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ABSTRACT

Employees in the hospitality industry continuously judge their peers and leaders in order to evaluate their work environment. Group and individual evaluations are systematic, as the restaurant industry is characterized by high labor intensiveness that typically involves substantial social interactions and task interdependence. As a consequence, employees come up with quick and broad conclusions about the characteristics of the people that they work with or for.

Along these lines, two of the most significant constructs that govern the social perceptions or evaluations of individuals and groups are people’s perceived warmth and competence. The warmth construct informs people whether a person or group has positive or negative intentions, while the competence construct indicates whether such person or group is capable of carrying out their intentions (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011). These two core constructs in social perception provide fundamental clues about the characteristics attributed to persons or groups when they perform tasks and interact with others (Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007).

The current study’s goal is to examine the influences of restaurant general managers’ and co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, two constructs that were previously shown to reduce employees’ turnover intentions and improve job performance (Ghiselli, LaLopa, & Bai, 2001; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Yang, 2010). The current study demonstrates that employees’ perceptions
about their co-workers and restaurant general managers have indeed significant relationships with employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions in a casual dining restaurant setting. Moreover, this study was able to confirm several relationships among various employees’ job attitudes and restaurant performance metrics (as measured by restaurants’ sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction).

In sum, the current study’s findings suggest that it is important for casual dining restaurant owners and operators to find ways to hire, compensate and train warm and competent hourly employees and general managers, since co-workers’ and general managers’ perceived warmth and competence are significantly associated with employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Moreover, satisfied and committed employees were found to be related with key restaurant performance measures, such as increased sales and customer satisfaction, meaning that the more employees are satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organization, the more likely restaurants will benefit from increased sales and customer satisfaction.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1.1.1 THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

The restaurant industry offers an amazing opportunity for researchers to study a sector that is projected to hire approximately fourteen million workers in the United States (U.S.) in 2015, representing 10% of the country’s workforce according to the National Restaurant Association (NRA, 2015a). Moreover, the American restaurant industry, which is also planned to generate more than $709 billion in sales in 2015, should create around 1.7 million new jobs by the year 2025 (NRA, 2015a). More than 66% of the projected revenue for 2015 will come from “eating places,” which include various types of commercial restaurant services, such as full service and quick service restaurants; cafeterias and buffets; social caterers; and snack and nonalcoholic beverage bars (NRA, 2015a). Among those “eating places,” the full service restaurant segment should produce around $220 billion in revenue for 2015 (Statista, 2015a), or almost half of all eating places’ projected sales.

Despite the fact that full service restaurants represent one of the largest restaurant segments in the U.S., they are the ones which suffered the largest drop in sales volume following the economic decline in 2008 (Akers, 2015). Full service restaurants provide complete and varied menus along with a wide selection of foods and beverages and table
service (The Law Dictionary, 2015), and are comprised of the following sub-segments: fine dining, casual dining, and family dining restaurants (NRA, 2010). Among those three full service restaurant sub-segments, casual dining restaurants find it the most challenging to recruit and retain employees (NRA, 2015a). Accordingly, 23% of casual dining restaurants believe that the recruitment and retention of employees constitutes a significant challenge, representing the third most significant challenge after food costs and the economy (NRA, 2015a).

Because casual dining restaurants hire many people in the United States and produce significant revenues, hospitality researchers need to address some of the problems that this restaurant sub-segment faces. The fact that half of all American adults have worked in the restaurant industry at some point during their lives, and that one in three adults has had their first job experience in a restaurant (NRA, 2015a), raises some concerns as to why so many people decide to quit their jobs in the restaurant industry, forgoing the opportunity of building a solid career in this sector. Although one could mention a variety of reasons for people to frequently quit their jobs in restaurants (e.g., low paying jobs, long hours, work on weekends, part-time jobs), there are likely other issues, possibly related to the work environment of restaurants, which are negatively influencing employees’ intentions to build long-lasting careers in casual dining restaurants.

The following section describes the financial and operational impacts that high turnover rates produce in the restaurant industry, and provides possible reasons as to why its employees may not want to work in this industry for longer periods of time.
1.1.2 **EMPLOYEE TURNOVER: A PROBLEM AFFECTING THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY**

One of the most challenging tasks that any hospitality manager has to confront is about a well-known human resource concern: employee turnover (Enz, 2009). Employee turnover has typically affected more significantly the hospitality industry in comparison to the overall private sector (CompData, 2013). According to the figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey program (2014), employee turnover rates have increased in the restaurants-and-accommodations sector since 2010, going from 56.6% to 62.6% in 2013. Consequently, restaurateurs need to find reliable solutions in order to reduce employee turnover rates, as excessive turnover negatively affects organizations with respect to increasing financial costs, lower productivity and service quality (Tews, Stafford, & Michel, 2014). Conversely, establishments with lower turnover rates have significantly better customer satisfaction, employee productivity, and revenue growth compared to those with a higher turnover (Blatt, Lee, & Lakhani, 2014).

In 2014, the foodservice industry’s annual turnover rate across all segments was 94% for hourly employees and 34% for managers according to Dallas-based People Report (as cited in Sullivan, 2015). Along these lines, a study conducted by the National Restaurant Association reported that the average cost of turnover was anywhere between $1,800 and $6,500 per hourly employee (as cited in Wiesberg, 2004), while another study with the top 100 American restaurant companies estimated that the loss for the restaurant industry as a whole was about $4 billion per year in turnover expenses for hourly employees, with an additional $454 million in management turnover costs (Spector, 2003). Turnover costs can include administrative and operational costs for the employee who is leaving and for the new hire, as well as recruitment and training costs and a loss of
productivity for the newly hired employee (Sonnenshein, 2012). When taking into account all of these negative outcomes that high turnover rates can cause to restaurants, it is not surprising that the restaurant industry, and in particular casual dining restaurants, consider the recruitment and retention of employees as one of their main concerns (NRA, 2015a).

Many reasons could be thought of when explaining the possible causes of employees’ high turnover rates, such as the long working hours and physically demanding work conditions that this industry imposes on its personnel; the obligation to work on weekends and holidays; the lower wages and benefits for part-time and full-time employees; as well as the hostile and stressful work environment (Gartenstein, 2015). Indeed, as Hinkin and Tracey (2000) point out, high staff turnover is often the consequence of a poor working environment and poor supervision. Studies have identified relationships with supervisors or managers and other staff as one of the most significant determinants affecting staff turnover (Lashley, 2000), showing that subordinates can be affected by a superior’s manner and behavior (Griffith, 1988), as well as by their co-workers (Susskind, Kacmar, & Borchgrevink, 2007). For all these reasons, researchers need to expand the current existing literature in order to measure how restaurant general managers and co-workers could eventually influence employees’ attitudes and behaviors in the restaurant industry and in casual dining restaurants.

The following section describes in more detail the influence that leaders and co-workers can play on important employee job attitudes, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which if improved, can help lower employees’ turnover
intentions and increase restaurants’ performance (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Yang, 2008).

1.1.3 THE INFLUENCE OF CO-WORKERS AND MANAGERS

Although the restaurant industry and casual dining restaurants are known for their high turnover rates, hospitality researchers and practitioners need to find ways to minimize such excessive turnover while improving restaurants’ financial and operational performance. Restaurant performance could be represented for instance by increased restaurants’ sales/profits and customer satisfaction scores. Along these lines, several studies have shown that strengthening employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment can not only reduce employees’ turnover intentions, but also increase restaurants’ performance (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Yang, 2008; Yang, 2010).

Accordingly, employees who are satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organizations tend to have longer job tenures (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Yang, 2010) and better job performance (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Yang, 2008) than employees who are not satisfied with their jobs or committed to their organization. Research also determined that employees perform better and are less likely to quit their jobs when hospitality companies offer some sort of social or organizational support (Karatepe, 2009; Karatepe, 2012). These findings go along with the social exchange theory (SET), which posits that employees who perceive high levels of social or organizational support feel obligated to repay the organization through positive attitudes and behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Social support, which is usually defined as a transaction involving such things as emotional concern, instrumental aid, and information
(Carlson & Perrewé, 1999), can emanate at work from different sources, such as leaders and co-workers (Parasuraman, Greenhaus, & Granrose, 1992). Similarly, perceived organizational support refers to the extent to which employees perceive that their contributions are valued by the organization and that the organization cares about their well-being (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986).

Along these lines, when hospitality companies offer a supportive work environment and a positive organizational climate, employees tend to remain longer in their jobs and also feel that their customers are more satisfied (Manning, Davidson, & Manning, 2005). For instance, in an attempt to conceptualize a relevant organizational climate scale for the tourism and hospitality industry, Manning et al. (2005) found that constructs such as leader facilitation and support; professional and organizational esprit; and workgroup cooperation, friendliness, and warmth; explain 9.18% of the variation in employee turnover intentions and 43.70% of the variation in employees’ perceptions of customer satisfaction. Such lower turnover intentions could reduce restaurants’ turnover costs, and satisfied customers could benefit employees and restaurants, as satisfied customers usually leave larger tips and are more likely to patronize restaurants. As a consequence, such customer loyalty could eventually result in increased restaurant sales and profits.

Despite the fact that previous research studied and analyzed the influence of leaders and co-workers in a work setting, it is important to better understand the social elements or perceptions that could possibly affect employees’ attitudes and behaviors in casual dining restaurants. These social perceptions, which are most of the time caused by the social and task-related interactions that occur among restaurant employees and
managers, need to be better understood, as there is a paucity of research that has investigated the influence of various social perceptions on important employee attitudes and behavioral outcomes in a restaurant setting.

The subsequent segment analyzes the phenomenon of social perceptions that result from the evaluation of individuals and groups, and explains the importance of two fundamental social constructs that should affect employees’ attitudes and behaviors in casual dining restaurants.

1.1.4 THE PHENOMENON OF SOCIAL PERCEPTIONS

Social perceptions and evaluations started to catch scholars’ attention in the 1940s and 1950s (Asch, 1946; Bales, 1950). Yet, it was only at the beginning of this millennium that researchers came up with a model that distinguished two constructs which people always use to describe or evaluate others, namely their perceived warmth and competence (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Studies have shown that when people have to define or describe other people, almost 80% of their impression formations fall under the social constructs of warmth and competence (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011; Wojciszke, 1994). This is the reason why most researchers consider the warmth and competence constructs to be the two most fundamental social constructs governing the social evaluations of individuals and groups (Fiske et al., 2002).

Accordingly, when individuals or groups meet or interact with “others,” they must quickly discover if the other person or group can be trusted and is capable or not of carrying out their intentions. Along these lines, people are perceived as warm if they have good intentions and do not represent a threat towards others (Cuddy et al., 2011), and if they strive to establish close relationships with others. Warm individuals typically
manifest themselves in empathy and understanding, as well as in moral behaviors (Abele, Uchronski, Suitner, & Wojciszke, 2008). On the other hand, the competence construct gives cues on the determination and capability of specific people or groups to execute their intentions. Moreover, competent persons or groups are usually considered to be more autonomous and individualistic, and also have a tendency to lead, dominate, and control their own environment (Abele et al., 2008). Consequently, one could say that the warmth construct is more of a socially-oriented characteristic, while the competence construct is more of an individualistic and task-oriented attribute.

Based on the bi-dimensionality of these two fundamental social constructs, Fiske et al. (2002) explain that a person can be evaluated either as warm or cold, and as competent or incompetent. The interaction of both social constructs can result in four different types of evaluation: individuals or groups can be perceived as (1) warm and competent (i.e., admired groups); (2) cold and incompetent (i.e., hated groups); (3) cold and competent (i.e., envied groups); and (4) warm and incompetent (i.e., pitied groups) (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007). According to the Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes (BIAS) Map, each of these perceptions elicits in turn specific emotions, which provoke as a result different behavioral intentions. For instance, admired groups or individuals (i.e., warm and competent) elicit an emotion called admiration, which encourage the perceiver to help or associate with the warm and competent target (Cuddy et al., 2007).

Unfortunately, most studies that assessed the influence of warmth and competence perceptions come from the fields of sociology and social psychology, but little attention was given to the influence of these social perceptions in a corporate
business setting (Cuddy et al., 2011). Cuddy et al. (2011) suggested that assumptions made about people in a work setting may affect the way they behave, such as whether an employee becomes motivated to exert extra effort or decides to avoid and not associate with a particular person or group. This assumption was verified in a seminal study by Tjosvold (1984), which investigated how leaders’ actions enhance subordinates’ motivation on future tasks. Tjosvold’s (1984) study found that participants who worked with a warm and directive (i.e., competent) leader were the most motivated to complete a subsequent task, while participants who worked with a warm but nondirective leader were the least productive. Furthermore, participants who worked with a warm leader also found such leader to be helpful, and were willing to work again and meet the leader in a social setting. Participants were likewise more satisfied with their relationship with the warm leader compared to participants who worked with a cold leader.

Although these findings are relevant, researchers need to broaden the existing literature related to the influence of the warmth and competence constructs, since these social constructs could influence important job attitudes, such as employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which were previously shown to decrease turnover intentions and increase organizations’ performance (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Yang, 2008; Yang, 2010). Moreover, it is important for hospitality researchers to study these specific social perceptions in a work setting, such as in the restaurant industry and more specifically in casual dining restaurants, since the jobs offered in this labor intensive restaurant sub-segment demand substantial social and professional interactions among employees, as well as between employees and their restaurant general managers.
The following section describes in detail the aims and objectives of the current study in order to conclude with specific research questions.

1.2 AIMS, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The current study aims to explore how employees’ social perceptions, measured through the warmth and competence constructs, towards their restaurant general managers and co-workers could affect two significant job attitudes. More specifically, the study’s goal is to examine the influence of restaurant general managers’ and co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, two constructs that were shown to reduce employees’ turnover intentions and improve restaurant performance (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Yang, 2008). Knowing whether restaurant general managers’ and co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence can positively influence such important job attitudes is a priority for restaurant owners and operators who desire to reduce employees’ turnover rates and increase their sales and customer satisfaction. One should outline that the incorporation of a warm and competent work environment should not require a lot of investments from restaurant operators, besides the implementation of some hiring and training procedures, as well as the creation of a strong organizational culture that encourages such things as open and frequent interactions among employees and restaurant general managers, as well as the certification that all of the restaurant’s service and organizational procedures are thoroughly respected and executed by casual dining restaurant owners and operators.

Not only do the effects of warmth and competence perceptions in a work setting need to be investigated, but the current study is also interested in confirming the positive effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment, a relationship that many
researchers have previously verified (Ki-Joon, Choon-Ki, & Abbott, 2011; Uludağ, Khan, & Güden, 2011; Zopiatis, Constanti, & Theocharous, 2014), as well as the relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978). In spite of the fact that turnover intention is the strongest indicator of employee turnover (Mobley et al., 1978), this relationship has to be confirmed in a restaurant setting, as very few hospitality studies were able to demonstrate such important relationship, possibly due to the difficulty for researchers to obtain confidential information from hospitality companies. Despite such difficulty, the current study was able to gather relevant secondary data from a large casual dining restaurant franchisee located in the U.S., in order to examine the relationships between turnover intention and turnover, and between employees’ job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and restaurant performance measures (as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction).

It is important to highlight that the current study’s theoretical framework is in line with the social identity theory, which posits that supportive or positive organizational experiences may increase employees’ self-worth, which in turn help reduce their turnover intentions (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The study’s rationale is also supported by Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory, which argues that cognitive evaluations precede affective responses, which in turn influence people’s behavioral intentions and behaviors. Along these lines, employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment should positively correlate with restaurants’ performance measures, as it is likely that satisfied and committed employees will be motivated to work harder and be more productive at work, thus impacting restaurants’ financial and operational performance (Ghiselli et al., 2001;
Huang, 2003; Kim & Brymer, 2011). Lastly, the social exchange theory represents the third theoretical framework that contributes to the support of the aforementioned relationships, as employees who perceive that they obtain enough support from their organizations usually feel obligated to repay these organizations through positive attitudes and behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 1990).

Since the warmth and competence interaction can produce various types of social perception (i.e., people can be evaluated as cold and competent; warm and incompetent; warm and competent; cold and incompetent), researchers must also discover which of these social evaluations or perceptions produces the most positive outcomes on employees’ levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Accordingly, the BIAS Map shows that the only individuals or groups that provoke positive emotional and behavioral responses are the ones who are evaluated as warm and competent (i.e., they elicit an emotion called admiration, which in turn encourages people to help or associate with them) (Cuddy et al., 2007). Hence, it is probable that employees who perceive their restaurant general managers and co-workers to be cold and/or incompetent will have lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and higher turnover intentions than employees who believe that their co-workers and restaurant general managers are both warm and competent.

The goal of the current study is to help restaurant general managers and employees understand how their perceived attitudes and behaviors could eventually affect other employees. Cuddy et al. (2011) noticed that leaders are continually judged by others, such as their employees, associates, clients, and suppliers. Those perceptions, in turn, affect how these stakeholders feel about their organizations, leading them to react
accordingly. Therefore, restaurant general managers must know how to positively influence those who work for them, in order to have satisfied and committed employees who will help the organization achieve its operational and financial goals. This rule also applies to restaurant employees, who must try to incorporate and portray attitudes and behaviors that encourage high levels of professionalism and camaraderie in the workplace. Such positive work environment may not only encourage employees to remain longer in their jobs, but also improve restaurants’ performance.

In other words, social evaluations related to the warmth and competence constructs could help employees and managers increase their levels of trust and collaboration, ultimately leading to the creation of a supportive work environment, which was previously found to affect employees’ emotional and behavioral responses (Colakoglu, Culha, & Atay, 2010; Karatepe, 2012). Although the warmth construct is usually known to have more influence on people’s overall attitudes than the competence construct (Wojciszke & Abele, 2008), this finding needs to be confirmed in a corporate work setting such as in casual dining restaurants, where significant social and professional interactions occurs among employees and restaurant general managers. Cuddy et al. (2011) confirm this suggestion, stating that it is important to know which of these social constructs is the most relevant in a work setting.

In sum, the current study addresses four main research questions:

1. How do warmth and competence perceptions of restaurant general managers and co-workers affect employees’ attitudes, as measured by job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions?
2. Can employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes differ based on the warmth and competence perceptions that they hold with regard to their co-workers and restaurant general managers?

3. Are employees’ levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment related to restaurants’ performance measures (as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction)?

4. Does the primacy of warmth over competence still apply in a corporate business setting such as in casual dining restaurants?

Having described the study’s main research questions, the following section covers the study’s limitations and delimitations.

1.3 LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1.3.1 LIMITATIONS

The current study’s main limitation was the use of a convenience sampling technique, which prevented the researcher from generalizing the study’s findings to the entire population of casual dining restaurant employees. Moreover, only employees from one specific casual dining restaurant chain located in the United States were asked to complete the online self-administered survey, and no other restaurant segment participated in the current study. Lastly, some limitations involved the data gathering procedures that the study used.

Along these lines, self-administered surveys may yield a self-report bias, which occurs when respondents want to answer in a way that makes them look as good as possible with regard to other people (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). Since the study asked respondents to evaluate the perceived warmth and competence of their co-workers
and restaurant general managers, the researcher cannot ignore the possibility that respondents may have inflated their answers, thus evaluating their co-workers and managers as extremely warm or competent. By judging their peers and restaurant general managers through a self-administered survey, respondents may have likewise been afraid that their answers would be shared with upper management or even with colleagues.

Having reviewed the study’s main limitations, the following section assesses the study’s main delimitations.

1.3.2 Delimitations

The proposed study had several delimitations, such as its sole focus on the social perceptions that employees hold with regard to their co-workers and restaurant general managers. The study did not take into account the social perceptions that employees might develop regarding their direct supervisors (i.e., assistant managers or shift leaders). In large restaurant units that have more than 40 employees, such as the casual dining restaurant chain which agreed to participate in the current study, many employees do not have much interaction with their restaurant general managers, either because of the existing hierarchy or due to the fact that they are new employees who have not had yet an opportunity to interact with their restaurant general manager. On the other hand, restaurant hourly employees often spend more time working or interacting with their fellow co-workers and immediate supervisors, and these interactions allow them to have a clearer idea of the social traits that characterize these individuals and groups.

Furthermore, the researcher decided not to differentiate employees’ roles within each restaurant (e.g., back of house versus front of house departments, such as administration, kitchen, and service). Lastly, the antecedents of social perceptions were
not analyzed in the current study, mainly because the researcher had to create a concise survey that would encourage employees of the restaurant chain to fully complete it. A long survey would have discouraged many restaurant employees to take the time to answer all of the survey’s questions, which would have negatively impacted the desired response rate.

Transitioning from the study’s main limitations and delimitations, the following section defines the main terms analyzed in the current study.

1.4 Definition of Terms

**Warmth**: This construct “refers to a person’s striving to be part of a community, to establish close relationships with others, and to subordinate individual needs to the common good.” This construct “manifests itself in empathy and understanding, in cooperation and caring for others, as well as in moral behavior” (Abele et al., 2008, p. 1204). The opposite of being perceived as warm it to be considered as a cold person or group (Cuddy et al., 2011).

**Competence**: This construct “refers to a person’s striving to be independent, to control one’s environment, and to assert, protect, and expand one’s self.” Competent individuals “are usually capable of high performance and are autonomous and individualistic; they like to lead and to dominate, are aspiring and strive to achieve their goals” (Abele et al., 2008, p. 1204). The opposite of being perceived as competent is to be considered as an incompetent person or group (Cuddy et al., 2011).

**Job satisfaction**: This construct “describes a positive feeling about a job, resulting from an evaluation of its characteristics. A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive feelings about his or her job, whereas a person with a low level of job satisfaction holds negative feelings about his or her job” (Abele et al., 2008, p. 1204).
satisfaction holds negative feelings” (Robbins & Judge, 2014, p. 35). Job satisfaction is also defined as a positive emotional state, such as happiness or pleasure, that results from the appraisal of one’s own job or job experience (Edward & Scullion, 1982; Locke, 1976).

**Organizational commitment:** This construct describes “the degree to which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals, and wishes to maintain membership in the organization” (Robbins & Judge, 2014, p.341). Consequently, organizational commitment represents a bond between the individual and his or her organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Employees who are affectively committed to their organization do not feel the need or the obligation of continuing employment but rather have the desire to do so (Meyer & Allen 1991).

**Turnover intentions:** These represent the perceptions that employees develop regarding whether they will be leaving their current job within a certain amount of time or not (Mobley et al., 1978). When employees are not satisfied with their jobs or are not committed to their organizations, turnover intentions slowly build up, leading employees to adopt withdrawing behaviors (e.g., being sick, late or absent), look for other job opportunities, evaluate and compare other jobs, and finally decide to quit (Mobley, 1983).

**Employee turnover:** The National Restaurant Association (2014) measures employee turnover as the ratio of the labor turnover to the average number of employees in a given period. As a ratio, employee turnover in the restaurant industry is portrayed in percentage terms and is commonly referred to as restaurant or employee “turnover rates.”

**Restaurant performance:** This measure is assessed in the current study through four data sets that were shared by a large casual dining restaurant franchisee: (1) the
percentage of same store sales change 2014 versus 2013; (2) the percentage of the cost of sales for 2014; (3) customers’ satisfaction scores for 2014; and (4) restaurants’ actual turnover rates for 2014.

Casual dining restaurant: This type of restaurant offers a table-service dining atmosphere, usually in a family-friendly environment. Casual dining restaurants employ waiters who take customers’ orders and serve the food. These restaurants may serve a variety of dishes or may have highly specialized menus (Johnson, 2015).

The following study first reviews the literature that examines the relationships among the aforementioned constructs, and proceeds with the description of the methodology, results and discussion chapters.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 AN OVERVIEW OF THE U.S. RESTAURANT INDUSTRY

Despite the slow economic recovery in the U.S., the foodservice industry seems to be in much better shape than the rest of the economy. Accordingly, this industry obtained a total sales volume of $658 billion in 2013, and is targeted to reach $706.6 billion in 2015, representing an average growth rate of more than 3.5% per year (Statista, 2015b). Furthermore, this industry employed almost 13.5 million people in 2014, representing about one out of ten American workers. When it comes to job growth projections, the foodservice industry is expected to outpace the overall economy for the 16th consecutive year in 2015 (NRA, 2014). As a note, the foodservice industry incorporates several restaurant segments such as “eating places” (i.e., full service restaurants, quick service restaurants, cafeterias, buffets, social caterers, snack and nonalcoholic beverage bars), which were estimated to obtain the largest share of the foodservice industry sales in 2015, surpassing by far any other foodservice segment, including “bars and taverns” or “lodging place restaurants” (NRA, 2015a).

Among those different eating places’ segments, full service restaurants were the ones that suffered the largest drop in sales volume following the economic decline in 2008 (Akers, 2015). Full service restaurants provide complete and varied menus along with a wide selection of foods and beverages and table service (The Law Dictionary,
and include the following restaurant sub-segments: casual dining, family dining and fine dining restaurants (NRA, 2010). Interestingly enough, among these three full-service restaurant sub-segments, the ones that have a harder time to recruit and retain employees are casual dining restaurants (NRA, 2015a). Accordingly, 23% of casual dining restaurants find this problem (of recruiting and retaining employees) to be a significant challenge, representing the third most significant challenge in this category, after food costs and the economy (NRA, 2015a). As a comparison, only 11% of fine dining restaurants and 16% of family dining restaurants perceive the recruitment and retention of employees to be a significant challenge (NRA, 2015a). Thus, it is important for researchers to help the restaurant industry, and more specifically casual dining restaurants, find practical and affordable ways to better recruit and retain their employees, as employees are vital for their financial and operational success.

The substantial turnover rates of the foodservice industry, which according to Dallas-based People Report (as cited in Sullivan, 2015) reached 94% for hourly employees and 34% for managers in 2014, cast some shadows on the positive economic outlook that is projected for 2015, as high turnover rates hurt restaurants’ performance. Accordingly, a recent national study that analyzed human resource practices, turnover and customer service in the restaurant industry, found that the costs of turnover represent on average $18,200 per fiscal year for an establishment with 30 employees (Blatt et al., 2014). Such costs impact an industry that is known for its low profit margins, especially as these costs generate further setbacks for restaurant operators and customers, such as the loss of hard-working and competent employees.
Some of these high turnover rates can be explained by several factors, such as workforce demographics (e.g., younger workers and students) and employers’ preferences for part-time workers. Because restaurants had increased turnover rates for the third consecutive year, going from 56.6% in 2010 to 62.6% in 2013 (NRA, 2014), part of this hike could also be attributed to the recent economic recovery and the decrease in joblessness that has occurred in recent years, giving employees more options to choose from in the job market, and the ability to switch jobs more easily. Unfortunately, the slow but consistent recovery of the American economy and the decline in joblessness are likely to raise employee turnover rates in the restaurant industry, as workers are able to choose from more job opportunities.

To illustrate this phenomenon, the restaurants-and-accommodations turnover rate was as high as 80.9% in 2007 (NRA, 2014), a year when only 4.6% of the active U.S. population was unemployed. In 2010, with an overall unemployment rate as high as 9.6%, the turnover rate of the restaurants-and-accommodations sector declined to 56.6% (United States Department of Labor, 2014), representing a 43% decrease in turnover rate. Such numbers clearly imply that as the economy recovers from one of the worst financial crisis in history, as it is the case in 2015, employees will soon be able to choose from many more job opportunities, potentially causing the restaurants-and-accommodations sector’s turnover rate to increase even more significantly.

While economic and demographic factors can partially explain the successive increases in restaurant employees’ turnover rates, casual dining restaurant operators need to know what can be done to keep their employees satisfied and committed, as the literature has shown that both of these job attitudes can considerably reduce employee
turnover intentions (Robbins & Judge, 2014). Moreover, when looking at the positive effects of both constructs (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment), several studies have demonstrated that these constructs are linked to increasing employee performance (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Yang, 2008). Knowing such phenomena is important for academia and practitioners, in order for them to continue their investigations into the possible factors that may influence employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment in a casual dining restaurant setting.

Along these lines, many studies have shown that supervisors and co-workers can produce significantly positive and negative influences on employees’ job attitudes, behavioral intentions, and actual behaviors (Karatepe & Kilic, 2007; Manning et al., 2005; Susskind et al., 2007). Accordingly, in a study that developed and validated a measure of employees’ basic assumptions about guests and co-workers in the hospitality industry, researchers found that employees’ assumptions about co-workers’ competence positively correlate with employees’ organizational commitment and job satisfaction; and that assumptions about co-workers’ responsibility positively correlate with employees’ intentions to stay with their organizations (Gjerald & Øgaard, 2010). Correspondingly, a study by Manning et al. (2005) found that leader facilitation and support; professional and organizational esprit; and workgroup cooperation, friendliness, and warmth explain a significant amount of variance in employee turnover intentions. Therefore, leaders’ and co-workers’ trait perceptions, which may have a significant influence on employees’ attitudinal and behavioral responses, need to be further investigated.

For this purpose, the current study first describes the warmth and competence constructs, which represent two of the major social constructs that people use to evaluate
others, in order to subsequently describe the various models (i.e., the Stereotype Content Model (SCM) and the Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes (BIAS) Map) that researchers have developed to measure the influence of both constructs on people’s emotions and behavioral intentions (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002). As a third step, the following sections portray the different groups that can result from such warmth and competence perceptions, as well as the reasoning behind the primacy of warmth over competence. Lastly, the following sections also analyze how employees’ perceptions of co-workers and general managers could eventually influence their job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and examines the relationships between job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

2.2 THE WARMTH AND COMPETENCE CONSTRUCTS

2.2.1 ORIGINS OF THE WARMTH AND COMPETENCE CONSTRUCTS

Employees in the hospitality industry continuously judge their peers and leaders in order to evaluate their work environment. Group and individual evaluations are systematic, as hospitality professions are characterized by a high labor intensiveness that typically involves substantial social interactions and task interdependence. As a consequence, employees come up with quick and broad conclusions about the characteristics of the people (e.g., peers and leaders) that they work with or for, since these social evaluations or perceptions allow them to differentiate those they can trust from those they should avoid. Fiske et al. (2007) explain that when individuals meet “others,” they must quickly determine whether the “other” is a friend or a foe (i.e., has good or bad intentions) and whether this other person or group has the ability to enact those intentions (i.e., competence or ability). Such social perceptions reflect how humans
and animals have always dealt with evolutionary pressures, in order to preserve their species and to protect themselves from possible threats (Fiske et al., 2007). Social evaluations regarding a person or group’s intentions (i.e., warmth) and capability (i.e., competence) always arise in people’s minds, so that they can make quick decisions whenever they meet or interact with other people. Along these lines, Aristotle was possibly one of the first philosophers to mention some of the qualities that humans use to evaluate others. Accordingly, two of the traits that he had already observed in his time and that he had mentioned in his teachings are the competence and sociability traits (Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007).

In the contemporary academic world, social evaluations really started to gain researchers’ interest back in the 1940s, right after the Second World War, as these researchers desired to understand the fundamental social constructs by which people perceived others. For example, in a study that contrasted a competent and warm person with a competent and cold person, Asch (1946) analyzed the importance of two significant social attributes that personality impression formation often involves; namely people’s perceived warmth and competence. Bales (1950) also used these two social attributes, as he was the first to differentiate between socio-emotional (i.e., warmth) and task-oriented (i.e., competence) leadership styles, observing that perceptions of individuals in groups can vary along task and social constructs (Bales, 1970).

Allport (1954) was another important pioneer in noting that groups can be discriminated against in different ways, reporting that a perceived personality trait (i.e., “determined ambition” – a trait that is often used to describe a competent person) could differ significantly between in-group icons (i.e., President Lincoln) and stereotyped
groups (i.e., Jewish individuals). Allport (1954) was also the first to confirm that the content of stereotypes could be ambivalent, meaning that a person could be perceived as warm and incompetent, or as cold and competent. Allport (1954), as well as Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950), were innovators in recognizing that the competence and warmth constructs could be not only be used in the perception of groups, but also in the perception or evaluation of single individuals.

Zanna and Hamilton (1977) later observed that the warmth trait was more significant than any other trait portraying the warmth construct, because this trait represented the only word that clearly depicted the warmth construct (Fiske, Xu, Cuddy, & Glick, 1999). Along these lines, Rosenberg, Nelson, and Vivekanathan (1968) confirmed that the underlying traits most often used to describe other people are directly related to the constructs of warmth (sociable and agreeable traits) and competence (intellectual and task traits) (Fiske et al., 1999). Accordingly, these authors showed that individuals tend to be perceived along a construct named “intellectual good-bad” (i.e., competence versus incompetence), and along another construct referred to as “social good-bad” (i.e., warm versus cold) (Rosenberg, et al., 1968). In a more recent work by Wojciszke (1994), who used the term “morality” to label the construct that is usually referred to as “warmth,” the constructs of morality and competence accounted for the vast majority of variance in the way individuals were perceived. More specifically, when participants were asked to portray real-life encounters with others, over 75% of them evaluated others according to their perceived warmth and competence (Wojciszke, 1994).

Knowing that the warmth and competence constructs represent two of the most important social dimensions which people use to evaluate others, the following section
explains in detail the resulting phenomena when warmth and competence perceptions interact, as well as the different groups that emerge from such social evaluations.

2.2.2 WARMTH AND COMPETENCE INTERACTION AND RESULTING GROUP FORMATIONS

Warmth, which includes traits such as sincerity, good nature, warmth and tolerance for others; and competence, which is comprised of such traits as intelligence, competence, confidence, competitiveness and independence, both represent two of the most significant constructs that govern the social perceptions of individuals and groups (Cuddy et al., 2011; Kervyn, Yzerbyt, Judd, & Nunes, 2009). The warmth construct informs people whether a person has positive or negative intentions, while the competence construct indicates whether a person is capable of carrying out those intentions (Cuddy et al., 2011). Additionally, for a person to be considered as warm, he or she must genuinely demonstrate a social and moral behavior (Fiske et al., 2007), as warmth involves cooperation among individuals and is predominantly associated with service orientation (Brambilla, Hewstone, & Colucci, 2013). On the other hand, competence is more closely associated with achievement orientation (Abele, Cuddy, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2008; Judd, James-Hawkins, Yzerbyt, & Kashima, 2005; Peeters, 2001), as well as with success and status (Leach et al., 2007). These two core constructs, which were previously shown to be negatively related between themselves (Kervyn et al., 2009), provide fundamental clues about the characteristics attributed to persons or groups when they perform tasks and interact with others (Fiske et al., 2007). The negative correlation between these two fundamental social constructs is explained by the fact that one construct (i.e., warmth) is social, while the other (i.e., competence) is more individualistic (Abele et al., 2008).
Fiske et al. (2002) have recently brought the warmth and competence constructs to researchers’ attention, as they developed a model known as the Stereotype Content Model (SCM), which hypothesizes that social perceptions are determined by two structural factors: (1) the relative power/status of the out-group (i.e., out-groups represent individuals who do not belong to a specific in-group), and (2) the nature of the relationship between the out-group and the in-group (i.e., in-group individuals represent people that have a shared interest or identity) (Echebarria-Echabe, 2013). The first structural factor acknowledges that low-status groups are usually regarded as incompetent, while high-status groups are perceived as competent. For example, in a study that asked U.S. respondents to give ratings to 20 different groups based on their perceived competence and warmth, respondents perceived groups such as drug addicts and welfare recipients as incompetent (low-status), while the rich and middle-class folks were considered to be competent (high-status) (Fiske et al., 2007). The second structural factor posits that when a group or individual is perceived as harmonious and cooperative, and when goals and interests between the target individual or group and the observer are compatible, the perceived target is considered as warm (Fiske et al., 2007). Oppositely, out-groups or non-members with conflictive or incompatible goals and interests are perceived as cold, since they do not share the same intentions or objectives as the perceiver. Hence, while high-status groups are generally associated with competence, the lack of competition is associated with warmth (Echebarria-Echabe, 2013).

Based on the aforementioned structural factors that determine the social perceptions of individuals and groups, in a work setting, employees who perceive their co-workers as non-threatening may evaluate them as warm, while co-workers considered
as more threatening or competitive may be considered as cold individuals or groups (Echebarria-Echabe, 2013). Furthermore, because of the relatively low status of restaurant co-workers, employees may evaluate them more negatively with regard to their perceived competence. On the other hand, it is likely that employees’ social perceptions regarding their restaurant general managers may significantly differ, as the latter have a higher status than employees’ co-workers and for this reason, may be considered as more competent than restaurant co-workers (Echebarria-Echabe, 2013). Likewise, if restaurant general managers are perceived by employees to be non-threatening and cooperative, they may be considered as warmer than those general managers who are perceived as having non-compatible goals or who are seen as more threatening. Based on the structural factors that determine warmth and competence perceptions, employees’ restaurant general managers may be considered to be warmer than employees’ co-workers, since the latter are directly competing with employees and are fighting for the same resources (e.g., customers’ tips, job promotions, rewards). On the other hand, restaurant general managers are not evaluated or paid the same way as hourly or frontline employees, and hence do not compete for the same resources (Echebarria-Echabe, 2013). Furthermore, since one of the main goals and responsibilities of restaurant managers is to continuously encourage and support their employees, in order to keep them motivated and engaged at work, restaurant general managers may be perceived as warmer and more supportive than employees’ co-workers.

As the Stereotype Content Model (SCM) has shown, the warmth and competence constructs can also lead to ambivalent stereotypes, in which a group or person can be considered as warm and incompetent, or as cold and competent (Fiske et al., 2002).
Groups considered to be warm and incompetent do not pose a threat to people, whereas groups that are perceived as cold and competent are seen as too ambitious, too competent, too hardworking and not sociable enough (Fiske et al., 2002; Hurh & Kim, 1989; Kitano & Sue, 1973). Despite the fact that warmth and competence perceptions can lead to ambivalent stereotypes, both constructs can also lead to non-ambivalent stereotypes, in which an individual or group is seen as cold and incompetent, or as warm and competent (Fiske et al. 2002). Consequently, four different groups can emerge from such warmth and competence perceptions (i.e., warm and competent; cold and competent; warm and incompetent; cold and incompetent) (Fiske et al., 2002). From a social and socio-psychological perspective, members of the in-group are always evaluated as warm and competent, whereas the other three group types (i.e., cold and competent; warm and incompetent; cold and incompetent) are usually considered as out-groups, since one or both of these fundamental social constructs are negatively evaluated by the perceiver (Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, 2009).

Having described the warmth and competence constructs and the group formations that can result from the warmth and competence interaction, the next section provides an overview of the emotional and behavioral outcomes that can arise from such social evaluations.

2.2.3 Emotional and Behavioral Outcomes Resulting from Warmth and Competence Perceptions According to the BIAS Map

In 2002, Fiske and colleagues developed the Stereotype Content Model (SCM), which five years later evolved into the Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes (BIAS) Map (Cuddy et al., 2007). As previously mentioned, these models depict four
groups emerging from the warmth-competence interaction (i.e., warm and competent, cold and competent, warm and incompetent, cold and incompetent) (Cuddy et al., 2007). The BIAS Map further links each of these four group categories to specific emotions and behaviors: (1) groups/individuals seen as warm and incompetent provoke an emotion called pity, which elicits in turn active facilitation (i.e., helping) or passive harm (i.e., neglect); (2) groups/individuals perceived as cold and incompetent provoke a feeling known as contempt, which in turn elicits active harm (i.e., attacking) or neglect; (3) groups/individuals evaluated as cold but competent provoke an emotion called envy, which elicits in turn active harm or passive facilitation (association); and finally (4) groups/individuals perceived as warm and competent elicit an emotion known as admiration, which leads in turn to active or passive facilitation (see Figure 2.1 below) (Fiske et al., 2007). Therefore, it is better for a person or group to be perceived as both warm and competent, as it is the only way for individuals or groups to provoke positive emotional and behavioral outcomes in their perceivers.

*Figure 2.1* The BIAS map: Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes. Figure 1 from Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick. P. (2007). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(4), 634. Reprinted with permission.
A study from Cuddy et al. (2007) that tested the BIAS Map using two correlational studies found that emotions better predict behavioral tendencies than cognitive evaluations (i.e., warmth and competence perceptions). Precisely, emotions were found to mediate the relationship between social perceptions (i.e., cognition) and behavioral intentions. This means that at first, individuals or groups proceed with cognitive assessments of other groups and individuals. Next, people’s cognitive evaluations lead them to experience specific emotions, which subsequently make them adopt specific behavioral or coping responses (Cuddy et al., 2007). While some studies linked warmth and competence perceptions directly to people’s behavioral intentions, the BIAS Map clearly demonstrated that emotions act as a strong mediator, thus predicting behavioral intentions more significantly than people’s social perceptions (Cuddy et al., 2007).

Such reasoning follows the tripartite view of Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory, which the current study uses as a general theoretical framework. Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory asserts that cognitive evaluations are the antecedent of affective reactions, which ultimately guide individuals’ intentions and behaviors (Lazarus, 1982). Although emotions, like the ones described in the BIAS Map, are not exactly the same as affect, the latter is a generic term that covers a broad range of feelings that people experience, including both emotions and moods (Barsade & Gibson, 2007). In fact, Robbins and Judge (2014) explain that affect is the emotional or feeling segment of an attitude. Along these lines, affective or attitudinal outcomes in a work-setting can include the likes of job satisfaction (Locke, 1976) and organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Considering that the organizational commitment of employees represents a bond between
individuals and their organizations (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), and that job satisfaction
denotes a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of job characteristics or
experiences (Edward & Scullion, 1982; Locke, 1976), it is possible that employees’
perceptions of their co-workers and managers’ social characteristics (i.e., perceived
warmth and competence) could affect some of these important job attitudes. Along these
lines, it is probable that employees who perceive their restaurant general managers and
coworkers to be warm and competent will more likely develop positive affective
responses (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment), which should in turn affect
their behavioral intentions (i.e., turnover intentions).

Having discussed the warmth and competence constructs, the following section
assesses in more detail such attitudinal and behavioral responses, which should be
influenced by employees’ social perceptions regarding their casual dining restaurant co-
coworkers and general managers.

2.3 JOB SATISFACTION, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS

2.3.1 JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction is often described as a positive emotional state, such as happiness
or pleasure, that results from the appraisal of one’s own job or job experience (Edward &
Scullion, 1982; Locke, 1976). In the restaurant literature, this construct was shown to be
influenced by a variety of antecedents, and to influence as well a multitude of outcomes.
For example, in a study by Young and Corsun (2010) that explored the variables that
drive cooks’ intent to leave their jobs, a survey of 213 unionized cooks in a major U.S.
city revealed some important relationships between the antecedents of work demands,
kitchen conditions, management’s concern for food quality, and work engagement, and
the outcomes of injuries, job satisfaction, and occupational turnover intentions.

Accordingly, management concern with food quality, kitchen conditions and work engagement were shown to have a positive influence on job satisfaction, while work demands had a negative effect on job satisfaction. The fact that management concern with food quality (i.e., this construct was represented by two variables: “management cares about food prepared” and “pressure to increase food quality”) had a significant influence on employees’ job satisfaction validates the assumption that employees appreciate when their managers have more task-oriented attitudes and behaviors at work (task-oriented individuals are considered to be competent).

A similar study developed by Ko (2012) explored the relationship between professional competence, job satisfaction and the career development confidence of chefs, and examined the mediators of job satisfaction for professional competence and career development confidence in Taiwan. The analytical results demonstrated that work attitude was the most influential construct for professional competence (M = 3.467). Moreover, professional competence significantly affected job satisfaction (β = .58; t = 7.84), and job satisfaction predicted actual career development confidence (β = .69; t = 8.76). Additionally, job satisfaction was found to mediate the influence of professional competence and career development confidence (β = .40; t = 6.43). Lastly, job satisfaction was also linked to customer’s perception of service quality, meaning that when employees are satisfied with their jobs, customers tend to evaluate more positively their restaurants’ perceived service quality. This finding is similar to Gazzoli, Hancer, and Park’s (2010) study, which after examining the answers from 474 restaurant frontline
employees and their 1,259 customers, confirmed the effects of empowerment ($\beta = .06; t = 9.03$) and job satisfaction ($\beta = .12; t = 2.86$) on customers’ perceptions of service quality.

Although the professional competence of employees represents a relevant construct that can affect employees’ job satisfaction, other studies have also depicted the influence of supervisors’ and co-workers’ perceived warmth on employees’ job satisfaction. For example, in a study by Hancer and George (2003) that examined the job satisfaction of restaurant employees working in non-supervisory positions, “moral values,” “technical supervision,” “human relations supervision” and “co-workers” were all found to be correlated with employees’ job satisfaction. It is interesting to observe that “moral values” were considered to be the third most important item influencing employees’ job satisfaction. Morality is a social characteristic that is often related to the perceived warmth of individuals, as warm individuals manifest themselves in empathy and understanding, as well as in moral behaviors (Abele et al., 2008). Hancer and George’s (2003) factor analysis demonstrated that the factor called “extrinsic job satisfaction” (which comprised the following items: supervision-technical, supervision-human relations, company policies and practices, working conditions, recognition, co-workers, and compensation) explained the most variance in employees’ job satisfaction (i.e., 35.87% of the variance in job satisfaction), revealing the importance of co-workers and supervisors’ perceived warmth and competence. Therefore, supervisors and co-workers represent extrinsic factors that can positively affect employees’ job satisfaction.

Having briefly analyzed in the restaurant literature some of the antecedents and consequences of increased job satisfaction, the following section follows the same
procedure with another important employee job attitude known as organizational commitment.

2.3.2 ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

There are usually three types of organizational commitment that are widely accepted and portrayed in the literature: normative, continuance, and affective commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Normative commitment is defined as a belief about one’s responsibility or obligation to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990), and usually occurs when employees feel that they have a moral obligation to stay with their organization. The second type of commitment is known as continuance commitment, which is related to the perceived cost of leaving the job (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Such cost or “fear of loss” can be financial, professional or social, and occurs when employees weigh up the pros and cons of leaving their organization. Lastly, affective commitment, which is the most prevalent approach to organizational commitment in the literature, is considered to be an affective or emotional attachment to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The conceptual differences of each type of organizational commitment result in different antecedents influencing each one of these components. Accordingly, the only type of organizational commitment that is affected by factors such as personal characteristics, job characteristics, work experience, work engagement and structural characteristics is affective commitment (Karatepe, 2011; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Therefore, in order to investigate the relationships among co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ personal or social characteristics (i.e., perceived warmth and competence) and employees’ organizational commitment, affective commitment is represented in the current study as organizational commitment.
Along these lines, the organizational commitment of restaurant employees can be affected by a variety of antecedents, and can result as well in many outcomes, such as lower turnover intentions and increased restaurant performance. For instance, in a study by Kim, Leong, and Lee (2005) regarding a casual dining restaurant chain, which examined the relationship between employee’s service orientation (customer focus, organizational support, and service under pressure), job satisfaction, organizational commitment and intention of leaving, a structural equation model revealed that the customer focus of employees was positively associated with their organizational commitment ($\beta = .66; t = 3.91$), and that organizational commitment was negatively associated with employees’ intention of leaving ($\beta = -.19; t = -2.42$). In another study by Kim, Lee, Murrmann, and George (2012) that examined the mediating role of management trustworthiness in the relationship between empowerment and organizational commitment, a survey of 330 employees in 29 upscale hotel restaurants in Seoul, South Korea, found that management trustworthiness fully mediated the relationship between influence, a construct of empowerment, and organizational commitment. As a consequence, empowerment can support the notion of management trustworthiness, which is an essential element of organizational commitment (Kim et al., 2012).

In another study by Kim (2014) performed in the Korean restaurant industry, results showed that the working environment influences employees’ service ability ($\beta = .41; p < .01$), which affected in turn employees’ organizational commitment ($\beta = .40; p < .01$). Moreover, teamwork/communication positively influenced both service ability ($\beta = .34; p < .01$) and employee satisfaction ($\beta = .49; p < .01$), the latter being positively
associated with employees’ organizational commitment ($\beta = .57; p < .01$). Such findings imply that when employees evaluate their work environment as professional or competent (e.g., “the appearance of employees is decent,” “necessary facilities for work are set up,” “goal of organization is clearly provided”) and when there is good communication and teamwork (e.g., “employees understand each others’ situation well,” “cooperation between departments goes smoothly,” “suggestion from employees are thoroughly considered”), the service ability and satisfaction of employees tend to increase, which improves in turn their organizational commitment. From an operational and financial perspective, the most interesting findings of Kim’s (2014) study are that employees’ organizational commitment significantly influenced customers’ perceived value of the restaurant, which affected in turn customers’ satisfaction, trust and loyalty to the restaurant.

Having assessed some of the antecedents and outcomes of employees’ organizational commitment in the hospitality literature, the following section examines the antecedents and consequences of employees’ turnover intentions.

2.3.3 Turnover Intentions

Turnover intentions represent the perceptions that employees develop regarding whether they will be leaving their current job within a certain amount of time or not (Mobley et al., 1978). When employees are not satisfied with their jobs or committed to their organizations, turnover intentions slowly start to build up, leading employees to adopt such things as withdrawing behaviors (e.g., being sick, late or absent), to look for other job opportunities, to evaluate and compare other jobs, and finally to decide to quit (Mobley, 1983). Literature has shown that turnover intentions can be affected by a
variety of people and antecedents. For example, Thompson and Prottas (2005) found that both supervisors’ and co-workers’ support reduce employees’ turnover intentions. This goes along with a study by Collins (2010) which assessed the effect of psychological contract fulfillment on manager turnover intentions, and its role as a mediator in a casual limited-service restaurant environment. Indeed, a structural equation model revealed that psychological contract fulfillment was a significant predictor of turnover intentions ($\beta = - .70; t = -11.55$), suggesting that turnover may be alleviated if leaders develop strong relationships with their subordinates based upon respect, trust and mutual obligation (Collins, 2010).

Without a doubt, establishing transparent relationships that are based on trust and respect are essential for employees to feel more engaged and remain longer in their organizations. This suggestion was confirmed by Karatepe (2013) in a study that showed that work engagement acts as a full mediator between the effects of organizational politics’ perceptions on employees’ affective organizational commitment, extra-role performance, and turnover intentions. Organizational politics refered to the attempt by organizational members to influence other members, so that personal or group objectives are achieved, most often at the expense of other organizational members (Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000). As a result, employees who perceive that their work environment is uncertain, risky, threatening and unfair are likely to have low levels of work engagement, which negatively influences employees’ organizational commitment, extra-role performance and turnover intentions. Karatepe (2013) suggested that the provision of training programs could empower employees, allowing them to better cope with the difficulties associated with organizational politics. If employees are empowered, they can
feel more at ease to speak up whenever they observe unfair decisions and practices in the workplace.

Lastly, in a study that developed and validated a measure of employee basic assumptions about guests and co-workers in the hospitality industry, Gjerald and Øgaard (2010) identified two constructs (i.e., control and affect) of basic assumptions about guests. Assumptions about co-workers also consisted of two constructs termed responsibility and competence. The responsibility construct included items such as “resourceful and self-sufficient co-workers are highly appreciated in this organization,” “good co-workers are willing to deal with issues on their colleagues’ behalf” and “it is important in this job to be able to trust your co-workers.” The competence construct comprised such items as “a competent co-worker knows his/her job better than a training manual,” “a good co-worker is someone who contributes largely to teamwork” and “good co-workers are very open to alternative solutions.” The results of the study showed that assumptions about co-worker competence positively correlated with organizational commitment and job satisfaction; and assumptions about co-worker responsibility were linked to employees’ intentions to stay with the organization (Gjerald & Øgaard, 2010). Therefore, when employees assume that their co-workers are competent and responsible, such employees tend to experience higher levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and have lower intentions to leave their organizations.

Having examined some of the most important antecedents of turnover intentions, the following section examines in detail the influence of co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence, which represent two fundamental social constructs, on employees’ levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
2.4 The Influence of Co-Workers’ Perceived Warmth and Competence on Employee Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Before assessing the influence of co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, it is important to first know some of the job requirements that are often cited in casual dining restaurant employees’ job descriptions, in order to better understand what this specific restaurant sub-segment regularly requires from its hourly employees. These job descriptions frequently include the following expectations and requirements: to provide friendly and responsive service and create an exceptional dining experience for all guests; have excellent communication skills and a positive attitude; work in a team-oriented, high-volume, fast-paced, guest-centric environment; partner with team members to serve food and beverages that meet or exceed guests’ expectations (Indeed.com, 2015, April 16; Indeed.com, 2014, November 22). As it is possible to observe, many of the aforementioned tasks and responsibilities are related to the adoption of social (i.e., warmth) and task-oriented (i.e., competence) attitudes and behaviors. Warmth-related responsibilities deal more with employees’ cooperation and caring for others (e.g., co-workers, customers…), while competence related duties are associated with task-oriented responsibilities that restaurant employees need to execute in order to deliver the best possible service. It is not a coincidence that such warmth and competence-related tasks are often described in employees’ job descriptions, as these are very important for the proper functioning of casual dining restaurants and for the construction of a warm and competent work environment.
A study by DiPietro and Milman (2008), which analyzed the most important employment characteristics for the retention of hourly employees in the quick service restaurant industry, confirmed the importance of “working with nice people,” a “humane approach to employees” and “clear information on the job.” The first two employment characteristics are related to the perceived warmth of co-workers and managers, while the third job characteristic deals more with the perceived competence of managers, who ought to give clear instructions to their employees in order for them to perform their jobs at their best. Communication is indeed an important component for restaurant employees, as a study by Fu and Mount (2002) clearly depicted. In their study, which examined the communication factors that influence older workers’ job satisfaction, two of the most important communication constructs were “communication climate” and “co-worker communication.” The first construct reflected communication on both the organizational and personal level, and included among other things estimates of whether people’s attitudes towards communicating were healthy. The second construct related to the satisfaction with horizontal and informal communication relationships in the organization, which ought to be accurate and free flowing (Fu & Mount, 2002). As a consequence, older employees who experienced healthy, accurate and open communication patterns with their co-workers tended to be more satisfied with their jobs, in comparison with those who worked in an environment that was more closed and in which organizational and personal communication patterns were unhealthy and inaccurate.

Despite the fact that researchers have mostly studied the warmth and competence constructs in sociology and socio-psychology, previous literature developed similar
constructs in different fields and disciplines, such as in human resources and hospitality management. For instance, in a study by Manning, Davidson, and Manning (2004) in which the researchers created a new scale to measure the influence of organizational climate on tourism employees’ turnover intentions and perceptions of customer satisfaction, items such as workgroup cooperation, friendliness, warmth and professional and organizational esprit accounted for 19.36% of the variation in employee turnover intentions and for 20.07% of the variation in employee perceptions of customer satisfaction. A similar study done by the same authors one year later found that leader facilitation and support, professional and organizational esprit, and workgroup cooperation, friendliness and warmth explained 9.18% of the variation in employee turnover intentions and 43.70% of the variation in employee perceptions of customer satisfaction (Manning et al., 2005). Consequently, employees’ perceptions regarding their co-workers’ attitudes (e.g., friendliness, professional and organizational esprit) and behaviors (e.g., cooperation) can shape their behavioral intentions and service perceptions in a hospitality setting.

Another study by Lam and Zhang (2003), which examined job satisfaction, organizational commitment and several job characteristics in the Hong Kong fast food industry, revealed that five job characteristics (i.e., a challenging job, a sense of accomplishment, meaningful work, friendly co-workers, and job security) affected both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In their study, the perceived friendliness of co-workers, which represented a trait dealing with warmth perceptions, had a significant influence on important employee job attitudes. As a result, the authors of the study recommended restaurant managers to create a friendly work environment and
facilitate fun and social activities that could occur inside or outside of the organization, so that employees can get to know other members and improve their organizational socialization; for organizational socialization represents an important element for employees during the early stages of their employment (Wanous, 1980). A similar study performed by Dermody, Young, and Taylor (2004) also revealed the importance of co-workers for both independent and chain restaurant employees. Their exploratory qualitative research study demonstrated that although compensation and monetary awards appeared to be the most important factors in choosing to work in and remaining in the industry, other important motivation factors were also relevant, such as relationships with co-workers, management and the work atmosphere of restaurants.

Many researchers also found that employees value organizations that employ competent and warm co-workers. For example, in a study by Dawson, Abbott, and Shoemaker (2011) that proposed a Hospitality Culture Scale with the help of 741 hospitality professionals and a panel of industry experts, a principal component analysis determined the importance of several factors for an optimal organizational culture, such as management principles, customer relationships, propitiousness, leadership, accuracy, and composure, among other factors. As it is possible to observe, most of these factors are related to warmth (e.g., customer relationships, propitiousness, and management principles) and competence (e.g., accuracy and leadership) perceptions. Such findings go along with a variety of psychological research studies that analyzed thousands of people from varied cultures, which acknowledged that two trait constructs (i.e., warmth and competence) were mostly used to sort out people’s perceptions in several social environments (Cuddy et al., 2011).
When analyzing the influence of the work environment on employees’ job attitudes, Barrows and Ridout (2010), as well as Solnet, Kandampully and Kralj (2010), explained that the elements of the work environment can be psychological or social in nature and can be found in interpersonal and social relationships. Accordingly, one element of the work environment is represented by a construct known as perceived organizational support, which research has found to have an influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For instance, in a study by Colakoglu et al. (2010) in the hotel industry, findings indicated that perceived organizational support had a significant positive effect on job satisfaction, affective, normative and continuous commitment. Perceived organizational support reflects employees’ general beliefs regarding the degree to which the organization cares about them and values their work (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In light of that, Joiner and Bakalis (2006) suggested that the perceived organizational support of a company can arise from managers and co-workers.

In a study by Karatepe (2012) based on data obtained from frontline hotel employees and their immediate supervisors in Cameroon, perceived organizational support was found to influence service recovery performance and job performance via career satisfaction. Therefore, career satisfaction fully mediated the relationships between perceived organizational support and service recovery performance and job performance. Research also indicated that perceived organizational support enhances job satisfaction (Muse & Stamper, 2007) and commitment (Gu & Siu, 2009). As a consequence, when employees perceive that they are receiving enough support from their co-workers, they tend to respond via positive job attitudes. This goes along with the social exchange theory and its associated norms of reciprocity, which posit that employees who perceive high
levels of organizational support feel obligated to repay their organization through positive 
attitudes and behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Along these lines, in a study by Farrell 
and Oczkowski (2009) that collected data from 170 employees of a major fast food 
restaurant, employees’ perceived organizational support had a direct positive impact on 
job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Although the construct of perceived 
organizational support is different than the warmth and competence constructs, perceived 
organizational support represents a cognitive construct that includes warmth and 
competence perceptions, such as “the organization is willing to extend itself in order to 
help me perform my job to the best of my ability” and “the organization really cares 
about my well-being.” Therefore, it is important for employees to perceive that they work 
with warm and competent co-workers, as they may affect their job satisfaction and 
organizational commitment.

Based on the aforementioned literature review and proposed research questions, 
the current study develops the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1a**: The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively 
related to employee job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2a**: The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively 
related to employee organizational commitment.

**Hypothesis 3a**: The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively 
related to employee job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 4a**: The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively 
related to employee organizational commitment.
As mentioned earlier, in a work environment, subordinates could also be affected by a superior’s manner and behavior (Griffith, 1988). Thus, the following section examines in detail how employees’ perceptions of their restaurant general managers could positively influence their job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

2.5 The Influence of Restaurant General Managers’ Perceived Warmth and Competence on Employee Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Restaurant general managers, who represent the most highly-ranked employees in any given restaurant property, are an interesting population to study, because they are supposed to portray the values and principles of their organization. Along these lines, one of their main responsibilities is to manage restaurant staff, such as assistant managers, supervisors and frontline employees, so that all of these stakeholders can be inspired and motivated to work for their company. Moreover, casual dining restaurant general managers’ job descriptions often include the following tasks or responsibilities: to create a learning and nurturing environment; minimize employee turnover rates by taking the time to effectively orient new employees, train, coach, and give them constructive feedback; cultivate an environment of open authentic dialogue with restaurant employees; ensure the consistent execution of policies and procedures; embrace, articulate, and reflect the company’s culture; demonstrate the company’s core values in all business decisions and actions; and possess complete knowledge, application and enforcement of all hospitality standards (Indeed.com, n.d.). As it is possible to observe, several of these job responsibilities require the adoption of social (e.g., to create a learning and nurturing environment; to cultivate an environment of open authentic dialogue with restaurant employees) and task-oriented (e.g., to ensure the consistent execution of policies and
procedures; to possess complete knowledge, application and enforcement of all hospitality standards) attitudes and behaviors.

Although most restaurant general managers’ job descriptions require such managerial knowledge and skills, a study by Murphy, DiPietro, Rivera, and Muller (2009) showed that casual dining multi-unit managers perceive that they lack some human resource skills. Their study, which investigated the factors impacting the turnover intentions and job satisfaction of multi-unit managers in the U.S., revealed that managers need training in the areas of human resources management, employee development, and leadership skills in order for them to have lower turnover intentions. This finding is quite alarming as the lack of human resource skills, which could be related to such things as manpower planning, succession planning, and work-team considerations (Goss-Turner, 1999), could also negatively impact hourly employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Employees’ warmth and competence perceptions towards their restaurant general managers could suffer from such lack of human resource skills, as managers who possess human resource and leadership skills are more likely to be perceived as warmer and more competent than those who lack such skills.

In fact, studies have shown that the way how leaders communicate could play an important role in the retention of employees. For example, in a study by Fu and Mount (2002), the second most important communication factor for older workers was related to supervisory communication, which included such items as the extent to which a supervisor is open to ideas, listens and pays attention, and offers guidance in solving job-related problems. Hence, empathy and openness, which are related to the warmth construct, as well as guidance in solving job-related problems, a communication
component that deals with the perceived competence of supervisors, can influence older workers’ job satisfaction. On the other hand, a study by Mathisen, Einarsen, and Mykletun (2008) that explored the occurrence of bullying in the restaurant sector, indicated that bullying was negatively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, employees’ perceptions of creative behavior, and external evaluations of restaurant creativity level; and positively related to burnout and intention to leave the job. Bullying occurs when cold and unprofessional (i.e., or incompetent) relationships are established, usually between higher ranking employees and newly hired employees. The authors believed that one of the main implications of their study is that there is a need to challenge the common attitude in the restaurant sector that aggression and bullying are an acceptable social component of the work environment.

Despite the fact that little research specifically used the warmth and competence constructs in order to assess their impacts on employees’ job attitudes, several studies used similar constructs. For example, in a study that examined turnover intentions of management staff using a sample of Cornell University School of Hotel Administration graduates from 1987 through 2002, Walsh and Taylor (2007) identified the job features that enhanced managers’ commitment with regard to their organizations and the hospitality industry as a whole, as well as those that reduced their likelihood of leaving both their organization and the hospitality industry. The work features that mostly improved managers’ commitment levels included a challenging job that offers growth opportunities, as well as competent leadership and fair compensation. When researchers asked participants about learning-oriented relationships, respondents rated open communication, trust in one another, and confidence in others’ abilities as the most
important factors in their work relationships (Walsh & Taylor, 2007). Therefore, managers must not only maintain an open and sincere (i.e., warm) communication pattern with their subordinates, but they should also demonstrate some competence in order to gain employees’ trust and confidence and increase their level of commitment to the organization.

A study by Kong (2013) also demonstrated the influence of supervisors, as his study explored the relationships among work-family supportive supervisors, career competencies, job involvement, and job satisfaction. Data collected from a sample of 1012 hotel employees working in China showed that a work-family supportive supervisor contributes positively to career competencies, job involvement, and job satisfaction. This study characterized supportive supervisors as those showing some effort to look after workers with family responsibilities, and the construct included items such as “my supervisor was understanding or sympathetic” (i.e., warmth) and “juggled tasks or duties to accommodate my family responsibility” (i.e., warmth and competence). This goes along with previous findings, which showed that psychological climate, such as supportive management, contributes positively to job involvement and job satisfaction (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Karatepe & Kilic, 2007). In another study by Kang, Gatling, and Kim (2014) that explored the relationships among supervisory support, organizational commitment, career satisfaction, and the turnover intention of frontline employees in the hospitality industry, results indicated that supervisory support has positive effects on both employees’ organizational commitment and career satisfaction.

Moreover, using data from the Albanian hotel industry, Karatepe (2009) developed and tested a model that examined the relationships between psychological
involvement, social support and frontline employees’ outcomes. Results revealed that job involvement and work social support increase job satisfaction, and that work social support negatively affects employees’ turnover intentions. Moreover, results also showed that lower job satisfaction leads to higher turnover intentions. The author explained that social support, which the study defined as “an interpersonal transaction that involves emotional concern, instrumental aid, information, or appraisal” (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999, p. 514), can emanate from different sources, such as supervisors and co-workers. The results of Karatepe’s (2009) study confirm the findings from Thompson and Prottas (2005) that the support emerging from supervisors and colleagues can positively influence employed adults’ job satisfaction.

In a more recent study by Larsen, Marnburg, and Øgaard (2012) in the cruise sector, which focused on the perceived work environment and its influence on organizational commitment and job satisfaction, the strongest work environment factors influencing job satisfaction resulted from the perceived social atmosphere (i.e., guests and co-workers), along with supervisor respect and fairness. The same factors were also shown to affect job commitment. Lastly, in a study conducted in hotels in Turkey, a multiple regression analysis revealed that trait perceptions of supervisors (e.g., my supervisor is “patient,” “tactful,” and “considerate”) have a statistically significant influence on employee job satisfaction and intention to continue working in the industry (Tutuncu & Kozak, 2007). Co-workers’ trait perceptions (e.g., “hardworking,” “intelligent,” and “friendly”) also had a significant influence on employees’ intentions to continue working in the industry, thus revealing the importance of warmth and competence perceptions in the workplace.
Based on the aforementioned literature, the current study proposes the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 1b*: The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction.

*Hypothesis 2b*: The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment.

*Hypothesis 3b*: The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction.

*Hypothesis 4b*: The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment.

Having explained and hypothesized the influence of co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment in casual dining restaurants, the next section examines the influence of job satisfaction on organizational commitment.

2.6 The Influence of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment

Many studies have confirmed the effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. Accordingly, Elangovan (2001) demonstrated that job satisfaction predicts commitment, and not the other way around. DiPietro and Bufquin (2014) were also able to verify this relationship, as they gathered data from 2683 restaurant employees in an American fast casual restaurant chain. The authors, who were mainly interested in analyzing the influence of management’s perceived concern for employees and work status congruence on employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions, found that job satisfaction has a significant influence on organizational...
commitment ($\beta = .47; t = 11.67$). Furthermore, results showed that job satisfaction ($\beta = - .24; t = -9.29$) and organizational commitment ($\beta = -.52; t = -19.54$) negatively affect employee turnover intentions in the fast casual restaurant industry. In another study by Kim et al. (2005), which measured the effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and the intention of leaving a casual dining chain restaurant, job satisfaction was also found to have a positive influence on organizational commitment. A more recent study by Kim (2014), which intended to empirically determine the relationships among such constructs as internal service quality, service ability, employee satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the Korean restaurant industry, also showed that improving employee job satisfaction has a significant positive influence on organizational commitment.

Similarly, researchers in the hospitality literature studied the mediating effect of job satisfaction between employees’ organizational commitment and perceived organizational support. For instance, in a study by Colakoglu et al. (2010), which measured the effects of perceived organizational support on hotel employees’ affective outcomes, job satisfaction was found to play a partial mediating role between perceived organizational support and constructs of organizational commitment. In another study by Karatepe and Kilic (2007), which analyzed the relationships among supervisor support and conflicts in the work-family interface and selected job outcomes (i.e., job satisfaction, job performance, affective organizational commitment, and turnover intentions) of hotel employees, job satisfaction was also positively associated with affective organizational commitment.
Based on the aforementioned literature, the current study suggests the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5: Job satisfaction is positively related to organizational commitment.

Having discussed the influence of job satisfaction on organizational commitment, the next section analyzes the influences of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on employee turnover intentions.

2.7 The Influence of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Turnover Intentions

The high turnover rates found in the hospitality industry constitute a problem to restaurant companies, as these rates often involve costly expenses such as administrative and operational costs for the employee who is leaving and for the new hire, as well as recruitment and training costs and a loss of productivity for the newly hired employee (Sonnenshein, 2012). Indeed, when employees reduce their overall productivity because of high turnover intentions, restaurant operators find it difficult to deliver excellent and consistent service quality to their customers, who may choose not to spend as much money as they would if the restaurant’s perceived service delivery was considered to be consistent or flawless.

Along these lines, one of the most effective ways to reduce employee turnover intentions is to increase employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment, given that many researchers have demonstrated the negative relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment and employee turnover intentions. For instance, a study by Yang (2008) which gathered data from 428 hotel employees in Taiwan, found that job satisfaction has a significant effect on individual commitment, leading to a
reduction in turnover intention. The author also found a direct negative relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention. In another study conducted in the Albanian hotel industry that tested a model examining the relationships of psychological involvement and social support with frontline employees’ outcomes, results revealed that lower job satisfaction leads to higher turnover intentions (Karatepe, 2009). Various studies have also shown a strong positive relationship between job dissatisfaction and turnover intention (Crossley, Bennett, Jex, & Burnfield, 2007; Huang, 2006).

Furthermore, in a study by Karatepe and Kilic (2007) on hotel employees in Northern Cyprus, findings revealed that job satisfaction negatively affects turnover intentions. Interestingly enough, organizational commitment did not have a statistically significant influence on turnover intentions in this study. A more recent study by DiPietro and Bufquin (2014) in the restaurant industry contradicted the non-influence of organizational commitment on turnover intentions and found that employees’ organizational commitment was the most significant predictor of turnover intentions (i.e., organizational commitment explained twice as much variance in turnover intentions than job satisfaction). Along these lines, a study by Kang et al. (2014), which explored the relationships among supervisory support, organizational commitment, career satisfaction, and turnover intention of frontline employees in the hospitality industry, also supported the significant influence of organizational commitment on turnover intentions.

Based on the literature, the current study proposes the following hypotheses and model (see Figure 2.2 below):

*Hypothesis 6:* Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intentions.
Hypothesis 7: Organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions.

Figure 2.2 Hypothesized Model. This figure illustrates the aforementioned relationships and hypotheses.

Note. H stands for hypothesis; + represents positive relationships, and – represents negative relationships.

Having described and explained the hypotheses and relationships depicted in the proposed model, the following section analyzes the literature that discusses the relationship between employees’ turnover intentions and restaurants’ actual turnover rates.

2.8 Relationship Between Turnover Intentions and Turnover

Turnover intentions, which represent the self-reported perceptions by employees of whether they will be leaving their current place of employment within a given amount of time, were found to be the strongest indicator of whether employees will actually leave their organization or not (Mobley et al., 1978). Although there are several ways to
measure actual employee turnover percentages, the National Restaurant Association (2014) usually portrays it as the ratio of labor turnover to the average number of employees in a given period of time. Consequently, the turnover rates of restaurants are often described as an annualized percentage (e.g., if a restaurant has an annualized turnover rate of 70% per year, it means that 7 out of 10 employees stopped working, either voluntarily or involuntarily, for that particular restaurant during a specific fiscal year).

Few hospitality researchers have been able to confirm the important relationship that exists between turnover intentions and actual turnover. This lack of confirmation is possibly due to the fact that it is hard for researchers to obtain sensitive data from hospitality companies, which in most cases are not willing to share confidential information with third parties. Another explanation for the lack of previous empirical confirmation regarding such relationship may rely on the fact that employees do not want to look bad with respect to their employers and colleagues, thus leading them to contradict their real turnover intentions whenever they report these via self-administered surveys. Nonetheless, such social desirability bias can be overcome by highlighting the complete anonymity of the survey to respondents (Mitchell & Jolley, 2010). The current study intends to confirm whether this relationship holds in the restaurant industry, and more specifically in a casual dining restaurant setting.

Based on the aforementioned literature, the current study suggests the following hypothesis:

_Hypothesis 8:_ Turnover intentions are positively related to casual dining restaurants’ turnover rates.
The following section reviews the relationships between job satisfaction, organizational commitment and restaurant performance.

2.9 RELATIONSHIPS AMONG JOB SATISFACTION, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND RESTAURANT PERFORMANCE

Schneider and Bowen (1985) argued that consumers are better served if an organization meets the needs of and satisfies employees, as it results in positive outcomes in terms of service quality for the consumer. Indeed, organizational dynamics have a direct influence upon employee performance, attitudes, and customer satisfaction (Davidson & Manning, 2003). Along these lines, studies have shown that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are highly correlated with employee performance, productivity, and job involvement (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Huang, 2003). For example, in a study that focused on the effect of four management commitment to service factors (i.e., organizational support, rewards, empowerment, and training) on employees’ job satisfaction and service behaviors in ten hotels, a structural equation model using Thai hotel workers indicated that job satisfaction has a significant influence on employees’ extra-role customer service behaviors and cooperation (Kim, Tavitiyaman, & Kim, 2009). Extra-role customer service behaviors referred to desirable behaviors performed by frontline employees to serve customers that go beyond their official role requirements (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986), while cooperation dealt with the helping behavior of frontline employees towards other members of their work group (Kim et al., 2009). Thus, when employees are satisfied with their jobs, they tend to perform better with regard to both customers and team members.
In a study by Young and Corsun (2010) that analyzed the influence of work aspects, injury, and job satisfaction on unionized cooks’ intentions to leave the cooking occupation, a survey of 213 respondents revealed that job satisfaction is highly correlated with work engagement and negatively correlated with turnover intentions. Work engagement is a measure that explains how engaging employees find their work to be and is concerned with how exciting, interesting, motivating and important the work is (Young & Corsun, 2010). Thus, when employees are satisfied with their jobs, they feel more engaged and have fewer intentions to quit. These findings go along with the social exchange theory, which posits that when employees perceive that they are obtaining enough support from their organization, they feel obligated to repay their organization through positive attitudes and behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Based on this theory, increased engagement and job satisfaction from employees could eventually improve their job performance, translating into such things as higher productivity and customer satisfaction, which could result in increased restaurant sales and profits.

In another study by Gazzoli et al. (2010), which analyzed the answers from 474 restaurant employees and 1,259 customers to determine the effects of empowerment and job satisfaction on customers’ perceptions of service quality, a structural equation model suggested that both constructs (i.e., empowerment and job satisfaction) have a significant influence on customers’ perception of service quality. Since the authors’ objective was to measure the service quality delivered directly from frontline employees, the service quality scale used in their study included the sub-constructs of interaction quality (attitude, behavior, and expertise) and outcome quality (waiting time, tangibles, and valence), and also included two items related to the overall service quality of the
restaurant. Valence is a construct that represented customers’ perceptions about employees’ best intentions and performance at work, and included such items as “I believe that this service employee tries to give me a good experience” and “I believe that this service employee knows the type of experience his or her customers want” (Gazzoli et al., 2010). Consequently, having satisfied employees positively affects restaurant customers’ service perceptions.

Along these lines, previous studies have shown the influence of organizational commitment on several behavioral outcomes. For example, in a study by Kim and Brymer (2011) that investigated the effects of ethical leadership on hotel middle managers’ job satisfaction and affective commitment, organizational commitment was the only construct to influence both middle managers’ behavioral outcomes (i.e., extra effort and turnover intention), and these behavioral outcomes produced in turn positive effects on hotel performance. This study distributed mail surveys to 30 U.S. hotels and 324 middle managers participated in the survey. Kim and Brymer (2011) were able to show that the ethical leadership of executives was positively related to middle managers’ job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. Although middle managers’ job satisfaction was also found to be positively related to their organizational commitment, job satisfaction did not lead to a willingness to exert extra effort. The organizational commitment of hotel middle managers was the only construct to lead them to exert extra effort, which in this case was represented by a measure portraying how much extra customer service they were willing to perform.
Based on the aforementioned literature, the researcher suggests the following hypotheses:

_Hypothesis 9:_ Employees’ job satisfaction is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores).

_Hypothesis 10:_ Employees’ organizational commitment is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores).

Having described the relationships among employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment and restaurant performance measures, the following section examines the literature that discusses the possible differences in the levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions that could occur after employees evaluate their co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence in a casual dining restaurant setting.

2.10 DIFFERENCES IN THE LEVELS OF JOB SATISFACTION, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS

According to the Stereotype Content Model (SCM) and Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes (BIAS) Map, four group formations can result from warmth and competence perceptions. A person or group can be seen as (1) warm and competent, (2) warm and incompetent, (3) cold and competent, or (4) cold and incompetent (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002). Members from the in-group are always perceived as warm and competent, whereas the other three group types are considered as out-groups (Caprariello et al., 2009), since they are negatively evaluated or
perceived in one or two of the social constructs. Moreover, the SCM model posits that the only positive emotion (i.e., admiration) that emanates from such perceptions occurs when warm and competent targets are evaluated. The other three perceived individuals or groups (i.e., out-groups) do not produce any positive emotion whatsoever (i.e., pity, contempt, envy) (Fiske et al., 2002).

Although the BIAS Map associates warmth and competence perceptions with specific emotions and behaviors, such social evaluations could eventually affect employees’ job attitudes and turnover intentions in a casual dining restaurant setting. Attitudes are not the same as emotions, but they do include an affective component that is comprised of such things as emotions and moods (Robbins & Judge, 2014). Along these lines, two of the most important job attitudes that employees develop about aspects of their work environment are job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Robbins & Judge, 2014). Both of these job attitudes should increase if employees perceive that they work with warm and competent co-workers and general managers. This suggestion implies that employees who believe that they work with incompetent and/or cold co-workers and general managers will probably experience lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and will tend to have higher turnover intentions.

Respectively, previous studies have shown that employees value organizations that employ competent or knowledgeable and friendly co-workers (Arnett, Laverie, & McLand, 2002; Carbery, Garava, O’Brien, & McDonnell, 2003; Lam & Zhang, 2003). With respect to managers, studies by Brown and Leigh (1996) and Karatepe and Kilic (2007) demonstrated that a supportive management positively contributes to employees’ job involvement and job satisfaction, as well as to their increased organizational
commitment and career satisfaction. Constructs such as workgroup cooperation, friendliness and warmth, and professional and organizational esprit were also linked to lower turnover intentions (Manning et al., 2004). Having warm and competent co-workers and general managers should thus contribute to establish a supportive work environment, which was previously shown to foster higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and decrease turnover intentions (Larsen et al., 2012; Tutuncu & Kozak, 2007).

A seminal study by Tjosvold (1984), which investigated leaders’ actions that enhance subordinates’ motivation on future tasks, found that participants who worked with a warm and directive (i.e., competent) leader were the most motivated to complete a subsequent task, while participants who worked with a warm but nondirective leader were the least productive. The participants who worked with the warm leader also found the leader to be helpful, and were willing to work again and meet him in a social context. Moreover, employees were more satisfied with their relationship with the warm leader compared to participants who worked with the cold leader.

Based on the aforementioned literature, the current study suggests the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 11a*: Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers.

*Hypothesis 11b*: Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will experience higher levels of job
satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager.

*Hypothesis 12a:* Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will have lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers/general managers.

*Hypothesis 12b:* Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will have lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager.

Having described the warmth and competence interaction and the different levels of employee job attitudes and turnover intentions that it can produce, the following section next reviews the past literature that assesses the relative importance of the warmth and competence constructs.

### 2.11 Importance of the Warmth and Competence Constructs

Previous studies have shown that the warmth construct has a greater impact on people’s overall attitudes towards others than the competence construct (Wojciszke & Abele, 2008). Fiske et al. (2007) explained that when individuals meet or interact with other individuals or groups, they must first determine whether the “other” is a friend or a foe (i.e., has good or bad intentions). After they know the person or group’s intentions, the observer determines whether the individual or group has the ability to enact those intentions or not. According to Richetin, Durante, Mari, Perugini, and Volpato (2012), knowing an individual or group’s intentions (i.e., warmth) is more important than
knowing how capable they are in executing their intentions (i.e., competence).

Accordingly, in a social context, warmth is conceptualized as other-profitable, while competence represents an individualistic characteristic (Peeters, 2001). Along these lines, a warm person is often seen as someone who looks after and is considerate of others, and who adopts moral behaviors; while a competent person is perceived to be someone who is self-centered and focuses more on achieving specific tasks, duties and personal goals.

Interestingly enough, the social evaluations about a person or group’s warmth are more easily lost and harder to reclaim than perceptions about a person or group’s competence (Singh & Teoh, 2000; Tausch, Kenworthy, & Hewstone, 2007; Ybarra & Stephan, 1999). This finding is explained by the fact that negative information about an individual or group has more influence on warmth perceptions than positive information, while the contrary is true for competence (Fiske et al., 2007). For example, honest (i.e., warm) individuals are expected to engage only in honest behaviors, whereas dishonest individuals can engage in both honest and dishonest behaviors (Tausch et al., 2007). Therefore, a single dishonest behavior constitutes enough information to evaluate someone as a dishonest person (i.e., cold), whereas a single honest behavior is less informative (Reeder & Spores, 1983). Given these reasons, the warmth construct was found to have a greater influence on people’s overall attitudes towards others than the competence construct (Wojciszke & Abele, 2008).

Although most studies have confirmed the primacy of warmth over competence, more research needs to be conducted in a corporate business setting, as the social dynamics of the work environment may differ from those of purely social environments. If both structural factors (i.e., status and competition) determining the social perceptions
of individuals and groups are taken into consideration in a work setting, employees should perceive their co-workers as less competent and less warm than their general managers, since casual dining general managers do not compete for the same resources (i.e., tips, awards, promotions) and possess a higher status than employees’ co-workers. However, this does not mean that general managers’ perceived warmth is more important than their perceived competence, as the relationships established in a restaurant setting are mostly professional rather than purely social. Such rule applies to co-workers, as employees need each other in order to satisfy customers, who will in turn compensate them with higher tips and better customer evaluations. Thus, in a work setting such as in casual dining restaurants, where the ultimate goal of employees is to be able to work in an orderly fashion in order to provide excellent customer service, it is probable that the perceived competence of restaurant co-workers and general managers may be more important to employees than their perceived warmth.

This goes along with the findings of Kim and Jogoratnam (2010), who studied the effects of individual and organizational factors on employees’ job satisfaction and their intent to stay in the hotel and restaurant industries. Supervisor leadership, which had a statistically significant positive effect on employees’ intent to stay, represented a construct that focused on specific actions that supervisors performed in order to encourage effective job performances from their employees (Nicholls, 1994), and included elements such as “to what extent does your supervisor set an example by working hard him/herself” (Taylor & Bowers, 1972). Therefore, when supervisors demonstrate hard work and competence, employees tend to remain longer in their organization. In another study by Gjerald and Øgaard (2010) that developed a measure of
employee basic assumptions about guests and co-workers in the hospitality industry, employees’ assumptions about co-workers’ competence were also positively correlated with employees’ organizational commitment and job satisfaction; and assumptions about co-workers’ responsibility were positively associated with employees’ intentions to stay in the organization. In their study, the competence construct comprised such things as “a competent co-worker knows his/her job better than a training manual,” “a good co-worker is someone who contributes largely to teamwork” and “good co-workers are very open to alternative solutions” while the responsibility construct included items such as “resourceful and self-sufficient co-workers are highly appreciated in this organization,” “good co-workers are willing to deal with issues on their colleagues’ behalf” and “it is important in this job to be able to trust your co-workers” (Gjerald & Øgaard, 2010).

Hence, the results of their study showed that when employees assume that their co-workers are competent and responsible, such employees tend to experience higher levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction and have lower turnover intentions.

Based on the literature, the current study suggests the following hypotheses:

*Hypothesis 13*: Restaurant co-workers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting.

*Hypothesis 14*: Restaurant general managers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting.
Having proposed all of the study’s hypotheses, the following section examines in detail the theories that were used in the current study to develop the aforementioned model and hypotheses.

2.12 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.12.1 THE SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY

The social identity approach, which refers to two intertwined theories (i.e., the social identity theory and the self-categorization theory), is a socio-psychological analysis of the role of self-conception in group membership, group processes, and intergroup relations (Hogg, 2006). The social identity theory was first introduced in 1979 by Tajfel and Turner (1979), who found that in order to improve one’s self-image, people tend to enhance the status of the group with which they identify. Accordingly, a group only exists if two or more people evaluate themselves as a distinct social entity that shares common attributes that ultimately creates an emotional and value-based significance (Hogg, 2006). On the other hand, the self-categorization theory suggests that people classify themselves and others in several social categories, such as in organizational affiliations, religious entities, gender, age, and cultural cohorts (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). The aforementioned social classifications allow individuals to define themselves, so that they know who they are and what they represent in this social world. For example, someone could define himself as a man and as a restaurant employee, or as an elderly person and as a manager, thus belonging to various social categories at the same time.

Along these lines, many authors differentiated social identity from personal identity. The social identity of an individual is more related to a collective self-construal
(e.g., “we” and “us” versus “them”), while personal identity deals more with the construction of an idiosyncratic personality (e.g., “I” and “me” versus “you”). Even though personal identity has little to do with group membership, the latter can have a significant influence on the development of the former (Hogg, 2006). For example, a study that examined the effect of social identity factors (i.e., organization-based self-esteem) on chefs’ burnout used the social identity theory as a theoretical framework, because it implies that people commit to their organization when it improves employees’ self-image. The authors of the study were able to confirm their hypothesis, as organizational-based self-esteem (i.e., “I am valuable and worthy to the food establishment”) reduced the likelihood of chefs’ burnout (Kang, Twigg, & Hertzman, 2010). In this particular study, organization-based self-esteem dealt with employees' self-reflection on how their performance contributed to their feelings as valuable members of the organization (Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989), while burnout was described as “an erosion of the soul” (Maslach, 1976). Burnout is also referred to a special type of job stress combined with a state of physical, emotional or mental exhaustion (Mayo Clinic, 2012). Consequently, supportive or positive organizational experiences increase employees’ self-worth, which in turn reduces their turnover intentions (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

The social identity theory posits that a social identity is the portion of an individual's self that is derived from perceived membership in a relevant social group. The theory analyzes groups and individuals from a cognitive perspective, encompassing such things as social perceptions, social categorization, social comparison, prejudice, discrimination, and intergroup conflict (Hogg, 2006). Once a social identity is formed via
social categorization, which is the cognitive basis for social identity processes (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), groups or individuals who share a social identity compete with other groups that do not share the same characteristics. Along this line, the social identity approach implies that individuals and groups are motivated to achieve a positive distinctiveness in society, rather than a negative one (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). For that reason, if the social identity of the in-group is considered to be positive, the members of the group are satisfied and consequently remain in their in-group. Conversely, if the in-group starts to lose its status or is evaluated as having a rather negative social identity, individuals no longer identify with their pertaining group and take action accordingly (e.g., individuals can leave their ingroup or even confront it) (Hogg, 2006).

The social exchange theory explains in more detail the emotional and behavioral consequences that occur when employees have positive or negative social perceptions with regard to the organizationa that they work for.

2.12.2 THE SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

The hypothesized influences of restaurant general managers’ and co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence on employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment are based on the principles provided by the social exchange theory (SET), which suggests that there is an implicit obligation for employees to return a favor after receiving a favor or benefit from another person (Blau, 1964). Accordingly, “social exchange relationships tend to involve the exchange of socioemotional benefits” and are “associated with close personal attachments and open-ended obligations” (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003, p. 161). In this sense, if employees perceive that they work in an
environment where they receive support from warm and competent co-workers and
general managers, these employees will probably respond with high levels of job
satisfaction and organizational commitment, which in turn should lower their turnover
intentions.

A study by Guchait, Pasamehmetoglu, and Dawson (2014) observed similar
relationships, as the researchers collected data from 22 restaurants in Turkey involving
236 employees. Their study used the SET as a theoretical framework in order to confirm
the direct main effects of perceived supervisor and co-worker support for error
management on employees’ engagement in service recovery performance. The study also
used this framework in order to confirm the positive interaction effect of perceived
supervisor and co-worker support for error management on perceived psychological
safety, as well as the mediating effect of perceived psychological safety between
perceived support for error management and employee engagement in service recovery
performance. These results suggest that front-line employees believe that they can share
their service errors when they have the support of their supervisors and co-workers.
Moreover, supervisors’ and co-workers’ support also influenced employees’ service
recovery performance efforts. Along these lines, frontline employees felt safer when they
believed that they were receiving greater support for error management from supervisors
and co-workers (Guchait et al., 2014).

Another study by Chan and Jepsen (2011) done in Australia, which examined the
effect of organizational justice on workplace relationships and attitudes of shift workers
in registered clubs, used a social exchange perspective as a theoretical framework. Clubs
are represented in their study by recreational, sporting, and community facilities that
provide its members with hospitality services such as bars, restaurants and entertainment. The study analyzed responses from 501 employees in three different clubs in order to assess employees’ workplace relationships, including leader-member exchanges and perceived organizational support and the work attitudes of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employees’ intention to quit. The study had the merit to provide weak support for past justice studies, raising concerns about the generalizability of current organizational justice research to both shift workers and the hospitality industry. Moreover, the study demonstrated that procedural, interpersonal and informational justices have positive relationships with job satisfaction, and that procedural justice was negatively related with the intention to quit in one of the three clubs. In sum, employees have a tendency to repay through positive attitudes and behaviors the employers that treat them fairly.

This section next discusses Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory, which the current study uses to explain the relationships between employees’ warmth and competence perceptions, and their attitudinal (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment) and behavioral intentions (i.e., turnover intentions).

2.12.3 BAGOZZI’S (1992) ATTITUDE THEORY

The hypothesized relationships between cognition (i.e., perceived warmth and competence), employee affective responses (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment), behavioral intentions (i.e., turnover intentions), and behaviors come from the tripartite view of Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory. This theory posits that cognitive evaluations of events, outcomes, and situations precede affective reactions, which in turn influence individual’s intentions and behaviors. Therefore, if employees perceive that
they work with competent and warm co-workers and restaurant general managers, employees should have increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Subsequently, employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment should negatively influence their turnover intentions, as prior studies demonstrate the negative relationships between positive job attitudes and turnover intentions.

A similar study by Alexandrov, Babakus, and Yavas (2007) in the retail sector examined the effects of management’s perceived concern for frontline employees and customers on turnover intentions, as mediated by job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. The results indicated that management’s perceived concern for employees and customers had significant positive effects on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which in turn had significant negative effects on employees’ turnover intentions. Burke, Borucki and Hurley (1992) first introduced the concept of management’s perceived concern for employees, as they covered the so-called psychological climate of the work environment, as well as employees’ cognitive evaluations of management decisions and behaviors. The latter concept included variables such as listening to what employees have to say, caring about the personal growth and achievements of employees, motivating employees without using fear and intimidation, and promoting teamwork throughout the company.

Lastly, another study from DiPietro and Bufquin (2014) also used Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory in order to analyze the influence of management’s perceived concern for employees and work status congruence on employee turnover intentions, as mediated by job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results from the study demonstrated that management’s concern for employees and ability to match employees’
preferred work schedule and status have some positive effects on their job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which in turn had negative influences on employees’ turnover intentions. Interestingly enough, management’s perceived concern for employees is a construct that is very similar to the warmth construct that Fiske et al. (2002) describe, as it relates to management’s capacity to communicate, listen, inspire, and motivate their employees. On the other hand, work status congruence is a construct that is much more related to management’s capacity to organize, schedule, and listen to employees’ preferences about specific job characteristics, and such construct is thus more similar to the competence construct.

Having reviewed the theoretical framework that was used to develop the proposed hypotheses and model, namely the social exchange theory, the social identity theory and Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory, the following section summarizes all of the proposed hypotheses of the study.

2.13 SUMMARY

In order to answer the first research question (i.e., how do warmth and competence perceptions of restaurant general managers and co-workers affect employees’ attitudes, as measured in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and turnover intentions?), the current study proposes that the social evaluations or perceptions of co-workers and general managers’ perceived warmth and competence will have positive relationships with employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e., Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b). It is also hypothesized that satisfied and committed employees will have lower turnover intentions than employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs and uncommitted to their organization (i.e., Hypotheses 6 and
7). Satisfied employees will also have higher levels of organizational commitment than unsatisfied employees (i.e., Hypothesis 5).

Additionally, in order to answer the second research question (i.e., can employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes differ based on the warmth and competence perceptions that they hold with regard to their co-workers and restaurant general managers?), it is hypothesized that employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent co-workers and general managers will have higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and lower turnover intentions than employees who believe that they work with cold and/or incompetent co-workers and general managers (i.e., Hypotheses 11a, 11b, 12a, and 12b).

Moreover, in order to answer the third research question (i.e., are employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment related to restaurants’ performance?), it is hypothesized that casual dining restaurants that work with employees who have low turnover intentions will benefit from lower turnover rates than those restaurants who work with employees that have higher turnover intentions (i.e., Hypothesis 8). Along these lines, it is also hypothesized that restaurants with satisfied and committed employees will also benefit from high performance measures, as measured by restaurants’ sales, cost of sales and customer satisfaction scores (i.e., Hypotheses 9 and 10).

Lastly, in order to answer the fourth research question (i.e., does the primacy of warmth over competence still apply in a corporate business setting, such as in casual dining restaurants?), it is hypothesized that it will be more important for employees to
work with competent co-workers and general managers than with warm co-workers and general managers (i.e., Hypotheses 13 and 14).

In sum, all of the following hypotheses are proposed in the current study:

_Hypothesis 1a:_ The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee job satisfaction.

_Hypothesis 1b:_ The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction.

_Hypothesis 2a:_ The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee organizational commitment.

_Hypothesis 2b:_ The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment.

_Hypothesis 3a:_ The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee job satisfaction.

_Hypothesis 3b:_ The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction.

_Hypothesis 4a:_ The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee organizational commitment.

_Hypothesis 4b:_ The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment.

_Hypothesis 5:_ Job satisfaction is positively related to organizational commitment.

_Hypothesis 6:_ Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intentions.

_Hypothesis 7:_ Organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions.
Hypothesis 8: Turnover intentions are positively related to casual dining restaurants’ turnover rates.

Hypothesis 9: Employees’ job satisfaction is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores).

Hypothesis 10: Employees’ organizational commitment is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores).

Hypothesis 11a: Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers.

Hypothesis 11b: Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager.

Hypothesis 12a: Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will have lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers/general managers.

Hypothesis 12b: Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will have lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager.
Hypothesis 13: Restaurant co-workers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting.

Hypothesis 14: Restaurant general managers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting.

Having presented all of the study’s hypotheses, the following chapter describes the methodology that was used in order to verify them.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

The research approach used in the current study is deductive in nature, since the proposed hypotheses are based on theory-testing (Brotherton, 2008). In such an approach, data collection takes place later in the study process and is preceded by the analysis of extant literature, which results in a theoretical framework or model to be tested. In this case, the proposed hypotheses and model are grounded in relevant literature as well as on solid theoretical frameworks (e.g., social identity theory, social exchange theory, Bagozzi’s attitude theory). The proposed hypotheses are tested and verified after selecting the target population, sampling method and frame and lastly, after collecting data through a self-administered survey. The following section describes in more detail the target population, sampling method and frame, as well as the methodology and data collection that were chosen for this specific study.

3.2 SAMPLE AND DATA COLLECTION

The target population for the current study is the casual dining restaurant employee. A non-probability convenience sampling technique was chosen since a comprehensive employee survey was distributed by a large franchisee, who owned and operated a large number of restaurant units of a national U.S. based casual dining restaurant chain. As of February 2015, the franchisee owned domestically a total of 43
restaurants spread in the Southeastern and Midwestern regions of the U.S. In order to collect data, a survey link was posted onto each restaurant’s intranet via employees’ scheduling program from the 15th of February until the 16th of March 2015, representing a total time period of 30 days. Once the data were gathered, the intranet link was closed and responses were transferred into a data file that was examined by the researcher. The program used for the collection of the online survey data was Qualtrics.

During the data gathering period, the management team of each restaurant frequently encouraged their employees to take the online survey. Once a week, an email message was sent from the corporate office to restaurants’ management teams to remind them to encourage employees to complete the survey. Employees only had to click on the available link to start fulfilling the self-administered survey. Employees were able to access the survey link anywhere and anytime, allowing them to complete the survey at home and even through their cell phones. Participation in the current study was totally voluntary and anonymous. Prior to posting the survey link onto restaurants’ intranet systems, the instrument and distribution procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the Committee on the Use of Human Research Subjects at the University of South Carolina.

In order to give the opportunity for Spanish speaking respondents to take the survey, a Spanish version was available for respondents who preferred to fulfill the survey in that specific language. The researcher translated the English survey to Spanish, and had the translation verified by a native Spanish speaker. Lastly, secondary data were also obtained from the restaurant franchisee’s properties in order to measure the relationship between turnover intentions and actual employee turnover, and to analyze the
relationships between employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and restaurant performance measures, which included (1) same store sales change 2014 versus 2013; (2) cost of sales for 2014; and (3) customer satisfaction scores for 2014.

3.3 LIMITATIONS OF ONLINE SELF-ADMINISTERED SURVEYS

It is important to note that self-administered surveys can yield a self-report bias and may eventually affect the validity of the research. Self-report bias occurs when respondents want to answer in a way that makes them look as good as possible with regard to other people (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). According to Donaldson and Grant-Vallone (2002), the threat of self-report bias may obstruct the development of theories in organizational behavior, although they agree that self-reports are not necessarily a less reliable source of research data when compared to other available sources. Because the current study asked respondents to evaluate the perceived warmth and competence of their co-workers and restaurant general managers, it is difficult to ignore the possibility of respondents inflating their responses (i.e., evaluating their co-workers and managers as extremely warm or competent). By judging their peers and restaurant general managers via a self-administered survey, respondents may have been afraid for example that their answers would be shared with upper management or even with colleagues.

However, the researcher made sure that respondents’ anonymity was assured at all times, and reminded them of such confidentiality in the introduction section of the survey. If respondents had any questions regarding the survey, the contact information of the researcher’s faculty adviser was documented in that section as well as the contact of the Office of Research Compliance at the University of South Carolina. Along similar
lines, with self-administered surveys, an order bias can also occur due to the ordering of the survey questions. To minimize such problem, the researcher randomized the answers of the questionnaire via the program used (i.e., Qualtrics) for the administration of the online survey, which allowed the researcher to randomize the order of the survey’s answers or items every time a respondent took the survey.

The following section describes in detail the research instrument that was used for the validation of the proposed model and testing of hypotheses.

3.4 Research Instrument

In order to verify the proposed hypotheses, the survey was developed from previously tested measures (see Table 3.1 below). The survey items related to the perceived warmth and competence of co-workers and restaurant general managers were taken from a study from Fiske et al. (2002), which developed the Stereotype Content Model. As a result, the competence construct included five items (i.e., competent, intelligent, independent, confident, and competitive), while the warmth construct included four items (i.e., sincere, good-natured, warm, and tolerant). In Fiske et al.’s (2002) study, two types of respondents completed their self-administered questionnaires: (1) 73 undergraduate students from the University of Massachusetts and (2) 38 non-students. Each participant rated 23 groups (e.g., rich, feminists, housewives, migrant workers) according to their perceived competence (α = .90 for students; α = .85 for non-students) and perceived warmth (α = .82 for students and non-students). Each of the 23 groups had their competence and warmth ratings averaged across participants, so the means supplied competence and warmth scores for each group. As predicted, the two constructs differentiated the groups via a cluster analysis.
The survey items for the constructs of job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment were taken from a study by Alexandrov et al. (2007), which measured the effects of frontline employees’ perceptions of management concern for employees and customers on turnover intention, mediated by job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. In Alexandrov et al.’s (2007) study, the reliability coefficients (Cronbach alpha values) of both constructs were above the .70 level suggested by Nunnally (1978) ($\alpha$ of job satisfaction = .78; $\alpha$ of affective organizational commitment = .84). The constructs also exhibited satisfactory convergent and discriminant validity, since their average variance extracted (AVE) was above .5, and none of the shared variances between pairs of constructs were larger than the AVE by each construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The job satisfaction construct thus included four items related to co-workers, restaurant manager, teamwork and pay. The organizational commitment construct included five items such as “I find that my values and this company’s values are similar,” “I really care about this company’s future” and “My work at this company gives me a sense of accomplishment.” Finally, three items from Singh, Verbeke, and Rhoads (1996) were used to measure turnover intentions, including items such as “It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year,” “I often think about quitting” and “I will probably look for a new job within the next 12 months.” The turnover intentions construct had a Cronbach alpha value of .79, which also surpasses Nunnally’s (1978) threshold of .70. Responses for all five constructs were based on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Therefore, a response of three out of five would be considered as neutral (i.e., “Neither agree or disagree”).
Table 3.1

Survey Scale Items and Their Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Warmth (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, &amp; Xu, 2002)</th>
<th>I consider my Restaurant General Manager/Co-workers at this restaurant to be...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good-Natured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Competence (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, &amp; Xu, 2002)</th>
<th>I consider my Restaurant General Manager/Co-workers at this restaurant to be...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction (Alexandrov, Babakus, &amp; Yavas, 2007)</th>
<th>I am satisfied with my co-workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my restaurant management team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the teamwork in my restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my pay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment (Alexandrov, Babakus, &amp; Yavas, 2007)</th>
<th>I find that my values and this restaurant’s values are similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am really glad that I chose to work for this restaurant rather than for other restaurants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really care about this restaurant’s future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not hesitate to recommend this restaurant as a good place to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work at this restaurant gives me a sense of accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover Intentions (Singh, Verbeke, &amp; Rhoads, 1996)</th>
<th>It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a new job next year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once respondents evaluated their co-workers and restaurant general manager’s perceived warmth and competence, a survey question asked them to choose which of those combined warmth and competence traits they considered to be the most important for them to have in the workplace. This question allowed them to pick only one trait out of the 9 traits pertaining to the warmth and competence constructs. Lastly, respondents answered some socio-demographic information at the end of the survey regarding their
gender, ethnicity, age, education, salary, tenure, work status, work shift and restaurant location. Restaurant executives, students, and academicians reviewed the proposed survey instrument for content validity before it was administered to restaurant employees.

3.5 Secondary Data

Secondary data were also obtained from the restaurant franchisee in order to measure the relationship between turnover intentions and employee turnover, and to analyze the relationships between employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and restaurant performance measures, which included such things as (1) same store sales change 2014 versus 2013; (2) cost of sales for 2014; and (3) customer satisfaction scores for 2014:

- Same store sales change (in percentage) represented the difference in sales that a restaurant unit obtained in 2014 in comparison to its 2013 sales. Therefore, the annualized percentage could either be positive or negative, depending on whether there was an increase or decrease in sales in comparison to the previous year.

- Cost of sales (in percentage) represented the ratio of the combined costs of food and beverage to restaurants’ overall food and beverage sales. To be precise, restaurants’ cost of sales are based on the dollar amount of all food and beverage purchases during a specific time frame, plus the value of the inventory on hand at the beginning of the reporting period, minus the value of the inventory at the end of a period, divided by total sales. The period considered in the current study was the year 2014.

- Customer satisfaction scores (in percentage) represented the scores related to the perceived service quality of the surveyed restaurants. This metric took into
consideration the speed of service; the attentiveness of the server; the cleanliness and maintenance of the restaurant; the taste of food; and the problems experienced by customers. Thus, customer satisfaction percentage scores were calculated as the arithmetic average of these five service quality variables for the year 2014.

- Turnover rates (in percentage) represented the total number of employees that left their jobs (i.e., either voluntarily or involuntarily) divided by the average number of employees that each restaurant had in 2014.

The four types of secondary data were shared by the restaurant franchisee for each of its 43 restaurant units. As mentioned earlier, the goal of the present study is to help restaurant owners understand how their general managers’ and employees’ perceived warmth and competence can increase employees’ satisfaction and organizational commitment, which in turn are expected to affect turnover intentions and restaurants’ performance. High turnover intentions is expected to correlate with actual restaurant employees’ turnover rates, as turnover intentions represents one of the largest predictors of turnover (Mobley et al., 1978). On the other hand, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are expected to positively correlate with restaurant performance measures, as research has shown that increasing levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment can positively influence employee job performance, productivity and involvement (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Ghiselli et al., 2001; Huang, 2003), which could then translate into various positive operational and financial outcomes, such as higher sales and profitability, as well as increased customer satisfaction.

The goal of the current study is to allow restaurant owners to know which trait to focus on when hiring and training restaurant general managers and employees, as
restaurant managers and co-workers were previously found to have an important influence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Arnett et al., 2002; Kang et al., 2014; Kong, 2013; Lam & Zhang, 2003). Moreover, in a work environment, subordinates can be affected by a superior’s manner and behavior (Griffith, 1988) as well as by their co-workers (Susskind et al., 2007). In that regard, restaurant staff can be trained to portray more warmth and competence, as several studies across a variety of subfields (e.g., social psychology, organizational psychology, organizational behavior) have previously demonstrated. Another objective of the current study is also to confirm the relationships that exist between employees’ job attitudes, behavioral intentions and behaviors, as few studies have confirmed those relationships in the hospitality literature, mostly due to the difficulty to obtain confidential secondary data from hospitality companies.

The following section portrays the statistical tools that were performed in order to verify the proposed hypotheses.

3.6 DATA ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

First, descriptive statistics were analyzed to portray the general profile of respondents (gender, ethnicity, age, education, salary, tenure, work status, work shift and restaurant location). Secondly, the first eleven proposed hypotheses (i.e., Hypotheses 1 to 7) were verified using structural equation model (SEM) with Lisrel version 9.1., as SEM assesses a series of dependent relationships simultaneously and is used for models involving multiple exogenous and endogenous variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). In structural equation models, exogenous variables represent the independent variables, while endogenous variables represent the dependent variables.
Following Anderson and Gerbing’s (1988) guidelines, a measurement model was estimated using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), followed by the SEM for the model evaluation and research hypotheses’ testing.

Pearson-product moment correlations were also performed with SPSS version 21 in order to measure the relationship between employees’ turnover intentions and turnover (i.e., Hypothesis 8), and to confirm the proposed relationships among employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and restaurant performance measures (i.e., Hypotheses 9 and 10). Subsequently, two hierarchical cluster analyses followed by independent-sample t-tests were run with SPSS version 21 to further examine the interrelationships among warmth-competence perceptions and employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions (i.e., Hypotheses 11a, 11b, 12a and 12b). Lastly, descriptive statistics were used to verify the primacy of competence over warmth in a corporate business setting (i.e., Hypotheses 13 and 14).

Before proceeding with the description of the SEM analysis, the following section first describes the optimal sample size that was initially targeted in the current study.

3.7 STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODEL

3.7.1 ESTIMATED SAMPLE SIZE

Because SEM is based on covariances, it is less stable when estimated from small samples (Kline, 2011) and therefore needs larger sample sizes for adequate analyses. On the other hand, if variables are highly reliable, it may be possible to estimate small models with fewer participants (Ullman, 2006). Although researchers have always been interested in determining the most appropriate sample size for structural equation model, there is no consensus among researchers with regard to the ideal sample size (Bagozzi &
Yi, 2012). Some believed that a sample size of at least 50 was acceptable (Iacobucci, 2010), while others described samples smaller than 200 to be insufficient (Barrett, 2007). Likewise, some researchers argued that 10 to 20 respondents per parameter estimate were good enough (Kline, 1998), while Costello and Osborne (2005) believed that a 10:1 ratio was not adequate, suggesting a ratio of 20:1 as ideal (i.e., there is a total of 77 parameters in the current study). Bagozzi and Yi (2012) reminded us that focusing solely on sample size leads researchers to miss the point on many other important issues, such as: estimation methods, distributional properties of measure, desired power, and model complexity (Nunkoo, Ramkissoon, & Gursoy, 2013).

Accordingly, a simulation was done in a website developed by Soper (2015) that calculates a priori sample sizes for structural equation models. After anticipating an effect size of 0.1 (i.e., small effect size), a desired power level of 0.8, and a probability level of 0.5, a minimum sample size of 463 respondents was recommended. In the current study, it is known that the restaurant franchisee who agreed to post the online self-administered questionnaire in his restaurants’ intranet system, had approximately 2000 employees throughout the 43 restaurant units during the data gathering period (i.e., the restaurant franchisee had an average of 46 employees per restaurant). If an estimated response rate of 40% was obtained from the online self-administered survey, a total of 800 valid responses would then be collected, which would have largely surpassed the minimum number of 200 respondents suggested by Barrett (2007) and Bagozzi and Yi (2012). Considering the number of parameter estimates of the proposed model (i.e., 77 parameters), a total of 800 respondents would satisfy the proposed 10:1 ratio from Costello and Osborne (2005). In a worst case scenario, where the obtained response rate
was lower than the projected 40% response rate, the researcher believed that a minimum response rate of 30% (i.e., about 600 responses) could be obtained from the self-administered survey, which does not satisfy the proposed 10:1 ratio (Costello & Osborne, 2005), but surpasses the minimum required sample size of 200 respondents (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012; Barrett, 2007), or even the 463 respondents suggested by Soper’s website (2015).

In sum, the researcher was confident that a sufficiently large sample size was going to be obtained, primarily because the restaurant franchisee and the management team of each restaurant frequently encouraged their employees to take the aforementioned online survey, (1) by having weekly email messages sent from the corporate office to restaurants’ management teams, (2) by having restaurant general managers encourage their employees to take the online survey, and (3) by having the presence of the survey link on restaurants’ intranet systems, which allowed employees to take the online survey whenever they wanted to. Moreover, a one month period for the data gathering process allowed respondents to take their time to complete the self-administered survey. As a note, prior to the launch of the self-administered survey onto the restaurant franchisee’s intranet system, the chief executive officer of the company had a meeting with his restaurant general managers in order to talk to them about the importance of the survey. Thus, based on extensive management support from the restaurant franchisee, a sufficiently large sample size was expected to allow for performance of all of the necessary statistical analyses.
The following section describes the steps that were undertaken for the evaluation of the measurement and structural models, as well as for the verification of the SEM assumptions.

3.7.2 SEM TWO-STEP APPROACH, ESTIMATION METHOD AND ASSUMPTIONS

SEM analyses can be performed in two ways: either using a one-step approach or a two-step approach (Kim et al., 2009). With a single-step approach, where both structural and measurement models are estimated simultaneously, the presence of interpretational confounding cannot be detected and results in fit are maximized at the expense of a meaningful interpretability of constructs (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). A single-step analysis is best when the model possesses both strong theoretical rationale and highly reliable measures (Hair et al., 1998). However, when measures are less reliable or a theory is tentative, researchers should consider a two-step process. Indeed, accurate representation of the reliability of the indicators is best accomplished in the two-step approach, since it avoids the interaction of measurement and structural models, and allows a more meaningful interpretation of the fit of the exogenous and endogenous variables (Hair et al., 1998). Consequently, a two-step approach was used in the current study.

The most common estimation technique used in SEM is maximum likelihood (ML). With ML, the estimates are the ones that maximize the likelihood that the data were drawn from a specific population. Furthermore, ML is a normal theory method because multivariate normality is assumed for the population distributions of the endogenous variables (Kline, 2011). Along these lines, only continuous variables can have normal distributions. Since a 5-point Likert-type scale was used in the survey to
measure participants’ responses, and because the Likert-type scale was treated as continuous, the ML estimation technique represented the most convenient estimation method. Another advantage of ML is that when all statistical requirements are met and the model is correctly specified, ML estimates in large samples are unbiased, efficient and consistent (Kline, 2011). Moreover, ML is appropriate for nonnormally distributed data and small sample sizes (Suhr, 2006). Even if there are other alternatives to ML, such as generalized least squares, least squares based on elliptical distributions, and the Satorra-Bentler method involving correction for violation of distributional assumptions (Satorra & Bentler, 1988), there is considerable evidence that ML is robust with respect to many types of violation of the multivariate normality assumption (Bollen, 1989; Chou, Bentler, & Satorra, 1991).

Prior to the evaluation of the appropriateness of the measurement and structural models, the following assumptions were verified (Kline, 2011): (1) the observations are independent and the variables are unstandardized; (2) there are no missing values when a raw data file is analyzed; (3) the joint distribution of the endogenous variables is multivariate normal, which also implies that the endogenous variables are continuous; (4) the exogenous variables are measured without error. The researcher had to ensure that such assumptions were rigorously inspected, since they were crucial for increasing the value of all SEM phases. As Kline (2011) explained, there are usually more assumptions in a typical application of SEM than with other standard statistical techniques. Once such assumptions are verified, Kline (2011) suggested future research to always (1) replicate the proposed model across independent samples and to (2) field test causal assumptions implied by the model. By doing so, researchers can truly validate a proposed
measurement and structural model. Although Kline’s (2011) suggestions are interesting from a theoretical perspective, they were not taken into consideration in the current study since they are mostly concerned with the validation of studies’ proposed models.

Having described in detail the way that the SEM analysis and the verification of its assumptions were conducted, the next section explains the tools that were used to evaluate the reliability and validity of the proposed measurement model.

3.7.3 **Reliability and Validity**

Reliability represents the degree by which measures are free from error, and is assessed by examining the indicator reliability and composite reliability (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012). Indicator reliability was evaluated in the current study by each indicator’s absolute standardized loadings, which should be higher than 0.70 (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). If indicators had loadings between 0.40 and 0.70, they were considered for removal only if it improved the composite reliability of the scale (Hair et al., 2011). The reliability of all constructs (i.e., perceived warmth, perceived competence, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions) was assessed with Cronbach alpha values, which recommended threshold was .70 (Nunnally, 1978).

The validity of the measurement model was assessed by convergent validity and discriminant validity (Nunkoo et al., 2013). The examination of the average variance extracted (AVE) allowed for the determination of convergent validity. The latter should have a value of 0.50 or more (Hair et al., 2011). On the other hand, although discriminant validity can be assessed in three different ways, it was assessed in the current study by the comparison of the squared correlation between a pair of constructs against the AVE for each of the two constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Consequently, discriminant
validity was achieved when for each pair of constructs, the squared correlation was smaller than both the average variance extracted values. Taken together, these results demonstrate that the proposed measurement model is reliable and valid.

The following section analyzes the fit indices that were used for the measurement and structural models’ evaluations.

3.7.4 Model Evaluation: Fit Indices

The appropriateness of the measurement and structural models were determined by several absolute, relative, and non-centrality based indices. Absolute fit indices determine how well the a priori model fits or reproduces the data, including fit indices like the Chi-Square Test ($\chi^2$) and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Relative fit indices were used to compare a chi-square for the tested model to one from a so-called null model, which specifies that all measured variables are uncorrelated. Relative fit indices include Bollen’s Incremental Fit Index (IFI) and the Normed Fit Index (NFI). Finally, non-centrality based indices, which include fit indices as the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) were also used to validate the proposed model (Kenny & McCoach, 2003; Lievens & Van Keer, 2001). In sum, the following goodness of fit indices were used in the current study: $\chi^2$, IFI, NFI, CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR. As Kline (2011) explained, the RMSEA, GFI (Goodness of Fit Index), CFI, and SRMR are four approximate fit indices that are among the most widely reported in the SEM literature, along with IFI and NFI.

As Nunkoo et al. (2013) described in their study, the evaluation and reporting of model fit present several controversies, since disagreements exist among researchers about the values and usefulness of different fit indices. For example, on the basis of
studies such as Joreskog and Sorbom (1982), Bagozzi and Yi (1988), Bentler (1986, 1990), and Joreskog (1989), if the NFI, IFI, and CFI are greater than .9 and the SRMR and RMSEA are less than .05 (Bentler, 1986, 1990), the measurement model is considered to be excellent. On the other hand, such cutoff values are not the same as the ones proposed by a more recent article from Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, and King (2006), who recommended a cutoff value of at least .95 for the GFI, AGFI, NFI, IFI, and CFI, and a threshold of less than .08 for SRMR and RMSEA values.

As a result, the current study considered the cutoff values proposed by the more recent article from Schreiber et al. (2006), and also included the chi-square relative value to degree of freedom ($\chi^2$/df), which according to Carmines and McIver (1981) should not exceed 3. It is important to note that $\chi^2$ values are influenced by the sample size: large samples can severely deviate the data from a normal distribution, causing an increase in the $\chi^2$ value. In sum, the research utilized the six aforementioned indices ($\chi^2$, IFI, NFI, CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR) in order to evaluate the proposed measurement and structural models. The idea behind having various fit indices that complement each other is that they increase the value of the information about model fit, and give more detailed information to the researcher about the models.

The next section describes the analyses that were performed to assess the proposed structural model and its eleven hypotheses.

3.7.5 STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODEL

The full structural model derived from the eleven hypotheses was assessed against widely published and recognized criteria (Hair et al., 1998). Measures of absolute fit ($\chi^2$, SRMR), comparative fit (CFI), relative fit (NFI and IFI), and root mean square of
approximation (RMSEA) should reflect a satisfactory fit between the model and the data (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988), so that the conceptual model is a satisfactory representation of the sample data. The fit indices followed the cutoff values suggested by Schreiber et al. (2006), who recommended a value of at least .95 for the GFI, AGFI, NFI, IFI, and CFI, and a value of less than .08 for SRMR and RMSEA.

All of the paths were expected to feature strong standardized path coefficients and significant t-values. The standardized path coefficients between perceived warmth and competence, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were expected to be positive, since the model hypothesized that co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence positively affect employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Moreover, job satisfaction was predicted to positively influence organizational commitment. On the other hand, the paths between job satisfaction and turnover intentions, and between organizational commitment and turnover intentions should be negative, since satisfied and committed employees are less likely to quit their jobs (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010; Yang, 2008). The reporting of effect size (i.e., \( R^2 \) value) was included in order to evaluate the effects of the exogenous variables of the structural models (Hair et al., 2011), as one of the goals of SEM is to explain and predict the endogenous latent variables. Along these lines, the reporting of the amount of variance in the endogenous variables that is explained by the exogenous variables, was provided by \( R^2 \) values. \( R^2 \) values of 0.75, 0.50, or 0.25 for the endogenous constructs are considered high, moderate, and weak (Hair et al., 2011).

Furthermore, the total effect of one variable on another can be decomposed into a direct effect and an indirect or mediating effect. Following Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude
theory and the BIAS Map (Cuddy et al., 2007), because the proposed model has two mediators (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment), the indirect effects of perceived warmth and perceived competence on turnover intentions were also analyzed. Following the recommendations by MacKinnon and Dwyer (1993) and MacKinnon, Warsi, and Dwyer (1995), Sobel tests were performed in order to test whether the indirect effects of the exogenous variables on employees’ turnover intentions (through the mediator variables) were significant. Accordingly, Bagozzi’s (1992) attitude theory states that cognitive evaluations precede affective responses, which in turn influence individuals’ behavioral intentions. Therefore, the proposed structural model hypothesized that job satisfaction and organizational commitment better predict employees’ turnover intentions than employees’ perceived warmth and competence of their co-workers and restaurant general managers, thus mediating the relationships between employees’ cognitive appraisals and their turnover intentions. Such relationships were also supported by the BIAS Map, which portrays that emotions better predict the behavioral outcomes of individuals or groups rather than the cognitive evaluations of specific persons or groups (Cuddy et al., 2007).

Having explained the methodology that was used for the SEM analysis, the following section describes the Pearson-product moment correlation analyses that were performed in order to examine the relationship between employees’ turnover intentions and turnover, as well as the relationships between job satisfaction, organizational commitment and restaurant performance.
3.8 Pearson-Product Moment Correlations

Despite the fact that there are several ways to measure employee turnover, the National Restaurant Association (2014) portrays it as the ratio of the number of employees that have left the organization to the average number of employees in a given period of time. In the current study, the surveyed restaurant franchisee was able to share the hourly turnover rate of each of its 43 restaurant units with the researcher, who proceeded with a Pearson-product moment correlation analysis using SPSS version 21, in order to measure the relationship between employees’ turnover intentions and turnover. Before performing a correlation analysis, the following assumptions were verified: (1) the variables are measured at the interval or ratio level; (2) there should be a linear relationship between the two variables; (3) there should be no significant outliers; (4) dependent variables should be approximately distributed.

The same assumptions’ verifications were done before proceeding with further Pearson-product moment correlation analyses, which would measure the relationships between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and the three restaurant performance metrics. As Davidson and Manning (2003) explained in their study, organizational dynamics have a direct impact upon employee performance, attitudes, and customer satisfaction. Other studies have also shown that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are highly correlated with employee performance, productivity, and job involvement (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Huang, 2003), which could impact companies’ financial performance. Accordingly, the restaurant franchisee agreed to share three types of performance measures for each of its 43 restaurants: (1) the...
percentage of same store sales change from 2014 versus 2013; (2) the percentage of the
cost of sales for 2014; and (3) customers’ satisfaction scores for 2014.

Once all of the aforementioned relationships regarding the obtained secondary
data were verified, two cluster analyses and independent-sample t-tests were run to
examine the interrelationships among warmth-competence perceptions and employees’
job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

3.9 Hierarchical Cluster Analyses

Before examining the interrelationships among warmth-competence perceptions
and employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, two
cluster analyses were first conducted with SPSS version 21 to classify respondents into
mutually exclusive groups based on the combinations of their (1) co-workers and (2)
restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence. The purpose of a cluster
analysis is to sort a system of organizing observations, usually people, into groups, where
members of the groups share properties in common. Not knowing the number of groups
or clusters that would emerge in the sample, a two-stage sequence of analysis occurred as
followed: (1) hierarchical cluster analyses using Ward’s method applying squared
Euclidean Distance as the distance measure were first carried out, as this helped to
determine the most favorable number of clusters to work with (Sharma, 1996); and (2)
the rerun of the hierarchical cluster analyses with the selected number of clusters, which
enabled the researcher to allocate every case in the sample to a particular cluster.

The goal of performing two hierarchical cluster analyses was to have an optimal
clustering solution. Accordingly, a hierarchical cluster analysis does not require a priori
knowledge of the number of clusters and is used in an exploratory fashion (Sharma,
Even though the warmth and competence interaction was shown in the BIAS Map to result in four different types of perception (i.e., people or groups can be seen as warm and competent; warm and incompetent; cold and competent; cold and incompetent), the researcher preferred to confirm if those groups would really emerge from the obtained data. Along these lines, it is possible that employees from the restaurant industry perceive their co-workers and restaurant general managers differently, and the only way to verify this assumption was to proceed with a hierarchical cluster analysis. Moreover, a Ward’s method was chosen because it tends to find clusters that are compact and nearly of equal size and shape, and several researchers have found this technique to be the most accurate hierarchical method (Mojena, 1977; Sharma, 1996).

Knowing that warmth and competence perceptions can result in different groups, the researcher hypothesized that each of these groups of employees who emerged from both cluster analyses would have significantly different levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. This goes along with the BIAS Map, which posits that warmth and competence perceptions can provoke different emotional and behavioral responses. Accordingly, research shows that the only group or person that elicits a positive emotion are people who are perceived as warm and competent (i.e., they elicit an emotion called admiration), which in turn encourages the perceiver to hold positive behavioral intentions (i.e., associating and helping intentions) towards the target person or group (Cuddy et al., 2007). Similarly, the current study hypothesized that employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant general managers and co-workers are likely to be more satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organizations, and have lower turnover intentions than employees who evaluate
their co-workers and restaurant general managers as cold and/or incompetent. To proceed with the cluster analyses, the following assumptions had first to be verified: (1) the sample is representative of the population, and (2) variables cannot be correlated. If variables are too correlated, they could either be removed or distance measures (e.g., such as Mahanalobis distance) could be used to compensate for the correlation (Sharma, 1996).

Since only two clusters were obtained from both hierarchical cluster analyses (i.e., employees either perceived their co-workers and general managers as (1) warm and competent, or as (2) cold and incompetent), the researcher proceeded with independent-sample t-tests, in order to compare the possible differences in employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions according to co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence.

3.10 Groups’ Comparisons Regarding Their Levels of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions

The intention of the hierarchical cluster analyses performed earlier was to find out how employees evaluate their (1) restaurant co-workers’ and (2) restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence. Having obtained two clusters of employees from each cluster analysis (i.e., employees perceived their co-workers and general managers either as (1) warm and competent, or as (2) cold and incompetent), the researcher proceeded with independent-sample t-tests with SPSS version 21 in order to measure if the levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions differed between both of these employees’ clusters. As mentioned earlier, it was hypothesized that employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent
restaurant general managers and co-workers are likely to be more satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organizations, and have less turnover intentions than employees who believe that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant general managers and co-workers.

In order to run an independent-samples t-test, six assumptions needed to be verified: (1) there is one dependent variable that is measured at the continuous level; (2) there is one independent variable that consists of two categorical, independent groups; (3) there is independence of observations, which means that there is no relationship between the observations in each group of the independent variable or between the groups themselves; (4) there are no significant outliers in the two groups of the independent variable in terms of the dependent variable; (5) the dependent variable is approximately normally distributed for each group of the independent variable; and (6) there is homogeneity of variances (i.e., the variance of the dependent variable is equal in each group of the independent variable).

Once the differences in employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions were identified among the groups that emerged from both cluster analyses, the primacy of competence over warmth was analyzed.

3.11 Importance of the Warmth and Competence Constructs

Many authors (Richetin et al., 2012; Wojciszke & Abele, 2008) illustrated the primacy of warmth over competence in a social context. According to these authors, warmth is more important than competence because the warmth construct deals with social skills and intentions, while the competence construct is more individualistic, relating to one’s abilities for carrying out those intentions. According to Richetin et al.
(2012), it is more important to know someone’s intentions than to know how capable a person is in enacting those intentions (Richetin et al., 2012). However, most studies that assessed the warmth and competence constructs were performed in fields such as sociology and social psychology. For that reason, it is important for researchers to evaluate which trait is more important in a restaurant setting, as it is still not clear whether employees might value more the perceived warmth or competence of their restaurant general managers and co-workers in a restaurant setting.

After respondents evaluated the perceived warmth and competence of their restaurant general managers, they were asked to choose one individual trait that they believe to be the most important among all of the traits portraying the warmth and competence constructs. The same question was asked after respondents evaluated the perceived warmth and competence of their co-workers. The question dealing with the importance of perceived traits was phrased as follows: “Which trait portrayed above do you think is the most important trait for any [restaurant general manager/co-worker] to possess?” In order to measure which trait was the most important for employees, descriptive statistics were used to describe the frequency of these traits. Once the frequency of each trait was described, the researcher determined which construct (i.e., warmth or competence) was the most significant by compiling or summing up the frequencies of each trait that was considered to be the most important.

Having reviewed the methodology used in the current study, the following section summarizes the statistical analyses that were conducted to verify all of the proposed hypotheses.
3.12 Summary

In sum, the statistical analyses that were performed in the current study to verify the proposed hypotheses are described in brackets:

Hypothesis 1a: The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee job satisfaction (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 1b: The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 2a: The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee organizational commitment (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 2b: The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 3a: The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee job satisfaction (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 3b: The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 4a: The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee organizational commitment (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 4b: The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 5: Job satisfaction is positively related to organizational commitment (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 6: Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intentions (Structural equation model).
Hypothesis 7: Organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions (Structural equation model).

Hypothesis 8: Turnover intentions are positively related to casual dining restaurants’ turnover rates (Pearson-product moment correlation analysis).

Hypothesis 9: Employees’ job satisfaction is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores) (Pearson-product moment correlation analyses).

Hypothesis 10: Employees’ organizational commitment is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores) (Pearson-product moment correlation analyses).

Hypothesis 11a: Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers (Cluster analysis and independent-sample t-tests).

Hypothesis 11b: Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager (Cluster analysis and independent-sample t-tests).

Hypothesis 12a: Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will have lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers/general managers (Cluster analysis and independent-sample t-test).
Hypothesis 12b: Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will have lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager (Cluster analysis and independent-sample t-test).

Hypothesis 13: Restaurant co-workers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting (Descriptive statistics).

Hypothesis 14: Restaurant general managers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting (Descriptive Statistics).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Responses were gathered during one month, namely from February 15th to March 16th 2015. Out of the 863 online self-administered surveys that the restaurant franchisee’s employees started to complete, a total of 805 valid responses were collected, representing a total of 58 invalid responses. Moreover, out of the total 805 valid responses, 28 respondents fulfilled the online survey in Spanish. Considering that the restaurant franchisee had approximately 2000 employees during the administration of the survey, a total of 805 valid responses represented a response rate of 40%. Out of these 805 valid responses, some respondents left a few questions unanswered (i.e., 37 surveys had unanswered questions). Since the number of unanswered questions was very low (i.e., less than 5% of the total number of responses), the researcher opted to replace them by choosing a method called “series mean” in SPSS version 21, which replaces missing values with the mean for the entire series (mean imputation). It is important to highlight that respondents’ missing socio-demographic information were not taken into consideration for the replacement of the missing values.

The following section analyzes first respondents’ socio-demographic profiles, in order to subsequently describe their evaluations regarding their co-workers’ and
restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence, and to finally portray their levels of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions.

4.2 Respondents’ Socio-Demographic Profiles

Employees of the restaurant franchisee were mostly composed of women (478 respondents or 59.4%), as male respondents only represented 36.6% (295 respondents) of the study’s sample (see Table 4.1 below). The sample was close to representing the American restaurant labor force, which according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014b) had 51.9% of women in 2014.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents were aged between 18 and 25 (436 respondents or 54.2%) (see Table 4.2 below), followed by respondents who were aged between 26 and 33 (186 respondents or 23.1%) and between 34 and 41 (92 respondents or 11.4%). Very few respondents were 42 years or older (49 respondents or 6.9%), thus confirming the relatively young age demographics of restaurant employees in the U.S. (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013).

The vast majority of respondents were Caucasian (555 respondents or 68.9%), followed by African American (82 respondents or 10.2%) and Hispanic respondents (71 respondents or 8.8%) (see Table 4.3 below). There were very little Asian respondents (5 respondents or .6%), and many respondents included themselves in the “other” category.
(57 respondents or 7.1%). In sum, the ethnic distribution of the sample was not really representative of the overall restaurant industry population (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014b), as the proportions of African American, Hispanic and Asian restaurant workers in the U.S. are larger than the ones obtained in the study’s sample.

Table 4.2

Age Groups of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-33</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-41</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3

Ethnic Profile of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to respondents’ education, most of them had some college or equivalent (420 respondents or 52.2%), followed by a high school degree (240 respondents or 29.8%) and a bachelor’s (70 respondents or 8.7%). Very few respondents had less than high school (22 respondents or 2.7%) or a graduate degree (16 respondents or 2%) (see Table 4.4 below).
Table 4.4

*Education of Research Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or equivalent</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to employees’ incomes, most respondents received less than $20,000 per year (433 respondents or 53.8%), confirming the restaurant industry’s reputation of paying low wages to its employees. The second most frequent group of respondents was represented by those who earned between $20,000 and $24,999 (151 respondents or 18.8%), followed by those who earned more than $35,000 (81 respondents or 10.1%) (see Table 4.5 below).

Table 4.5

*Annual Income of Research Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below $20,000</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 or more</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, there were more full-time (404 respondents or 50.2%) than part-time (378 or 47%) employees (see Table 4.6 below), and the majority of them worked mostly at dinner (541 respondents or 67.2%) (see Table 4.7 below). The latter finding was expected since the casual dining restaurant franchisee generates most of its revenues at
dinner. On the other hand, it was surprising to observe that most respondents considered themselves as full-time employees, as the restaurant industry is known to hire a substantial number of part-time employees. According to the National Restaurant Association (2015b), the health care law defines a full-time worker someone who works 30 hours a week for a specific restaurant.

Table 4.6

Work Status of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7

Work Shift of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Shift</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, almost half of respondents had one year or less (366 respondents or 45.4%) of tenure for their current employer, while 22.5% of them (i.e., 181 respondents) had more than three years of tenure. Lastly, a total of 214 respondents (26.6%), or more than a quarter of them, had between 1 and 3 years of tenure for their current employer (see Table 4.8 below).
Table 4.8

Tenure of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure (Months)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 ≤</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 24</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 36</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 36</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ≤ (“less or equal to”); > (“more than”).

Finally, out of the 43 properties where the self-administered survey was posted online onto each restaurant’s intranet system, the majority of restaurants had more than 10 respondents and many of them had more than 20 respondents who filled out the survey (see Table 4.9 below). Also, 26 respondents did not answer the question regarding their restaurant location.

Table 4.9

Restaurant Location of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurant Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiken, SC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, GA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta, GA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden, SC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Forest, SC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester, SC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, GA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, SC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbison, SC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinesville, GA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington, SC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milledgeville, GA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Beach, SC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Charleston, SC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Crossing, GA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley, SC</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statesboro, GA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having described in detail respondents’ socio-demographic information, the next section analyzes employees’ answers with regard to their co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence, as well as their levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions.

4.3 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SOCIAL PERCEPTIONS, JOB ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS

4.3.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF SOCIAL PERCEPTIONS

When looking at the warmth and competence perceptions that employees had with regard to their restaurant general managers, it is possible to observe that employees
tended to consider the latter as more competent than warm (see Table 4.10 below).

Accordingly, because social perceptions are determined by two structural factors (i.e., the relative power/status of individuals/groups and the nature of the relationships between them), the study’s findings make sense as the first structural factor acknowledges that low-status groups (e.g., co-workers) are usually regarded as being more incompetent, while high-status groups (e.g., restaurant general managers) are perceived as more competent (Echebarria-Echabe, 2013).

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warmth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Sincere</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Good natured</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Warm</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Tolerant</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Competent</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Confident</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Intelligent</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Competitive</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM-Independent</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* RM (restaurant general manager).

It is interesting to observe how employees found their co-workers to be in general less warm and competent than their restaurant general managers (see Table 4.11 below). Furthermore, employees’ perceptions of their co-workers’ warmth and competence appear to level out, meaning that employees tended to rate their co-workers’ warmth and competence equally (co-workers’ warmth mean = 3.83; co-workers’ competence mean = 3.77). Although co-workers were considered to be less warm and competent than employees’ general managers, the average means of co-workers’ perceived warmth and
competence was higher than 3 out of 5, meaning that employees tended to perceive their co-workers as being rather warm and competent than cold and incompetent.

Table 4.11

*Warmth and Competence Perceptions of Restaurant Co-Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CW-Sincere</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Good natured</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Warm</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Tolerant</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Competent</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Confident</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Intelligent</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Competitive</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW-Independent</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CW (restaurant co-workers).

Having described the warmth and competence perceptions that employees held with respect to their co-workers and restaurant general managers, the following section portrays employees’ levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

4.3.2 Descriptive Statistics of Job Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions

Employees appeared to be relatively satisfied with their jobs (M = 3.57) (see Table 4.12 below). When comparing employees’ organizational commitment (M = 3.97) with their job satisfaction, their commitment level tended to be higher than their overall job satisfaction (see Table 4.13 below). Finally, employees appeared to have low turnover intentions, despite the fact that the restaurant industry is known for its high turnover rates (see Table 4.14 below).
Table 4.12

*Job Satisfaction of Research Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JS: I am satisfied with my co-workers</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS: I am satisfied with my restaurant management team</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS: I am satisfied with the teamwork in my restaurant</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS: I am satisfied with my pay</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* JS (job satisfaction).

Table 4.13

*Organizational Commitment of Research Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC: I find that my values and this restaurant’s values are similar</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC: I am really glad that I chose to work for this restaurant rather than for other restaurants</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC: I really care about this restaurant’s future</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC: I would not hesitate to recommend this restaurant as a good place to work</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC: My work at this restaurant gives me a sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* OC (organizational commitment).
Table 4.14

Turnover Intentions of Research Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TI: It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI: I often think about quitting</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI: I will probably look for a new job next year</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. TI (turnover intentions)*

Having described employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, the following section analyzes the proposed measurement and structural models.

4.4 Analysis of the Structural Equation Model

4.4.1 Examination of Assumptions, Estimation Method and Sample Size

Before evaluating the appropriateness of the measurement and structural models, the following assumptions were verified (Kline, 2011): (1) the observations were independent and the variables were unstandardized; (2) there were no missing values when the raw data file was analyzed; (3) the joint distribution of the endogenous variables was multivariate normal (i.e., multivariate normality held based on low skewness and kurtosis values (i.e., 4 <) and acceptable standard deviations (i.e., 1.36 <=). Moreover, in the stem-and-leaf plots, items also appeared to be normally distributed; (4) and the exogenous variables were measured without error.

Since the data were multivariately normally distributed, the researcher could use the Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation technique in order to proceed with the evaluation of the measurement and structural models (Bagozzi & Yi 2012; Hair et al.
Lastly, it is important to note that a sufficiently large sample size (i.e., 805 respondents) was gathered to analyze the proposed model, which had a total of 77 parameters. Thus, when comparing the number of parameters with the number of respondents, a 10:1 ratio was obtained, which satisfies the proposed 10:1 ratio (Costello & Osborne, 2005), and surpasses the minimum required sample size of 200 respondents that Bagozzi and Yi (2012) suggested.

The following section analyzes the findings of the proposed measurement model.

4.4.2 Measurement Model

First, Cronbach’s alphas were calculated to evaluate the reliability of all constructs: perceived warmth of co-workers (α = .918); perceived competence of co-workers (α = .898); perceived warmth of restaurant general managers (α = .947); perceived competence of restaurant general managers (α = .94); job satisfaction (α = .773); organizational commitment (α = .919); and turnover intentions (α = .909). All factors had Cronbach alpha values greater than the cutoff value of .70 suggested by Nunnally (1978), and all completely standardized factor loadings were statistically significant (i.e., p < .01). There were three factor loadings that are lower than .70, but none of them were removed, since their removal would have decreased the composite reliability of the scale (Hair et al., 2011). Along these lines, all completely standardized loadings exceeded the minimum criterion of 0.4 (Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986) (see Table 4.15 below).
Table 4.15

*Measurement Model Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Standardized Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers’ Perceived Warmth</strong></td>
<td>.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good natured</td>
<td></td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tolerant</td>
<td></td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managers’ Perceived Competence</strong></td>
<td>.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Workers’ Perceived Warmth</strong></td>
<td>.918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good natured</td>
<td></td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tolerant</td>
<td></td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Workers’ Perceived Competence</strong></td>
<td>.898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Competent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confident</td>
<td></td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am satisfied with my co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am satisfied with my restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with the teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am satisfied with my pay</td>
<td></td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td>.919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I find that my values and this restaurant’s values are similar</td>
<td></td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am really glad that I chose to work for this restaurant rather than for other restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I really care about this restaurant’s future</td>
<td></td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would not hesitate to recommend this restaurant as a good place to work</td>
<td></td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My work at this restaurant gives me a sense of accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover intentions</strong></td>
<td>.909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year</td>
<td></td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often think about quitting</td>
<td></td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I will probably look for a new job next year</td>
<td></td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* All factors loadings are significant at p < 0.01.
As recommended in previous research (e.g., Fornell & Larcker, 1981), discriminant validity was also assessed by comparing AVE values and squared correlations between constructs. Table 4.16 shows below that AVE values for all constructs exceeded the squared correlations between constructs. With regard to the convergent validity of the constructs, all average variances extracted (AVE) exceeded the threshold value of .50 (Hair et al., 1998), except for the construct of job satisfaction, which had an AVE of .491, which is very close to the threshold value of .50. Therefore, based on such findings, it is possible to affirm that convergent and discriminant validity were obtained in the current study.

When looking at the correlations between the latent variables, one could initially suppose that the correlations between co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence, and managers’ perceived warmth and competence were too high (i.e., > .70) (see Table 4.16 below). On the other hand, such correlations did not surpass the threshold of .90, and the tolerance (i.e., 1 – R²) of the exogenous and endogenous variables were above the cutoff value of .2, confirming that there were no multicollinearity issues with the obtained data.

Furthermore, the appropriateness of the measurement model was assessed by several absolute, relative, and non-centrality based indices, such as the Chi-square Test (χ²), Bollen’s Incremental Fit Index (IFI), the Normed Fit Index (NFI), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), and the Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). Results indicated that the measurement model provided a good fit to the data (χ² = 1540.223 [df = 384, p < 0.001], IFI = 0.983, NFI = 0.977, CFI = 0.983, RMSEA = 0.0612, SRMR = 0.0661). The IFI, NFI, and CFI
values surpassed the recommended cutoff value of .95, and the RMSEA and SRMR yielded values below than the recommended threshold of .08 (Schreiber et al., 2006). The chi-square relative value to degree of freedom ($\chi^2$/df) was equal to 4.01, which exceeded the recommended value of 3 (Carmines & McIver, 1981). On the other hand, large sample sizes, such as the one obtained in the current study, can increase the $\chi^2$ value of a model, and such an issue has to be taken into consideration when analyzing the chi-square relative value to degree of freedom (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).

Table 4.16

Construct Correlations, Average Variance Extracted, and Squared Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RM Warmth</th>
<th>RM Competence</th>
<th>CW Warmth</th>
<th>CW Competence</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>TI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM Warmth</td>
<td>.818&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.679&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM Competence</td>
<td>.824&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW Warmth</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW Competence</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>-.325</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>-.491</td>
<td>-.602</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Note.</sup> RM (restaurant general manager); CW (restaurant co-workers); JS (job satisfaction); OC (organizational commitment); TI (turnover intentions).

<sup>a</sup>Average variance extracted (AVE).

<sup>b</sup>Correlations between constructs are below the diagonal.

<sup>c</sup>Squared correlations between constructs are above the diagonal.

Having assessed the appropriateness of the measurement model, the following section analyzes the proposed structural equation model and its eleven hypotheses.
4.4.3 Structural Equation Model

The results for the various fit indices indicated that the proposed model provided a good fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 1558.30 \ [df = 388, p < 0.001]$, IFI = 0.982, NFI = 0.977, CFI = 0.982, RMSEA = 0.0612, SRMR = 0.0669). Once again, the IFI, NFI, and CFI values surpassed the recommended cutoff value of .95, and the RMSEA and SRMR had values that were less than the recommended threshold of .08 (Schreiber et al., 2006). The chi-square relative value to degree of freedom ($\chi^2$/df) was equal to 4.02, which exceeded the recommended value of 3 (Carmines & McIver, 1981). However, as mentioned earlier, the sample size should be taken into consideration when analyzing the chi-square relative value to degree of freedom, since large sample sizes have the tendency to increase the chi-square value of a proposed model (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Figure 4.1 shows below the SEM results and Table 4.17 summarizes the results of hypothesis testing.

![Figure 4.1 Results of the Proposed Model](image_url)

**Note.** Figures in parentheses are t-values; figures outside the parentheses are completely standardized path coefficients; arrows indicate hypothesized structural paths; * Supported hypothesis.
Table 4.17

Structural Parameter Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized path</th>
<th>Completely standardized estimate</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a: CW Warmth -&gt; JS</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>3.353</td>
<td>Supported**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2a: CW Warmth -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>Supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3a: CW Competence -&gt; JS</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>7.917</td>
<td>Supported**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4a: CW Competence -&gt; OC</td>
<td>-0.300</td>
<td>-3.567</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b: RM Warmth -&gt; JS</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>Supported**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2b: RM Warmth -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>5.523</td>
<td>Supported**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3b: RM Competence -&gt; JS</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4b: RM Competence -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5: JS -&gt; OC</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>8.551</td>
<td>Supported**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6: JS -&gt; TI</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>-0.682</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7: OC -&gt; TI</td>
<td>-0.575</td>
<td>-12.080</td>
<td>Supported**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CW (Co-Worker), RM (Restaurant General Manager), JS (Job Satisfaction), OC (Organizational Commitment), TI (Turnover Intentions); Structural model fit: $\chi^2 = 1558.30$, df = 388, $p < 0.001$, IFI = 0.982, NFI = 0.977, CFI = 0.982, RMSEA = 0.0612, SRMR = 0.0669; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

The exogenous variables (restaurant general manager and co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence) explained 50.3% of the variance in organizational commitment, 71.8% of the variance in job satisfaction, and 18.5% of the variance in turnover intentions. These explained variances are quite significant, although one could argue that the explained variance in turnover intentions is weak. Along these lines, $R^2$ values of 0.75, 0.50, or 0.25 for the endogenous constructs are considered high, moderate, and weak (Hair et al., 2011).

It was the perceived competence of co-workers that had the most influence on employees’ job satisfaction ($\beta_{3a} = .551$, $p < .01$), followed by restaurant general
manager’s perceived warmth ($\beta_{1b} = .231$, p < .01) and co-workers’ perceived warmth ($\beta_{1a} = .223$, p < .01). Interestingly enough, restaurant general manager’s perceived competence did not have any significant influence on employees’ job satisfaction ($\beta_{3b} = .001$, p > .05). Moreover, the only two constructs that had an influence on employees’ organizational commitment were restaurant general manager’s perceived warmth ($\beta_{2b} = .393$, p < .01) and co-workers’ warmth ($\beta_{2a} = .223$, p < .01).

The perceived competence of restaurant general managers ($\beta_{4b} = .008$, p > .05) did not have a statistically significant influence on employees’ organizational commitment, while the perceived competence of co-workers had a negative influence ($\beta_{4a} = -.30$, p < .01) on such attitude. Since the study hypothesized positive influences from both social perceptions (i.e., warmth and competence) on employees’ organizational commitment, the negative influence of co-workers’ competence was disregarded by the researcher, as competent co-workers should positively influence employees’ organizational commitment.

Moreover, job satisfaction had a statistically significant effect ($\beta_{5} = .643$, p < .01) on organizational commitment. With regard to the influence of job satisfaction ($\beta_{6} = -.032$, p > .05) and organizational commitment ($\beta_{7} = -.575$, p < .01) on turnover intentions, the organizational commitment of employees was the only construct to have a significant influence on turnover intentions. As a conclusion, the SEM results provided support for seven of the eleven proposed hypotheses, leading the researcher to affirm that most of them were supported.

Following the recommendations by MacKinnon and Dwyer (1993) and MacKinnon, Warsi, and Dwyer (1995), SOBEL tests were performed in order to verify
the indirect effects of the exogenous variables (i.e., perceived warmth and competence of co-workers and restaurant general managers) on employees’ turnover intentions (i.e., endogenous variable) through employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of the SOBEL tests indicated the significant indirect effect of restaurant general manager’s perceived warmth (Z (RM Warmth) = -5.05, p < .01) and co-workers’ perceived warmth (Z (CW Warmth) = -2.04, p < .05) on employees’ turnover intentions through organizational commitment. On the other hand, restaurant general managers’ perceived competence (Z (RM Competence) = -0.12, p > .05) and co-workers’ perceived competence (Z (CW Competence) = 3.42, p < .01) did not have any significant indirect effect on employees’ turnover intentions through organizational commitment. Along these lines, there were no significant indirect effects through the job satisfaction mediator (Z (RM Warmth) = -0.66, p > .05; Z (CW Warmth) = -0.66, p > .05; Z (RM Competence) = -0.02, p > .05; Z (CW Competence) = -0.67, p > .05), as job satisfaction did not have any significant influence on employees’ turnover intentions (see Table 4.17 above).

Having analyzed the proposed structural model and its hypotheses, the next section analyzes the Pearson-product moment correlation analyses that were performed in order to verify the relationships between turnover intentions and turnover (i.e., Hypothesis 8), and among employees’ job attitudes and restaurant performance measures (i.e., Hypotheses 9 and 10).

4.5 Pearson-Product Moment Correlations

As mentioned earlier, the surveyed restaurant franchisee was able to share the (1) the percentage of same store sales change from 2014 versus 2013; (2) the percentage of
the cost of sales for 2014; (3) the percentage of customers’ satisfaction scores for 2014; and (4) the percentage of restaurants’ actual turnover rates for 2014 for each of its 43 restaurant units. Before proceeding with Pearson-product moment correlation analyses in order to measure the relationships between turnover intentions and turnover (i.e., Hypothesis 8), and among employees’ job attitudes and restaurant performance measures (i.e., Hypotheses 9 and 10), the following assumptions were verified: (1) the variables were measured at the interval or ratio level; (2) there was a linear relationship between the two variables; (3) there was no significant outlier; (4) dependent variables were approximately distributed.

According to the obtained results, employees’ turnover intentions were not significantly correlated \( r = .059 \) with the actual turnover rates of restaurants. However, employees’ job satisfaction \( r = .089 \) and organizational commitment \( r = .106 \) were significantly related to same stores’ sales changes (see Table 4.18 below). This finding implies that the more employees are satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organizations, the more likely a restaurant unit will benefit from increases in sales. Moreover, employees’ job satisfaction was related to customer satisfaction scores \( r = .075 \). This means that customers are positively affected when employees are satisfied with their jobs, as employees possibly perform better in their jobs and better serve customers when they are satisfied. Interestingly enough, increases in customer satisfaction scores were also linked to decreases in restaurants’ cost of sales \( r = -.145 \).

On the other hand, it is surprising to observe that job satisfaction \( r = .088 \) and organizational commitment \( r = .095 \) were positively correlated with restaurants’ cost of sales. Despite the fact that the Pearson-product moment correlations between these
variables were statistically significant, they were not taken into consideration in the current study. Cost of sales is a financial ratio that is strongly influenced by the cost of food sold, a financial variable that does not have a lot to do with employees’ levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Based on these findings, one could affirm that Hypothesis 8 was not supported, while Hypotheses 9 and 10 were partially supported in the current study.

Table 4.18

_Relationships among Employees’ Attitudes and Restaurant Performance_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same Store Sales Change 2014 VS 2013</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Cost of Sales 2014</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Customer Satisfaction Score 2014</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>JS</th>
<th>OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Store Sales Change 2014 VS 2013</td>
<td>.947**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cost of Sales 2014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Score 2014</td>
<td>.125**</td>
<td>-.145**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>.089*</td>
<td>.088*</td>
<td>.075*</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>.106**</td>
<td>.095**</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.654**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); JS (job satisfaction); OC (organizational commitment).
Having analyzed the proposed relationships between turnover intentions and turnover, and between employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and restaurant performance measures, the next section describes the results of the hierarchical cluster analyses that were performed to classify respondents into mutually exclusive groups based on the combinations of their (1) co-workers and (2) restaurant general manager’s perceived warmth and competence.

4.6 Hierarchical Cluster Analyses

Before examining the interrelationships among warmth-competence perceptions and employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions, two cluster analyses were first conducted to classify respondents into mutually exclusive groups based on the combinations of their (1) co-workers and (2) restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence. Not knowing the number of groups or clusters that would emerge in the sample, a two-stage sequence of analysis occurred as followed: (1) hierarchical cluster analyses using Ward’s method applying squared Euclidean Distance as the distance measure were first carried out, as this helped to determine the most favorable number of clusters to work with (Sharma, 1996); (2) the next stage involved the rerun of the hierarchical cluster analyses with the selected number of clusters, which enabled to allocate every case in the sample to a particular cluster. The goal of performing two hierarchical cluster analyses was to have an optimal clustering solution.

To proceed with the cluster analyses, the following assumptions had first to be verified: (1) the sample was representative of the population, and (2) variables were not too correlated. A total of two clusters emerged from both hierarchical cluster analyses,
which were performed in order to sort employees according to their (1) co-workers and (2) restaurant general manager’s perceived warmth and competence. According to the obtained findings, employees perceived their co-workers and restaurant general managers as warm and competent, or as cold and incompetent (see Table 4.19 below). The obtained clusters’ sizes differed significantly from one another, although the response patterns of the two clusters were quite similar. Indeed, most respondents agreed that their co-workers and restaurant general manager were warm and competent. However, many employees also thought the opposite and believed that their co-workers and restaurant general managers were cold and incompetent. When observing the means of employees’ responses, it is possible to observe that the perceptions of restaurant general managers were more antagonistic than the perceptions of co-workers, meaning that employees tended to perceive their restaurant general managers either as very warm and competent, or as very cold and incompetent. It is also interesting to observe that a larger number of employees tended to have negative perceptions about their co-workers (i.e., 243 employees) than with regard to their restaurant managers (i.e., 131 employees).

Table 4.19

Clusters Generated from Employees’ Perceptions With Regard to their Restaurant Co-Workers and General Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cluster 1 Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Cluster 2 Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers’ Competence</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers’ Warmth</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s Warmth</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager’s Competence</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cluster 1 represents employees who perceive their co-workers and general managers as cold and incompetent, while cluster 2 represents employees who perceive them as warm and competent.
The following section compares the differences in the levels of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions according to the obtained clusters.

4.7 Groups’ Comparisons Regarding their Levels of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions

Knowing that two clusters emerged from (1) co-workers and (2) restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence, a variety of independent-sample t-tests were performed in order to analyze if employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions differed between these clusters. In order to run an independent-samples t-test, six assumptions needed to be met: (1) there was one dependent variable that was measured at the continuous level; (2) there was one independent variable that consisted of two categorical, independent groups; (3) there was independence of observations; (4) there were no significant outliers in the two groups of the independent variable in terms of the dependent variable; (5) the dependent variable was approximately normally distributed for each group of the independent variable; and (6) there was homogeneity of variances.

Results demonstrated that employees who perceived their restaurant general managers to be warm and competent (i.e., cluster 2) had higher levels of job satisfaction ($M_{c2} = 3.71$ vs $M_{c1} = 2.86$) and organizational commitment ($M_{c2} = 4.16$ vs $M_{c1} = 2.98$), and lower turnover intentions ($M_{c2} = 2.47$ vs $M_{c1} = 3.42$) than employees who perceived their restaurant general managers to be cold and incompetent (i.e., cluster 1) (see Table 4.20 below). Results also showed that employees who perceived their restaurant co-workers to be warm and competent (i.e., cluster 2) had higher levels of job satisfaction ($M_{c2} = 3.91$ vs $M_{c1} = 2.8$) and organizational commitment ($M_{c2} = 4.19$ vs $M_{c1} = 3.46$),
and lower turnover intentions ($M_{c2} = 2.43$ vs $M_{c1} = 3.06$) than employees who perceived their restaurant general managers to be cold and incompetent (i.e., cluster 1) (see Table 4.21 below). Therefore, hypotheses 11a, 11b, 12a and 12b were confirmed in the current study.

Table 4.20

Comparison of Employees’ Job Attitudes and Turnover Intentions According to their Perceptions of Restaurant General Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **All t-values are significant at p < 0.01; Cluster 1 represents employees who perceive their co-workers and general managers as cold and incompetent, while cluster 2 represents employees who perceive them as warm and competent.

Table 4.21

Comparison of Employees’ Job Attitudes and Turnover Intentions According to their Perceptions of Restaurant Co-Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **All t-values are significant at p < 0.01; Cluster 1 represents employees who perceive their co-workers and general managers as cold and incompetent, while cluster 2 represents employees who perceive them as warm and competent.

Finally, the next section describes employees’ views about the most important social constructs that co-workers and restaurant general managers should possess in a work setting, as the study hypothesized that co-workers’ and restaurant general
managers’ perceived competence was more important than their perceived warmth in casual dining restaurants.

4.8 IMPORTANCE OF THE WARMTH AND COMPETENCE CONSTRUCTS

After respondents evaluated the perceived warmth and competence of their restaurant general managers, they were asked to choose one individual trait that they believed to be the most important among all of the traits portraying the warmth and competence constructs. The same question was asked after respondents evaluated the perceived warmth and competence of their co-workers. The question dealing with the importance of perceived traits was phrased as follows: “Which trait portrayed above do you think is the most important trait for any [restaurant general manager/co-worker] to possess?” In order to measure which trait was the most important for employees, descriptive statistics were used to describe the frequency of these traits.

According to restaurant employees, restaurant general managers should be: competent (24%), good natured (19%), confident (17%), sincere (14%), and intelligent (13%) (see Table 4.22 below). Thus, out of the five most important traits related to restaurant general managers, three traits were related to the competence construct and two traits with the warmth construct. When summing up the percentages of the warmth and competence traits, restaurant general manager’s perceived competence was more important for 59% of respondents, while 41% believed that it is more important for restaurant general managers to be warm.
Table 4.22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important Traits Concerning Restaurant General Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good natured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such response pattern repeated itself when employees had to evaluate their co-workers (see Table 4.23 below). Accordingly, it was more important for employees to have competent co-workers (62%) rather than warm co-workers (38%). Along these lines, restaurant co-workers should be: competent (31%), good natured (20%), confident (12%), intelligent (9%) and sincere (9%). It is interesting to observe that the two most important traits (i.e., competent and good natured) for co-workers account for more than half of employees’ responses, highlighting the importance of these two traits.
In sum, the current study was able to verify hypotheses 13 and 14, which proposed that co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ perceived competence is more important than their perceived warmth. Such findings also reflected the results of the structural equation modelling (SEM) that was performed earlier, which portrayed that co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence both affect employees’ job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction and organizational commitment), granting that the competence construct of co-workers has more influence than their perceived warmth. On the other hand, although employees attached more importance to the perceived competence of restaurant general managers, the SEM results revealed that employees were much more affected by restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth than their perceived competence (the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warmth</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good natured</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.23**

*Most Important Traits Concerning Restaurant Co-Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good natured</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100%
perceived competence of restaurant general managers did not influence employees’ job attitudes), which somehow contradicted the obtained results regarding the importance of the competence construct for restaurant general managers.

The following section summarizes all of the results obtained in the current study.

4.9 Summary

As mentioned earlier, in order to answer the first research question (i.e., how do warmth and competence perceptions of restaurant general managers and co-workers affect employees’ attitudes, as measured in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and turnover intentions?), the current study proposed that the social evaluations or perceptions of co-workers and general managers’ perceived warmth and competence would have positive relationships with employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e., Hypotheses 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b). Such hypotheses were partly verified, as general managers’ perceived competence did not influence employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e., Hypotheses 3b and 4b), and co-workers’ perceived competence did not affect employees’ organizational commitment (i.e., Hypothesis 4a). It was also hypothesized that satisfied and committed employees would have lower turnover intentions (i.e., Hypotheses 6 and 7). The former hypothesis was not supported, while the latter was supported. Moreover, satisfied employees also appeared to have higher levels of organizational commitment, thus confirming Hypothesis 5.

Additionally, in order to answer the second research question (i.e., can employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes differ based on the warmth and competence perceptions that they hold with regard to their co-workers and restaurant
general managers?), it was hypothesized that employees who perceived their co-workers and general managers to be warm and competent would have higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and lower turnover intentions than employees who perceived that they worked with cold and/or incompetent co-workers and general managers (i.e., Hypotheses 11a, 11b, 12a, and 12b). All of the aforementioned hypotheses were indeed verified in the current study.

Moreover, in order to answer the third research question (i.e., are employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment related to restaurants’ performance?), it was hypothesized that casual dining restaurants that worked with employees with low turnover intentions would benefit from lower actual turnover rates than restaurants who worked with employees that had higher levels of turnover intentions (i.e., Hypothesis 8). This hypothesis was not confirmed in the present study. Along these lines, it was also hypothesized that restaurants with satisfied and committed employees would benefit from high performance measures, as measured by restaurants’ sales, cost of sales and customer satisfaction scores (i.e., Hypotheses 9 and 10). The aforementioned hypotheses were partly confirmed, as employees’ organizational commitment was not statistically significantly related to customer satisfaction scores.

Lastly, in order to answer the fourth research question (i.e., does the primacy of warmth over competence still apply in a corporate business setting, such as in casual dining restaurants?), it was hypothesized that it would be more important for employees to work with competent co-workers and general managers than with warm co-workers and general managers (i.e., Hypotheses 13 and 14). Both of these research hypotheses were confirmed in the current study.
In sum, all of the following hypotheses were examined in the current study:

*Hypothesis 1a:* The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee job satisfaction *(Supported).*

*Hypothesis 1b:* The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction *(Supported).*

*Hypothesis 2a:* The perceived warmth of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee organizational commitment *(Supported).*

*Hypothesis 2b:* The perceived warmth of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment *(Supported).*

*Hypothesis 3a:* The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee job satisfaction *(Supported).*

*Hypothesis 3b:* The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee job satisfaction *(Not supported).*

*Hypothesis 4a:* The perceived competence of restaurant co-workers is positively related to employee organizational commitment *(Not supported).*

*Hypothesis 4b:* The perceived competence of restaurant general managers is positively related to employee organizational commitment *(Not supported).*

*Hypothesis 5:* Job satisfaction is positively related to organizational commitment *(Supported).*

*Hypothesis 6:* Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intentions *(Not supported).*

*Hypothesis 7:* Organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intentions *(Supported).*
Hypothesis 8: Turnover intentions are positively related to casual dining restaurants’ turnover rates (Not supported).

Hypothesis 9: Employees’ job satisfaction is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores) (Partially supported).

Hypothesis 10: Employees’ organizational commitment is positively related to restaurants’ performance (i.e., as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores) (Partially supported).

Hypothesis 11a: Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers (Supported).

Hypothesis 11b: Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment than employees who perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager (Supported).

Hypothesis 12a: Employees who perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant co-workers will have lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive that they work with cold and/or incompetent restaurant co-workers/general managers (Supported).

Hypothesis 12b: Employees who perceive that they work with a warm and competent restaurant general manager will have lower turnover intentions than employees who
perceive that they work with a cold and/or incompetent restaurant general manager

(Supported).

Hypothesis 13: Restaurant co-workers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting (Supported).

Hypothesis 14: Restaurant general managers’ perceived competence will be more important to employees than their perceived warmth in a casual dining restaurant setting (Supported).

Having described the entirety of the obtained results, the following chapter examines the study’s findings in more depth and compares them to previous literature. The next chapter also discusses the implications of the research for academia and for the restaurant industry, and gives some suggestions to both of these entities. Lastly the limitations and conclusion of the study are also included.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 EMPLOYEES’ ATTITUINAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESPONSES REGARDING THE PERCEIVED WARMTH AND COMPETENCE OF CO-WORKERS AND RESTAURANT GENERAL MANAGERS

5.1.1 THE INFLUENCE OF CO-WORKERS’ PERCEIVED WARMTH AND COMPETENCE

In order to answer the first research question (i.e., How do warmth and competence perceptions of restaurant general managers and co-workers affect employees’ attitudes, as measured in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and turnover intentions?), the current study examined and confirmed the relationships between co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence and employees’ job attitudes in a casual dining restaurant setting. Accordingly, both social constructs had a statistically significant influence on most employees’ job attitudes (i.e., Hypotheses 1a, 2a, and 3a), although the influence of co-workers’ perceived competence on employees’ organizational commitment was not supported (i.e., Hypothesis 4a). On the other hand, co-workers’ perceived competence had the most influence on employees’ job satisfaction, far more than the perceived warmth of co-workers. This means that when employees have the impression that they work with competent co-workers, this influences them to be much more satisfied at work; and when employees evaluate their co-workers as being warm, this influences them to be more committed to their organization and satisfied with their jobs. Such results imply that employees’ job
satisfaction may be influenced more specifically by co-workers’ professional attitudes and behaviors at work, while employees’ organizational commitment may be positively affected not only by their co-workers’ competence, but also by the social environment and social ties that are created among hourly employees.

Such findings make sense, as job satisfaction is a construct that is more related to the evaluation or appraisal of a job’s characteristics (Robbins & Judge, 2014), which could include extrinsic factors such as co-workers and their perceived competence; while organizational commitment is a construct that represents an emotional bond that employees develop with regard to their organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Thus, in order to feel committed to an organization, or in other words, for employees to develop an emotional bond with their organization, the SEM model implies that this phenomenon can occur if employees evaluate their co-workers as warm (i.e., sincere, good natured, warm, and tolerant). It is interesting to observe how co-workers’ competence (i.e., competent, confident, intelligent, competitive, and independent) only had a statistically significant positive influence on employees’ job satisfaction. In fact, the SEM results show that the perceived competence of co-workers negatively affect employees’ organizational commitment. This is an interesting finding, as it suggests that when employees perceive their co-workers to possess such traits as confidence, competitiveness and independence, they are likely to become less committed to their organization. Such negative relationship (between co-workers’ perceived competence and employees’ organizational commitment) reinforces the importance of having socially-oriented co-workers, as competent individuals are characterized by being more
autonomous, independent and individualistic (Abele et al., 2008), which represent traits that are sometimes perceived to be unsocial.

The current study’s findings go along a study by Hancer and George (2003), which examined the job satisfaction of restaurant employees working in non-supervisory positions. Accordingly, their factor analysis demonstrated that the factor called “extrinsic job satisfaction” (i.e., which comprises the following items: supervision-technical, supervision-human relations, company policies and practices, working conditions, recognition, co-workers, and compensation) explains the most variance in employees’ job satisfaction, revealing the influence of competence-oriented characteristics (e.g., supervision-technical, company policies and practices, working conditions) and external factors (e.g., co-workers) on employees’ job satisfaction. Along these lines, a study developed by Ko (2012) also showed that professional competence affects the job satisfaction of chefs. Although the professional competence of chefs represented a self-reported competence that included their culinary knowledge, working attitude, culinary skill, communication skill, and culinary creativity, it is possible to suggest that chefs may be more satisfied with their jobs if their co-workers possess the same professional competence, as restaurant employees need to work with competent individuals in order for their restaurant operations to run smoothly.

It is not a coincidence that most job descriptions of casual dining restaurant employees often require them to provide friendly and responsive service; to have excellent communication skills and a positive attitude; and to partner with team members in order to perform a service that exceeds guests’ expectations (Indeed.com, 2015, April 16; Indeed.com, 2014, November 22), as these skills and abilities are key for the financial
and operational success of casual dining restaurants. As it is possible to observe, many of these job requirements are related to warmth and competence-related attitudes and behaviors. Accordingly, warmth, which comprises more sociable and agreeable traits; and competence, which portrays intellectual and task-oriented traits (Fiske et al., 1999), were shown in previous hospitality studies to be very important for employees. For instance, in a study by Kim (2014) performed in the Korean restaurant industry, results demonstrated that teamwork/communication (i.e., a construct related to co-workers’ perceived warmth) positively influences employees’ job satisfaction. Such finding implies that when employees evaluate that there is open communication and teamwork (e.g., “employees understand each others’ situation well,” “cooperation between departments goes smoothly”), employees’ satisfaction increases due to the perceived cooperation and understanding among different departments and employees.

It is interesting to observe how the cluster analysis that was performed in the current study, in order to answer the second research question (i.e., Can employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes differ based on the warmth and competence perceptions that they hold with regard to their co-workers and restaurant general managers?), revealed that employees tend to evaluate their co-workers in two different ways (they perceive their co-workers either as warm and competent, or as cold and incompetent). A series of subsequent t-tests showed that employees who judge their co-workers as cold and incompetent have lower job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e., Hypothesis 11a) and higher turnover intentions (i.e., Hypothesis 12a) than employees who perceive their co-workers to be warm and competent. Such findings contradict the SEM model, which revealed a non-statistically significant influence of co-
workers’ perceived competence on employees’ organizational commitment. This is an important finding, as it implies that in order for employees to create an emotional attachment or bond with their organization (i.e., organizational commitment), they must evaluate their co-workers to be socially-oriented, caring and empathetic (Abele et al., 2008). On the other hand, when they perceive their co-workers to be more independent and competitive, their levels of organizational commitment tend not to increase, as these traits are usually considered to be more individualistic and less warm.

On the other hand, the study was able to answer the second research question by confirming the significant relationships among co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence, and employees’ increased levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and lower turnover intentions. This means that from a human resource perspective, it is important for restaurant operators to know that restaurant employees need to develop a social connection with their fellow colleagues in order to be satisfied at work and committed to their organization, as many organizations tend to believe that employees only serve a single purpose: to serve customers and work hard in order to deserve their salaries and jobs. Although it is important for restaurant owners and operators to encourage the development of such social bonding, it does not mean that employees’ co-workers do not need to show some level of competence, as the SEM model clearly demonstrates that employees’ job satisfaction is highly enhanced when they evaluate their co-workers as competent. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, the cluster analysis and subsequent t-tests revealed that employees have higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and lower turnover intentions when they perceive their co-workers to be both warm and competent. Therefore, casual dining
restaurant companies need to instill an organizational culture that compensates warm and competent employees, and they should not forget to train those warm employees who lack the necessary skills and abilities (i.e., competence), so that the latter can improve their performance at work.

These findings go along the obtained results from DiPietro and Milman (2008), which established that “working with nice people” (an item that is related to warmth perceptions) and “clear information on the job” (an item that is associated with competence perceptions) are important employment characteristics that influence the retention of hourly employees in the quick service restaurant industry. Another study by Thompson and Prottas (2005) found similar results: co-workers’ support, a construct that usually includes both warm and competent behaviors and attitudes, reduces employees’ turnover intentions. Along those lines, the current study’s findings are similar to the ones obtained by Gjerald and Øgaard (2010), which described that assumptions about co-workers’ competence, a construct that comprises such items as “a competent co-worker knows his/her job better than a training manual,” “a good co-worker is someone who contributes largely to teamwork” and “good co-workers are very open to alternative solutions,” positively correlate with employees’ job satisfaction; and assumptions about co-workers’ responsibility positively correlate with employees’ intentions to stay with the organization. It is interesting to observe in the current study that although co-workers’ perceived competence only had a statistically significant influence on employees’ job satisfaction, and not on their organizational commitment, employees considered it to be more important to work with competent co-workers than with warm co-workers (i.e., Hypothesis 13). This finding, which answers the fourth research question (i.e., Does the
primacy of warmth over competence still apply in a corporate business setting, such as in casual dining restaurants?) may explain why co-workers’ perceived competence has more influence on employees’ job satisfaction than co-workers’ perceived warmth (i.e., co-workers’ perceived competence had twice as much influence on employees’ job satisfaction than co-workers’ perceived warmth).

Accordingly, many other researchers have found that employees value organizations that employ competent and warm co-workers. For example, in a study by Farrell and Oczkowski (2009) that collected data from employees of a major fast food restaurant, employees’ perceived organizational support was found to have a direct positive influence on their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The construct of perceived organizational support includes perceptions that are similar to warmth and competence perceptions, such as “the organization is willing to extend itself in order to help me perform my job to the best of my ability” (i.e., similar to the competence construct) and “the organization really cares about my well-being” (i.e., similar to the warmth construct) (Farrell & Oczkowski, 2009). Joiner and Bakalis (2006) suggested that organizational support can arise from both managers and co-workers. As mentioned earlier, in the current study, co-workers’ perceived warmth was the only construct between the two to significantly influence both employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e., co-workers’ perceived competence only had a statistically significant influence on employees’ job satisfaction). Such finding underlines the significance of working with warm co-workers, in order to not only have a satisfied workforce, but also a committed one.
Having discussed and analyzed the study’s findings regarding the importance and influence of co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence, the next section examines the influence and importance of restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence on employees’ job attitudes and behavioral intentions.

5.1.2 The Influence of General Managers’ Perceived Warmth and Competence

In order to answer the current study’s fourth research question (i.e., Does the primacy of warmth over competence still apply in a corporate business setting, such as in casual dining restaurants?), it was found that while a majority of respondents rated the competence construct as the most important social construct for restaurant general managers to possess (i.e., Hypothesis 14), the structural equation model (SEM) showed the opposite: the only fundamental social construct affecting employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment is restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth (i.e., Hypotheses 1b and 2b). Even if the perceived competence of restaurant general managers does not statistically significantly influence employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e., Hypotheses 3b and 4b), the cluster analysis and t-tests showed that employees who perceive their restaurant general managers to be both warm and competent have a tendency to experience higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (i.e., Hypothesis 11b) and lower turnover intentions (i.e., Hypothesis 12b) than employees who perceive their restaurant general managers as cold and incompetent. The latter findings answer the current study’s second research question (i.e., Can employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes differ based on the warmth and competence perceptions that they hold with regard to their co-workers and restaurant general managers?), and match the job descriptions of several casual dining restaurant
general managers’ positions, which often include the following requirements: casual restaurant general managers are supposed to create a learning and nurturing environment; minimize employee turnover rates by taking the time to effectively orient new employees, train, coach, and give them constructive feedback; cultivate an environment of open authentic dialogue with restaurant employees; and embrace, articulate, and reflect the company’s culture (Indeed.com, n.d.).

Despite the fact that little research in hospitality organizations used the warmth and competence constructs, several studies employing similar constructs confirmed the importance and influence of leaders’ warm-oriented attitudes and behaviors. For example, Walsh and Taylor (2007) identified that learning-oriented relationships with managers, which include such things as open communication, trust and confidence in one another, represent the most important job features. Other studies have also confirmed the important role of managers’ communication in the retention of employees. For example, in a study by Fu and Mount (2002), the second most important communication factor for older workers was related to supervisory communication, which includes several items such as the extent to which a supervisor is open to ideas; the extent to which the supervisor listens and pays attention; and the extent to which guidance is offered in solving job-related problems. Hence, empathy and openness, which are mostly related to the warmth construct, as well as guidance in solving job-related problems, a communication characteristic that deals with the perceived competence and warmth of managers, are important attributes that help diminish older employees’ turnover intentions.
Another study by Kong (2013) also showed the influence of supervisors’ perceived warmth, as his study explored the relationships among work-family supportive supervisors, career competencies, job involvement and job satisfaction. Data collected from a sample of hotel employees working in China demonstrated that work-family supportive supervisors contribute positively to employees’ career competencies, job involvement, and job satisfaction. Kong’s (2013) study defined supportive supervisors as those showing some effort to look after workers with family responsibilities, and this construct includes items such as “my supervisor was understanding or sympathetic” and “juggled tasks or duties to accommodate my family responsibility.” A work-family supportive supervisor is thus someone who cares about employees’ personal and professional well-being (such caring and understanding are major characteristics of warm individuals). This finding goes along with previous studies which showed that a supportive management contributes positively to employees’ job involvement and satisfaction (Brown & Leigh, 1996; Karatepe & Kilic, 2007). For instance, in a study by Kang, Gatling, and Kim (2014) that explored the relationships among supervisory support, organizational commitment, career satisfaction, and the turnover intention of frontline employees in the hospitality industry, results indicated that supervisory support has positive effects on both employees’ organizational commitment and career satisfaction. Thus, the aforementioned literature and the current study are in concordance with regard to the significant influence of managers on various employees’ job attitudes, such as their job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which if increased, could significantly lower employees’ turnover intentions.
Likewise, a study performed by Karatepe (2009) also demonstrated the influence of work social support, a construct that is similar to managers’ perceived warmth, on employees’ job satisfaction and turnover intentions. The author of that study explains that social support, which is defined as “an interpersonal transaction that involves emotional concern, instrumental aid, information, or appraisal” (Carlson & Perrewé, 1999, p. 514), can emanate from different sources, such as supervisors and co-workers (as cited in Parasuraman et al., 1992). Using data from the Albanian hotel industry, Karatepe (2009) developed and tested a model that examined the relationships between psychological involvement and work social support with frontline employees’ outcomes. Results revealed that job involvement and work social support increase job satisfaction, and that work social support negatively affects employees’ turnover intentions. The obtained results are similar to the findings of Thompson and Prottas (2005), which showed that the support emerging from supervisors and colleagues can significantly and positively influence employed adults’ job satisfaction.

Thus, the aforementioned studies, as well as the current study, reveal the significant positive outcomes that occur with employees when managers demonstrate some warm-oriented attitudes and behaviors at work. Accordingly, it is interesting to observe in the SEM model how general managers’ perceived competence does not have any statistically significant influence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, although the t-tests that followed the cluster analysis, which were performed in order to answer the second research question, appear to contradict the SEM model. Indeed, the cluster analysis and t-tests, as well as the importance question related to the warmth and competence perceptions of restaurant general managers, reveal that
employees are also affected by their general managers’ perceived competence, and consider this construct to be the most important. Such findings imply that restaurant employees need general managers who are not only competent, but who are also socially-oriented and warm and willing to establish close relationships with their subordinates (Abele et al., 2008). This makes sense, as employees tend to appreciate leaders who know how to take care of them and who have the knowledge and capability to work in teams, characteristics which should favor the operational and financial success of restaurants.

These suggestions go along with a recent study by Larsen et al. (2012) in the cruise sector that focused on the perceived work environment and its influence on employees’ organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Their study found that the strongest work environment characteristics influencing employees’ job satisfaction resulted from the perceived social atmosphere (i.e., guests and co-workers), along with supervisor respect and fairness. Supervisors’ respect and fairness represent traits related to warmth perceptions, as warm individuals are characterized by empathetic, understanding and moral behaviors (Abele et al., 2008). It is interesting to observe that these factors (i.e., perceived social atmosphere and supervisors’ respect and fairness) also affect employees’ job commitment, matching the current study’s finding (i.e., restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth influences employees’ organizational commitment).

Lastly, in a study conducted in hotels in Turkey, a multiple regression analysis revealed that supervisors’ social perceptions (e.g., my supervisor is “patient,” “tactful,” and “considerate”) have a statistically significant influence on employees’ job satisfaction and intention to continue working in the industry (Tutuncu & Kozak, 2007). The aforementioned traits are similar to those used in the current study based on Fiske et al.’s
(2002) survey, which labels warm individuals or groups as “good-natured,” “warm,” “sincere” and “tolerant.”

In sum, the current study’s findings reveal the significant influence of restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth on employees job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as well as the lack of statistically significant influence of restaurant general managers’ perceived competence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The latter finding was somewhat contradicted in a subsequent cluster analysis and t-tests, which determined that employees tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and lower turnover intentions when they perceive that they work with warm and competent restaurant general managers. Moreover, this study also showed that employees appear to think that it is more important to work with competent rather than with warm restaurant general managers, which constitutes another finding that also contradicts the SEM results. The current study’s results are very important from a human resource perspective for the casual dining restaurant industry, as they imply that restaurant general managers are key in enhancing hourly employees’ job attitudes and in decreasing their turnover intentions. As a result, restaurant general managers should be very attentive to the way they communicate and behave with their employees, as their communication and behavioral patterns could significantly affect employees’ work attitudes in casual dining restaurants.

Having examined the influence of employees’ perceptions of their general managers’ perceived warmth and competence, the following section examines the findings regarding the influence of job satisfaction on organizational commitment.
5.1.3 THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SATISFACTION ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

In order to continue answering to the first research question (i.e., How do warmth and competence perceptions of restaurant general managers and co-workers affect employees’ attitudes, as measured in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and turnover intentions?), the current study confirmed the strong influence of job satisfaction on organizational commitment (i.e., Hypothesis 5), which is a relationship that was previously tested in various hospitality studies. For example, in a study of restaurant employees in an American fast casual restaurant chain, DiPietro and Bufquin (2014) demonstrated that job satisfaction is a strong antecedent of organizational commitment. In another study by Kim et al. (2005), which measured the effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and the intention of leaving in a casual dining restaurant chain, job satisfaction was also found to have a positive influence on organizational commitment. A more recent study by Kim (2014), which intended to empirically determine the relationship between such constructs as internal service quality, service ability, employee satisfaction, and organizational commitment in the Korean restaurant industry, also revealed that increased employee job satisfaction has a statistically significant influence on organizational commitment. In another study by Karatepe and Kilic (2007), which analyzed the relationships among supervisor support and conflicts in the work-family interface and selected job outcomes of hotel employees, job satisfaction was also found to be positively associated with affective organizational commitment. Lastly, in a study by Colakoglu et al. (2010) which measured the effects of perceived organizational support on hotel employees’ affective outcomes, job satisfaction played a partial mediating role between perceived organizational support and constructs
of organizational commitment. Thus, it is important for casual dining restaurant operators and owners to first find ways to first satisfy their employees (e.g., by hiring warm and competent restaurant general managers and employees), in order for their employees to be committed to their organization.

Having compared the study’s findings with previous literature concerning the positive influence of job satisfaction on organizational commitment, the following section examines the influence of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on employees’ turnover intentions.

5.1.4 THE INFLUENCES OF JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT ON TURNOVER INTENTIONS

In order to completely answer the study’s first research question (i.e., How do warmth and competence perceptions of restaurant general managers and co-workers affect employees’ attitudes, as measured in job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and turnover intentions?), results demonstrated that employees’ organizational commitment has a statistically significant influence on turnover intentions (i.e., Hypothesis 7), meaning that the more employees are committed to their restaurant, the less likely they are to quit their jobs. On the other hand, although job satisfaction has a significant influence on organizational commitment, job satisfaction does not have a statistically significant direct influence on employees’ turnover intentions (i.e., Hypothesis 6). These findings go along with a study realized by Yang (2008), who gathered data from hotel employees in Taiwan and found that job satisfaction has a significant influence on individual commitment, which in turn leads to a reduction in turnover intentions. Yang (2008) found a direct negative relationship between job
satisfaction and turnover intention, a finding that contradicts the current study’s finding. Results also did not support a study conducted by Karatepe (2009) in the Albanian hotel industry, which tested a model examining the relationships of psychological involvement and social support with frontline employees’ outcomes. Accordingly, the results of that study revealed that lower job satisfaction leads to higher turnover intentions (Karatepe, 2009). Various studies have also shown a strong positive relationship between job dissatisfaction and turnover intention (Crossley et al., 2007; Huang, 2006), contradicting once again the current study’s findings.

The study’s results imply that job satisfaction is a feeling that does not suffice in order for employees to want to remain in their organization. Accordingly, employees need to identify with their organization and its goals (Robbins & Judge, 2014), and create an emotional bond with their company (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Such finding goes along the social identity theory, which posits that employees commit to their organization when it improves their self-image and self-worth, which in turn reduces their turnover intentions (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Once this emotional bond is created, it is likely that employees will want to remain longer in their organization. Along these lines, the SEM results show that the best ways to enhance employees’ organizational commitment is for them to perceive their restaurant general managers and co-workers as being warm individuals. Hence, casual dining restaurant owners and operators should do everything they can in order to hire socially-oriented general managers and employees, as warm individuals or groups refer to those who strive to establish close relationships with others. Moreover, warm persons are known to be empathetic and understanding, and tend to cooperate and care for others, and are also known to adopt moral behaviors (Abele et al.,
If such characteristics are not observed by restaurant owners and operators in their employees and general managers, then they should try to instill a corporate culture that values and compensates those who possess such social characteristics and abilities.

As a conclusion, the current study’s findings assert that having satisfied employees does not ensure that they will not quit or look for other jobs elsewhere. On the other hand, when employees feel emotionally connected or attached to their organization, such attachment likely encourages them to remain in their organization and not quit their jobs. Although the current study did not control for any socio-demographic variables, it is also possible that the lack of statistical influence of employees’ job satisfaction on turnover intentions may be due to the fact that a lot of the surveyed hourly employees were students who were working to cover some or most of their living and educational expenses. This means that even if working college students are satisfied with their current work, they know that their current job is temporary, since they will probably quit their jobs before or after graduating from college. Thus, in order for these employees to have lower turnover intentions, they must possess a higher commitment to their organization. In other words, they must be emotionally committed to pursuing a career in their current organization or in the restaurant industry. Once employees are affectively committed to their organization, the current study’s findings demonstrate that it is harder for them to quit their jobs. And one way to increase employees’ organizational commitment is for casual dining restaurant operators to hire warm restaurant general managers and co-workers to work with and for them.

Having examined and compared with the existing literature the findings related to the self-administered survey, the following section next assesses the relationships that
exist between employees’ turnover intentions and actual turnover rates, and among employees’ job satisfaction, organizational commitment and restaurant performance metrics (as measured by their sales, cost of sales, and customer satisfaction scores), using secondary data that was shared by a large casual dining restaurant franchisee. Such relationships and hypotheses were mainly proposed in order to answer the third research question of the study (i.e., Are employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment related to restaurants’ performance?).

5.2 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TURNOVER INTENTIONS AND TURNOVER, AND AMONG EMPLOYEES’ JOB ATTITUDES AND RESTAURANT PERFORMANCE

Turnover intentions, which represent the self-reported perception by employees of whether they will be leaving their current place of employment within a given amount of time, was found in previous research to be the strongest indicator of whether an individual will leave an organization or not (Mobley et al., 1978). To measure employee turnover, the researcher obtained from the casual dining restaurant franchisee the turnover rate of each of its 43 restaurant units. The turnover rate of each of these restaurants was represented by an annualized percentage (e.g., if a restaurant had a turnover rate of 70% in 2014, it means that 7 out of 10 employees quit their jobs during that specific year either voluntarily or involuntarily).

Unfortunately, the study’s findings could not confirm the relationship between employees’ turnover intentions and restaurants’ turnover rates (i.e., Hypothesis 8). One of the possible reasons for this empirical disconfirmation may rely on the fact that employees may not want to look bad with regard to their restaurant general managers or employers, thus leading them to not reveal their real turnover intentions in a self-reported
survey. Employees’ social desirability bias may not have been overcome in the current study, despite the fact that the survey’s introduction highlighted the complete anonymity of respondents (Mitchell & Jolley, 2010). Another explanation for the lack of relationship between employees’ turnover intentions and turnover may be due to the fact that many respondents had a short tenure (i.e., almost one-third of all respondents had less than six months of work experience with their current restaurant), thus leading them to have lower turnover intentions at the time of the administration of the survey.

When it comes to analyzing the relationships among employees’ job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment) and restaurant performance measures, some of the restaurant performance measures had statistically significant relationships with employees’ job attitudes, leading the researcher to partially confirm Hypotheses 9 and 10, which were also developed in order to answer the current study’s third research question. Job satisfaction was indeed positively correlated with same store sales change and with customers’ satisfaction scores, and organizational commitment also had a positive relationship with same store sales change. On the other hand, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were positively correlated with increased cost of sales, which contradicts the supposition that employees who are more satisfied with their jobs and committed to their organization should demonstrate higher performance levels and be more productive, leading in turn to a decrease in the cost of sales (e.g., a decrease in restaurants’ cost of sales could translate for example into less food waste and stolen goods from employees). Despite the fact that the Pearson-product moment correlations between such variables (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and cost of sales) were statistically significant, their positive relationships were not taken into
consideration in the current study. Along these lines, it is important to remember that the cost of sales represents a financial ratio that is strongly influenced by the cost of food sold, a variable that has not been previously shown in other studies to have a significant relationship with employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

It is interesting to observe however that higher job satisfaction is correlated with higher sales and customers’ satisfaction, and that organizational commitment is also linked to increases in sales. The current study proves that organizational dynamics do have indeed a direct influence upon employee attitudes, performance, and customer satisfaction (Davidson & Manning, 2003). This means that when employees are satisfied with their jobs, customers’ satisfaction increases, which benefits restaurants’ sales. Similarly, when employees are committed to their organization, restaurant sales also improve, possibly because of the positive attitudes resulting from employees’ commitment. Therefore, it is important for casual dining restaurant owners and operators to do everything they can in order to have satisfied and committed employees, as these positive attitudes were found in the current study to be associated with increased sales and customer satisfaction. As mentioned earlier, the best way to have satisfied employees is for them to perceive their co-workers to be competent and warm, and their restaurant general managers to be warm. Moreover, in order for restaurant employees to be committed to their organization, the best way is for them to perceive their restaurant general managers and co-workers as being warm individuals. These findings imply that in order for casual dining operators to obtain higher sales and customer satisfaction scores, they must focus on having competent and warm employees, as well as warm general managers.
The study’s findings go along with other studies’ findings, which have previously shown that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are highly correlated with employee performance, productivity, and job involvement (Ghiselli et al., 2001; Huang, 2003). For example, in a study by Gazzoli et al. (2010), which analyzed the answers from 474 restaurant frontline employees and 1,259 customers to determine the effects of empowerment and job satisfaction on customers’ perceptions of service quality, a structural equation model suggested that both constructs (i.e., empowerment and job satisfaction) have a significant influence on customers’ perception of service quality. Consequently, Gazzoli et al.’s (2010) study also shows that having satisfied employees is important, as it directly affects restaurant consumers’ service perceptions.

Previous studies have also demonstrated the influence of employees’ organizational commitment on different behavioral outcomes. For example, a study by Kim and Brymer (2011) that investigated the effects of ethical leadership on hotel middle managers’ job satisfaction and affective commitment found that organizational commitment represents the only construct to influence both behavioral outcomes (i.e., extra effort and turnover intention), and these in turn have positive impacts on hotel performance. Their study revealed that executives’ ethical leadership is positively related to middle managers’ job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. Middle managers’ job satisfaction was also found to be related to their organizational commitment, but a higher job satisfaction did not lead middle managers to exert extra effort. Only the organizational commitment of hotel middle managers led them to exert extra effort, which in this case was a measure representing how much extra customer service they performed. Therefore, the current study serves as a reminder for casual
dining restaurant operators and managers to try to keep their staff as satisfied and committed as possible, as their overall restaurant sales and customer satisfaction may be positively related to these positive employee attitudes.

Having discussed the totality of the study’s findings, the following section examines its implications and proposes as well some suggestions for researchers and casual dining restaurant operators. There are indeed several things to consider from a theoretical and practical standpoint, in order to overcome some of the challenges and opportunities presented in the current study.

5.3 IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR RESEARCHERS AND RESTAURANT OPERATORS

5.3.1 IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR RESEARCHERS

The current study was able to show a variety of findings that are relevant for researchers as well as for casual dining restaurant owners and operators. It first demonstrated that employees’ social perceptions with regard to their co-workers and restaurant general managers have indeed a significant influence on important employee job attitudes, such as their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The fact that social perceptions are so influential imply that researchers need to further examine the possible factors that lead employees to perceive their co-workers and general managers either as warm or cold, and competent or incompetent. Researchers need to investigate the antecedents of each of these social perceptions, in order to better understand the social elements that characterize warm and competent individuals and groups. For instance, there could be a variety of antecedents affecting employees’ perceptions of co-workers and general managers, such as: (1) their oral communication patterns (Fu & Mount, 2002; Kim, 2014); (2) their manners and behaviors (Abele et al, 2008; Griffith,
1988); (3) their status and the nature of relationships (Echebarria-Echabe, 2013; Fiske et al., 2007); (4) their attitudes inside and outside the work environment (Karatepe & Kilic, 2007; Tjosvold, 1984). All of these antecedents need to be assessed in order for restaurant companies to improve their restaurant general managers’ and employees’ social and task-oriented skills and abilities, as well as to hire those that already possess such skills and abilities.

Once these antecedents are examined in depth, researchers could further elucidate the outcomes that such warmth and competence perceptions provoke on individuals and groups. It would thus be interesting for example to use other relevant attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, such as employee engagement, burnout, or willingness to exert extra effort, in order to expand the current literature related to the influence of warmth and competence perceptions. It would also be useful to assess how employees’ emotional outcomes, as described in the BIAS Map (i.e., envy, admiration, pity, contempt), could eventually affect employees’ behavioral outcomes, since the relationship between such emotions and behaviors needs to be verified in a corporate business setting and in the hospitality literature to add value to academics. Moreover, it would also be relevant to examine the relationships between warmth and competence perceptions and the organizational climate of hospitality companies, as some authors outlined that the leadership style of managers could have an influence on the perceived organizational climate of restaurants (Lee, Almanza, Jang, Nelson, & Ghiselli, 2013). Considering that the elements of the work environment can be psychological or social in nature, and can also be found in interpersonal and social relationships (Barrows & Ridout, 2010; Solnet
et al., 2010), there is a need for academia to evaluate how warmth and competence perceptions could be related to the perceived work environment of restaurants.

Furthermore, it is interesting to observe how restaurant employees perceive their co-workers and general managers only in two different ways (either as warm and competent, or as cold and incompetent), while previous literature has shown that people can perceive other people in four distinct ways (i.e., warm and competent; cold and incompetent; warm and incompetent; cold and competent). Consequently, it is important for future research to understand how ambivalent perceptions (i.e., warm and incompetent, cold and competent) of co-workers and general managers could eventually affect employees’ attitudinal and behavioral responses, as it is still not clear which of these two “mixed” perceptions has the most influence in a work setting. For example, a study by Tjosvold’s (1984) finds that participants who work with a warm and directive (i.e., competent) leader are the most motivated to complete a subsequent task, while participants who work with a warm but nondirective leader are the least productive. And what happens when employees are asked to work with a cold and competent leader? Accordingly, the current study found that it was very important for employees to work with competent co-workers and general managers. However, general managers’ competence had no influence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and employees’ perceived competence did not have a statistically significant positive influence on employees’ organizational commitment. Such contradictions need to be elucidated by more empirical studies, which could for example use other techniques (e.g., importance-performance analysis) in order to examine the
relative importance and performance of leaders and co-workers’ perceived warmth and competence in different restaurant settings.

Having described the implications and suggestions for researchers based on the current study’s findings, the next section follows the same procedure with regard to restaurant operators.

5.3.2 IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR RESTAURANT OPERATORS

From a restaurant operator perspective, there are several things that casual dining restaurants need to consider in order for their general managers and employees to portray more warmth and competence at work. Firstly, whenever hiring restaurant general managers and employees, casual dining restaurant operators should make sure that they pay attention not only to candidates’ perceived knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) (i.e., their perceived competence), but also to their attitudes and behaviors (i.e., their perceived warmth). A variety of structured/unstructured interviews and psychological tests could be performed during the interviewing process, in order for human resource managers and restaurant operators to observe if there is a match between employees’ KSAs and those that are portrayed in the proposed job description. In case employees have the right attitude but lack the necessary KSAs required for a specific job function, it is up to restaurant operators to do everything they can to train such employees, so that the latter can perform at their best and be as competent and professional as they can.

The aforementioned structured (e.g., behavioral and situational interviews) and unstructured interviews (e.g., face-to-face and panel interviews) and psychological tests could clearly help detect employees’ and general managers’ perceived warmth (i.e., sincere, good-natured, warm, tolerant) and competence (i.e., competent, confident,
intelligent, competitive, independent) in a work setting, and more specifically in a casual dining restaurant setting. For instance, well-prepared and detailed face-to-face interviews could allow restaurant owners to observe if candidates are socially-oriented or not, as warm individuals usually manifest themselves in empathy, understanding, cooperation and caring for others, as well as in moral behavior (Abele et al., 2008). Along these lines, the morality of employees and general managers could also be assessed through various psychological tests such as integrity tests, which allow companies to analyze the honesty of the potential candidate in respect to theft and counterproductive work behavior. Moreover, through the observation of the candidate’s oral and behavioral responses to the interview questions and the monitoring of the candidate’s body language, human resource managers and restaurant owners could quickly observe if the candidate possesses a personality that is more socially-oriented (i.e., warmth), or if the candidate is more of an individualistic, autonomous and independent type of person (i.e., competence) (Abele et al., 2008). Along these lines, situational or behavioral interviews could also be performed to test if the candidate has the right KSAs, as these interviewing techniques are often used by companies to measure employees’ problem solving skills, attitudes and behaviors in a work setting.

Although the perceived competence of general managers did not have any statistically significant direct influence on employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (as shown in the SEM model), the cluster analyses and subsequent t-tests, which were performed in order to answer the second research question (i.e., Can employees’ attitudinal and behavioral outcomes differ based on the warmth and competence perceptions that they hold with regard to their co-workers and restaurant
general managers?), demonstrate that employees who perceive their restaurant general managers and co-workers to be warm and competent have higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and lower turnover intentions than employees who perceive their restaurant general managers and co-workers to be cold and incompetent. Therefore, both warmth and competence perceptions should be taken into consideration by restaurant companies when making decisions about hiring restaurant general managers and employees.

Moreover, in order for restaurant co-workers to portray more competence at work (co-workers’ perceived competence was shown in this study to highly influence employees’ job satisfaction), service standards should be consistently taught to restaurant employees and reinforced by restaurant managers, since effective service standards constitute the basis for managers and employees to work in a competent and professional manner. Without the development and implementation of quality service standards, it is hard for employees to perform at their best and achieve all of the necessary objectives set up by the company. Along these lines, training should be considered as a top priority, since it not only teaches managers and employees how to behave and perform at work, but it also gives an opportunity for organizations to set a strong organizational culture. There are several examples of successful hospitality companies, such as the Ritz-Carlton, Walt Disney and Southwest Airlines, that were able to create exceptional organizational cultures that focus on both guests and employees. For example, the Ritz-Carlton has set Gold Standards, which encompass the values and philosophy of the company. Among those Gold Standards, the Employee Promise reminds employees: (1) that they represent the most important resource for the company’s commitment to guests; (2) to apply the
principles of trust, honesty, respect, integrity and commitment, and to nurture and maximize talent to the benefit of each individual and the company; (3) to foster a work environment where diversity is valued, quality of life is enhanced and individual aspirations are fulfilled (Ritz-Carlton, 2015). Moreover, the Ritz-Carlton has twelve Service Values that employees are asked to recite every day at the beginning of their work shifts, such as: “I am involved in the planning of the work that affects me,” “I create a work environment of teamwork and lateral service so that the needs of our guests and each other are met” and “I build strong relationships and create Ritz-Carlton guests for life” (Ritz-Carlton, 2015). The company’s Motto also says a lot about the role and purpose of employees at this particular company: “We are Ladies and Gentlemen serving Ladies and Gentlemen” (Ritz-Carlton, 2015). Therefore, as shown with the Ritz-Carlton, the implementation of a strong organizational culture could definitely help employees adopt warmer and more competent attitudes and behaviors in the workplace, as the messages portrayed in the company’s Motto, Service Values and Gold Standards reflect important values and principles that could enhance employees’ commitment and willingness to collaborate and to perform at their best, so that customers and employees can obtain the most satisfaction out of their service and professional experiences.

The goal is to have a satisfied and committed workforce, that will not only lower employees’ turnover intentions, but that will also help increase customer satisfaction and restaurant sales. Knowing how to motivate, direct and engage team members before, during and after each shift is critical to minimize turnover and maximize performance (Sullivan, 2015). Along these lines, casual dining restaurant companies should try their best to have the finest communicators in every role. As Sullivan (2015) reminds
restaurant operators and owners, employees simply want to be happy at work and be treated with respect and dignity. The greatest hospitality companies know how to keep their teams happy, engaged and inspired. The good news is that all of these solutions are affordable and will cost much less than the costs associated with high turnover rates or low customer satisfaction. It is important to remember that companies with well-established hiring processes and training programs, and strong organizational cultures end up attracting a pool of talents that other companies have a difficult time to find. If casual dining restaurant companies closely follow these procedures, they are likely to have lower turnover rates and higher customer satisfaction and restaurant sales.

Having covered the research implications and suggestions for academia and restaurant operators, the following section describes the main research limitations.

5.4 Research Limitations

As mentioned earlier, one of the study’s main limitations was the use of a convenience sampling technique, which prevents the researcher from generalizing the study’s findings to the entire population of casual dining restaurant employees. Only employees from one specific casual dining restaurant chain were asked to complete the online self-administered survey, and no other restaurant segment participated in the current study. Future research could use “purest” forms of probability sampling, such as random or systematic sampling techniques, which allow each member of the population to have an equal and known chance of being selected, thus making it possible for researchers to generalize the obtained findings for the entire targeted population. Also, researchers could develop similar studies to confirm if other restaurant segments replicate the study’s findings, in order to better understand if the influence of warmth and
competence perceptions of restaurant general managers and co-workers are similar across different restaurant segments. Other hospitality segments or sub-segments could also be contemplated, such as hotels, cruises, or even fine dining restaurants.

Some limitations also involve the data gathering procedures and method analysis used in the current study. For example, self-administered surveys can yield a self-report bias which may impact the validity of the research. Self-report bias occurs when respondents want to answer in a way that makes them look as good as possible with regard to other people (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002). Since the study asked respondents to evaluate the perceived warmth and competence of their co-workers and restaurant general managers, the study cannot ignore the possibility that respondents may have inflated their answers, by evaluating their co-workers and managers as extremely warm or competent. Along these lines, with self-administered surveys, an order bias could have occurred due to the ordering of the survey questions. Lastly, like in most models found in the literature, the proposed SEM model was mispecified, as one can not assume with confidence that the phenomena portrayed in the proposed model lies within a specified parametric family of probability distributions (White, 1982).

Moreover, the study’s sole focus on the social perceptions that employees have with regard to their co-workers and restaurant general managers also poses a problem. The current study did not take into account for example the social evaluations of employees regarding their direct supervisors, such as assistant or shift managers. In large restaurant units, many employees do not have much interaction with their restaurant general managers, either because of the existing hierarchy or due to the fact that they are new employees who have not yet had opportunities for interaction. On the other hand,
restaurant hourly employees often spend more time working or interacting with their fellow co-workers and immediate supervisors, and these interactions allow them to have a clearer idea of the social traits that characterize these groups. Therefore, future studies should also assess the influence of warmth and competence perceptions of direct supervisors, as these may produce more important impacts on employees’ job attitudes than the influence of restaurant general managers.

Furthermore, the current study did not differentiate employees’ roles within each restaurant. Future research could analyze for instance if the effects of warmth and competence perceptions differ according to employees’ primary positions (e.g., kitchen, service, administration) and rankings (e.g., subordinates, supervisors, managers, owners), as the expected attitudes and behaviors for each of these departments and statuses may vary considerably. Lastly, another important limitation was the fact that the current study only analyzed the influence of warmth and competence perceptions on well-known employees’ job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment) and turnover intentions. It would thus be interesting for researchers to use other relevant attitudinal and behavioral outcomes, such as employee engagement, burnout, or willingness to exert extra effort, in order to expand the existing literature related to the influence of warmth and competence perceptions in a hospitality setting.

5.5 Conclusion

The warmth and competence constructs, which represent two of the most important social constructs characterizing the evaluation of individuals and groups, were brought to light in the current study. The obtained findings are interesting because they show how employees’ social perceptions regarding two important stakeholders (i.e., their
co-workers and general managers) can provoke significant consequences in the workplace. Indeed, co-workers’ and restaurant general managers’ perceived warmth and competence have an influence on employees’ job attitudes, which in turn help reduce their turnover intentions. More specifically, warm restaurant general managers and co-workers help increase employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, while competent co-workers positively affect employees’ job satisfaction. Although restaurant general managers’ perceived competence did not influence employees’ job attitudes, the study’s findings demonstrate that employees who perceive their restaurant general managers to be cold and incompetent have much lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and higher turnover intentions than employees who perceive them as warm and competent. Such findings also apply to employees’ co-workers, who are also perceived in two different ways (i.e., as cold and incompetent; or as warm and competent). Therefore, whenever hiring restaurant general managers and employees, restaurant operators should not only hire them based on their perceived knowledge, skills and abilities (i.e., competence), but they should also pay attention to their social nature.

Along these lines, it is worrisome to know that many multi-unit restaurant managers lack specific human resource skills that are related to the warmth and competence constructs. For instance, Murphy et al. (2009) revealed in a study that managers need more training in the areas of human resource management, employee development, and leadership skills. This finding is alarming as the lack of human resource skills, which could be related to such things as manpower planning, succession planning, and work-team considerations (Goss-Turner, 1999), not only negatively influences hourly employees, who feel that their managers do not communicate with
them properly and do not provide them with the necessary tools to feel engaged and content at work; but such lack of skills was also shown to increase restaurant managers’ turnover intentions (Murphy et al., 2009). Therefore, it is essential for restaurant companies to continuously train all of its employees and transmit them the necessary service standards and cultural values, in order for general managers and hourly employees to better communicate and behave at work. As a result, the implementation of these organizational standards and culture will increase employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which will reduce their turnover intentions and improve customers’ satisfaction and restaurants’ performance (i.e., sales and cost of sales).

In sum, this study outlines the importance of people in the restaurant industry as well as the influence of social perceptions in casual dining restaurants. Once restaurant owners and operators understand the importance of such factors, they will have to take appropriate measures, in order to develop a warm and competent organizational culture, which will ultimately benefit employees as well as the overall organizational and financial performance of their restaurant units.
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# APPENDIX A – ENGLISH SURVEY

Q1 Thank you for your participation in this survey sponsored by the University of South Carolina. As many of you know, Greg and I have partnered for years together sharing restaurant-level presentations and information with my hospitality students at USC. The purpose of the survey is to learn about your specific restaurant’s work environment. The survey will take approximately 5-8 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. All individual survey response data will be treated as anonymous and held in confidence by the researchers. By completing the survey you are giving your consent to the researchers to use the information collected. If you have questions at any time about the survey, you may contact the researcher Dr. Robin DiPietro at the Carolina Coliseum, Room 1020-C, Columbia, SC 29208, or by phone (803-777-2600). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant, please contact the University of South Carolina Office of Research Compliance at 803-777-7095. Thank you!

Q2 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: I consider my Restaurant General Manager at this restaurant to be…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincere (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good natured (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 Which trait do you think is the most important trait for any Restaurant General Manager to possess?

- Competent (1)
- Confident (2)
- Intelligent (3)
- Competitive (4)
- Independent (5)
- Sincere (6)
- Good natured (7)
- Warm (8)
- Tolerant (9)

Q4 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and this restaurant’s values are similar (1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am really glad that I chose to work for this restaurant rather than for other restaurants (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really care about this restaurant’s future (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not hesitate to recommend this restaurant as a good place to work (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work gives me a sense of accomplishment (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements: I consider my Co-Workers at this restaurant to be…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincere (1)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good natured (2)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm (3)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant (4)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent (5)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident (6)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent (7)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive (8)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (9)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6 Which trait do you think is the most important trait for any restaurant Co-Worker to possess?

- Competent (1)
- Confident (2)
- Intelligent (3)
- Competitive (4)
- Independent (5)
- Sincere (6)
- Good natured (7)
- Warm (8)
- Tolerant (9)
Q7 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my co-workers (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my restaurant management team (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the teamwork in my restaurant (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my pay (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree (3)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a new job next year (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not thinking about leaving this company anytime soon (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 Please select the restaurant where you work:

- Aiken, SC (1)
- Albany, GA (2)
- Augusta, GA (3)
- Barry Rd., MO (21)
- Camden, SC (4)
- Carolina Forest, SC (5)
- Columbia, MO (22)
- Dorchester, SC (6)
- Evans, GA (7)
- E. Wichita, KS (23)
- Florence, SC (8)
- Harbison, SC (9)
- Hinesville, GA (10)
- Hutchinson, KS (24)
- Independence, MO (25)
- Jefferson City, MO (26)
- LaVista, NE (27)
- Lawrence, KS (28)
- Lee's Summit, MO (29)
- Lexington, SC (11)
- Liberty, MO (30)
- Lincoln, NE (31)
- Manhattan, KS (32)
- Merriam, KS (33)
- Milledgeville, GA (12)
- Myrtle Beach, SC (13)
- N. Charleston, SC (14)
- N. Wichita, KS (34)
- Olathe, KS (35)
- Omaha I., NE (36)
- River Crossing, GA (15)
- Salina, KS (38)
- Shawnee Mission, KS (39)
- S. Overland Park, KS (37)
- Speedway, KS (40)
- Spring Valley, SC (16)
- Statesboro, GA (17)
- St. Joseph, MO (41)
- Sumter, SC (18)
- Tifton, GA (19)
- Topeka, KS (42)
- Valdosta, GA (20)
- W. Wichita, KS (43)
Q10 How many years and months have you been working for your current employer?
   Years (1)
   Months (2)

Q11 How are you classified by your company?
    Full-time (1)
    Part-time (2)

Q12 When do you work most of your shifts?
    Lunch (1)
    Dinner (2)

Q13 Gender
    Male (1)
    Female (2)

Q14 Ethnic group
    African American (1)
    Caucasian (2)
    Asian (3)
    Hispanic (4)
    Other (5)

Q15 Age group
    18-25 (1)
    26-33 (2)
    34-41 (3)
    42-49 (4)
    50 or more (5)

Q16 Highest education attained
    Less than high school (1)
    High school (2)
    Some college or equivalent (3)
    Bachelor's degree (4)
    Graduate degree (5)
Q17 Annual income

- Below $20,000 (1)
- $20,000 to $24,999 (2)
- $25,000 to $29,999 (3)
- $30,000 to $34,999 (4)
- $35,000 or more (5)
**APPENDIX B – SPANISH SURVEY**

Q1 Gracias por su participación en esta encuesta patrocinada por la Universidad de Carolina del Sur (USC). Como muchos de ustedes saben, Greg y yo hemos colaborado durante años compartiendo presentaciones e información con mis alumnos de hostelería en la USC. El propósito de la encuesta es conocer el ambiente laboral que se vive en su restaurante. La encuesta le tomará aproximadamente de 5 a 8 minutos. Su participación es voluntaria. Todas las respuestas serán tratadas como anónimas y mantendrán su carácter confidencial por los investigadores. Al completar la encuesta, usted está dando su consentimiento a los investigadores para que utilicen la información para sus fines académicos. Si usted tiene preguntas en cualquier momento sobre la encuesta, puede comunicarse con el investigador, Dr. Robin DiPietro en el Carolina Coliseum, Sala 1020-C, Columbia, SC 29208, o por teléfono (803-777-2600). Si usted tiene cualquier pregunta acerca de sus derechos como participante, por favor póngase en contacto con la Oficina de Cumplimiento de Investigación de la Universidad de Carolina del Sur (803-777-7095). Gracias.

Q2 Indique su grado de acuerdo con cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones: Considero que mi Gerente General en este restaurante es...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)</th>
<th>Discrepar (2)</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Acordar (4)</th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sincero (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondadoso (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afectuoso (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerante (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competente (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seguro (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inteligente (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitivo (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independiente (9)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3 En su opinión, ¿cuál es la característica más importante que un gerente general de un restaurante debe poseer?

- Competente (1)
- Seguro (2)
- Inteligente (3)
- Competitivo (4)
- Independiente (5)
- Sincero (6)
- Bondadoso (7)
- Afectuoso (8)
- Tolerante (9)

Q4 Indique su grado de acuerdo con cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>afirmación</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)</th>
<th>Discrepar (2)</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Acordar (4)</th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Me parece que mis valores y los valores de este restaurante son similares</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Estoy muy contento de haber elegido trabajar en este restaurante (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realmente me preocupo por el futuro de este restaurante (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yo no dudaría en recomendar este restaurante como un buen lugar para trabajar (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi trabajo en este restaurante me da una sensación de logro (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q5 Indique su grado de acuerdo con cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones: considero que mis compañeros de trabajo en este restaurante son...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)</th>
<th>Discrepar (2)</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Acordar (4)</th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sinceros (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondadosos (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afectuosos (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerantes (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competentes (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seguros (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inteligentes (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitivos (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independientes (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6 En su opinión, ¿cuál es la característica más importante que un compañero de trabajo debe poseer?

- Competente (1)
- Seguro (2)
- Inteligente (3)
- Competitivo (4)
- Independiente (5)
- Sincero (6)
- Bondadoso (7)
- Afectuoso (8)
- Tolerante (9)
Q7 Indique su grado de acuerdo con cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)</th>
<th>Discrepar (2)</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Acordar (4)</th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estoy satisfecho con mis compañeros de trabajo (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy satisfecho con mi equipo de la gerencia del restaurante (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy satisfecho con el trabajo en equipo en mi restaurante (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy satisfecho con mi salario (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 Indique su grado de acuerdo con cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo (1)</th>
<th>Discrepar (2)</th>
<th>Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo (3)</th>
<th>Acordar (4)</th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Es probable que voy a buscar activamente un nuevo empleo el próximo año (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A menudo pienso en dejar de trabajar en este restaurante (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probablemente voy a buscar un nuevo trabajo el año que viene (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No estoy pensando en dejar el restaurante en el corto plazo (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 Por favor, seleccione el restaurante donde trabaja:

- Aiken, SC (1)
- Albany, GA (2)
- Augusta, GA (3)
- Barry Rd., MO (21)
- Camden, SC (4)
- Carolina Forest, SC (5)
- Columbia, MO (22)
- Dorchester, SC (6)
- Evans, GA (7)
- E. Wichita, KS (23)
- Florence, SC (8)
- Harbison, SC (9)
- Hinesville, GA (10)
- Hutchinson, KS (24)
- Independence, MO (25)
- Jefferson City, MO (26)
- LaVista, NE (27)
- Lawrence, KS (28)
- Lee's Summit, MO (29)
- Lexington, SC (11)
- Liberty, MO (30)
- Lincoln, NE (31)
- Manhattan, KS (32)
- Merriam, KS (33)
- Milledgeville, GA (12)
- Myrtle Beach, SC (13)
- N. Charleston, SC (14)
- N. Wichita, KS (34)
- Olathe, KS (35)
- Omaha I., NE (36)
- River Crossing, GA (15)
- Salina, KS (38)
- Shawnee Mission, KS (39)
- S. Overland Park, KS (37)
- Speedway, KS (40)
- Spring Valley, SC (16)
- Statesboro, GA (17)
- St. Joseph, MO (41)
- Sumter, SC (18)
- Tifton, GA (19)
- Topeka, KS (42)
- Valdosta, GA (20)
- W. Wichita, KS (43)
Q10 ¿Cuántos años y meses ha estado trabajando para su empleador actual?

Años (1)
Meses (2)

Q11 ¿Cómo su empresa le clasifica?

☑ Full-time (1)
☑ Part-time (2)

Q12 ¿Cuándo usted trabaja la mayoría de sus turnos?

☑ Almuerzo (1)
☑ Cena (2)

Q13 Género

☑ Masculino (1)
☑ Femenino (2)

Q14 Grupo étnico

☑ Afroamericano (1)
☑ Caucásico (2)
☑ Asiático (3)
☑ Hispano (4)
☑ Otro (5)

Q15 Edad

☑ 18-25 (1)
☑ 26-33 (2)
☑ 34-41 (3)
☑ 42-49 (4)
☑ 50 o más (5)
Q16 Nivel de educación alcanzado
☑ Menos que una escuela secundaria (1)
☑ Escuela secundaria (2)
☑ Un poco de universidad o equivalente (3)
☑ Licenciatura (4)
☑ Título de posgrado (5)

Q17 Renta anual
☑ Menos de $ 20.000 (1)
☑ $ 20.000 a $ 24.999 (2)
☑ $ 25,000 a $ 29,999 (3)
☑ $ 30,000 a $ 34,999 (4)
☑ 35.000 dólares o más (5)
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