

THE EFFECTS OF LOCUS OF CONTROL AND
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE ON
JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER INTENTION OF
HOTEL MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES

By

KYUNG AH LEE

Bachelor of Science
Sookmyung Women's University
Seoul, Korea
1997

Master of Science
Sookmyung Women's University
Seoul, Korea
1999

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
The Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 2005

THE EFFECTS OF LOCUS OF CONTROL AND
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE ON
JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER INTENTION OF
HOTEL MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Patrick J. Moreo

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Bill Ryan

Dr. Bo Hu

Dr. Kay Bull

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank my dissertation committee for their continuous support and valuable input. Dr. Patrick J. Moreo, my advisor and committee chair, tolerated a lot more than he should and provided me encouragement, insight, and great ideas throughout the work on this dissertation as well as in attaining my degree. Dr. Bill Ryan and Dr. Bo Hu always offered suggestions and recommendations of which I would not have been able to finish. In addition, Dr. Kay Bull gave me the encouragement and support with the knowledge of locus of control. Their insightful comments and assistance in the review of this manuscript are much appreciated. I also enjoyed all my courses, and was inspired by all my professors in the School of Hotel & Restaurant Administration: Dr. Hailin Qu, Dr. Woo Gon “Woody” Kim, and Dr. Jerrold Leong.

I appreciate my all friends and family members: particularly Sharon Gallon, Kelly Way, Cheryl Lafaye, Yeon-Ho Shin, Hae-Young Lee, Lucia Sun, parent and parent-in-law. I have been blessed with their love, friendship and support. I would like to give special thanks to my dear friend Angelo Camillo, Dr. Yong-Ki Lee and his family who provided me an invaluable friendship. They were more convinced of my ability to complete this project than I was. Finally, I would like to give deepest thanks to my husband Yong-Wha Moon, MD for his ongoing tolerance, unending love, and unconditional support given me these four years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Purpose of This Study.....	4
Significance of This Study.....	4
Definition of Terms.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Hypotheses.....	7
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
Locus of Control (LOC).....	8
Organizational Structure.....	11
The relationship between LOC and Organizational Structure.....	13
Job Satisfaction.....	15
The Effects of LOC and Organizational Structure on Job Satisfaction.....	17
Turnover Intention.....	19
III. METHODOLOGY.....	20
Research Design.....	20
Population and Sample.....	21
Procedures.....	22
Instruments.....	23
Data Analysis.....	26
IV. RESULTS.....	28
Demographic Profile.....	28
Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Test.....	32
Correlation Analysis.....	35
Testing of Hypothesis.....	35

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	50
Summary of Findings and Conclusion.....	51
Implications.....	55
Recommendations.....	57
Limitations.....	59
Further Research.....	60
REFERENCES.....	63
APPENDIXES.....	70
APPENDIX A: APPROVAL FORM FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS (IRB FORM)	71
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Demographic Profile.....	30
II. Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Test for Organizational Structure.....	33
III. Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Test for Job Satisfaction.....	34
IV. Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Test for Turnover Intention	35
V. Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations.....	35
VI. Two-Way ANOVA Tests on Job Satisfaction by Type of LOC and Organizational Structure.....	37
VII. Tukey's HSD Test on Job Satisfaction by the Interaction of Type of LOC and Organizational Structure.....	39
VIII. Two-Way ANOVA Tests on Turnover Intention by Type of LOC and Organizational Structure.....	40
IX. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Gender.....	42
X. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Age.....	42
XI. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Education....	43
XII. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Marital Status.....	44
XIII. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Hotel Rating.....	44
XIV. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Number of Employees.....	45
XV. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Years of Experience.....	46
XVI. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Working Departments.....	46
XVII. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Position.....	47
XVIII. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Hotel Operation.....	48
XIX. The Chi-Square Test of LOC and Organizational Structure by Management Structure.....	49

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	Page
I. Relationship between LOC and Organizational Structure.....	36
II. Job Satisfaction by Type of LOC and Organizational Structure.....	38
III. Turnover Intention by Type of LOC and Organizational Structure.....	41

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Locus of control (hereafter LOC) is one of the most frequently researched personality constructs in psychology and social sciences (e.g., see Rotter, 1990; Strickland, 1989). LOC has been also implicated in a wide variety of career and vocational behaviors (Duvdevany & Rimmerman, 1996; Donnelly, Quirin, & O'Bryan, 2000; Reed, Kratchman, & Strawser, 1994; Spector, 1982; Spector & O'Connell, 1994). The popularity of this personality factor results from the simplicity with which it can be interpreted (Ciccone, 1993). LOC refers to an individual's generalized belief in his or her abilities to control life events (Rotter, 1966). Individuals who have an internal LOC (hereafter internals) tend to believe that their actions directly influence outcomes. Prior research suggests that internals tend to perform more effectively in environments that allow them more control over their actions. Conversely, individuals who have an external LOC (hereafter externals) tend to believe that outcomes are more attributable to outside forces than to their own actions. Previous research suggests that externals generally perform better when more control is imposed on them (Rotter 1990; Spector, 1982). By identifying an individual's LOC, Rotter (1975) considered that one can potentially predict the behaviors of that individual.

Since the mid-1980s, there has been increased interest in personality effects on job satisfaction. Spector and Jex (1991) have provided convincing evidence that personality is clearly a factor to influence job satisfaction. One personality trait found to demonstrate a significant relationship with job satisfaction is LOC (Spector, 1982). Rotter (1966) characterized internals as more self-reliant, challenge seekers, and generally experiencing greater job satisfaction, whereas externals tend to seek little challenge and experience lower job satisfaction.

Furthermore, research in psychology and organizational behavior indicates that characteristics of the work environment (e.g., organizational structure) may interact with employees' personal characteristics, and thereby affect individual job satisfaction. Organizational structure is categorized into centralized or decentralized depending on the extent of decision-making within the organization (Chia, 1995). In a decentralized organization, the perceived job satisfaction level of employee can be enhanced when he or she can take those actions and make decisions to further his or her self-interests (Chia, 1995). This suggests that as firms hire and place employees, they should consider how organizational structure affects employees' job satisfaction by interacting with their personality.

Over the years, turnover has been a serious issue especially in the hospitality industry. Employee turnover can result in a reduction of the remaining employees' morale, operational disruptions within an organization, and can cost the organization thousands of dollars for recruitment, reselection, and retraining. In service organizations, these costs would become even more serious when the company loses valuable employees who are highly committed and who have strong relationships with customers.

When these employees leave jobs, the customers they served often feel abandoned, and leave as well. The origins of an individual's LOC may reflect a view of the social, political, economic, and structural environment in which that person resides. LOC and organizational structure can be critical elements in reducing employee turnover.

Problem Statement

Employee turnover is a serious issue affecting the hospitality industry today. Hospitality studies that have chosen to include costs directly associated with filling vacated position and other costs, such as lost productivity, lost sales, and management's time, estimate the turnover costs of an hourly employee to be \$3,000 to \$10,000 each (Woods, 1995). The National Restaurant Association estimates turnover costs per restaurant employee to be \$5,000 (Woods, 1995). As a result, firms are frequently faced with the financial burden of recruiting and training new employees. Furthermore, this constant turnover can have a negative effect on the remaining employees and customers, resulting in psychological and emotional damage. Job satisfaction is a vital factor in the retention of staff members. By achieving greater levels of job satisfaction among employees, it is anticipated that turnover rate would be reduced. Prior research has revealed that LOC and organizational structure, respectively, affect job satisfaction, and the interaction of these variables affect job satisfaction as well. Therefore, this study also suggests that LOC and organizational structure may indirectly affect turnover intention of employees.

Rotter (1966) found that the managers of organizations tend to be more internal oriented than non-management personnel. He also concluded that externals who feel they have little control over the incidents of their lives, are more likely to express unrealistic career aspirations, less able to cope with the demands of reality, are typically not leaders, and experience less job satisfaction. Since managerial employees set the tone for the organization, it is important to understand what factors contribute to their satisfaction.

Purposes of This Study

This study examined the relationship between hotel managerial employees' job satisfaction, turnover intention, and their individual LOC and their perceptions of the organizational structure in which they work. It was further the purpose of this study to explore the relationship between LOC, organizational structure, and certain demographic variables. Finally, this study developed practical recommendations regarding what types of candidates hotels should hire, and regarding how employees should be managed after they have been hired.

Significance of This Study

A tremendous amount of research has been conducted on LOC in psychology, social sciences, and business. However, only a few research studies have been conducted in the hospitality field. Furthermore, research which considers the effects of LOC and

organizational structure on job characteristics has been rare. The results of this study could be unique and applicable to the hospitality industry.

By documenting the interaction between hotels' organizational structures and individual employees' LOC, this study could contribute to our understanding of how employees' individual LOC and hotels' organizational structures affected the human resources employed in firms. These results extended previous research that examined the main effects of organizational structure on employees' job satisfaction and turnover intention. The results of this study may help hotel executives in selecting managerial employees who find their jobs to be more satisfying, whereby potentially reducing turnover and costs. Furthermore, this study is also relevant to both hotel firms and individual employees seeking to make hiring and employment decisions that maximize the likelihood of good performance.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

1. Locus of control: A generalized expectancy of reinforcements where individuals believe that what happens to them is a result of their own control or the result of forces beyond their control such as chance, fate, or powerful others (Rotter, 1966).
2. Organizational structure: The anatomy of the organization, reflecting the generally permanent and formal relationships of roles and tasks to be performed in achieving organizational goals, the grouping of these activities, delegation of authority, and informational flow vertically and horizontally in the organization (Park & Mason, 1990).

3. Centralization: The extent to which authority is concentrated at the top of the organization (Stoner & Freeman, 1989).
4. Decentralization: The delegation of power and authority from higher to lower levels of the organization, often accomplished by the creation of small, self-contained organizational units (Stoner & Freeman, 1989).
5. Job satisfaction: An affective state describing an employee's feelings about their work (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969).
6. Turnover: The avoidable, voluntary departure of an employee due to such factors as increased salary or personal problems for an individual with the current organization (Jenkins, 1993).
7. Management: The level at which one has responsibility for any one of the primary or support operations; also known as functional management (Megginson, Mosley, & Pietri, 1992). Common job titles for those in this category would be manager or director.
8. Upper management: Those who have overall responsibility for an entire operating division within an organization and the subordinates within that division (Megginson et al., 1992). Common job titles for those in this category would be general manager, vice president, chief operations officer, executive vice president, or president.

Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant correlation between LOC and organizational structure?
2. What is the difference in job satisfaction based on LOC (internals and externals)?

3. What is the difference in job satisfaction based on organizational structure (decentralized and centralized)?
4. Is there a significant interaction between LOC and organizational structure in relation to job satisfaction?
5. What is the difference in turnover intention based on LOC (internals and externals)?
6. What is the difference in turnover intention based on organizational structure (decentralized and centralized)?
7. Is there a significant interaction between LOC and organizational structure in relation to turnover intention?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are grounded in research found in the literature:

- H1: There is a significant correlation between LOC and organizational structure.
- H2: There is a significant effect of LOC on job satisfaction.
- H3: There is a significant effect of organizational structure on job satisfaction.
- H4: There is a significant interaction between LOC and organizational structure in relation to job satisfaction.
- H5: There is a significant effect of LOC on turnover intention.
- H6: There is a significant effect of organizational structure on turnover intention.
- H7: There is a significant interaction between LOC and organizational structure in relation to turnover intention.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship among LOC, organizational structure, job satisfaction, and turnover intention is complex, multi-faced, and ever changing. Analyzing this relationship requires familiarity with the literature relating the various aspects to the other, as well as research that has examined the relationship among the combined factors of LOC, organizational structure, job satisfaction, and turnover intention. Clarifying the intricate inter-relationship of all these elements is an undertaking that past research has not examined. This chapter, therefore, will review the literature that has examined the various elements' relationship to one another.

Locus of Control (LOC)

As part of his social learning theory, Rotter (1954) introduced the construct of LOC. According to Rotter (1975):

Interest in this variable was developed because of the persistent observation that increments and decrements in expectancies following reinforcement appeared to

vary systematically depending on the nature of the situation and also as a consistent characteristic of the particular person who was being reinforced (p. 56).

Rotter's perception for this variable suggests that the LOC construct can have a major effect on a person's actual experiences. It's interesting to note that other Social Science Disciplines (e.g., Management and Health Care Administration) recognize the importance of LOC as it relates to performance and personal satisfaction.

LOC is defined as an individual's generalized expectancies regarding the forces that determine rewards and punishments. When performing a task, people tend to evaluate the degree to which they were either successful or not successful. Generally speaking, people either internalize or externalize their performance according to their level of LOC. In other words, LOC is an empirically validated measure of individual perception of one's power to impact external events (Lefcourt, 1982).

Individuals with an external LOC believe that the events in their lives are due to uncontrollable forces (i.e., dependent on luck, chance, powerful persons or institutions). Conversely, individuals with an internal LOC trust in their capacity to influence the environment. Internals believe that they can control events in their lives by effort and skill. It has been suggested that when engaged in important tasks, internals are more likely to exert themselves, because they believe that outcomes are dependent upon their effort and ability. On the other hand, externals are likely to make less effort because they do not perceive a strong link between personal efforts and outcomes. Since LOC is clearly associated with motivation, its effect on employees and organizations can be

profound. Externals exhibit relatively ineffective task-oriented coping behaviors in ambiguous task settings (Anderson, 1977).

Considerable attention has been paid to the significant correlation of LOC with many work variables. For example, LOC relates to job performance, leadership behavior, and perceptions of the job and work motivation (Spector, 1982). More recently, researchers have suggested that LOC may act as a strong mediating variable in job stress and strain (Spector & O'Connell, 1994). LOC has also been related to attitude toward work and client participation in vocational rehabilitation for individuals with industrial injuries (Duvdevany & Rimmerman, 1996). Besides, LOC influences dysfunctional audit behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions (e.g., Donnelly et al., 2000; Reed et al., 1994). Internals are considered to be more purposeful and active in attempting to control their work environment, while externals are considered to be less motivated and to have more stress and problems on the job.

As Spector (1982, p. 485) pointed out, internals would probably attempt to control the organizational work setting, including work flow, task accomplishment, operating procedures, work assignments, relationships with superior and subordinates, working conditions, goal setting, work scheduling, and organizational policy. Hence, internals seem to exhibit greater personal career effectiveness, exert greater effort, and perform better on the job (Spector, 1982). Other evidence indicates that internals are more likely to attempt to influence their environments, to obtain job-relevant information, and to expect that effort will lead to rewards (Spector, 1982).

The concept of LOC may have a substantial impact when applied to the hospitality management world. If people feel they have no control over future outcomes,

they are less likely to seek solutions to their problems. In a service-oriented environment, this can have dire consequences, such as service quality. Therefore, it becomes important to investigate the extent to which this construct impacts hospitality management and organization.

Organizational Structure

Organizational structure provides the basic foundation within which an organization functions. One of the structural parameters which has received a great deal of attention in organizational research is the one that defines the extent to which decision-making within the organization is centralized or decentralized (Chia, 1995).

Centralization

Centralization refers to the inverse of the amount of delegation of decision-making authority throughout an organization and the extent of participation by organizational members in decision-making (Aiken & Hage, 1968). There are two important aspects of centralization. First, organizations vary in the extent to which members are assigned tasks and then provided with the freedom to implement them without interruption from superiors; Aiken and Hage (1968) called this the degree of hierarchy of authority. It expresses the extent of reliance upon supervisors in making decisions about individually assigned tasks. A second, and equally important, aspect of the distribution of power is the degree to which staff members participate in setting the

goals and policies of the entire organizations; Aiken and Hage (1968) called this the degree of participation in decision-making. It reflects the relative degree of participation in decisions affecting the entire organization, such as those involving the adoption of new programs, new policies, and the hiring and promotion of personnel.

Prior research has found that employees at centralized firms perceive a higher level of formalization of rules and procedures, relatively less personal control and discretion over the specific procedures used, more similarity between one employee and the next, and more responsibility to use firm-provided materials and tools, than do employees at decentralized firms (Bamber, Snowball, & Tubbs, 1989; Prawitt, 1995).

Decentralization

Decentralization is one type of organizational structure which refers to where decisions are taken within the organization, i.e., the level of autonomy that is delegated to managers for their decision-making. The higher the degree of decentralization, the lower the hierarchical level in the organization where the decisions are taken. This also implies that sub-unit managers in more decentralized organizations will operate under a greater degree of devolution in decision-making (Chia, 1995).

Waterhouse and Tiessen (1978) have explored the notion that decentralization provides managers with greater access to information than is available to the corporate board. Furthermore, through decentralization an organization is able to provide its managers with greater responsibility and control over its activities and also greater access to the required type of information (Waterhouse & Tiessen, 1978). As Galbraith (1973)

argued, decentralization facilitates information processing at the source of an event that required decision-making. The degree of decentralization also affects how information, such as management accounting information and performance evaluation information, is gathered, processed and communicated in the organization (Gerloff, 1985). For example, in an uncertain environment, the unforeseen requirements for action cannot be broken down or distributed automatically through the functional roles defined within the organization.

The organizational structure literature suggests that organizational structure affects employees' judgments and perceptions and, thus, plays an important role in human-resource issues (Bowrin, 1998). Organizational structure also affects judgments and perceptions in that unstructured firms offer relatively little structured guidance or other mechanisms to encourage control and uniformity, whereas structured firms impose more specific guidance and control mechanisms to enhance consistency and uniformity (Cushing & Loebbecke, 1986; Prawitt, 1995).

The Relationship between LOC and Organizational Structure

Externals tend to perceive that the organization is highly centralized (i.e., low participation and high authority hierarchy). Because centralized organizational structure prescribes more rules and step-by-step guidance, imposes a relatively high degree of control, and allows less discretion over specific hotel operation procedures, centralized

firms' work environments are expected to be more congruent with the characteristics of externals.

Internals are likely to participate in decisions about the allocation of resources and the determination of organizational policies and can make decisions involving the tasks associated with their position without consulting their superiors. Because internals believe they can control the environment without external constraints or regulations, they may be more sensitive to the existence of any formal policies in the organization. Internals may emphasize their personal control over the environment (Spector, 1982) in terms of higher participation in decision making and low authority hierarchy. If they perceive no participation but high authority hierarchy in the organization, they may take action or quit their jobs (Cheng, 1994). Consequently, Cheng (1994) concluded that internals tend to view the organizational structure of the organization as being decentralized and encouraging of employee participation.

These findings are relevant to firms and individual employees seeking a match between personal and firm characteristics, and to firms seeking to determine the potential impact of employee selection and placement. Spector (1982) suggested that externals may be best suited to employment in more structured jobs with directive supervision. In terms of management style preferences, Runyon (1973) found externals to be more satisfied with directive management, while internals were more satisfied with participative management.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been one of the most focused and well studied topics in the field of industrial and organizational psychology. Locke (1976), in his work, *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction*, presented a historical overview of job satisfaction theories. He noted that attempts to study the nature and causes of job satisfaction began in earnest in the 1930s, but original mention of this concept began with Taylor in 1912. Following World War II, the focus of the studies turned to the human relations aspect of job attitudes. This focus emphasized the importance of the supervisor and the work group in determining employee satisfaction and productivity; “real satisfaction with the job could only be provided by allowing individuals enough responsibility and discretion to enable them to grow mentally” (Locke, 1976, p. 1304). Generally speaking, job satisfaction refers to the pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the evaluation of one’s job or job experiences (Locke, 1976). In other words, job satisfaction is the degree to which people like their jobs. Some people enjoy work and find it to be a central part of life. Others hate to work and do so only because they must (Knoop, 1995).

Variables, such as needs, values, expectancies, perceptions, as well as the interrelationship of these variables, are considered to be related to overall job satisfaction. An individual’s emotional reactions are dependent on the interactions between the person and the environment. The degree of job satisfaction that is experienced then is related to the fulfillment of the individual’s needs. Thus, “job satisfaction results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one’s important job values, providing and to the degree that those values are congruent with one’s needs” (Locke,

1976, p. 1332). The numerous theories and analyses related to job satisfaction have generated many different studies.

Job satisfaction can contribute to organizational effectiveness since it can lead to improved productivity and efficiency, increased organizational commitment, and reduced absenteeism and turnover. Those who are satisfied with their jobs are commonly those who may encounter challenges, assume responsibilities, make creative decisions and overcome obstacles (Andrisani, 1978). In a 1993 study, Knoop considered the relationship between work values and job satisfaction. He measured work values and job satisfaction separately, then concurrently. Job satisfaction was measured by the Job Perception Scale which assessed five facets of job satisfaction: work itself, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and co-workers. A factor analysis revealed that job satisfaction was determined by five dimensions: the work itself, work outcomes, the job itself, job outcomes, and the people at work. Thus, internal determinants as well as external variables contributed to overall job satisfaction. Finally, Knoop (1995) defined job satisfaction as "...a person's general attitude toward the job and toward specific aspects of the job such as the nature of the work or relations with co-workers" (p.379).

Antecedents of job satisfaction can be classified into two major categories (Spector & Jex, 1991). First, the job environment itself and factors associated with the job are important influences on job satisfaction. This includes how people are treated, the nature of the job tasks, relations with others in the workplace, work-family conflicts, work schedules, and rewards (Spector & Jex, 1991). Second, there are individual factors that the person brings to the job. This includes both personality and prior experiences (Spector & Jex, 1991). Both categories of antecedents often work together to influence

employee satisfaction. The fit between the individual and the job has been shown to be an important influence on employee job satisfaction (Kristof, 1996).

The Effects of LOC and Organizational Structure on Job Satisfaction

Since the mid-1980s, studies have provided convincing evidence that personality is a clear factor affecting job satisfaction (Spector & Jex, 1991). One personality trait found to demonstrate a significant relationship to job satisfaction is LOC (Spector, 1982). LOC is a cognitive variable that represents an individual's generalized belief in his or her ability to control positive and negative reinforcements in life (Spector, 1982).

In general, internals seem more satisfied with their jobs than externals (Abdel-Halim, 1980; King, Murray, & Atkinson, 1982; Knoop, 1981; Perrewe, 1986; Spector & O'Connell, 1994). Cummins (1989) suggests that there is a positive relationship between internal LOC and job satisfaction, and this positive relationship occurs regardless of the level of stress. Cheng (1994) found further support for the relationship between internal LOC and job satisfaction and proposed that internals are more likely than externals to be satisfied with opportunities for job autonomy and participation in decisions affecting their jobs. Internals tend to seek situations in which personal control is possible (Kabanoff & O'Brien, 1980; Kahle, 1980). If internals are not satisfied in their current job with the opportunities available to them to exert job influence, they will find other alternatives, because internals often perceive a greater number of available alternatives and tend to take action on their beliefs more frequently than externals do (Giles, 1977; Harvey, Barnes, Sperry, & Harris, 1974).

Several mechanisms might account for the relation of LOC and job satisfaction. Spector (1982) hypothesized that the relation between these two variables might be mediated by job performance. He noted that internals tend to perform their jobs better than externals, and if job performance is associated with rewards, satisfaction with the job might result. Thus, internals have higher job satisfaction because they benefit from the rewards of their better job performance (Spector, 1982).

Furthermore, organizational structure also influences job satisfaction of employees. Chia (1995) contended that in a decentralized organization, the perceived job satisfaction level of the employee can be enhanced when he or she can take action and make decisions to further his or her self-interests.

Moreover, Pervin (1968) conducted an early review of studies of job satisfaction. He found that these studies indicated that job satisfaction resulted from the interaction between personality and organizational environment variables, rather than the main effects of personality or organizational environment variables themselves. Both Mischel (1973) and Bowers (1973) also agreed with this conclusion. Spector (1997) postulated that two main factors, that is, individual personality and work environment, influenced job satisfaction. He also concluded that when characteristics of the work environment match the characteristics that the employee prefers, the individual is likely to have high job satisfaction.

Turnover Intention

Employee turnover is the process of intraorganizational or interorganizational movement. Intraorganizational movement occurs when an employee changes from one position to another within the same organization, such as promotion or transfer.

Interorganizational movement occurs when an employee resigns from their current employer to be employed at another organization (Fottler, Hernandez, & Joiner, 1994).

There are four factors that can influence the turnover intention of an employee, such as psychological, individual, organizational, and environmental factors (Fottler et al., 1994). Psychological factors include job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Individual factors consist of the level of ability, current skill level, performance level, and personal aspirations. Organizational (e.g., size, type of organization) and environmental (e.g., actual location of the hotel) factors contribute significantly in an individual's decision to leave the organization.

Unlike other behaviors at workplaces, turnover has a negative relationship between individuals and the organization. This separation incurs a significant amount of cost to the organization, and perhaps to the individual as well. Costs of turnover may include opportunity costs, costs required for reselection and retaining, and decreased level of morale of the remaining workers. These costs would become even more serious when the company loses valuable employees such as highly committed ones (Chang, 1999).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The following chapter reviews the methodology utilized in conducting this study. The design of the study will be described first, followed by a description of the sample. The procedures employed to gain access to the sample, and how the respondents were exposed to the research instrument are described next. The discussion of the analytic tools employed in the analysis of the data is then followed by detailed descriptions of the instruments themselves.

Research Design

This study involved a cross-sectional study to collect data. This research design was considered capable of reliably collecting descriptive data on large populations to observe the relationship between LOC, organizational structure, and job characteristics such as job satisfaction and turnover intention (Churchill & Brown, 2003). A limitation to this type of design is that it examines only a single point in time and how survey participants are that moment in time (Fink, 2003). After a review of the literature, a survey instrument was developed to conduct this study. Survey research is an example of

research designed to obtain basic information including characteristics as they pertain to the goals of the study, and this can be completed through the use of questionnaires (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

Population and Sample

The target population for this study consisted of managerial and executive level hotel employees. A goal of the research was to be able to generalize the findings to this population. A convenience sampling method was used because of the limitations on human resources, financial resources, and time. Gall et al. (1996) described a convenience sampling as a method in which the participants were chosen based on how accessible and suitable they were in terms of obtaining the goals of the study. The sample of hotel managerial employees employed in this study was drawn from the current databases of Global Hotelier Club Members ($n = 613$) including email addresses of members. The databases are kept current: 2003 was the most recent update to this database. Only hotel managerial employees in the U.S. were targeted and selected from this database.

All six hundred thirteen ($N = 613$) U.S. hotel managerial employees were selected to participate in the study and were emailed the survey questionnaire. One hundred ninety six ($n = 196$) of the managerial employees responded to the survey. This represents a 32.0% rate of return. 189 (30.8%) were complete surveys. Seven surveys were partially completed by the respondents.

Procedures

Prior to the collection of data for this study, written approval was obtained from the Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) provided in Appendix A.

An online survey was utilized since it provided the most effective, efficient method of data collection for a large sample that was geographically scattered.

The survey instrument included a cover letter that described the purpose of the study, the importance of his/her involvement and a solicitation for his/her participation, and contained information regarding the confidential and anonymous nature of data collection, contact information used when they have any questions about their participation in the study, and instructions for completing the survey information. The instrument also contained the Rotter I-E scale, organizational structure, job satisfaction and turnover intention, and demographic information. In an effort to enhance the accuracy and ease of completion, closed forced-choice responses were used exclusively within the instrument (Fink & Kosecoff, 1988). This instrument was distributed in an online survey format with email used to make contact and encourage participation. A private website was established, and an online survey developed using Microsoft FrontPage 2002 was organized to collect data. Participants' responses were recorded in Microsoft Excel 2002 developed in conjunction with the survey instrument. Participants received an email providing a cover letter, and a URL link to the survey instrument.

Survey administration began December, 10th, 2003 and was completed January, 25th, 2004. A total of 196 questionnaires were returned. This established a 32.0 percent

return rate. Of those 196, seven questionnaires were not used because of incomplete information supplied, such as missing and incomplete questionnaires. Thus, 189 valid questionnaires constituted the study's sample. Anonymity was assured because no names or any other identifying information were on the surveys returned. The consent form and questionnaire form that was sent to subjects are provided in Appendix B.

Instruments

A five-part, self-reporting questionnaire was used. All measures were scored so that higher numbers reflect correspondingly greater amounts of the construct.

Rotter's Locus of Control Scale

The Rotter's I-E locus of control scale was used to determine whether the subject has an internal or external LOC orientation. The Rotter I-E scale is the most widely used measure of LOC regardless of numerous scales that have been developed. The Rotter I-E scale is a 29-item, forced choice test with six filler items intended to disguise the purpose of the test. Subjects choose between two statements on the ends of the I-E continuum and identify which one they believe most strongly. For example, a) many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck, or b) people's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make (see Appendix B). One point is scored for each of question that is externally oriented, which means that higher scores denote an external orientation. The scale incorporates a scoring mechanism of either 0 or 1 for each internal or external response given, respectively. The total possible score is between 0 and 23 (due to the

filler questions). Each subject is scored based on the total number of external responses. If a respondent's score falls between 11 and 23, that individual is considered to have an external LOC, while a score of 0-10 reveals a person's internal LOC. Rotter (1966) reported that scores on this instrument produced a coefficient alpha of .81.

The research slightly modified the original Rotter's LOC scale, so that it would be meaningful to hospitality industry professionals. While it was determined that since the changes were so minor that a pilot test would not be necessary, the research did have the questionnaire reviewed by professional experts.

Organizational Structure

Organizational Structure was measured by scales modified on the basis of Aiken and Hage's (1968) study. The following 6-item centralization-decentralization scale assessed the degree of hierarchical authority within an organization: (1) "There can be little action taken here until my boss approves a decision," (2) "A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly encouraged here," (3) "Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer," (4) "I usually don't have to ask my boss before I do most things," (5) "Any decision I make has to have my boss' approval," and (6) "Getting things done here takes excessive paperwork." All items were scored on a 7-point scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured by using the following nine items developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969): (1) “I consider my job rather unpleasant,” (2) “I am often bored with my job,” (3) “I feel fairly well-satisfied with my present job,” (4) “Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work,” (5) “I definitely dislike my work,” (6) “Most days I am enthusiastic about my work,” (7) “My job is pretty uninteresting,” (8) “I find real enjoyment in my work,” and (9) “I am disappointed that I ever took this job.” All items were scored on a 7-point scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

Turnover Intention

Turnover intention was assessed by a 3-item measure drawn from Donnelly and Ivancevich (1975), including (1) “it is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year,” (2) “I often think about quitting,” and (3) “I will probably look for a new job next year.” Self-reported responses were obtained on a 7-point “strongly agree-strongly disagree” Likert scale for items related to employees’ thoughts about quitting the organization. In addition, it has been shown to be a consistent predictor of actual turnover in several studies (cf. Sager et al., 1989).

Demographic Data

This part consisted of eleven questions covering the respondents' demographic data (see Appendix B). This information was solicited to identify demographic profiles of hotel managerial employees participating in the study. Respondents were asked to identify gender, age, education, marital status, their hotel rating, number of employees in their hotel, number of years for employment in the hospitality industry, working department, position, type of their hotel operation, and their hotel management structure.

Data Analysis

Version 11.5 (2002) of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. SPSS includes most statistical procedures and is widely used for data analysis in the social science field.

Descriptive statistical procedures were implemented to determine the mean and standard deviation for each of the survey items on five of the instruments. Frequencies and percentages of the items on the demographic data were also compiled for sample descriptive purposes. A chi-square test was used to identify the relationship between LOC, organizational structure, and demographic data.

To check the unidimensionality for all factors except the locus of control measure, exploratory factor analysis (hereafter EFA) and reliability testing were used. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is particularly useful in the validation of scales for the measurement of specific constructs. In this procedure, items with low factor loadings (below .50) were dropped from further analyses.

To examine the internal consistency of each construct, reliabilities were assessed on samples using coefficient alpha. The coefficient α 's of each construct for samples were above .60, which is considered to be acceptable for the study.

The chi-square test of independence was used to determine if there was a correlation between LOC and organizational structure.

Two-way ANOVA was employed to examine if there were significant main effects of LOC and organizational structure and interaction effect of both variables on both job satisfaction and turnover intention.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter includes a description of the findings in relation to the research question, analysis, and discussion of these findings.

Demographic Profile

Demographic profiles from the sample of hotel employees in the study were collected and analyzed. As shown in Table 1, the demographic information gathered included gender, age, education, marital status, their hotel rating, the total number of employees in their hotel, the number of years for employment in the hospitality industry, working department, position, the type of their hotel operation, and their hotel management style.

A majority of the participants were male. One hundred and forty-eight of the respondents (78.3%) were male. Forty-one of the respondents (21.7%) were female. With regard to age, the majority of the respondents (46.6%) were between 40 and 49 years.

The educational level of the participants was distributed as follows. Thirty respondents (15.9%) had completed high school, fifty-two respondents (27.5%) had

completed two-year college, fifty-five respondents (29.1%) had completed four-year college, and fifty-two respondents (27.5%) had earned graduate degree. Seventy-three respondents (38.6%) were single, and one hundred and sixteen respondents (61.4%) were married.

When asked to categorize the rating of their hotel, forty-nine respondents (25.9%) responded five-star hotel, eighty respondents (42.3%) answered four-star hotel, and sixty respondents (31.7%) answered three-star hotel. Regarding the number of employees in their hotel, seventy-nine of the sample (41.8%) reported less than 100 employees, and eighty-seven (46%) reported between 100 and 499 employees.

With regard to the number of years for employment in the hospitality industry, forty-six respondents (24.3%) have worked in the hospitality industry under 10 years, thirty-six respondents (19.1%) 10-19 years, fifty-eight (30.7%) 20-26 years, and forty-nine (25.9%) above 27 years.

When asked about their working department, thirteen respondents (6.9%) indicated they worked in front office, ninety-three respondents (49.2%) in food and beverage, fifty-nine respondents (31.2%) in administrative and support department, and twenty-four respondents (12.7%) in other departments. Regarding their position, eighteen of the sample (9.5%) were supervisors, fifty-nine (31.2%) managers, forty (21.2%) directors, fifty-eight (30.7%) executive/owner, and fourteen (7.4%) other.

Eighty-seven of the participants (46%) reported that their hotel is an independent hotel without affiliation, and one-hundred and two of the participants (54%) indicated that their hotel is a chain (brand name) affiliated hotel. Ninety-two respondents (48.7%)

indicated that their hotel is independently managed, fifty-nine (31.2%) corporately managed, thirty-eight (20.1%) corporately managed by separate management.

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gender		
Female	41	21.7
Male	148	78.3
Total	189	100.0
Age		
Under 20 years	0	0
20-29 years	27	14.3
30-39 years	36	19.0
40-49 years	88	46.6
50-59 years	28	14.8
Above 60 years	10	5.3
Total	189	100.0
Education		
High school	30	15.9
Two-year college	52	27.5
Four-year college	55	29.1
Graduate degree	52	27.5
Total	189	100.0
Marital status		
Single	73	38.6
Married	116	61.4
Total	189	100.0
Hotel rating		
Five-star hotel	49	25.9
Four-star hotel	80	42.3
Three-star hotel	60	31.7
Total	189	100.0

TABLE 1
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE
continued

	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Number of employees in your hotel		
Less than 100	79	41.8
100-499	87	46.0
More than 500	23	12.2
Total	189	100.0
Number of years for employment in the hospitality industry		
Under 10 years	46	24.3
10-19 years	36	19.1
20-26 years	58	30.7
Above 27 years	49	25.9
Total	189	100.0
Department		
Front office	13	6.9
Food & Beverage	93	49.2
Administrative and Support	59	31.2
Other	24	12.7
Total	189	100.0
Position		
Supervisor	18	9.5
Manager	59	31.2
Director	40	21.2
Executive/Owner	58	30.7
Other	14	7.4
Total	189	100.0
Your hotel is		
Independent hotel without affiliation	87	46.0
Chain (brand name) affiliated hotel	102	54.0
Total	189	100.0
Your hotel is		
Independently managed	92	48.7
Corporately managed	59	31.2

(“Brand Name” corporation)		
Corporately managed by		
separate management	38	20.1
company		
Total	189	100.0

Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability Test

To check the unidimensionality for all factors except locus of control measure, exploratory factor analysis (hereafter referred to EFA) and reliability testing were used. In EFA using the maximum likelihood method and oblique rotation, the proportion (of variance accounted for) should be at least 0.50 (Merenda, 1997, p. 158; Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987, p. 421) and factor loadings of ± 0.50 are considered to meet the minimum level (Hair et al., 1998). All factors with a reliability coefficient above 0.6 were considered to be acceptable in this study. Once acceptable dimensions were obtained, the remaining items were summed.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table 2 presents the results of EFA for all measures in which items with factor loading lower than 0.5 were removed. For the organizational structure measure, three items: “A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly encouraged here,” “I usually don’t have to ask my boss before I do most things,” and “Getting things done here takes excessive paperwork,” were deleted. As shown in Table 2, three organizational structure items had an eigenvalue of 1.575, accounting for 52.495% of the total variance. To test the appropriateness of EFA, two measures were used. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) overall measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) was .698, which falls

within the acceptable level. In addition, the Bartlett's test of sphericity was 143.528, significant at $p = .000$ which showed a significant correlation among the variables (Hair et al., 1998). Cronbach's α for remaining three items for organizational structure estimated .764.

TABLE 2
EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS AND RELIABILITY TEST FOR
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

	Factor loadings	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	α
OS1. There can be little action taken here until my boss approves a decision.	.703	1.575	52.495	.764
OS2. A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly encouraged here.	-			
OS3. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.	.749			
OS4. I usually don't have to ask my boss before I do most things.	-			
OS5. Any decision I make has to have my boss' approval.	.721			
OS6. Getting things done here takes excessive paperwork.	-			

For job satisfaction measure, four items of "I feel fairly well-satisfied with my present job," "I definitely dislike my work," "Most has I am enthusiastic about my work," and "I find real enjoyment in my work" were deleted. As shown in Table 3, five job satisfaction items had eigenvalue of 2.528, accounting for 50.558% of the total variance. To test the appropriateness of EFA, two measures were used. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) overall measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) was .788, which falls within the acceptable level. In addition, the Bartlett's test of sphericity was 335.786, significant at $p = .000$ which showed a significant correlation among the variables (Hair et al., 1998). Cronbach's α for remaining three items for organizational structure estimated .830.

TABLE 3
EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS AND RELIABILITY TEST FOR
JOB SATISFACTION

	Factor loadings	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	α
JS1. I consider my job rather unpleasant (R).	.703	2.528	50.558	.830
JS2. I am often bored with my job (R).	.693			
JS3. I feel fairly well-satisfied with my present job.	-			
JS4. Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work (R).	.647			
JS5. I definitely dislike my work (R).	-			
JS6. Most has I am enthusiastic about my work.	-			
JS7. My job is pretty uninteresting (R).	.645			
JS8. I find real enjoyment in my work.	-			
JS9. I am disappointed that I ever took this job (R).	.848			

Finally, Table 4 represents the result of EFA for turnover intention measure.

Three items remained and had eigenvalue of 2.377, accounting for 79.225% of the total variance. As a result of testing the appropriateness of EFA, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) overall measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) was .746, which falls within the acceptable level. In addition, the Bartlett's test of sphericity was 418.288, significant at $p = .000$ which showed a significant correlation among the variables. Cronbach's α for remaining three items for organizational structure estimated .918.

TABLE 4
EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS AND RELIABILITY TEST FOR
TURNOVER INTENTION

	Factor loadings	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	α
TI1. It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year.	.905	2.377	79.225	.918
TI2. I often think about quitting.	.828			
TI3. I will probably look for a new job next year.	.934			

Correlation Analysis

Table 5 indicated that there were significant correlations between locus of control, decentralization, job satisfaction, and turnover intention by employing correlation analysis. As expected, all intercorrelations were consistent with previous studies.

TABLE 5
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND INTERCORRELATIONS

	Mean	S.D.	Internal LOC	Decentralization	Job satisfaction	Turnover intention
Internal LOC *	N/A	N/A	1.000			
Decentralization	4.62	1.45	.408 ^a	1.000		
Job satisfaction	5.67	1.19	.307 ^a	.451 ^a	1.000	
Turnover intention	2.81	1.77	.226 ^b	-.376 ^a	-.788 ^a	1.000

a) $p < .001$, b) $p < .01$

* Locus of Control was coded "0" as Externals and "1" as Internals.

Testing of Hypotheses

Two-way ANOVA was used to examine the potential interaction effects of locus of control and organizational structure as factors of influencing managers' job

satisfaction and turnover intention. The organizational structure measure was divided into two groups using mean scores. High scores of organizational structure indicate “decentralized organization”, whereas the low scores indicate “centralized organization.”

The Relationship between Locus of Control and Organizational Structure

Hypothesis 1 proposes that there is a significant correlation between LOC and organizational structure. As shown in Figure 1, the chi-square tests indicate that there was a significant correlation between LOC and organizational structure [chi-square = 24.867, df = 1, $p < .001$]. Internals were related to decentralized organization structure, whereas externals are associated with centralized organizational structure. Thus H1 is supported.

FIGURE 1
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

	Centralized Organizational Structure	Decentralized Organizational Structure	Total
External	n = 41 (21.7%)	n = 18 (9.5%)	n = 59 (31.2%)
Internal	n = 40 (21.2%)	n = 90 (47.6%)	n = 130 (68.8%)
Total	n = 81 (42.9%)	n = 108 (57.1%)	

* chi-square = 24.867, df = 1, $p < .001$

The Relationship between Locus of Control, Organizational Structure, and Job Satisfaction

The following hypotheses addressed the associations between locus of control, organizational structure, and job satisfaction. Hypothesis 2 proposes that there is a significant effect of LOC on job satisfaction. As shown in Table 6, the ANOVA tests indicate that there was a significant main effect on job satisfaction between internals and externals [$F(1, 185) = 6.295, p < .05$]. Internals (mean = 5.91) have higher levels of job satisfaction than externals (mean = 5.13). Thus H2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3 proposes that there is a significant effect of organizational structure on job satisfaction. As shown in Table 6, the ANOVA tests also indicate that there was a significant main effect on job satisfaction between managers who work in decentralized and centralized organizational structure [$F(1, 185) = 20.161, p < .001$]. Managers who work in a decentralized organizational structure (mean = 6.04) have higher scores of job satisfaction than those who work in centralized organizational structure (mean = 5.17). Thus H3 is supported.

TABLE 6
TWO-WAY ANOVA TESTS ON JOB SATISFACTION BY TYPE OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Main effect				
Intercept	1	4315.104	3677.134	.000
Locus of Control (LOC)	1	7.387	6.295	.013
Organizational structure (OS)	1	23.659	20.161	.000
Interaction effect (LOC * OS)				
LOC * OS	1	4.375	3.729	.055
Error	185	1.173		
Total	189			

$R^2 = .183$ (Adjusted $R^2 = .170$)

FIGURE 2
JOB SATISFACTION BY TYPE OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

	Centralized Organizational Structure	Decentralized Organizational Structure	Total
External	4.77 (1.22)* (n = 41)	5.95 (.97) (n = 18)	5.13 (1.27) (n = 59)
Internal	5.59 (1.20) (n = 40)	6.06 (.97) (n = 90)	5.91 (1.06) (n = 130)
Total	5.17 (1.27) (n = 81)	6.04 (.96) (n = 108)	

* Mean (Standard Deviation)

Hypothesis 4 states that there is a significant interaction between LOC and organizational structure in relation to job satisfaction. The two-way ANOVA tests revealed that there was a significant interaction between types of LOC and organizational structure with respect to job satisfaction level [$F(1, 185) = 3.729, p < .10$]. Thus, H4 is supported. As shown in Figure 2, managers (mean = 6.06) who have an internal LOC and work in a decentralized organizational structure reported significantly higher levels of job satisfactions than any other managers.

The interaction of the two main effects (LOC and organizational structure) was statistically significant at the 0.10 level, which indicated the differences in LOC of hotel managers were not equal across their current organizational structure for the job satisfaction. When an interaction is significant, the intervening effects of the two independent variables may veil comparisons between the means of one independent

variable (Hu, Morrison, & O’Leary, 2002). In this research, the combination of the two independent variables played a more critical role in explaining the effects of LOC and organizational structure on job satisfaction. The interaction of these two independent variables divided the sample into four groups including: 1) externals working in a centralized organizational structure, 2) internals working in a centralized organizational structure, 3) externals working in a decentralized organizational structure, and 4) internals working in a decentralized organizational structure. Post hoc testing was conducted to further identify the group’s differences for job satisfaction. Tukey’s HSD test was used, since it had greater power than the other post hoc tests under most circumstances (Hochberg & Tamhane, 1987). Tukey’s HSD test concluded, as in Table 7, that externals working in a centralized organizational structure were significantly lower in their job satisfaction than the other three groups. In addition, job satisfaction was not statistically different among the other three groups.

TABLE 7
TUKEY’S HSD TEST ON JOB SATISFACTION BY THE INTERACTION OF TYPE
OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

	Job Satisfaction	
	Mean	Grouping*
1) Externals - Centralized	4.77	A
2) Internals - Centralized	5.59	B
3) Externals – Decentralized	5.95	B
4) Internals – Decentralized	6.06	B

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

The Relationship between Locus of Control, Organizational Structure, and Turnover Intention

The following hypotheses stated the associations between locus of control, organizational structure, and turnover intention. Hypothesis 5 proposes that there is a significant effect of LOC on turnover intention. As shown in Table 8, the ANOVA tests indicated that there was a significant main effect on turnover intention between internals and externals [$F(1, 185) = 2.744, p < .10$]. Internals (mean = 2.53) have lower scores of turnover intention than externals (mean = 3.40). Thus H5 is supported.

Hypothesis 6 proposes that there is a significant effect of organizational structure on turnover intention. As shown in Tables 4-8, the ANOVA tests also indicated that there was a significant main effect on turnover intention between managers who work in decentralized and centralized organizational structure [$F(1, 185) = 12.192, p < .001$]. Managers who work in decentralized organizational structure (mean = 2.33) have lower scores of turnover intention than those who work in centralized organizational structure (mean = 3.43). Thus H6 is supported.

TABLE 8
TWO-WAY ANOVA TESTS ON TURNOVER INTENTION BY TYPE OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Source	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Main effect				
Intercept	1	1184.996	418.642	.000
Locus of Control (LOC)	1	7.767	2.744	.099
Organizational structure (OS)	1	34.509	12.192	.001
Interaction effect (LOC * OS)				
LOC * OS	1	1.238	.437	.509
Error	185	2.831		
Total	189			

$R^2 = .112$ (Adjusted $R^2 = .098$)

FIGURE 3
TURNOVER INTENTION BY TYPE OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL
STRUCTURE

	Centralized Organizational Structure	Decentralized Organizational Structure	Total
External	3.76 (1.73)* (n = 41)	2.57 (1.00) (n = 18)	3.40 (1.63) (n = 59)
Internal	3.10 (2.09) (n = 40)	2.28 (1.55) (n = 90)	2.53 (1.77) (n = 130)
Total	3.43 (1.93) (n = 81)	2.33 (1.47) (n = 108)	

* Mean (Standard Deviation)

Hypothesis 7 states that there is a significant interaction between LOC and organizational structure in relation to turnover intention. The two-way ANOVA tests reveal that there was not significant interaction between types of LOC and organizational structure with respect to turnover intention level [$F(1, 185) = .437$, n.s.]. Thus, H7 is not supported.

The Mean Differences of LOC and Organizational Structure by Demographic Variables

Tables 9-19 show the mean differences of LOC and organizational structure by demographic variables such as gender, age, education marital status, hotel rating, number of employees, number of experience (years), working departments, position, type of hotel operation, and type of management style.

Table 9 presents the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by gender. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and gender ($\chi^2 = .209$, $df = 1$, n.s.), but there is a significant relationship between organizational structure and gender ($\chi^2 = 3.948$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$).

TABLE 9
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY GENDER

Variables	Female	Male	Statistics
Locus of Control			
Externals	14	45	$\chi^2 = .209$, $df = 1$, $p = .647$
Internals	27	103	
Organizational Structure			
Centralized	12	69	$\chi^2 = 3.948$, $df = 1$, $p = .047$
Decentralized	29	79	

Table 10 reveals the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by age. The chi-square test indicates that there is a significant relationship between LOC and age ($\chi^2 = 9.899$, $df = 3$, $p < .05$), but there is no significant relationship between organizational structure and age ($\chi^2 = 1.870$, $df = 3$, n.s.).

TABLE 10
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY AGE

Variables	20-29 (n=27)	30-39 (n=36)	40-49 (n=88)	Over 50 (n=38)	Statistics
Locus of Control					
Externals	13	14	18	14	$\chi^2 = 9.899$, $df = 3$, $p = .019$
Internals	14	22	70	24	
Organizational Structure					
Centralized	14	17	36	14	$\chi^2 = 1.870$, $df = 3$, $p = .600$
Decentralized	13	19	52	24	

As shown in Table 11, the chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and education ($\chi^2 = 2.810$, $df = 3$, n.s.), and between organizational structure and education ($\chi^2 = 3.983$, $df = 3$, n.s.).

TABLE 11
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY EDUCATION

Variables	High School (n=30)	2-Year (n=52)	4-Year (n=55)	Graduate Degree (n=52)	Statistics
Locus of Control					
Externals	10	16	13	20	$\chi^2 = 2.810$, $df = 3$, $p = .422$
Internals	20	36	42	32	
Organizational Structure					
Centralized	16	22	26	17	$\chi^2 = 3.983$, $df = 3$, $p = .263$
Decentralized	14	30	29	35	

a) $p < .05$

Table 12 demonstrates the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by marital status. The chi-square test indicates that there is a significant relationship between LOC and marital status ($\chi^2 = 15.501$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$), but there is no significant relationship between organizational structure and marital status ($\chi^2 = .671$, $df = 1$, n.s.).

TABLE 12
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY MARITAL STATUS

Variables	Single (n=73)	Married (n=116)	Statistics
Locus of Control			
Externals	35	24	$\chi^2 = 15.501$, df = 1, p = .000
Internals	38	92	
Organizational Structure			
Centralized	34	47	$\chi^2 = .671$, df = 1, p = .413
Decentralized	39	69	

As shown in Table 13 the chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and hotel rating ($\chi^2 = .963$, df = 2, n.s.), and between organizational structure and hotel rating ($\chi^2 = 1.152$, df = 2, n.s.).

TABLE 13
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY HOTEL RATING

Variables	Five-Star (n=49)	Four-Star (n=80)	Three-Star (n=60)	Statistics
Locus of Control				
Externals	18	23	18	$\chi^2 = .963$, df = 2, p = .618
Internals	31	57	42	
Organizational Structure				
Centralized	19	33	29	$\chi^2 = 1.152$, df = 2, p = .562
Decentralized	30	47	31	

Table 14 indicates the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by number of employees in their organization. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and number of employees ($\chi^2 = 5.026$, $df = 2$, n.s.), and between organizational structure and number of employees ($\chi^2 = 1.753$, $df = 2$, n.s.).

TABLE 14
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

Variables	<100 (n=79)	100 - 499 (n=87)	>500 (n=23)	Statistics
Locus of Control				
Externals	19	29	11	$\chi^2 = 5.026$, $df = 2$, $p = .081$
Internals	60	58	12	
Organizational Structure				
Centralized	38	33	10	$\chi^2 = 1.753$, $df = 2$, $p = .416$
Decentralized	41	54	13	

Table 15 presents the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by years of experience in the hospitality industry. The chi-square test indicates that there is significant relationships between locus of control and years of experience ($\chi^2 = 14.559$, $df = 3$, $p < .05$), and between organizational structure and years of experience ($\chi^2 = 9.435$, $df = 3$, $p < .05$). As the literature states, as one experience incidents in life, there is a greater possibility that contingencies of reinforcement will be internal.

TABLE 15
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

Variables	< 10 (n=46)	10 – 19 (n=36)	20 -26 (n=58)	> 27 (n=49)	Statistics
Locus of Control					
Externals	22	13	8	16	$\chi^2 = 14.559$, df = 3, p = .002
Internals	24	23	50	33	
Organizational Structure					
Centralized	27	10	21	23	$\chi^2 = 9.435$, df = 3, p = .024
Decentralized	19	26	37	26	

Table 16 demonstrates the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by working department. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and working department ($\chi^2 = 1.771$, df = 3, n.s.), and between organizational structure and working department ($\chi^2 = 1.447$, df = 3, n.s.).

TABLE 16
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY WORKING DEPARTMENTS

Variables	Front Desk (n=13)	F & B (n=93)	Administrative (n=20)	Other (n=24)	Statistics
Locus of Control					
Externals	5	25	20	9	$\chi^2 = 1.771$, df = 3, p = .621
Internals	8	68	39	15	
Organizational Structure					
Centralized	4	41	24	12	$\chi^2 = 1.447$, df = 3, p = .694
Decentralized	9	52	35	12	

Table 17 demonstrates the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by position. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and position ($\chi^2 = 3.870$, $df = 4$, n.s.), and between organizational structure and position ($\chi^2 = 5.194$, $df = 4$, n.s.).

TABLE 17
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY POSITION

Variables	Supervisor (n=18)	Manager (n=59)	Director (n=40)	Executive/ Owner (n=58)	Other (n=14)	Statistics
Locus of Control						
Externals	6	17	16	14	6	$\chi^2 = 3.870$, $df = 4$, $p = .424$
Internals	12	42	24	44	8	
Organizational Structure						
Centralized	8	32	14	21	6	$\chi^2 = 5.194$, $df = 4$, $p = .268$
Decentralized	10	27	26	37	8	

Table 18 indicates the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by type of hotel operation. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and type of hotel operation ($\chi^2 = 0.044$, $df = 1$, n.s.), and between organizational structure and type of hotel operation ($\chi^2 = 0.070$, $df = 1$, n.s.).

TABLE 18
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY TYPE OF HOTEL OPERATION

Variables	Independent Hotel (n=87)	Chain Hotel (n=102)	Statistics
Locus of Control			
Externals	28	31	$\chi^2 = 0.044$, df = 1, p = .833
Internals	59	71	
Organizational Structure			
Centralized	38	43	$\chi^2 = 0.070$, df = 1, p = .791
Decentralized	49	59	

Table 19 presents the relationships between locus of control and organizational structure by management structure. The chi-square test indicates that there is no significant relationship between locus of control and management structure ($\chi^2 = 1.534$, df = 2, n.s.), and between organizational structure and management structure ($\chi^2 = 1.489$, df = 2, n.s.).

TABLE 19
THE CHI-SQUARE TEST OF LOC AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE
BY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Variables	Independently managed (n=92)	Corporately managed ("Brand Name" corporation) (n=59)	Corporately managed by separate management company (n=38)	Statistics
Locus of Control				
Externals	29	21	9	$\chi^2 = 1.534$, df = 2, p = .464
Internals	63	38	29	
Organizational Structure				
Centralized	42	26	13	$\chi^2 = 1.489$, df = 2, p = .475
Decentralized	50	33	25	

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between hotel managerial employees' job satisfaction, turnover intention, and their individual LOC and their perceptions of the organizational structure in which they work. Understanding this relationship would be very helpful in terms of improving hiring and employee retention practices. In other words, by linking certain personality attributes (e.g., LOC) to organizational structure, service organizations could substantially improve management performance due to cost savings associated with hiring the right candidates and ensuring employees maintain a high level of job satisfaction, thus reducing the likelihood for employee conflict and stress. Conversely, managerial employees might achieve greater organizational fit and satisfaction if they were aware of these relationships.

This chapter will discuss the summary of findings, implications of these findings, recommendation, and suggestions for future research.

Summary of Findings and Conclusion

Demographic Information

The results of this study suggest that LOC is significantly associated with age, marital status, and the total number of year for employment in the hospitality industry. Research on LOC with respect to age indicates that age is a predictor of control orientation. Lefcourt (1984) found that as one grows older, there is a greater tendency to become more internally control-oriented. The findings of this research support this statement. Older managerial employees were found to be more internally control oriented. Similarly, the number of year for employment in the hospitality industry is also related to LOC. As employees have more experience in the same work field, they can achieve more confidence, skills, and knowledge related to their jobs. Experienced employees are likely to prefer to have more opportunities for job autonomy and participation in decisions. In other words, experienced employees tend to be more internally control oriented.

Interestingly, the current study reported that there was a significant relationship between LOC and marital status. The current findings show that married people are more likely to be internally control oriented. This finding may result from the tendency that people might feel more stable, secure, responsible, and mature through their marriage.

Furthermore, the findings of this study indicate that organizational structure is significantly associated with gender, and years of experience in the hospitality industry.

Similar to LOC, because experienced employees are more active in attempting to control their work environment, they are more likely to work in a decentralized organization.

The literature has suggested that a number of demographic variables are associated with locus of control and organizational structure. These relationships were investigated in this study, however, the findings did not always support previous research. For example, there have been numerous studies on the relationship between LOC and gender. However, this study did not support previous research that there is a significant relationship between LOC and gender. According to Lefcourt (1982) and Rotter (1966), gender may play a role in the development of one's locus of control. Considering the unique challenges women face in the workforce, and their socialized limitations related to career options, it would seem likely that female employees would have a more external LOC. Women have been found to have a more external LOC than men in some cases (Bishop & Solomen, 1989; Jensen, Olsen, & Hughes, 1990; Rotter, 1966; Sherman, Higgs, & Williams, 1997).

LOC and Organizational Structure

Kanter (1983) argued that, with a decentralized structure, managers have more autonomy and more control over resources, enabling them to initiate and test a greater number of creative new ideas that eventually result in numerous innovations. Mitchell, Smyser, and Weed (1975) also found that internals preferred a participative style of management.

The study supported previous research that there is a significant relationship between LOC and organizational structure. In other words, internals prefer to work in a decentralized organization structure, while externals prefer to work in a centralized organizational structure. Internal LOC has been used to distinguish successful managers from unsuccessful ones, as well as to distinguish managers from the general public (Gliad, 1982; Ward, 1989). Likewise, this study found that the hospitality managers it surveyed were more internally control oriented. Therefore, this research can conclude that the management group in this study prefers to work at decentralized organizational structure.

LOC, Organizational Structure, and Job Satisfaction

This study shows that LOC and organizational structure, respectively affect job satisfaction. This study further suggests that there is a significant interaction between LOC and organizational structure in relation to job satisfaction.

Mitchell et al. (1975) found that internally controlled participants were more satisfied with their jobs than were externals by conducting a field experiment using public utility workers. Job satisfaction was also found to be associated with organizational structure (Omundson, Schroeder, & Stevens, 1996). In general, internals have higher levels of job satisfaction in a work environment where participation exists rather than they do in an authoritarian structure (Runyon, 1973; Spector, 1982).

LOC, Organizational Structure, and Turnover Intention

As mentioned earlier, employee turnover is related to the high costs of turnover in organizations. To minimize the cost of turnover, previous studies of turnover (e.g., Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Pettman, 1973) attempted to identify causes or antecedents of turnover from personal characteristics.

Internals show greater involvement with work and perceive it to be more meaningful than externals (Runyon, 1973). Internals also seem to be more ready to grasp for information that can contribute to the interpretation of and coping with various tasks and situations. Lefcourt (1982) demonstrated that internals have been found to be more perceptive to and ready to learn about their work surroundings. Besides, Phares (1971) reported that externals were more likely to blame other persons for their failures than were internals. Their failures are more of an irritant to externals, causing them rearrange their constructions of events. On the other hand, the stability of internals indicates that there is not the finality in failure that there is for externals. Kirkcaldy, Cooper, Furnham, and Brown (1993) also discovered that internals perceive less job stress than externals; thus, they are more likely to express high job satisfaction. Reed et al. (1994) found that externally-oriented employees exhibited slightly less attachment to their organizations. Furthermore, Omundson et al. (1996) demonstrated that turnover intention was associated with centralized or decentralized organizational structure.

On the basis of this previous research, we hypothesized that there are main effects and interaction effect of LOC and organizational structure in relation to turnover intention. By employing two-way ANOVA tests, this study proved that LOC and

organizational structure, respectively affect turnover intention, but there is no interaction effect of the two variables in relation to turnover intention. This study also found that even though managers have different control orientation (e.g., externals or internals), they prefer to work in a decentralized organizational structure. This could reflect that considering their position, age, and experience in the hospitality industry, they tend to want more authority to make a decision and control their jobs, i.e., they might migrate toward a stronger internal LOC over time?

Hence, the current findings suggest that employees' personality traits and organizational structure play critical roles in reducing turnover rate of employees.

Implications

From this study, the personality trait of LOC was found to be a significant factor of job satisfaction and propensity to leave. Organizational structure is also found to be a crucial factor to affect job satisfaction and turnover intention by interacting with or without LOC.

A challenge faced by the hospitality industry is the competition for highly skilled employees. A person with the right skills is highly sought after by recruiters. The intensity of competition increases annually and organizations must maximize their strategic resources to survive in such a constant state of competition. This phenomenon leads to the increased importance of human resources as part of the organization's intangible resources with the potential for organizational success (Lado & Wilson, 1994).

The results of this study have implications for human resources management with respect to recruiting, training, motivating, and holding managerial employees.

Furthermore, the practical intent of this research was to provide academic educators with information that can be as they seek to implement and train future employees. The identification of LOC can provide practitioners with a new tool that can be used in the initial phase of a new employment. This tool may be quite helpful to management in running the organization and having satisfied employees. It may be preferable to have employees with an internal LOC placed in positions that require some of the same characteristics that they possess. It may also be desirable to assign some internals to all departments, since they prefer this type of job design. When internals meet a new challenge or are engaged in and important tasks, they are more likely to exert themselves, because they believe that outcomes depend on their effort and ability.

This study may also help hotel executives/owners assess the needs of their current managerial employees. Moreover, this research provides the basis for upper-management to understand the causes of managerial employee turnover and to strategically manage it through the use of appropriate Human Resource (HR) policies and practices.

Several recommendations for appropriate HR practices will be described in the next section.

Recommendations

The results of this study provide recommendations especially to organizations interested in managing the careers of their managerial employees.

First, with respect to recruiting, managers might screen job candidates carefully for positions on their personality traits. Considering the potential impact of LOC on job satisfaction and turnover intention, the executive/owners may want to recruit employees who possess internal LOC coinciding with the organizational policy. Individuals of this type would experience less job tension and greater job satisfaction which should reduce absenteeism and turnover (Rogers, Clow, & Kash, 1994).

These findings are relevant to firms and individual employees seeking a match between personal and firm characteristics, and to firms seeking to determine the potential impact of employee selection and placement. Surveys of general employment practices consistently show that personality tests are used less frequently in evaluating job candidates than are interviews, work samples, mental abilities tests, medical/drug screens, and background investigations (Bureau of National Affairs, 1988). In a national survey of 10,000 sales and marketing managers, respondents overwhelmingly reported feeling that basic aptitude and personality tests are unable to predict who will succeed in their area (Granger, 1988). Tett, Jackson, and Rothstein (1991) have empirically demonstrated how personality tests used in selection programs that are based on initial job analysis research tend to be significantly more accurate in predicting success on the job. Barrick and Mount (1991) reported that personality trait was correlated with job performance.

Second, organizations will have to develop programs that will train and motivate each managerial employee to perform at an optimum level to keep up with the changes within and outside of the organization's environment. Although LOC is considered to be a stable personality trait (Rotter, 1966), other researchers (Anderson, 1977; Andrisani & Nestel, 1976) found that LOC can change over time through increased knowledge, education, experience, training or direct instruction. Especially, training could certainly be used to enhance internal LOC.

In general, training offers the individual the opportunity to experience greater control over situations previously believed to be unattainable. If organizations invest in training and career development programs of employees, they will have higher levels of attachment or loyalty to their organizations. Employee training and education would be also focused on the personality and preferred learning styles of each associate, rather than on a mandatory curriculum dictated and force fed by headquarters. The current study suggests that managers may find it rewarding to implement tailored training programs. Specifically, managers can tailor their training programs so as to target specific facets of LOC and achieve specific output goals. Such tailored programs are potentially not only more efficient (i.e., because of their focus), but also likely to be more effective (i.e., because of their link to specific outcomes) than currently available methods of encouraging managerial employees to have internal LOC.

Therefore, organizations need to develop management techniques or strategies linked with developing their employees' careers which in turn can lead to the employees' devotion to the company. This possibility also provides an entirely new area within the training arena for the development, delivery, and evaluation of materials.

Third, job descriptions need to be clearly written and taught to managerial employees. Job descriptions need to indicate what actions can and cannot be taken. Without violating policies of the firm, empowerment and flexibility within the job description makes internally control-oriented employees have higher levels of job satisfaction and lower levels of turnover intention. Clear job descriptions also reduce conflicts among employees and between employees and management.

In summary, job candidates' characteristics should be screened for in the recruiting process or enhanced during the training process. Therefore, recruiting efforts should be directed to rewards identifying job candidates who possess, among other qualities, an internal orientation (internal LOC). Alternatively, trainers can enhance efforts to build a sense of influence in trainees who are more externally oriented, with the idea in mind that the reoriented managerial employees will practice internal LOC.

Limitations

The following are limitations of this study:

1. There may be unidentified factors that influence the response of the participants.
2. The sampling frame may not be representative of the full population of hotel managerial employees. The hotel managers who chose not to participate in the research study were assumed to possess the same characteristics of the participants. A sample of managerial employees (N = 613) was drawn from the current databases of the Global Hotelier Club Members. Not all the names and

email addresses of every hotel managerial employee in the US are found in this database. Due to this, the generalizability of the study results and conclusions are limited to those employees whose name appears in the database.

3. A majority of the managers participated in this study were working in the Food and Beverage operations, and therefore, the sample was likely to be overrepresentative of a Food and Beverage background. The results cannot be generalized to the general population. A larger number of subjects from diverse departments would provide more strength and support to the research findings.
4. Due to the fact that a one-time survey was employed to obtain the results, the results of the study could induce biases. Therefore, the results of the study could not be generalized to other hotels due to its lack of randomization.
5. To conduct this study, a self-report instrument was used. There may be some reporting bias in the data used. It is possible that the subjects would behave differently from what they reported. In the area of research there has always been skepticism regarding the validity of self-reports (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977).

Further Research

This study was, by necessity, very tightly focused. Many factors other than those used in this study can impact the likelihood of job satisfaction and turnover intention. For example, job performance, life satisfaction, organizational commitment, and many others could potentially be examined to further expand the knowledge of this relationship.

It might also be possible to extend the results of this study by including an examination of job satisfaction to personal satisfaction with one's life in general. This would examine and possibly explain any relationship between one's overall outlook at life and job satisfaction. Many talented professionals leave their organizations because they are not happy in their jobs and lives. Butler and Waldroop (1999) argued that the job matches employees' deeply embedded life interests, which then are emotionally driven passions. At work, happiness often links to commitment by keeping employee engaged and keeping them from quitting.

Research which investigates the manager's or non-managerial employee's LOC in greater depth might offer more insight into why the differences in perceptions of organizational structure and job satisfaction were found. Further studies would examine the differences between managers and subordinates. It may help managers and businesses to understand their employees better and this understanding may lead to better way to supervise and motivate them. It could address specific factors by approaching the issue from a qualitative approach rather than the quantitative approach used here. Interviews could offer more depth to the findings of this research and enhance its findings.

It would also be interesting to follow the individuals on a longitudinal basis to determine which changes affect their level, position, or satisfaction in the future. Periodic examination over a number of years could reveal insight into how the person changes over time and how these changes affect the satisfaction experienced. By researching certain individuals from their college time to working period, the further research can examine personal changes on LOC. It would further develop theory to know if LOC changes with changing organizational affiliation, life circumstances, etc. For example, if

a person who is a predominant internal locus of control works for an extended period of time in a highly centralized and rule driven organization, would they tend to become more external, and visa versa?

Furthermore, replication of these results in other types of work contexts are needed to further explore the boundary conditions and moderators of the relationships among LOC, organizational structure, job satisfaction, and turnover intention.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Halim, A. A. (1980). Effects of person-job compatibility on managerial reactions to role ambiguity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26, 193-211.
- Aiken, M., & Hage, J. (1968). Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structure. *American Sociological Review*, 33 (6), 912-930.
- Anderson, C. R. (1977). Locus of control, coping behaviors, and performance in a stress setting: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62 (4), 446-451.
- Andrisani, P. J. (1978). Job satisfaction and working women. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 3 (3), 588-607.
- Andrisani, P. J., & Nestel, G. (1976). Internal-external control as contributor to and outcome of work experience. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61 (2), 156-165.
- Bamber, E. M., Snowball, D., & Tubbs, R. M. (1989). Audit structure and its relation to role conflict and role ambiguity: An empirical investigation. *The Account Review*, 64 (April), 285-299.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Bowers, K. S. (1973). Situationism in psychology: An analysis and a critique. *Psychological Review*, 80, 307-336.
- Bowrin, A. R. (1998). Review and synthesis of audit structure literature. *Journal of Accounting Literature*, 17, 40-71.
- Bureau of National Affairs (1988). *Recruiting and selection procedures*. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of National Affairs.
- Butler, T., & Waldroop, J. (1999). Job sculpting: The art of retaining your best people. *Harvard Business Review*, 77 (5), 144-152.
- Chang, E. (1999). Career commitment as a complex moderator of organizational commitment and turnover intention. *Human Relations*, 52 (10), 1257-1278.

- Cheng, Y. C. (1994). Locus of control as an indicator of Hong Kong teachers' job attitudes and perceptions of organizational characteristics. *Journal of Educational Research*, 87 (3), 180-188.
- Chia, Y. M. (1995). The interaction effect of information asymmetry and decentralization on managers' job satisfaction: A research note. *Human Relations*, 48 (6), 609-624.
- Churchill, G. A., & Brown, T. J. (2003). *Basic marketing research* (5th ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson, South-Western.
- Ciccone, J. C. (1993). *The relationship between a high school principal's locus of control and the academic achievement of students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, South Orange.
- Cotton, J. L., & Tuttle, J. M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, 11 (1), 55-70.
- Cummins, R. (1989). Locus of control and social support: Clarifiers of the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 772-788.
- Cushing, B. E., & Loebbecke, J. K. (1986). *Comparison of audit methodologies of large accounting firms* (Accounting Research Study No. 26). Sarasota, FL: American Accounting Association.
- Donaldson, L. (1990). The ethereal hand: Organizational economics and management theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 15, 36-381.
- Donnelly, D. P., Quirin, J. J., & O'Bryan, D. (2000). Antecedents and consequences of dysfunctional audit behavior: The roles of locus of control, performance, and turnover intentions. Working paper, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS.
- Donnelly, J. H. Jr., & Ivancevich, J. M. Role clarity and the salesman. *Journal of Marketing*, 39 (1), 71
- Duvdevany, I., & Rimmerman, A. (1996). Individuals with work-related disabilities: Locus of control, attitudes toward work, and cooperation with the rehabilitation worker. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 27 (2), 30-35.
- Fink, A. (2003). *How to design survey studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. (1998). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Fottler, M. D., Hernandez, S. R., & Joiner, C. L. (1994). *Strategic management of human resources in health services organization* (2nd Ed.). Albany, NY: Delmar.
- Galbraith, J. (1973). *Designing complex organizations* (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.)
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gerloff, E. A. (1985). *Organizational theory and design: A strategic approach for management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Giles, W. F. (1977). Volunteering for job enrichment: A test of expectancy theory predictions. *Personnel Psychology*, 30, 427-435.
- Gliad, B. (1982). On encouraging entrepreneurship: An interdisciplinary analysis. *Journal of Behavioral Economics*, 11, 132-163.
- Granger, R. H. (1988). Sales management: Is it fact or fancy? *National Underwriter*, 92, 63-65.
- Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Harel, G. H., & Tzafrir, S. S. (1999). The effect of human resource management practices on the perceptions of organizational and market performance of the firm. *Human Resource Management*, 38 (3), 185-200.
- Harvey, J. H., Barnes, R. D., Sperry, D. L., & Harris, B. (1974). Perceived choice as a function of internal-external locus of control. *Journal of Personality*, 42, 437-452.
- Hochberg, Y., & Tamhane, A. C. (1987). *Multiple comparison procedure*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hu, B., Morrison, A. M., & O'Leary, J. T. (2002). An analysis of the variety-seeking behaviour of the U.S. visiting friends and relatives market. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 13 (2), 28-40.
- Jenkins, J. M. (1993). Self-monitoring and turnover: The impact of personality of personality on intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 83-91.
- Kabanoff, B., & O'Brien, G. E. (1980). Work and leisure: A task-attributes analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 38, 50-56.

- Kahle, L. R. (1980). Stimulus condition self-selection by males in the interaction of locus and skill-chance situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 50-56.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The changemasters*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- King, M., Murray, M. A., & Atkinson, T. (1982). Background, personality, job characteristics, and satisfaction with work in a national sample. *Human Relations*, 32 (2), 119-133.
- Kirkcaldy, B. D., Cooper, C. L., Furnham, A., & Brown, J. I. (1993). Personality, job satisfaction, and well-being among public sector (police) managers: The validity and utility of personality assessment in occupational strategy. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 43, 241-248.
- Knoop, R. (1981). LOC as moderator between job characteristics and job attributes. *Psychological Reports*, 48, 519-525.
- Knoop, R. (1995). Influence of participative decision-making on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of school principals. *Psychological Reports*, 76, 379-382.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personal Psychology*, 49, 1-49.
- Lado, A. A., & Wilson, C. M. (1994). Human resource systems and sustained competitive advantage: A competency-based perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 699-727.
- Lefcourt, H. M. (1982). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lefcourt, H. M. (1984). *Research with the locus of control construct: Extensions and limitations* (Vol. 3). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Meggison, L. C., Mosley, D. C., & Pietri, P. H. (1992). *Management: Concepts and application*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Merenda, P. F. (1997). A guide to the proper use of factor analysis in the conduct and reporting of research: Pitfalls to avoid. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 30, 156-164.

- Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283.
- Mitchell, T., Smyser, C., & Weed, S. (1975). Locus of control: Supervision and work satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 623-631.
- Omundson, J. S., Schroeder, R. G., & Stevens, M. B. (1996). Type A personality, job satisfaction, and turnover intention among certified public accountants: A comparison of Euro-Americans and Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 18 (1), 39-50.
- Park, M. H., & Mason, J. B. (1990). Toward an integrated model of the determinants of business performance: A business-level strategic planning perspective. *Research in Marketing*, 10, 157-202.
- Perrewe, P. L. (1986). Locus of control and activity level as moderators in the quantitative job demands-satisfaction/psychological anxiety relationship: An experimental analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 16, 620-632.
- Pervin, L. A. (1968). Performance and satisfaction as a function of individual environment fit. *Psychological Bulletin*, 69, 56-68.
- Pettman, B. D. (1973). Some factors influencing labor turnover: A review of the literature. *Industrial Relations Journal*, 4 (3), 43-61.
- Phares, E. J. (1971). Internal external control and the reduction of reinforcement value after failure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 37, 386-390.
- Prawitt, D. F. (1995). Staffing assignments for judgment-oriented audit tasks: The effects of structured audit technology and environment. *The Accounting Review*, 70 (July), 443-465.
- Reed, S., Kratchman, S., & Strawser, R. (1994). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intentions of United States accountants: The impact of locus of control and gender. *Accounting, Auditing, & Accountability Journal*, 7, 31-58.
- Rogers, J. D., Clow, K. E., & Kash, T. J. (1994). Increasing job satisfaction of service personnel. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 8 (1), 14-26.
- Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80 (1) (Whole No. 609).

- Rotter, J. B. (1975). Some problems and misconceptions related to the construct of internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 43 (1), 56-67.
- Rotter, J. B. (1990). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A case history of a variable. *American Psychologist*, 45 (April), 489-493.
- Runyon, K. E. (1973). Some interactions between personality variables and management styles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57 (June), 288-294.
- Sager, J., Futrell, C., & Varadarajan, R. (1989). Exploring salesperson turnover. *Journal of Business Research*, 18 (4), 303-326.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1982). Behavior in organizations as a function of employee's locus of control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 482-497.
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1991). Relations of job characteristics from multiple data sources with employee affect, absence, turnover intentions, and health. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 46-53.
- Spector, P. E., & O'Connell, B. J. (1994). The contribution of personality trait, negative affectivity, locus of control, and type A to the subsequent reports of job stressors and job strains. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 1-12.
- Strickland, B. R. (1989). Internal-external control expectancies: From contingency to creativity. *American Psychologist*, 44 (January), 1-12.
- Stoner, J. A. F., & Freeman, R. E. (1989). *Management* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ : Prentice Hall.
- Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703-742.
- Tinsley, H. E. A., & Tinsley, D. J. (1987). Uses of factor analysis in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34, 414-424.
- Ward, E. A. (1989). Entrepreneurs: An international review of their psychological profile. *Proceedings of the International Personnel and Human Resources Management Conference*, Hong Kong.

Waterhouse, J. H., & Tiessen, P. (1978). A contingency framework for management accounting systems research. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 3 (1), 65-76.

Woods, R. H. (1995). *Managing hospitality human resources*. East Lansing, MI: Educational Institute of the American Hotel and Motel Association.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

APPROVAL FORM FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS (IRB FORM)

**Oklahoma State University
Institutional Review Board**

Protocol Expires: 11/17/2004

Date: Tuesday, November 18, 2003

IRB Application No HE0421

Proposal Title: The Effects of Locus of Control and Organizational Structure on Job Satisfaction and
Turnover Intention of Hospitality Employee

Principal
Investigator(s):

Kyung-Ah Lee
201 HESW
Stillwater, OK 74078

Patrick J. Moreo
201 HESW
Stillwater, OK 74078

Reviewed and
Processed as: Exempt

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

Dear PI :

Your IRB application referenced above has been approved for one calendar year. Please make note of the expiration date indicated above. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact me in 415 Whitehurst (phone: 405-744-5700, colson@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Carol Olson, Chair
Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Participant:

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between hospitality employees' job satisfaction, turnover intention, their perceptions of the organization in which they work and their individual perceptions of control. Would you please take 5-10 minutes of your time to complete this survey? Your input is extremely important to the outcome of this study. The results will be valuable to both the academic and industry sectors of hospitality management.

Your response is completely **voluntary** and will be kept strictly **confidential**. If you would like to receive the results of this study, please send an email to kyungl@okstate.edu with your email address.

If you have any further questions or need further assistance, please contact me at (405) 332-0220 (kyungl@okstate.edu). I am looking forward to receiving your response.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Kyung Ah Lee

Ph. D. Candidate

The School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration

Oklahoma State University

Part I. Locus of Control

Please select letter "A" or letter "B".

- | | | |
|---|----|--|
| 1 | A. | Employees get into trouble because their supervisors are too strict with them. |
| | B. | The trouble with most employees nowadays is that their supervisors are too easy with them. |
| 2 | A. | Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck. |
| | B. | People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make. |
| 3 | A. | One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics. |
| | B. | There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them. |
| 4 | A. | In the long run, people get the respect they deserve in this world. |
| | B. | Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized, no matter how hard he/she tries. |
| 5 | A. | The idea that supervisors are unfair to employees is nonsense. |
| | B. | Most employees don't realize the extent to which their performance is influenced by accidental happenings. |

6	A.	Without the right breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.
	B.	Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
7	A.	No matter how hard you try, some people just don't like you.
	B.	People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8	A.	Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
	B.	It is one's experiences in life which determine what one is like.
9	A.	I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
	B.	Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
10	A.	In the case of the well-prepared employee, there is rarely, if ever, such a thing as an unfair evaluation.
	B.	Many times, evaluations tend to be so unrelated to the work performance that working hard is really useless.
11	A.	Becoming a success is matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
	B.	Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
12	A.	The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
	B.	This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
13	A.	When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
	B.	It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.
14	A.	There are certain people who are just no good.
	B.	There is some good in everybody.
15	A.	In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
	B.	Many times, we might as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
16	A.	Who gets to be boss often depends on the one who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
	B.	Getting people to do the right thing depends on ability; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
17	A.	As far as world affairs are concerned, most of use are the victims of the forces we can neither understand, nor control.
	B.	By taking an active part in political and social affairs, the people can control world events.
18	A.	Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
	B.	There is really no such thing as "luck."
19	A.	One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
	B.	It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20	A.	It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.

- B. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.
- 21 A. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
B. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
- 22 A. With enough effort, we can wipe out political corruption.
B. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
- 23 A. Sometimes I can't understand how supervisors arrive at the evaluation they give.
B. There is a direct connection between how hard I work and the evaluation I get.
- 24 A. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
B. A good leader makes clear to everybody what his/her jobs are.
- 25 A. Many times I felt that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
B. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.
- 26 A. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
B. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people-if they like you.
- 27 A. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
B. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
- 28 A. What happens to me is my own doing.
B. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
- 29 A. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
B. In the long run, the people are responsible for bad government on the national as well as on the local level.

Part II. Organizational Structure

Please select the number that best describes the extent of your agreement with each of the following statements regarding the organizational structure of your hotel.

	Statement	Strongly Disagree	⇒	Strongly Agree
1	There can be little action taken here until my boss approves a decision.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7	
2	A person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly encouraged here.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7	
3	Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7	
4	I usually don't have to ask my boss before I do most things.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7	
5	Any decision I make has to have my boss' approval.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7	
6	Getting things done here takes excessive paperwork.	1	2 3 4 5 6 7	

Part III. Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Please select the number that best describes the extent of your agreement with each of the following statements regarding job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Statement	Strongly Disagree	⇒	Strongly Agree
1 I consider my job rather unpleasant.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
2 I am often bored with my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
3 I feel fairly well-satisfied with my present job.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
4 Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
5 I definitely dislike my work.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
6 Most of the time I am enthusiastic about my work.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
7 My job is pretty uninteresting.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
8 I find real enjoyment in my work.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
9 I am disappointed that I ever took this job.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
10 It is likely that I will actively look for a new job next year.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
11 I often think about quitting.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		
12 I will probably look for a new job next year.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7		

Part IV. Demographic Profile.

1. Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male

2. Age: ☐ Under 20 yrs. ☐ 20-29 yrs. ☐ 30-39 yrs.
☐ 40-49 yrs. ☐ 50-59 yrs. ☐ Above 60 yrs.

3. Education: ☐ High School ☐ Two Year College
☐ Four Year College ☐ Graduate Degree

4. Marital status: ☐ Single ☐ Married

5. Your hotel rating: ☐ Five-Star Hotel ☐ Four-Star Hotel ☐ Three-Star Hotel

6. Number of employees in your hotel:
☐ Less than 100 ☐ 100-499 ☐ More than 500

7. Number of experience in the hospitality industry: _____ years

8. Working department:

____ Front Desk ____ Housekeeping ____ Food & Beverage
____ Administrative and Support ____ Other

9. Your position: ____ Supervisor ____ Manager
____ Director ____ Executive/Owner
____ Other

10. Number of years working in your current: _____ years

11. Hotel location: _____
City State

12. Your hotel is: ____ Independent hotel without affiliation
____ Chain (brand name) affiliated hotel

13. Your hotel is: ____ Independently managed
____ Corporately managed ("Brand Name" corporation)
____ Corporately managed by separate management company

I appreciate your time and effort!



VITA

KYUNG-AH LEE

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE EFFECTS OF LOCUS OF CONTROL AND ORGANIZATIONAL
STRUCTURE ON JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER INTENTION OF
HOTEL MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES

Major Field: Human Environmental Science

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Seoul, Korea, July 16, 1974; the daughter of Young-Bok Lee and Kyung-Ok Kim

Education: Graduated from Ban-Po High School, Seoul, Korea, in February 1993; received Bachelor of Science degree in Food Science and Nutrition from Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul, Korea, in February 1997; Master of Science degree in Food Science and Nutrition from Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul, Korea, in February 1999; completed the requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree with major in Human Environmental Sciences at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in May 2005.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul, Korea, 1997-1998; Researcher, Seoul National University, 1999-2000; Research Assistant, Oklahoma State University, 2001; Internship, Tan-Tar-A Resort, Golf Club, Marina & Indoor Waterpark, Osage Beach, Missouri, 2002; Teaching Assistant, Oklahoma State University, 2002-2003.

Name: Kyung Ah Lee

Date of Degree: May, 2005

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: THE EFFECTS OF LOCUS OF CONTROL AND ORGANIZATIONAL
STRUCTURE ON JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER
INTENTION OF HOTEL MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES

Pages in Study: 78

Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Human Environmental Science

Scope and Method of Study: The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between hotel managerial employees' job satisfaction, turnover intention, and their individual LOC and their perceptions of the organizational structure in which they work. It was further the purpose of this study to explore the relationship between LOC, organizational structure, and certain demographic variables. Participants in the study were 189 managerial and executive level hotel employees in the U.S. All participants received an email providing a cover letter and a URL link to the survey instrument including the Rotter I-E scale, organizational structure, job satisfaction, turnover intention, and demographic information. Seven null hypotheses were tested by using chi-square test and two-way ANOVA.

Findings and Conclusions: The results of this study indicated that internals preferred to work in a decentralized organizational structure, while externals preferred to work in a centralized organizational structure. In addition, hospitality managers were more internally control oriented. This study showed that LOC and organizational structure had a significant interaction effect as well as main effects on job satisfaction. Finally, the author found that LOC and organizational structure, respectively affected turnover intention indirectly, but there was no interaction effect of the two independent variables in relation to turnover intention.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: _____ Dr. Patrick J. Moreo