

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Research on the Satisfaction Degree of Basic Level Employees in Chain Hotels —— Take Jinan Rujia Chain Hotel as an Example

To cite this article: Yiwen Zhang 2019 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **237** 032129

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Research on the Satisfaction Degree of Basic Level Employees in Chain Hotels —— Take Jinan Rujia Chain Hotel as an Example

ZHANG Yiwen¹

¹School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Toronto, Canada, M4Y 0C3

1965986725@qq.com

Abstract. In recent years, there is a common problem in hotels. The turnover of grass-roots staffs is frequent and the turnover rate of staffs is high. This paper takes Jinan Rujia Chain Hotel as an example, designing a questionnaire to investigate the satisfaction of the grass-roots employees of Rujia Hotel. The principal component analysis of the data obtained from the survey was carried out by using SPSS analysis tools, then the conclusions were drawn as follows: The overall satisfaction of the grassroots staff of Rujia Hotel in Jinan is not very high. Among the five main factors, the employee satisfaction of the job treatment factor is the highest, while the interpersonal relationship factor is the lowest, which is only 0.0373. Personal development factor is second only to interpersonal relationship factor, employee satisfaction is 0.0482, but on the whole, the employee satisfaction of the five main factors is low.

1. Introduction

With the rapid development of China's Hotel industry, domestic hotel chains have developed sequentially. Since foreign famous hotel chains have already entered the Chinese market, and the hotel industry is facing more fierce competition. Hotel industry is a labor-intensive industry. The frequent turnover of employees is not conducive to the daily management and operation of hotels. The effective way to reduce the turnover rate of employees is to improve employee satisfaction. At the same time, the hotel industry is also a service industry. Improving employee satisfaction will directly promote customer satisfaction and then exert a significant influence on enterprise performance. The paper conducts a survey on the satisfaction degree of the grass-roots employees of Rujia Hotel in Jinan by means of questionnaires and principal component analysis of the data obtained by the survey using SPSS tools. The satisfaction degree of the grass-roots employees of Rujia Hotel in Jinan is obtained, and the main factors affecting the satisfaction degree of the grass-roots employees are analyzed.

2. Journals reviewed

This paper summarizes the research on employee satisfaction from three aspects: first, the connotation analysis of employee satisfaction; second, the factors affecting employee satisfaction; third, the evaluation methods and tools analysis of employee satisfaction.

2.1. Connotation Analysis of Employee Satisfaction

Employee satisfaction was first proposed and studied by American psychologist Hoppock in 1935. The concept mainly includes employees' physiological and psychological sense of job satisfaction and environmental satisfaction (Kuang Jiaqing, 2013). Xu Qin (2015) believes that employee satisfaction



is the difference between the actual value of employees and the expected value of that in the working environment. Chen Shan (2016) believes that employee satisfaction refers to the degree to which employees compare their actual feelings and expectations in terms of salary and benefits, working environment, promotion mechanism, vocational training and other labor conditions provided by enterprises.

2.2 Analysis of factors affecting employee satisfaction

Gu Yingkang et al (2012) considered that salary and welfare, management system, superior leadership, personal development, work itself, working environment, interpersonal relationship and other seven factors affect hotel staff satisfaction. Ouyang Zhenan et al (2012) considered that the main factors affecting employee satisfaction were job satisfaction, job reward satisfaction, job group satisfaction and job environment satisfaction. Lei Jianfeng et al (2016) found that employee satisfaction was related to working years, educational background, position level, job autonomy, variability, cooperation and appreciation. Through factor analysis, Ruth McPhail et al (2015) extract three factors affecting employee satisfaction: career development, interpersonal relationship and personal will. Eunice Fay Amissah et al (2016) use the standard multiple regression method to analyze the predictive factors of job satisfaction, then four main factors affecting Ghana hotel staff satisfaction were identified, namely salary, supervision, promotion and training.

2.3 Analysis of the Methods and Tools for Evaluating Employee Satisfaction

Zhang Ziang et al (2012) used factor analysis method to evaluate the satisfaction of employees of star hotels in Nanjing, and used Herzberg's two-factor theory to analyze the factors affecting satisfaction. Zhang Bilan et al (2012) based on evidence theory, employee satisfaction of librarians was assessed by questionnaire survey. Tang Jianxiong et al (2013) conducted a questionnaire survey on the employees of high-star hotels in Changsha, using factor analysis, multiple regression analysis and other methods to study the relationship between Hotel Leaders' orientation of social responsibility and employee satisfaction. Tang Xiuli et al (2013) used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation model (SEM) to empirically analyze the relationship between influencing factors of hotel employee satisfaction and employee follow-up behavior on the basis of questionnaire sampling survey.

Overall, the study of employee satisfaction by scholars from different perspectives has greatly broadened our understanding of employee satisfaction. This paper will investigate the grass-roots employees of Rujia Hotel in Jinan. According to the data of the questionnaire survey, the principal component analysis method will be used to measure the job satisfaction of employees, so as to make the research more pertinent.

3. Data Source and Reliability and Validity Test

Rujia Hotels Group, as the leader of chain hotels in China, ranks first in terms of hotel size, number of employees and members. According to the author's survey, there are 46 hotels in Rujia Hotel in Jinan, mainly distributed in the urban areas of Jinan.

3.1 Questionnaire design

The subjects of this paper are the grass-roots employees of Rujia Hotel. Grass-roots employees are those who are at the lowest level in the organizational structure and have the most direct contact with customers. The grass-roots employees can be defined in this paper as front desk staff, room staff and restaurant staff of Rujia Hotel. They are front-line employees who directly provide services to customers.

The content of the questionnaire is mainly composed of basic personal information and main information. Personal information includes gender, age, educational background, length of service and position, which are the reference indicators. The main information includes 27 evaluation indicators, specifically: Basic wage X_1 , allowance and bonus X_2 , board and lodging X_3 , rest time X_4 , working environment safety X_5 , health protection X_6 , facility and equipment safety X_7 , occupational security X_8 ,

fringe benefits X_9 , punctuality of wage payment X_{10} , fairness of wages X_{11} , overtime pay X_{12} , relations with superiors X_{13} , relationship with peers X_{14} , relationship with customers X_{15} , relations with other store colleagues X_{16} , self-confidence X_{17} , self-respect X_{18} , superior recognition X_{19} , coworkers' affirmation X_{20} , guests' praise X_{21} , collaboration among employees X_{22} , ability of interpersonal communication X_{23} , the pertinence of training content X_{24} , effect of training X_{25} , clarification of promotion mechanism X_{26} , fairness of promotion system X_{27} .

In the end, 173 questionnaires were sent out and 140 valid questionnaires were retrieved. The validity rate of the questionnaires was 80.9%. Among them, 47 are front desk staff, accounting for 33.6%; 83 are room staff, accounting for 59.3%; 10 are restaurant staff, accounting for 7.1%.

3.2 Data assignment

At present, the definition of employee satisfaction by domestic scholars is the degree of comparison between employees' expectations and actual feelings. Two data surveys are needed in the research process. This paper only conducted a data survey once, so it expressed employee satisfaction in the form of percentage, 20% said very unsatisfactory, 40% said relatively unsatisfactory, 60% said uncertain, 80% said relatively satisfied, 100% said very satisfied.

3.3 Validity and reliability analysis

Validity is to test the validity of measurement results. Factor analysis was carried out by SPSS statistical software, and KMO and Bartlett tests were carried out. Table 1 shows that the KMO value of this paper is $0.853 > 0.6$. Bartlett's sphericity test gives a concomitant probability of 0.000, so it is suitable for factor analysis. As shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Examination of KMO and Bartlett

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure		.853
Bartlett Examination	Approximate chi square	1997.672
	df	351
	Sig.	.000

Reliability is to check the reliability of measurement results. By using SPSS tool and analyzing the reliability of measurement data, it can be seen from Table 2 that the Cronbach coefficient is 0.923 and the reliability is high. As shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Item number
.923	32

4. Factor analysis

According to the analysis of 27 variables, the characteristic root value of five factors is more than 1. Therefore, the factors affecting the satisfaction of grass-roots employees in Rujia Hotel in Jinan are summed up as five main factors, and the cumulative contribution rate of these five main factors is 61.581%, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Total variance explained

	Initial eigenvalue			Extract Square Sum Loading			Rotating Square Sum Loading		
	Total	Variance %	accumulate %	Total	Variance %	accumulate %	Total	Variance %	accumulate %
1	9.145	33.871	33.871	9.145	33.871	33.871	3.688	13.657	13.657
2	2.834	10.496	44.367	2.834	10.496	44.367	3.681	13.632	27.290
3	1.739	6.442	50.809	1.739	6.442	50.809	3.679	13.627	40.917
4	1.574	5.830	56.640	1.574	5.830	56.640	3.074	11.386	52.303
5	1.334	4.942	61.581	1.334	4.942	61.581	2.505	9.279	61.581
6	.998	3.698	65.279						
7	.868	3.216	68.495						
8	.806	2.984	71.479						

9	.755	2.797	74.276
10	.716	2.653	76.929
11	.682	2.525	79.454
12	.649	2.403	81.857
13	.604	2.238	84.095
14	.505	1.869	85.965
15	.485	1.798	87.762
16	.417	1.544	89.306
17	.402	1.489	90.795
18	.363	1.345	92.140
19	.348	1.288	93.428
20	.310	1.147	94.575
21	.300	1.112	95.687
22	.286	1.058	96.744
23	.226	.838	97.582
24	.206	.764	98.346
25	.187	.693	99.039
26	.140	.519	99.559
27	.119	.441	100.000

Five main factors were analyzed. The first main factors include: basic wage X_1 , allowance and bonus X_2 , rest time X_4 , fairness of wages X_{11} , fringe benefits X_9 , board and lodging X_3 . It was named as the factor of work treatment, and the contribution rate was 33.871%. The second main factors include: guests' praise X_{21} , self-confidence X_{17} , working environment safety X_5 , self-respect X_{18} , ability of interpersonal communication X_{23} , coworkers' affirmation X_{20} , facility and equipment safety X_7 . It was named work atmosphere and environment factor, and the contribution rate was 10.496%. The third main factors include: effect of training X_{25} , the pertinence of training content X_{24} , clarification of promotion mechanism X_{26} , superior recognition X_{19} , fairness of promotion system X_{27} . It was named personal development factor with a contribution rate of 6.442%. The fourth main factor includes: collaboration among employees X_{22} , relations with other store colleagues X_{16} , relationship with customers X_{15} , relationship with peers X_{14} , and relations with superiors X_{13} . It was named as interpersonal relationship factor with a contribution rate of 5.830%. The fifth main factors include: punctuality of wage payment X_{10} , health protection X_6 , overtime pay X_{12} , and occupational security X_8 . It was named as work stability factor with a contribution rate of 4.942%. See Table 4.

Table 4 Rotating Component Matrix

	Ingredients				
	1	2	3	4	5
X_1	.871	.031	-.016	.036	.055
X_2	.833	.130	-.063	.068	.159
X_4	.748	.131	.301	-.052	.066
X_{11}	.714	-.045	.242	.266	.058
X_9	.538	.315	-.036	.179	.418
X_3	.400	.312	.308	-.324	.045
X_{21}	.030	.764	.115	.146	.026
X_{17}	.075	.711	.033	-.007	.278
X_5	.147	.658	.123	.465	.154
X_{18}	.059	.575	.234	.432	.006
X_{23}	.278	.551	.519	.125	-.039
X_{20}	.055	.501	.257	.344	.138
X_7	.209	.484	.437	.050	.222
X_{25}	.020	.323	.743	.285	-.009
X_{24}	.084	.332	.695	.059	.342

X_{26}	-.099	-.004	.693	.510	.003
X_{19}	.188	.078	.599	.259	.354
X_{27}	.338	.507	.563	.187	-.045
X_{22}	-.042	.276	.221	.690	.056
X_{16}	.134	.170	.181	.614	.383
X_{15}	.384	.158	.069	.575	.065
X_{14}	-.010	.384	.314	.570	.183
X_{13}	.182	.036	.467	.517	.179
X_{10}	-.114	.162	.011	.045	.743
X_6	.152	.030	.032	.183	.692
X_{12}	.309	.081	.295	.014	.631
X_8	.247	.124	.366	.200	.477

Method of extraction: principal component. The rotation converges after 12 iterations.

The principal components were analyzed by regression method, and the scoring table of principal components was obtained. See Table 5 for details.

Table 5 Component Score Coefficient Matrix

	Ingredients				
	1	2	3	4	5
X_1	.293	-.042	-.079	.024	-.062
X_2	.267	.005	-.130	.029	-.008
X_3	.091	.107	.141	-.275	-.022
X_4	.222	-.032	.092	-.100	-.059
X_5	-.006	.215	-.158	.139	-.022
X_6	-.019	-.065	-.072	.028	.338
X_7	-.006	.121	.108	-.135	.041
X_8	.009	-.073	.088	-.018	.186
X_9	.129	.076	-.165	.035	.138
X_{10}	-.123	.030	-.065	-.067	.398
X_{11}	.230	-.141	.033	.107	-.075
X_{12}	.020	-.071	.082	-.114	.287
X_{13}	.019	-.148	.114	.174	.003
X_{14}	-.058	.047	-.024	.188	.006
X_{15}	.118	-.034	-.131	.281	-.070
X_{16}	-.007	-.057	-.085	.247	.116
X_{17}	-.046	.310	-.124	-.122	.098
X_{18}	-.024	.175	-.066	.122	-.091
X_{19}	-.011	-.131	.215	-.015	.111
X_{20}	-.037	.139	-.031	.066	-.008
X_{21}	-.043	.320	-.103	-.038	-.055
X_{22}	-.042	.007	-.068	.296	-.058
X_{23}	.035	.142	.134	-.093	-.123
X_{24}	-.068	.004	.268	-.174	.112
X_{25}	-.055	-.010	.274	-.027	-.094
X_{26}	-.072	-.177	.267	.144	-.073
X_{27}	.057	.102	.150	-.061	-.137

The function that can express the factor score is: $Y_n = \sum_{m=1}^{27} a_{mn} X_m$ $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ formula (4.1)

Among them, Y_n represents the n th common factor score in grass-roots employee satisfaction. a_{mn} denotes the coefficients of the n th column in the m row of the coefficient matrix. According to SPSS analysis, it can be concluded that Jinan Rujia Hotel grassroots employee satisfaction score expression:

$$Y = 0.33871Y_1 + 0.10496Y_2 + 0.06442Y_3 + 0.05830Y_4 + 0.04942Y_5 \quad \text{formula (4.2)}$$

Formula (4.1) is introduced into formula (4.2) employee satisfaction score expression, and the satisfaction degree of grassroots employees of Rujia Hotel in Jinan is calculated to be 0.5048.

5. Conclusion

Through data analysis, it is concluded that the comprehensive satisfaction of the basic staff of Rujia Hotel in Jinan is 0.5048, and the overall comprehensive satisfaction is not very high. According to the score table of employee satisfaction of each factor in table 6, we can see that among the five main factors, the job treatment factor is the highest, employee satisfaction with interpersonal factors is the lowest.

Table 6 Score Table of Employee Satisfaction for Each Factor

factor	Score of factors
work treatment Y_1	0.2957
work atmosphere and environment Y_2	0.0860
personal development Y_3	0.0428
interpersonal relationship Y_4	0.0373
work stability Y_5	0.0430

5.1 Analysis of the factors of job treatment

Among the five main factors, grass-roots employees are the most satisfied with their work treatment. This is mainly due to the fact that Home Inn provides accommodation and meals for employees, as well as some monthly living benefits, which greatly saves employees living expenses such as renting, eating and so on. But it is also an indisputable fact that the salary of grass-roots employees is low, the salary of 2300 Yuan can hardly meet their living needs. The proportion of people aged 25-45 is 63.6%. Employees in this aged group are the main source of family economy. They need higher wages to support their families and plan for their children.

5.2 Analysis of working atmosphere and environmental factors

The working environment includes work safety, working time system, working facilities and so on. A good working environment can keep employees happy and improve their working enthusiasm. In Rujia Hotel, the working environment of employees is relatively good with air conditioning in summer and heating in winter. Some green plants in each floor and the surroundings are relatively good. Every night, the hotel will have on-duty security patrols to ensure the safety of hotel personnel.

5.3 Analysis of Personal Development Factor

The score of personal development factor is low. The main reasons for this phenomenon are as follows: from the aspect of Home Inn, Home Inn does not make long-term personal career planning for employees, and does not let employees clearly understand their abilities; Home Inn does not provide reasonable training for employees; Home Inn does not provide transparent promotion channels for grass-roots employees, providing basis for them. Employees at the top have few opportunities for promotion.

5.4 Analysis of interpersonal relationship factors

Interpersonal relationship factor employee satisfaction is the lowest, the main reasons are as follows: firstly, hotels rarely provide a platform for employees to establish harmonious interpersonal

relationship, and departments only communicate when they are working. Secondly, from the personal point of view, employees tend to be more willing to solve problems by themselves rather than relying on the cooperation between departments. It lacks of initiative communication awareness, which is mainly caused by the personality of employees and their communication skills.

5.5 Analysis of Working Stability Factor

In terms of occupational security, hotel employees will not be easily dismissed, and there will be no unreasonable phenomenon of employees working overtime, no overtime pay, no deliberate deduction of employees' wages. The Hotel would pay insurance designed for its employees. These measures have increased occupational stability.

References

- [1] Zheng Liming. Employee Response Behavior Based on Job Satisfaction [J]. *Economic Issues*, 2017 (02): 101-106.
- [2] Kuang Jiaqing. Causes and Countermeasures of hotel staff turnover: from the perspective of employee satisfaction [J]. *Development Research*, 2013 (02): 142-145.
- [3] Xu Qin. Empirical analysis of the impact of knowledge workers' satisfaction on job performance [J]. *Statistics and decision-making*, 2015 (05): 117-119.
- [4] Chen Shan. Employee Satisfaction Survey from the Perspective of Harmonious Labor Relations [J]. *China Labor*, 2016 (04): 50-55.
- [5] Gu Yingkang, Zeng Xuehui, Wang Yan. Study on Influencing Factors of hotel employee satisfaction and their perception differences [J]. *Enterprise economy*, 2012 (05): 80-82.
- [6] Ouyang Zhenan, Tan Hongfang. Establishment and measurement of employee satisfaction evaluation index in micro-enterprises [J]. *Statistics and decision-making*, 2012 (23): 57-59.
- [7] Lei Jianfeng, Gong Ya, Tu Xiao. Investigation and Research on Employee Satisfaction in Logistics Industry: Taking Shunfeng Express as an Example [J]. *China Market*, 2016 (32): 19-20.
- [8] Zhang Ziang, Liu Zhishan, Lu Aihua. Empirical Study on Employee Satisfaction in Nanjing Hotel Industry Based on Factor Analysis [J]. *Journal of Southeast University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2012 (S3): 107-111.
- [9] Zhang Bilan, Feng Yousheng. Evaluation method and Empirical Study of librarian satisfaction [J]. *Library*, 2012 (04): 73-74.
- [10] Tang Jianxiong, Tuxin, Bo H. Ferns. The influence of leadership social responsibility orientation on Hotel employees' job satisfaction [J]. *Journal of Tourism*, 2013 (03): 62-72.
- [11] Tang Xiuli, Zeng Xuehui and Gu Yingkang. A study on hotel employee satisfaction and its follow-up behavior based on SEM [J]. *Enterprise Economy*, 2013 (01): 51-54.
- [12] Yuan Ling, Jia Lingling, Li Jian. Employee Satisfaction Survey and Evaluation of Enterprise Labor Relations [J]. *Systems Engineering*, 2014 (05): 29-36.
- [13] Duan Zhengliang, Peng Tiezhen, Wei Xiangheng. Hotel staff leadership trust and its relationship with job satisfaction [J]. *Journal of Tourism*, 2015 (02): 69-78.
- [14] Ruth McPhail, Anoop Patiar, Carmel Herington, Peter Creed, Michael Davidson. Development and initial validation of a hospitality employees' job satisfaction index [J]. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 2015 (8): 07-09.
- [15] Eunice Fay Amissah, Emmanuel Gamor, Mildred Nuong Deri, Agnes Amissah. Factors influencing employee job satisfaction in Ghana's hotel industry [J]. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 2016 (2): 15-17.