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The purpose of this survey is to determine how food & beverage service employees experience their job and working conditions. We would like to specifically measure the Quality of Work Life in your establishment. All responses will be kept confidential, no names are required. Please complete all the sections of the questionnaire and return it to your manager as soon as possible.

SECTION A – DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Year of birth: 19............

Current relationship status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating and living together</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest level of Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of Service at current Establishment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At Which unit are you Currently Employed:

- Hotel Restaurant
- Fast Food Outlet
- Family Restaurant
- Restaurant
- Bar or Club
- Other (specify)

Added benefits of my Employment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not Agree at All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits:

- Stay-in facilities
- Staff meals
- Medical aid
- Pension
- Accommodation Contribution
- Bonus
- Study Loans

Where do you see yourself in 5 years (please only choose one)

- Same Position
- Promoted
- Managerial Position
- Different department at this Establishment
SECTION B – WORK LIFE DOMAINS

This section is aimed at the work life domains that might influence your Quality of Work Life. Please rate to which extent you agree with the following statements. 1 = Do not agree at all and 5 = Totally agree.

**Job attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Do not Agree</th>
<th>Do not Agree at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My salary is reasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am taken care of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job allows family time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working hours are too long</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work at this establishment because.....</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I enjoy the F&amp;B industry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I enjoy serving people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* This is what I studied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cannot find a better job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I have family connections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I needed a job in this area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* I am gaining experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Do not Agree</th>
<th>Do not Agree at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good friends at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have flexible hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We communicate effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees feel valued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have work place unity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers show interest in us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Esteem attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Do not Agree</th>
<th>Do not Agree at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am appreciated at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work is acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contribute to our success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our uniform looks good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest satisfaction is my goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actualisation attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Do not Agree</th>
<th>Do not Agree at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job allows...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My full potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me to use my talents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Me greater responsibility
Me to give new & fresh ideas
Me to lead a meaningful life
My professional development

Creativity and aesthetic attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity is encouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have artistic work facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity is appreciated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION C – BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

This section is aimed at the business environment that might influence your Quality of Work Life. Please rate to which extent you agree with the following statements. 1 = Do not agree at all and 5 = Totally agree.

Organisational support and employee commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will work hard for the establishments success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I promote the establishment to my friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishments and My values are similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment inspires job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I normally have a good mood during work hours

This is the best establishment to work for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived service delivery and productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totally Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neutral</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do not Agree at All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a productive employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing productivity will decrease quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer individual service for customer needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are reached through customer satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good relationship with loyal customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get frustrated when I am not productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of customer complaints</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation.

Mr Armand Viljoen & Dr Stefan Kruger
Tourism Research in Economic Environs and Society (TREES)
North-West University
Potchefstroom Campus
adam.viljoen@nwu.ac.za or stefan.kruger@nwu.ac.za
Appendix 2: Article
Understanding food and beverage employees perception concerning service delivery and productivity

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to investigate the perceived service delivery and productivity of commercial food and beverage service employees in Potchefstroom, South Africa. Self-administrated questionnaires were distributed at selected food and beverage establishments in Potchefstroom. In total, 224 questionnaires were included in the statistical data analysis. The data analysis consisted of demographic profiles, a factor analysis and a structural equation model to illustrate the relationships between the worklife domains and business environment attributes and their influence on the perceived service delivery and productivity. The results indicated that the job attributes creativity and aesthetics, actualisation and organisational support and employee commitment each make an influence on employees’ perceived service delivery and productivity. This implies that food and beverage managers should try to improve the working conditions of employees as well as provide the appropriate level of recognition to hardworking employees. Management should consider the recommendations that are made, in terms of job satisfaction of food and beverage service employees, as they possess the ability to positively influence organisational performance and success.

Keywords: employee management, hospitality sector, job satisfaction, Potchefstroom, Quality of Work Life, Structural Equation Model
Introduction

According to George (2008:179), the food and beverage sector is the second largest category, after accommodation, in the hospitality industry as well as being a core aspect of the tourism industry. In South Africa, the food and beverage sector contributed to a 6.8% increase in the total tourism income in the country during the period March 2011 to March 2012 (Stats SA, 2012:23-25). According to Statistics South Africa (2012:2), the food and beverage sector’s growth was most prominent among take-away and fast-food outlets (3.9%), restaurants and coffee shops (3%) and catering services (1.9%). To further indicate the importance of this sector, the food and beverage sector employs a very significant workforce (approximately 308 500 employees). This indicates that that the food and beverage sector is the largest employer in the South African tourism industry (Stats SA, 2010:29).

The food and beverage sector can be divided into two major categories, i.e. the commercial and subsidised/welfare sectors. The commercial food and beverage sector is a large generator of income, revenue and business that is of importance to the tourism and hospitality industry (Davis, Lockwood, Pantelidis & Alcott, 2008:21). This sector is a complex combination of many different types of establishments, including, hotel restaurants, family restaurants, restaurants, fast-food outlets, bars, coffee shops and commercial caterers (Ninemeier & Perdue, 2005:9; Davis et al., 2008:9). However, the food and beverage sector is characterised by certain challenges, including long working hours, high employee turn-over, a dearth of experienced labour and, in general, poor wages (Bohle, Quinlan, Kennedy & Williamson, 2004:22; Gustafson, 2002:106; Marchante, Ortega & Pagan, 2000:6; Lo & Lamm, 2005:23). Lessing (2008:68) also notes that the South African labour market has a shortage of skilled employees and is further characterised by poor worker productivity. The South African food and beverage sector as a whole faces challenges such as low employment, poor wages, low quality service and limited education or training opportunities (National Treasury, 2011:39; Department of Labour, 2008:5; Mle, 2012:297; Department of Basic Education 2011:21).

With these challenges to the food and beverage sector in mind, quality service becomes one of the most important constructs (Mei, Dean & White, 1999:136). The food and beverage experience includes not only the quality of food, but also the quality of service, the way the food is presented, the ambience, together with the staff and their friendliness (Saayman, 2007:262). The role of service employees in many competitive business environments is, according to Liao and Chuang (2004:41), to interact with customers and, by delivering high-quality services, generate favourable reviews from customers who experience higher satisfaction and, as a result,
will increase the purchases during, and frequency of, future visits. For this reason, Davis, Lockwood, Pantelidis and Alcott (2008:37) offer the opinion that food and beverage service employees should complement the meal experience, and that the staff should be able to do this in a variety of ways, certainly through their social skills, but perhaps also through their age, gender, the uniforms worn or even the tempo of service delivery. The quality of service is, however, greatly influenced by how satisfied employees are in their job (Liao & Chuang, 2004:41).

According to Lau (2000:426), satisfied employees tend to provide greater productivity that enhances quality service delivery. Skalli, Theodossiou and Vasileiou (2008:1906) agree and state that overall job satisfaction is likely to reflect the combination of partial satisfactions related to various features of the employee’s job, such as pay, security, the work itself, working conditions and working hours, all of which influence the quality of the employee’s work life. Therefore, the employees’ Quality of Work Life contributes to the satisfaction that the employees experience, both from the work place and from the work itself (Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel & Lee, 2001:241). It therefore becomes important to investigate how food and beverage service employees themselves perceive their job satisfaction, as well as the quality of their work life, since managers may have a positive influence on the working environment that could lead to greater productivity and higher levels of quality service delivery. Seth, Deshmukh and Vrat (2005:913) agree, and state that the quality of service delivery and productivity has been a major area of concern for practitioners, managers and researchers, as these two factors have a strong influence on business performance, as well as lower costs, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and profitability. In particular, lower costs are vital for the success and ultimate profitability of the commercial food and beverage sector, particularly when considering the challenges faced by this sector.

Therefore, the purpose of this research is to investigate the perceived service delivery and productivity in the commercial food and beverage sector of Potchefstroom in South Africa. In order to achieve this goal, the article is arranged as follows: the introduction is followed by a review of the related literature. Thereafter, an explanation of the method of research and a discussion of the results and their implications follow. Finally, conclusions will be presented.

Theoretical background

Work is the number of hours of labour from which an employee gains real pay, derives benefits, improved self-concept and self-esteem, as well as opportunities to engage in activities that fulfil an employee’s contribution to society (Stark & Goldsbury, 1990:80; Fisher, 2010:14). According
to Martell and Dupuis (2006:333), it is important to investigate the influence that work has on life, as work is a major role player in everyday life. Furthermore, work occupies an employee’s thoughts, largely determines an employee’s schedule and contributes to social identity. Work is the connection that the employee experiences with the outside world and the quality of that connection regulates all relationships (Martell & Dupuis, 2006:334). Work is often a vehicle through which an individual establishes his/her identity and place in society, related peer groups, and the level of economic independence gained. This fact alone supports the need for organisations (such as those in the food and beverage sector) to take a closer look at how well they provide individuals (employees) with opportunities for satisfaction and success, both on and off the job. It is, therefore important, to emphasise at the outset that work is becoming increasingly important, not merely because of the amount of time that people spend on the job, but also because work is assuming a larger, more meaningful role in most people’s lives (Kiernan & Knutson, 1990:101). In response, organisations are beginning to recognise that they have a primary responsibility to their employees (Kiernan & Knutson, 1990:102). This is especially vital for the food and beverage sector, due to the nature of the sector, and its employees’ working conditions.

Bearing in mind the nature of the food and beverage service employees’ working conditions, Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel and Lee (2001:243) and Fisher (2010:39) emphasise that a happy employee is a productive employee and that a happy employee is a dedicated and loyal employee. This implies that Quality of Work Life has an influence on the behavioural responses of employees, such as job satisfaction and job performance, as shown in Figure 1 (Sirgy et al., 2001:242). Furthermore, the quality of service delivery and productivity has a direct relationship with overall job satisfaction (Johnston & Jones, 2004:204). Job satisfaction as experienced by employees is therefore closely related to Quality of Work Life. Quality of Work Life (consisting of various worklife domains) is a process by which organisations respond to employees’ needs, developing mechanisms to allow them (employees) to share fully in making the decisions that design their lives at work (Kiernan & Knutson, 1990:103). Quality of Work Life therefore enables employees to design their own level of overall job satisfaction that will contribute to improved perceived service delivery and productivity.
However, according to Sirgy et al. (2001:242), Quality of Work Life is more meaningful than this, and goes beyond mere job satisfaction. The basic premise, according to Neal, Sirgy and Uysal (1999:154), is that satisfaction is functionally related to the satisfaction of life domains and sub-domains, such as work, personal health, family and leisure. The study of different life domains has indicated that there are many life domains that influence the satisfaction of employees in their own working environments. These life domains have an influence on one another and the effect is referred to as the bottom-up-spillover theory, meaning that satisfaction in one domain will also influence satisfaction in another domain (Sirgy et al., 2001:244). Since the different life domains are based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, that explains how in order to reach self-actualisation, an individual must satisfy or saturate all previous lower-order needs, being psychological, safety, belonging and self-esteem (Maslow, 1970:18). This gives insight into different worklife domains that are largely composed of work-related needs (Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel & Lee, 2001:278). A measure of Quality of Work Life based on needs satisfaction and spillover theories was developed and designed to capture the extent to which the work environment, job requirements, supervisory behaviour and ancillary programmes of an organisation are perceived to meet the needs of an employee. Seven (7) major needs, each having several dimensions, were identified by Sirgy et al. (2001:278):

1. health and safety needs (protection from ill health and injury at work and outside of work, and the enhancement of good health),
2. economic and family needs (pay, job security, and other family needs),
3. social needs (collegiality at work and leisure time off work),
4. esteem needs (recognition and appreciation of work within the organisation and outside the organisation),
5. actualisation needs (realisation of one’s potential within the organisation and as a professional),

6. knowledge needs (learning to enhance job and professional skills), and

7. aesthetic needs (creativity at work as well as personal creativity and general aesthetics).

These needs are not just important to employees, but are equally important to management, as these needs have to be managed to meet the perceived needs of employees through the work environment, job requirements, supervisory behaviour and ancillary programmes for service delivery.

Therefore, the participative management style has been widely accepted as a core concept of Quality of Work Life. Participative management creates opportunities for employees to have an impact upon their working environment by participating in decisions made concerning their job, thereby enhancing self-esteem and the level of satisfaction realised (Kiernan & Knutson, 1990:104). Kim (2002:232) agrees, stating that participative management and empowerment through human motivation both positively influence job satisfaction and productivity. Other studies indicate that employee management delivers better performance, improved labour productivity, greater guest satisfaction and, overall, a competitive advantage (Ball, Johnson & Slattery, 1986:141; Hu & Cai, 2004:28; Smeral, 2007:27; Cook, Yale & Marqua, 2010:182; Tanke, 2001:4; Borrows, Powers & Reynolds, 2012:688; Baum, 2007:1383).

With these outputs in mind, research done by authors such as Ladhari (2009) on hospitality and satisfaction found that service quality uses both direct and indirect effects through emotional satisfaction on behavioural intentions. Riley (2006) analysed the career patterns of those with food and beverage backgrounds and found that the career paths are changing but offers the suspicion that skills are at the foundation of the issue. Studies that have been undertaken into the Quality of Work Life include those of Green and Hatch (2002), who investigated whether empowerment and autonomy are the true cornerstones of effectiveness, Manning, Davidson and Manning (2005) concluded that organisational climate influenced employee turnover and that employee perception influenced customer satisfaction. Lee, Singhapakdi and Sirgy (2007) researched marketing managers and found that Quality of Work Life had a positive influence on job satisfaction and organisational commitment. However, many of these studies focused on other sectors of business (such as marketing), while there is limited, or no, specific reference to the food and beverage sector.
The investigation into the Quality of Work Life of employees in the food and beverage sector or how their satisfaction plays a role in the quality of service delivery and productivity has, to date, received limited attention (Lau, 2000:424). This study attempts to investigate the relationship that worklife domains (those that contribute to Quality of Work Life) have on food and beverage service employees’ perceived service delivery and productivity. Properly understood and addressed, these will guide the sector into improving working conditions and, in return, establishments will have the opportunity to effect improvements to their own performance. Therefore, it is vital to investigate the influence that worklife domains have on perceived service delivery and productivity of food and beverage service employees, as well as to demonstrate the impact that these employees have on organisational performance and customer satisfaction.

**Methodology**

This section describes the study focus, the questionnaire, the sampling method and survey and the statistical analysis conducted.

**Study focus**

The research was quantitative in nature, where a self-administrated questionnaire was distributed among commercial food and beverage service employees at Potchefstroom in the Tlokwe Municipality of the North West Province of South Africa (see Map 1). As shown in Map 1, Potchefstroom is located on the eastern border of the North West Province of South Africa. It is in relatively close proximity to major metropolitan areas of South Africa, such as Johannesburg, (the Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality) and Pretoria (Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality). Potchefstroom is a growing city with many amenities, including a world-renowned university. The city also attracts many international visitors as the weather and altitude conditions are excellent for sport training. The city offers a wide variety of commercial food and beverage establishments and the employees at the various establishments include people from every walk of life (Tourism North West, 2012).

The establishments that participated in this research study include hotel restaurants, family restaurants, restaurants, fast-food outlets, bars, coffee shops and commercial caterers. The food and beverage service employees at these establishments completed a self-administrated questionnaire to determine whether their worklife domains contribute to their Quality of Work Life and how this contributes to their perceived service delivery and productivity.
The questionnaire

The questionnaire used in the survey was adapted from the work of Sirgy et al. (2001:249) as well as that from a previous study completed by Naude, Kruger and Saayman (2010:116-125) concerning the Quality of Work Life of front office employees. A similar questionnaire was used for related research done by Jones and Pizam (2008:270) concerning the productivity of hospitality operations. The questionnaire used consisted of three (3) sections. Section A included questions to determine the demographic profile, section B is related to Work Life domains, while section C is related to the business environment.

Sampling method and survey

The questionnaires were administered from November 2011 to February 2012 at selected commercial food and beverage establishments in Potchefstroom. The owners or managers of the respective establishments in Potchefstroom were contacted to seek permission, and to determine whether or not employees would be allowed to complete the questionnaire during working hours.
The sample size included 450 commercial food and beverage service employees in Potchefstroom. The target population was chosen based on the availability of the employees at the selected establishments. The use of a stratified random sampling technique (as used in this study), and sometimes called proportional or quota random sampling, involves dividing the population into homogeneous subgroups and then taking a simple random sample in each subgroup (Trochim & Donnelly, 2007:44). According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970:608), for a population (N) of 460, a sample size (s) of 210 is required. In total, 224 completed questionnaires were received and were included in the analysis. This is more than the necessary number of questionnaires.

Statistical analysis
The data was captured in the Statistical Package of Social Sciences, version 20.0 (SPSS Inc., 2012), and SPSS was further utilised for the statistical analysis as well as to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the analytical process. This assured that the data is interpretable according to the goals and objectives that had been set for the research. Amos (Amos Development Company, 2009) was used for the Structural Equation Model (SEM). The statistical analysis employed in this study formed three (3) stages.

Firstly, the profile of the respondents, the worklife domains and the employee’s business environment were compiled with the help of two-way frequency tables. Secondly, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was applied to the worklife domains and business environment.

Thirdly, a Structural Equation Model was performed to indicate the relationships between the worklife domains and the influence thereof on perceived service delivery and productivity.

Results
The following section will discuss the results of the demographic profile, the factor analysis and the Structural Equation Model.

Results of the demographic profile
The demographic profile indicated that the majority of the respondents were female (61%) with an average age of 31 years. The majority of the food and beverage service employees were single, accounting for 58% of the respondents. This grouping was followed by 37% who were married or living together. The respondents indicated that their highest level of education was
Grade 12 (48%), followed by respondents who indicated that they attended high school (21%). A large percentage (30%) of the employees had not been employed for longer than a year. The majority of the respondents were employed at family restaurants (21%), followed by those employed by bars and clubs (19%). Respondents indicated hotel restaurants (17%) as their place of employment, while 16% were employed at restaurants and 15% indicated that their place of employment was a catering business. The majority (61%) indicated that they received staff meals as an additional benefit and that a quarter (25%) of the employees would have a new job at another type of establishment in the next five years.

Results of the factor analysis

The factors were extracted from the data using a Principal Axis Factor technique to determine the smallest number of factors representing the inter-relationships among the values. The factors in Table 1 were labelled according to the worklife domains and business environment. As discussed in the previous section, no items were cross-loaded onto two or more factors with loadings larger than 0.4. All the items, with a factor loading greater than 0.4, were considered as a contributing factor.

Table 1: Pattern matrix of exploratory axis factor analysis with Oblimin rotation and Kaizer Normalisation on items measuring Quality of Work Life domains and business environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Job attributes</th>
<th>Social attributes</th>
<th>Esteem attributes</th>
<th>Actualisation attributes</th>
<th>Creativity and aesthetic attributes</th>
<th>Organisational support and employee commitment</th>
<th>Service and productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the F&amp;B sector</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy serving people</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am building up experience</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good friends at work</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have flexible hours</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We communicate effectively</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees feel valued</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have workplace unity</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers are interested in us</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am appreciated at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total percentage variance explained for the factors identified in this study ranged between 53.34% and 73.43% (see Table 2). To aid in the interpretation of these factors, an Oblimin with Kaizer Normalisation rotation technique was applied, indicating that factors with an eigenvalue of 1.0> were extracted by Kaiser’s criterion. The factors that were identified, included job attributes, social attributes, esteem attributes, actualisation attributes, creativity and aesthetic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My work is acknowledged</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I contribute to our success</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our uniform looks good</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest satisfaction is my goal</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My full potential</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me to use my talents</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me greater responsibility</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me to give new &amp; fresh ideas</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me to lead a meaningful life</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My professional development</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity is encouraged</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have artistic work facilities</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity is appreciated</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will work hard for the establishment’s success</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk this establishment up to my friends</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine and the establishment’s values are similar</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment inspires job performance</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I normally have a good mood during work hours</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the best establishment to work for</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a productive employee</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I offer individual service for customer needs</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are reached through customer satisfaction</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good relationship with loyal customers</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get frustrated when I am not productive</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of customer complaints</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attributes, organisational support and employee commitment and perceived service delivery and productivity.

**Table 2: Factor analysis of Quality of Work Life domains**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Bartlett’s test P-value</th>
<th>KMO</th>
<th>Variance explained (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha (Reliability coefficient)</th>
<th>Minimum communities</th>
<th>Maximum communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social attributes</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteem attributes</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>56.24</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actualisation attributes</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>66.60</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and aesthetic attributes</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>73.43</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational support and employee commitment attributes</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>58.94</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and productivity attributes</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>61.84</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to interpret the seven factors on the original five-point Likert scale of agreement, factor scores were calculated as the average of all items contributing to a specific factor. The results (Table 2) indicated that the service and productivity business environment attributes scored the highest mean value (4.00), with a reliability coefficient of 0.83. This was followed by the esteem worklife domain (3.68) with a reliability of 0.80. The organisational support and employee commitment business environment attribute scored a mean value of 3.62 and a reliability coefficient of 0.86. This was followed by the social factor (3.42) with reliability of 0.82. The creativity and aesthetic worklife domain indicated a mean value of 3.23 and the reliability coefficient was indicated as 0.82. The actualisation worklife domain indicated the highest reliability coefficient, i.e. 0.90, with a mean value of 3.22. The job satisfaction worklife domain
indicated a mean value of 2.04 and a reliability of 0.74, which indicated that employees evaluated the statement unfavourably.

Results of the Structural Equation Model

Three (3) Structural Equation Models were performed to indicate the relationship between the worklife domains, business environment attributes and perceived service delivery and productivity. It is also normal to test more than one model to obtain the most acceptable fit (Hancock & Mueller, 2006:371). For this reason, different models should be investigated to ensure the best fit. The following results were obtained.

The data was incorporated into Amos (Amos Development Company, 2009) to test the relationship between the worklife domains (social-, esteem- and actualisation attributes) displayed in Figure 2. According to Maslow (1970:22), by satisfying all prior needs, self-actualisation can be reached. As social and esteem attributes are lower in Maslow’s hierarchy than actualisation attributes are, combining social and esteem attributes to actualisation seems appropriate.

The interpretation of correlations as suggested by Cohen (1988:79-81) suggests that a small relationship (r=.10 to .29), a medium relationship (r=.30 to .49) and a large relationship (r=.50 to 1.0) are indicated by these measurements. The correlations between the factors in Figure 2 indicated a large positive correlation between social and actualisation attributes (r=0.66) and between esteem and actualisation attributes (r=0.71) as well as between the social and esteem attributes (r=0.84). Additionally, the standardised regression weights (β - value) indicate that social attributes have a negative influence (β=-.02) on perceived service delivery and productivity, but that this was statistically insignificant (p ≤0.05). Actualisation attributes had a β=.44 influence on the perceived service delivery and productivity, while esteem attributes had a β=.13 influence on perceived service delivery and productivity, but also had no statistical significance.

According to Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin and Summers (1977:86), one example of a statistic that minimises the impacts of sample size on the Model Chi-Square is the relative/normed chi-square or (χ²/df). An acceptable ratio for the Chi-square divided by its degrees of freedom is between 2.0 and 5.0 (Tabacknick & Fidell, 2007:542). Values for the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) should vary between 0.0 and 1.0, with values closer to 1.0 indicating a good fit (Hooper, Coughlan & Mullen, 2008:54) According to Blunch (2008:115), models with RMSEA values of 0.10> should not be accepted. The proposed four-factor model in Figure 2 was tested and revealed the
following results. The $\chi^2$/df is considered acceptable as its value was 3.30. The CFI value for the proposed model was good as its value was 0.81; however, the RMSEA 0.10 with a 90% confidence interval of [0.094; 0.110] was reported. This indicated that the social attributes’ standardised coefficient had a negative influence as respondents could have interpreted this as negative. For this reason, the fit was not acceptable and the model was modified because social and esteem attributes were not statistically significant.

* Statistical significance on a 5% level of significance (p≤0.05)

**Figure 2:** Proposed model of Quality of Work Life on employees’ perceived service delivery and productivity

As the social attributes and esteem attributes (Figure 2) had no statistical significance for the first model, the model was modified and so included two worklife domains and a business environment attribute, as shown in Figure 3. Model 2 includes job attributes, organisational support and employee commitment attributes and actualisation attributes. The correlations between the factors in the modified four-factor model (Figure 3) indicate that there exists a
small-to-large positive correlation between the organisational support and employee commitment attribute and the actualisation attributes (r=0.60), between the actualisation and job attributes (r=0.61) and between the organisational support and employee commitment and job attributes (r=0.54). Additionally, the standardised regression weights (β - value) indicated that actualisation attributes had a β=.20 influence on the perceived service delivery and productivity, but with no statistical significance, while organisational support and employee commitment had no statistically significant (β=.11) influence on perceived service delivery and productivity. The statistically significant influence that job attributes (β=.41) had on perceived service delivery and productivity was the highest. The model in Figure 3 provided the following fit statistics. The \( \chi^2/df \) was considered acceptable, as its value was 2.40. The CFI value for the model was acceptable as its value was 0.88, while the RMSEA was greatly acceptable with a value of 0.08, with a 90% confidence interval of [0.069; 0.088] produced. The RMSEA for Model 2 produced a good fit. However, further modification was necessary so that more literature is supported.
* Statistical significance on a 5% level of significance (p≤0.05)

**Figure 3:** Adapted model of Quality of Work Life on employees’ perceived service delivery and productivity

As organisational support and employee commitment attributes and actualisation attributes (Figure 3) were statistically insignificant (p≤0.05), the model was modified to include three worklife domains and a business environment attribute (see Figure 4). These include job attributes, creativity and aesthetic attributes, organisational support and employee commitment attributes, as well as actualisation attributes.

The correlations between the factors recorded in Figure 4 indicated that there existed large correlations between organisational support and employee commitment and actualisation attributes (r=0.60), between actualisation and job attributes (r=0.61), and between organisational support and employee commitment and job attributes (r=0.54). Creativity and aesthetic attributes and job attributes (r=0.46) also indicated correlations, while organisational support and creativity and aesthetic attributes correlated (r=0.64). Actualisation and creativity and aesthetic attributes correlated (r=0.60) as well. Additionally, the standardised regression weights (β-value) indicated that actualisation attributes had a β=.26 non-statistically significant influence (p≤0.05) on the perceived service delivery and productivity, while organisational support and employee commitment had a β=.20 non-statistically significant influence on perceived service delivery and productivity. The non-statistical significance that creativity and aesthetic attributes (β= -.19) had on perceived service delivery and productivity was negative. The statistically significant influence that job attributes (β=.42) had on perceived service delivery and productivity was the highest.

The model in Figure 4 led to results with the following effects. The x2/df is considered acceptable as its value was 2.35. The CFI value for the proposed model was good with a value of 0.87, while the RMSEA was most acceptable with a value of 0.078 and a 90% confidence interval of [0.070; 0.086] was produced. The results therefore indicated that the data fits this study’s SEM (in Figure 4) well. This suggests adequate and acceptable fit, while other factors (such as creativity and aesthetic-, organisational support and employee commitment- and actualisation attributes) are, according to literature, contributors to perceived service delivery and productivity. The model represented in Figure 4 had a good fit and is suitable in terms of literature support.
* Statistical significance on 5% level of significance (p≤0.05)

**Figure**: 4: Fitted Structural Equation Model of Quality of Work Life on employees’ perceived service delivery and productivity

**Managerial implications**

The following findings were obtained from the Fitted Structural Equation Model, as shown in Figure 4. The contributing attributes will be discussed below along with the implications of each attribute for food and beverage managers.
Firstly, employees felt that their best interests in their working environment should have top priority and that job satisfaction would lead to improved perceived service delivery and productivity. Job satisfaction is also a contributor to Quality of Work Life and supported the argument that a happy employee will be a productive employee. Job attributes had the highest influence on perceived service delivery and productivity and is closely related to job satisfaction. This is supported by Kiernan and Knutson (1990:103), Sirgy et al. (2001:241), Ruab et al. (2006:135), Baum (2007:1383), Robbins and Langton (2007:207), Zelenski et al. (2008:522) and Poulston (2009:24), to name but a few. The implications for managers in the food and beverage sector are that job satisfaction could contribute to perceived service delivery and productivity. According to Silva (2006:321), job satisfaction would increase significantly when employees felt that their remuneration, promotion opportunities, fringe benefits, communication and working conditions would improve.

Secondly, creativity and aesthetic attributes regressed negatively towards perceived service delivery and productivity of employees, and were not statistically significant, although the literature review supports them. According to Maslow (1970:25), human beings have aesthetic needs that require satisfaction, particularly as it contributes to the quality of the working environment. When employees perceive that their current working environment’s level of aesthetics does not contribute towards their productivity, the regression will be negative. Phrased differently, when creativity and aesthetics are developed, the enhancement will have an improved influence on perceived service delivery and productivity. Aesthetics have an influence on satisfaction at work. This implies that managers in the food and beverage sector should try to improve the work environment of employees and make it more instrumental, so that employees can perform at peak levels of productivity. This will ensure an increase in perceived service delivery and productivity (Vilnai-Yavetz, Rafaeli & Yaacov, 2005:545).

Thirdly, the perceived organisational support that the establishments offered to employees positively influenced perceived service delivery and productivity and would lead to job satisfaction, as supported by Susskind, Borchgrevink, Kacmar and Brymer (2000:67). When employees experienced job satisfaction, they were more committed towards the organisation and would experience an employment relationship that was more likely to be perceived as an advantage, one that would encourage the maintenance of employment. Organisational support comes in different shapes and sizes, but tending to the needs of employees should be the main effort that management should undertake. Managers and human resource practitioners should consistently remind themselves that organisational support from the establishment would lead to
job satisfaction that will, in turn, lead to employee commitment. A satisfactory employment relationship will ensure that employees feel valued, thereby contributing to job satisfaction and improved perceived service delivery and productivity (Susskind et al., 2000:67).

Lastly, actualisation had an influence on perceived service delivery and productivity. Sirgy et al. (2001:242) suggest that when one life domain is satisfied, it will spill over to the next life domain. When incorporating worklife domains, it is understandable that when an employee is satisfied with the work environment and reaches ‘actualisation’ at work by fulfilling the employee’s needs, this will generate favourable attitudes and behaviours resulting in improved performance (Kuvaas, 2008:2). Just as actualisation needs contribute to overall life satisfaction, so actualisation attributes at work contribute to job satisfaction. The empowering of employees will lead to job satisfaction that will lead to growth (professional development) and ultimately, to self-actualisation at work (Margalies & Kleiner, 1995:14). By involving employees in decision-making at work and developing their professional skills, managers and human resource practitioners can improve perceived service delivery and productivity. According to Margulies and Kliener (1995:14), when empowering employees and implementing empowered teams, management should treat their employees as an integral part of the team and should spend time getting to know their employees. The latter is one of the core aspects of basic management principles (Saayman, 2009:227). It is, furthermore, recommended that management must demonstrate genuine care for the employee, and build on the employees’ strengths rather than concentrating on their weaknesses. Management should invest in people by creating opportunities for training and development, could share information of the strategic direction and the performance of the establishment, and finally, should allow employees some control over decisions and so enable them to be their own authority.

Limitations and future research
The aim of this study was to investigate the perceived service delivery and productivity in the commercial food and beverage sector of Potchefstroom in South Africa.

The results indicated that job satisfaction is a major contributor to Quality of Work Life and, as expected, it has a large influence on employees’ perceived service delivery and productivity. Job satisfaction incorporates a vast range of possibilities and is the major contributor to perceived service delivery and productivity. When looking at the other worklife domains that were included in the SEM, it would have been possible to use only job satisfaction as the variable that correlates and regresses towards perceived service delivery and productivity. However, there is a
difference between job attributes that lead to job satisfaction and job satisfaction on its own. When investigating the influence of job attributes, creativity and aesthetic attributes, organisational support and employee commitment and actualisation attributes on perceived service delivery and productivity of employees, the research indicated that job attributes had the most significant influence, followed by actualisation attributes, organisational support and employee commitment and lastly creativity and aesthetic attributes. Based on the results, it is recommended that food and beverage managers improve the working conditions of employees as well as providing the appropriate level of recognition for hardworking employees. Management should furthermore consider the recommendations that are made in terms of the job satisfaction of food and beverage service employees, as the recommendation possesses the ability to influence organisational performance and success.

This research was the first study conducted among South African employees in the commercial food and beverage sector and, as such, it contributes to the literature of hospitality management within the South African context. There is, to date, only limited research available on the influence that Quality of Work Life has on the perceived service delivery and productivity of employees in the food and beverage sector. Furthermore, the South African working conditions that influence the employees in their working environments are unique, as are some of the challenges faced in South Africa, and this research considered these aspects.

One possible limitation of the research could be that the research was completed in just one South African city. Furthermore, it was only conducted as it concerned food and beverage service employees, and therefore no generalisations concerning the hospitality industry can be made. It is therefore recommended that future research be conducted on the advancement of perceived service delivery and productivity in the greater tourism industry and hospitality sector as this could lead to a more competitive industry. An investigation into the improvement of perceived service delivery and productivity could also be conducted, nationally, and internationally, to compare results. Furthermore, research into other sectors of the expanded tourism industry could also be undertaken. Investigating other front-line employees in different departments or sectors could well reveal interesting results and have interesting managerial implications. All functional departments in the hospitality sector of the great tourism industry would benefit from this type of research, as tourism is a service-orientated sector, and is highly dependent on the employees who serve therein.
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