chance was there to be friends during the working day with your fellow workers?

1 2 3 4 5

12. How important is it to you to have a chance to be friends with your fellow workers during the working day?

1 2 3 4 5

13. How much feeling of being pushed was there in your job?

1 2 3 4 5

14. How important is it to you to not have a feeling of being pushed?

1 2 3 4 5

15. How much chance was there to be on friendly terms with your boss during the working day?

1 2 3 4 5

16. How important is it to you to be on friendly terms with your boss during the working day?

1 2 3 4 5

17. How much chance was there to be trained for your job or another job in this food service?

1 2 3 4 5

18. How important is it to you to have a chance to be trained for your job or another job?

1 2 3 4 5

19. How much feeling of being told how well you were doing was there in your job?

1 2 3 4 5

20. How important is it to you to be told how well you are doing in your job?

1 2 3 4 5

- 3 -

P

- | SCALE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|------|-------------|------|----------------|--------------|
| | none | a
little | some | quite
a bit | very
much |
| 21. How nice a place did this employer provide you for your breaks (rest and lunch) and personal belongings? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. How important is it to you to have a nice place to take your breaks? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. How well were you told who to go to if you had problems with your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. How important is it to you to know who to go to with problems in your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. Was information given to you telling you how to go about being promoted from your job to a better job in the food service? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. How important is it to you to be told how to go about being promoted? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. How much chance was there to help other people with their work in your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. How important is it to you to be able to help others in your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. How much chance was there for you to help decide the best way to do your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. How important is it to you to help decide the best way to do your job? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. How much chance was there for you to know important people in the food service? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- 4 -

P

SCALE:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	a	some	quite	very
		little		a bit	much

32. How important is it to you to know important people in your job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
33. Did you feel the pay you received was equal to the work you did?
- 1 2 3 4 5
34. How important is it to you to feel your pay is equal to the work you do?
- 1 2 3 4 5
35. How much respect was given you in your job by your friends and relatives?
- 1 2 3 4 5
36. How important is it to you to have your friends and relatives respect your job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
37. When an opening became available, were you told about them so that you could have a chance to have the job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
38. How important is it to you to be told when a job is open so that you may have a chance to have the job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
39. How much feeling did you have that your job was important to your boss?
- 1 2 3 4 5
40. How important is it to you to know your job is important to your boss?
- 1 2 3 4 5
41. How much feeling of security (your job is there as long as you want it) was there in your job?
- 1 2 3 4 5
42. How important is it to you to feel secure in your job?
- 1 2 3 4 5

- 5 -

P

SCALE:	1	2	3	4	5
	none	a	some	quite	very
		little		a bit	much

43. Were you told what must be done in order to get a pay raise?

1 2 3 4 5

44. How important is it to you to know what must be done to get a pay raise?

1 2 3 4 5

45. How important is it to you to have a job?

1 2 3 4 5

If you have any other comments about your job not covered here, please write them below. For example: working conditions (heat or lighting, danger), hours of work, problems getting to work, or the reason you resigned from your job.

January 31, 1974

Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

Directors of Food Service
N.A.C.U.F.S.

Dear Friends,

Enclosed are the questionnaires I have previously contacted you about. There are two bundles, one for the current employees and one for your past employees. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes are included for each employee to return their completed questionnaires directly to me. Blank envelopes are also enclosed for you to address to your past employees. This was necessary as several of the N.A.C.U.F.S. members reported that release of employee addresses was against school policy. I sincerely hope that this will not cause you too much inconvenience.

I will appreciate your prompt cooperation and humbly apologize for my tardiness. I also would appreciate your encouraging your employees to promptly fill out these questionnaires and return them to me.

An abstract, as appears in my thesis, will be mailed to you upon completion of my work at V.P.I. & S.U. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Suzanne P. Schultz

APPENDIX D

Part II Questions, Break-down by Area

- I Career Opportunities - Variable # 11
How much Q's: 5, 17, 25, 37
Importance Q's: 6, 18, 26, 38
- II Wages and Fringe Benefits - Variable #12
How much Q's: 9, 33, 43
Importance Q's: 10, 34, 44
- III Supervision Characteristics - Variable # 13
How much Q's: 15, 19, 23, 31, 39
Importance Q's: 16, 20, 24, 32, 40
- IV Job Characteristics - Variable # 14
How much Q's: 3, 7, 13, 29, 41
Importance Q's: 4, 8, 14, 30, 42
- V Facilities and Social Characteristics - Variable # 15
How much Q's: 1, 11, 21, 27, 35
Importance Q's: 2, 12, 23, 28, 36
- VI How important is it to have a job? - Variable # 16
Question: 45

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

DETERMINANT FACTORS OF LABOR TURNOVER IN THE
INSTITUTIONAL FOOD SERVICE INDUSTRY

by

Suzanne Paula Schultz

(ABSTRACT)

This study investigated the factors which may affect turnover in a college food service operation. The subjects were current and former employees of food service operations operating in Virginia and holding membership in the National Association of College and University Food Services.

Demographic data and employee ratings of job satisfaction were surveyed. Chi-square analysis of the data indicated that: age of the employee, method of remuneration, and how the employee applied for the job, were factors which contributed to turnover rates. Analysis of mean satisfaction levels reported by current and past employees versus demographic data indicated: former employees generally experienced less satisfaction than current employees. However, past employees reported higher satisfaction levels for wages and fringe benefits in 41 per cent of the descriptive variables. Differences in the reported satisfaction levels were slight. The variables used to determine satisfaction could not be assumed to influence the termination decision.

This data was skewed as a result of a low return rate for the questionnaire and of a high concentration of employees over 45 years of age, who had worked more than one year. An imbalance of responses from

current and former employees may have contributed to the skew. If these data are representative, then turnover in the institutions surveyed may not be a problem.

It is recommended that future studies relating turnover to satisfaction levels of employees survey a larger population and use a method that assures a greater response. The factors external to the job should be included in the study, and finally, the pre-test should provide for the rating of desirability of responses, if regression is to be used.