The Effects of industrial workers' food choice attribute on sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction with Structural Equation Model
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BACKGROUND/OBJECTIVES: This research analyzes the effects of the food choices of industrial workers according to their sugar intake pattern on their job satisfaction through the construction of a model on the relationship between sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction.

SUBJECTS/METHODS: Surveys were collected from May to July 2015. A statistical analysis of the 775 surveys from Kyungsangnam-do was conducted using SPSS13.0 for Windows and SEM was performed using the AMOS 5.0 statistics package.

RESULTS: The reliability of the data was confirmed by an exploratory factor analysis through a Cronbach's alpha coefficient, and the measurement model was proven to be appropriate by a confirmatory factor analysis in conjunction with AMOS. The results of factor analysis on food choice, sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction were categorized into five categories. The reliability of these findings was supported by a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.6 and higher for all factors except confection (0.516) and dairy products (0.570). The multicollinearity results did not indicate a problem between the variables since the highest correlation coefficient was 0.494 ($P < 0.01$). In an attempt to study the sugar intake pattern in accordance with the food choices and job satisfaction of industrial workers, a structural equation model was constructed and analyzed.

CONCLUSIONS: All tests confirmed that the model satisfied the recommended levels for the goodness of fit index, and thus, the overall research model was proven to be appropriate.
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INTRODUCTION

People's eating habits have a decisive effect on their health. Food choice is a seemingly simple but actually very crowded behavior influenced by many interacting factors. The mood is used most often in customer and marketing service research examining store atmospherics. Environmental factors of people, time of consumption, smell, colors, or physical setting might influence food intake and food choice, resulting in a lack of appropriate adaptations in intake. Knowledge of consumer behavior was soon asserted by marketing sections who, being trained in general marketing techniques, usually had very little knowledge about the sensory and nutritional aspects of the products they were dealing with and little insight into the very special nature of eating behavior.

Sugar now accounts for an unprecedented proportion of the human diet. A study has preliminarily probed the hypothesis that sugar consumption may impact the prevalence of major depression by correlating the per capita consumption of sugar with the prevalence of major depression. Generally speaking, 'sugar' signify simple sugars and the consumption of food with a lot of simple sugars causes an individual to consume less of other foods that are high in diverse nutrients, leading to a nutritional imbalance. It could also lead to obesity as the calories got from sugar can accumulate easily as body fat. The use of favorite foods is however recently increasing and the intake of sugar is showing a continual increase because of the westernization of dietary life. The sugar intake of Koreans in 2010 was 61.4 g, an growth of 23% from 49.9 g in 2008. Especially, sugar intake from processed food grew by 41% from 19.3 g in 2008 to 27.3 g in 2010. This trend was indicated across all ages, leading to concerns about young children developing adult diseases. The Korean government has set up a nationwide food safety system with strict control of hazardous nutrients like sugar, fatty acids and sodium as well as an advanced nutrition education system. Previously, it was reported that as the level of stress experienced by students increased, the more frequently they consumed sugar such as candy, chocolate, pastry and beverages. Therefore, this study aims at finding the relationship between job satisfaction and sugar intake pattern for industrial workers.

Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state resulting from the valuation of one's work and experience. Job satisfaction is an essential part of the organizational climate and an important element in the management-employee relationship. It is the positive emotional state that appears when a person's job
seems to achieve important job values, provided these values are harmonious with one’s needs [11]. The effects of workplace stress on employees’ health is associated with negative organizational outcomes such as job dissatisfaction, burnout, and absenteeism [12-14]. There are many existing studies that have researched food intake for different age groups, but many of them were focused on children. Thus, the present study intends to provide basic data to improve job satisfaction by determining the sugar intake pattern and explicating its relationship with job satisfaction through analyzing the food choices of industrial workers.

**SUBJECTS AND METHOD**

**Subjects**

This study conducted a survey of 1,050 male and female industrial workers (White & blue collar) in Kyungsangnam-do from May to July 2015. 775 workers were selected as the subjects of analysis, and each participant spent approximately 30 to 40 minutes on the survey. Survey protocols, instruments, and the process for obtaining informed consent for this study were approved by the institutional review committees of Sookmyung Women’s University (SMWU-1504-HR-006). All participants gave their written informed consent.

**Questionnaire**

For the general status of the target sample, we investigated gender, age and general health status of workers. And the questionnaire for Food choice attributes was constructed with reference to relevant previous studies [15-19] and consisted of 22 items on Sugar intake [7,10,19] from fruits, snacks, beverages, confections and dairy products. The questionnaire for industrial workers’ job satisfaction was composed with reference to related previous studies [20-22] and consisted of 22 items on work, pay, performance, people, and environment satisfaction, measured using a 5-point Likert scale.

**Research hypotheses**

A structural equation model was used to examine the effect of industrial workers’ food choices on their sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 1. Food choice attribute will be significantly different depending on the sugar intake pattern.

Hypothesis 2. Sugar intake pattern will be significantly different depending on the job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3. Food choice attribute will be significantly different depending on the job satisfaction.

**Statistical analysis**

All of the collected data were analyzed with SPSS 13.0 for Windows and AMOS (Analysis of Moment Structure) 5.0 Statistical programs. In order to test the unidimensionality of multiple items that comprised each factor, exploratory factor analysis and reliability tests were performed. After evaluating the validity of the measured items by performing confirmatory factor analysis for each factor, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to determine the path coefficients of the research model.

**RESULTS**

**General characteristics**

As shown in Table 1, 638 (82.3%) industrial workers were male and 535 (69.0%) were aged 30-49. The majority (52.9%) of industrial workers was in normal health, and 39.0% of them were either unhealthy or very unhealthy.

**Exploratory factor analysis on measurement models**

**Food choice attribute**

According to the results of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on Food choice attribute items, 5 factors were extracted (Table 2). The explanatory power was 71.582%, and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients showed a reliability of 0.811, 0.903, 0.853, 0.814 and 0.660. Factor 1 was named ‘Health’, factor 2 ‘Mood’, factor 3 ‘Convenience’ factor 4 ‘Sensory appeal’, and factor 5 ‘Price’.

**Sugar intake pattern**

The results for the 16 items under the sugar intake pattern as determined by the exploratory factor analysis are presented in Table 3. Sugar intake pattern was categorized into the five factors ‘Fruit’, ‘Snack’, ‘Beverage’, ‘Confection’ and ‘Dairy product’. The reliability of these findings was supported by Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.851, 0.705, 0.744, 0.516, and 0.570, respectively. The validity was established by an explanatory power of 64.207% for the dietary factors.

**Job satisfaction**

Table 4 displays the results of the 18 items under health promotion behavior as indicated by the exploratory factor analysis. Five factors in total were identified as a result of the first factor analysis, but a low Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was found from the factor including items. Therefore, a second factor analysis was conducted after the items were excluded. Five factors were subsequently identified and explained 69.424% of the results. The respective Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for factors 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were reported as 0.878, 0.860, 0.794, 0.728, 0.792 and 0.787. Factor 1 was named ‘Work’, factor 2 ‘Pay’, factor 3 ‘Performance’, factor 4 ‘People’, and factor 5 ‘Environment’.

| **Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of the respondents (N = 775) |
|-----------------|---------|-------------|
| **Category**    | **N**   | **%**       |
| Gender          |         |             |
| Male            | 638     | 82.30       |
| Female          | 137     | 17.70       |
| Age(yrs)        |         |             |
| 20-29           | 159     | 20.50       |
| 30-39           | 334     | 43.10       |
| 40-49           | 201     | 25.90       |
| ≥50             | 81      | 10.50       |
| General health status |     |             |
| Very healthy    | 21      | 2.70        |
| Healthy         | 155     | 20.00       |
| Average         | 402     | 51.90       |
| Unhealthy       | 167     | 21.50       |
| Very unhealthy  | 30      | 3.90        |
Table 2. Explorative factor analysis on food choice attributes of industrial workers

| Factor name | Question                       | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 | Cronbach’s alpha |
|-------------|--------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Health      | Is nutritious                  | 0.764    |          |          |          |          | 0.811           |
|             | Contains natural ingredients  | 0.886    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Contains no additives         | 0.843    |          |          |          |          |                 |
| Mood        | Cheers me up                   | 0.893    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Helps me to cope with life    | 0.858    |          |          |          | 0.903    |                 |
|             | Makes me feel good            | 0.856    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Helps me relax                 | 0.844    |          |          |          |          |                 |
| Convenience | Can be cooked very simply     |          | 0.905    |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Is easy to prepare            |          | 0.855    |          | 0.853    |          |                 |
|             | Can be bought in shops close to where I live or work |          | 0.812    |          |          |          |                 |
| Sensory appeal | Has a pleasant texture  |          |          | 0.830    |          |          |                 |
|             | Looks nice                     |          |          | 0.829    |          | 0.814    |                 |
|             | Smells nice                    |          |          | 0.786    |          |          |                 |
|             | Tastes good                    |          |          | 0.668    |          |          |                 |
| Price       | Is not expensive               |          |          |          |          | 0.823    |                 |
|             | Is cheap                       |          |          |          | 0.740    | 0.660    |                 |
|             | Is good value for the money   |          |          |          |          | 0.694    |                 |
| Eigen-value |                                 | 2.226    | 3.134    | 2.626    | 2.343    | 1.840    |                 |
| Explained rate (%) |                         | 13.095   | 18.438   | 15.446   | 13.780   | 10.823   |                 |
| Cumulative percentage |                      | 13.095   | 31.533   | 46.979   | 60.759   | 71.582   |                 |

Table 3. Explorative factor analysis on sugar intake pattern of industrial workers

| Factor name | Question                               | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 | Cronbach’s alpha |
|-------------|----------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Fruit       | Pear                                   | 0.867    |          |          |          |          | 0.851           |
|             | Persimmon                              | 0.843    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Grape                                  | 0.822    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Tangerine                              | 0.688    |          |          |          |          |                 |
| Snack       | Sweet and sour pork                    | 0.775    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Jabchae                                | 0.691    |          |          |          |          | 0.705           |
|             | Tteok-bokki                            | 0.671    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Pizza                                  | 0.622    |          |          |          |          |                 |
| Beverage    | Soda                                   | 0.821    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Beverages                              | 0.797    |          |          |          |          | 0.744           |
|             | Juice or fruit-flavored                | 0.782    |          |          |          |          |                 |
| Confection  | Chocolate                              | 0.796    |          |          |          |          |                 |
|             | Caramel                                | 0.669    |          |          |          |          | 0.516           |
|             | Candies                                | 0.651    |          |          |          |          |                 |
| Dairy product | Yogurt eaten with a spoon          | 0.789    |          |          |          |          | 0.570           |
|             | Drinking yogurt                       |          |          |          |          |          | 0.775           |
| Eigen-value |                                 | 2.873    | 2.206    | 2.042    | 1.673    | 1.480    |                 |
| Explained rate (%) |                     | 17.955   | 13.785   | 12.760   | 10.457   | 9.250    |                 |
| Cumulative percentage |                  | 17.955   | 31.739   | 44.500   | 54.957   | 64.207   |                 |

Correlation analysis for the variables

The results, as shown in Table 5, indicate that multicollinearity was not a problem with most variables since the highest correlation coefficient was 0.494. The highest expected correlation was between 'Pay' and 'Performance' (r = 0.494, P < 0.01), followed 'Fruit' and 'Snack' (r = 0.417, P < 0.01), 'People' and 'Environment' (r = 0.382, P < 0.01) and 'Pay' and 'People' (r = 0.378, P < 0.01).

Confirmatory factor analysis on the measurement model

The results of confirmatory factor analysis on the measurement model are shown in Table 6. The Goodness-of-fit index results for the model are shown in Table 6 along with the recommended level for each index. The model was also confirmed as appropriate since the optimal results revealed the values of $\chi^2 = 2423.627$, GFI = 0.886, AGFI = 0.865, IFI = 0.921, NFI = 0.862, CFI = 0.920, RMR = 0.054, and RMSEA = 0.039, which satisfied the recommended standards, and also proved the model to be appropriate.
Table 4. Explorative factor analysis of job satisfaction of industrial workers

| Factor name | Question | Factor1 | Factor2 | Factor3 | Factor4 | Factor5 | Cronbach's alpha |
|-------------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|
| Work        | I like doing the things I do at work | 0.863   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | My job is enjoyable             | 0.854   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | I feel a sense of pride in doing my job | 0.794   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | I enjoy my work more than others | 0.784   |         |         |         |         |                  |
| Pay         | I receive high wages compared to others doing the same job | 0.844   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | Wage determination process is fair | 0.849   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases | 0.757   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | I feel I am being paid a suitable amount for the work I do | 0.749   |         |         |         |         |                  |
| Performance | There are sufficient opportunities for training relevant to operations | 0.837   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | I have opportunities to learn what I want to learn | 0.784   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | Personnel evaluation is relatively fair | 0.594   |         |         |         |         |                  |
| People      | My supervisor is fair to me | 0.805   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | Communications seem good within this organization | 0.797   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | The supervisor encourages employees when a problem arises | 0.718   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | I enjoy my coworkers | 0.685   |         |         |         |         |                  |
| Environment | The labor force maintains suitable business conduct in the office | 0.842   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | There is a fresh, novel atmosphere about the place | 0.831   |         |         |         |         |                  |
|             | I am satisfied with the office environment | 0.693   |         |         |         |         |                  |

Eigen-value  2.989  2.924  1.915  2.526  2.142
Explained rate (%) 16.607 16.244 10.640 14.033 11.900
Cumulative percentage 16.607 32.851 43.491 57.524 69.424

Table 5. Correlation analysis for variables

| Variables | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A         | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B         | 0.272** | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| C         | -0.151** | 0.046 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| D         | 0.065 | 0.282** | 0.265** | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| E         | 0.050 | 0.133** | 0.235** | 0.258** | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| F         | 0.098** | -0.029 | -0.071* | -0.027 | -0.039 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| G         | -0.002 | -0.040 | -0.029 | -0.072* | -0.040 | 0.417** | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| H         | 0.020 | 0.006 | 0.059 | 0.035 | 0.048 | 0.223** | 0.288** | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| I         | -0.085* | 0.035 | 0.034 | 0.051 | 0.007 | 0.318** | 0.329** | 0.179** | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| J         | 0.022 | 0.055 | -0.091* | -0.025 | -0.055 | 0.326** | 0.320** | 0.097** | 0.290** | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |
| K         | 0.152** | 0.095** | 0.074* | 0.122** | 0.126** | 0.008 | -0.119** | -0.029 | -0.064 | -0.029 | 1 |   |   |   |   |
| L         | 0.048 | 0.081* | 0.023 | 0.098** | 0.059 | 0.061 | -0.018 | 0.021 | 0.010 | -0.062 | 0.324** | 1 |   |   |   |
| M         | 0.052 | 0.044 | 0.046 | 0.030 | -0.024 | 0.045 | 0.005 | -0.012 | -0.001 | -0.009 | 0.267** | 0.494** | 1 |   |   |
| N         | 0.023 | 0.065 | 0.072* | 0.165** | 0.116** | -0.020 | -0.110** | 0.001 | -0.043 | -0.066 | 0.378** | 0.233** | 0.315** | 1 |   |
| O         | 0.090* | 0.038 | 0.057 | 0.053 | 0.088** | 0.015 | -0.072* | 0.006 | -0.028 | -0.112** | 0.328** | 0.335** | 0.361** | 0.382** | 1 |

1) A: Health, B: Mood, C: Convenience, D: Sensory appeal, E: Price, F: Fruit, G: Snack, H: Beverage, I: Confection, J: Dairy Product, K: Work, L: Pay, M: Performance, N: People, O: Environment.
*, ** P < 0.05, ** P < 0.01, *** P < 0.001.

Model fit test of the measurement model

The Structural Equation Model, which is a multi-variate analysis method that simplifies the process of making inferences on the causality among variables, is a technique that can analyze and evaluate interrelation among variables within the whole model and clarify the structural relationships among variables. The present study selected the optimal model as well as the optimal fit indices (CMIN/DF, IFI, CFI), which play a role in enhancing the fit of the model using the modification indices. The structural equation model was used as the theoretical model to analyze sugar intake and job satisfaction in accordance with the food choices of industrial workers. Table 7 presents the results of the hypothetical model fit indices as χ² = 2767.575, GFI = 0.874, AGFI = 0.852, IFI = 0.901, NFI = 0.843,
Table 6. Goodness of fit in confirmatory factor analysis

| Model               | $\chi^2$ (P-value) | $\chi^2$/df | GFI | AGFI | IFI | NFI | CFI | RMR | RMSEA |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Optimum model       | P > (.05)          | 2-3         | .90-1| .90-1| .90-1| .90-1| < .05| < .5 |
| Hypothetical model  | 2,423.627 (.000)   | 2.166       | 0.886| 0.865| 0.921| 0.862| 0.920| 0.054| 0.039 |

1) $\chi^2$: Chi-square.
2) $\chi^2$/df: Chi-square divided by degree of freedom.
3) GFI: Goodness of fit index.
4) AGFI: Adjusted goodness of fit index.
5) IFI: Incremental fit index.
6) NFI: Normed fit index.
7) CFI: Comparative fit index.
8) RMR: Root mean residual.
9) RMSEA: Root mean squared error of approximation.

Table 7. Hypothetical model fit index

| Model               | $\chi^2$ (P-value) | $\chi^2$/df | GFI | AGFI | IFI | NFI | CFI | RMR | RMSEA |
|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| Goodness of fit criteria | P > (.05)          | 2-3         | .90-1| .90-1| .90-1| .90-1| < .05| < .5 |
| Hypothetical model  | 2,767.575 (.000)   | 2.443       | 0.874| 0.852| 0.901| 0.843| 0.900| 0.059| 0.043 |

1) $\chi^2$: Chi-square.
2) $\chi^2$/df: Chi-square divided by degree of freedom.
3) GFI: Goodness of fit index.
4) AGFI: Adjusted goodness of fit index.
5) IFI: Incremental fit index.
6) NFI: Normed fit index.
7) CFI: Comparative fit index.
8) RMR: Root mean residual.
9) RMSEA: Root mean squared error of approximation.

Fig. 1. Final results of the model analysis using AMOS

CFI = 0.900, RMR = 0.059, and RMSEA = 0.043. Although the $\chi^2$ value indicated a poor fit, the current research model in Fig. 1 was confirmed to be appropriate since the other indices like CMIN/DF, IFI, CFI, and RMSEA were proven to be appropriate, and GFI, AGFI, NFI and RMR satisfied the recommended standards.

**DISCUSSION**

This research analyzes the food choices of industrial workers, presenting the effect of sugar intake on their food choices through the construction of a model on the relationship between the sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction. The audience for the surveys was industrial workers, and they were sampled during the period between May to July 2015.

Factor analysis was applied to: 17 questions related to food choice attribute, 16 questions related to sugar intake pattern and 18 questions related to job satisfaction. Questions in the food choice attribute category were grouped under 5 factors, as were sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction. The results of exploratory factor analysis showed that the Cronbach's alpha was nearly 0.6 or above for all factors, which established the reliability. Correlation analysis revealed that multicollinearity was not a problem with most of the variables since the highest correlation coefficient was 0.494. After factors were identified through exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis of the measurement model was performed with AMOS to establish the validity. The $\chi^2$ value was found to be unsuitable, but the other indices except for these two values were good enough to satisfy the recommended level.
The results of testing Hypothesis 1 showed that ‘Price’ had a significant negative (-) effect on ‘Fruit’, ‘Snack’, ‘Dairy Product’, ‘Confection’ and ‘Beverage’. Sensory appeal was found to have a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Fruit’, ‘Snack’, ‘Dairy Product’, ‘Confection’ and ‘Beverage’. ‘Convenience’ had a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Snack’, ‘Confection’, ‘Beverage’ and ‘Fruit’, but not on ‘Dairy Product’. ‘Health’ and ‘Mood’ did not have significant effects on ‘Fruit’, ‘Snack’, ‘Beverage’, ‘Confection’ or ‘Dairy Product’. This result was in agreement with that of Yea [24], who reported that health and natural content scored the lowest for dessert choice attributes. On the other hand, Meiselman [25] reported that the influence of the environment on food choice affected the perception of food quality.

The results of testing Hypothesis 2 showed that the consumption of sugar in the form of fruits had a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Work’, ‘Pay’, ‘Performance’, ‘People’ and ‘Environment’. The intake of sugar in the form of snacks was shown to have a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Performance’, ‘Pay’, ‘Environment’, ‘People’ and ‘Work’ while the intake of sugar in the form of beverages had a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Pay’, ‘Environment’, ‘Work’, ‘People’ and ‘Performance’. The intake of sugar in the form of confections was found to have a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Performance’, ‘Pay’, ‘Environment’, ‘People’ and ‘Work’. In contrast, the consumption of sugar in the form of daily products was found to have a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Work’, ‘Performance’, ‘People’, and ‘Pay’, but not on ‘Environment’. Similar results were reported by Yan [26]. In this previous study, sugary food was consumed more often when satisfaction with school life was higher. This study found that all sugar intake patterns affect the job satisfaction of industrial workers. Therefore, the results obtained in this study would be useful for the development of a sugar reduction policy or project plans involving the relationship between sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction.

The results of testing Hypothesis 3 showed that ‘Price’ had a significant positive (+) effect on ‘Pay’, ‘Performance’, ‘Environment’, ‘Work’ and ‘People’. Sensory appeal was shown to have a significant negative (-) effect on ‘Performance’, ‘Pay’, ‘Environment’ and ‘Work’, but not on ‘People’. ‘Convenience’ had a significant negative (-) effect on ‘Pay’, ‘Performance’, ‘Environment’ and ‘People’, but not on ‘Work’. ‘Health’ and ‘Mood’ did not have significant effects on ‘Work’, ‘Pay’, ‘Performance’, ‘People’ or ‘Environment’. Job satisfaction affects work behavior and organizational performance [27]. A study evaluating the breakfast eating habits of workers found that breakfast boosted job satisfaction and had a positive effect on work efficiency [28]. Ryu [22] also reported that income did affect the job satisfaction of workers. The study demonstrated that the higher the average monthly income is, the higher the level of job satisfaction. According to the present study, ‘Price’ was found to have a significant positive effect on all aspects of job satisfaction. This may have been because ‘Price’ is one of the most important food choice attributes for industrial workers.

The results of this study provide exact data on the food choices of industrial workers and demonstrate the effects on their sugar intake pattern and job satisfaction. The results can be used as basic data to determine the right food choices, optimal diets and suitable nutrition policies in the future with proper regulation of sugar intake. Additionally, a national support policy is necessary for the continued maintenance and development of a variety of programs that facilitate job satisfaction for industrial workers and promote personal education guidelines.

REFERENCES

1. Sharma A, Stafford TF. The effect of retail atmospherics on customers’ perceptions of salespeople and customer persuasion. An empirical investigation. J Bus Res 2000;49:183-91.
2. Köster EP. Diversity in the determinants of food choice: a psychological perspective. Food Qual Prefer 2009;20:70-82.
3. Meiselman HL. Methodology and theory in human eating research. Appetite 1992;19:49-55.
4. Meiselman HL. Obstacles to studying real people eating real meals in real situations. Appetite 1992;19:84-6.
5. Westover AN, Marangell LB. A cross-national relationship between sugar consumption and major depression? Depress Anxiety 2002;16: 118-20.
6. Kang JH. The Correlation Analysis of Sugars Excess-intake and Obesity or Chronic Disease and the Development of Sugar-reduction Model. Cheongwon: National Institute of Food and Drug Safety Evaluation; 2013.
7. Yoo JH. Frequency of sweetened food consumption from elementary school students and assessment [master’s thesis]. Seoul: The Graduate School of Education Sookmyung Women’s University; 2010.
8. Park HR. Developing a Nutrition Education Model for Reducing Sugar Intake. Cheongwon: Ministry of Food and Drug Safety; 2013.
9. Park YG, Lee EM, Kim CS, Eom JH, Byun JA, Sun NK, Lee JH, Heo OS. Survey on the content and intake pattern of sugar from elementary and middle school foodservices in Daejeon and Chungcheong province. J Korean Soc Food Sci Nutr 2010;39:1545-54.
10. Yan HY. The impact of the academic stress level on sugar food consumption patterns for high school students in Gyeonggi area [master’s thesis]. Seoul: The Graduate School of Education Kyung Hee University; 2012.
11. Kafetsios K, Zampetakis LA. Emotional intelligence and job satisfaction: testing the mediatory role of positive and negative affect at work. Pers Individ Dif 2008;44:712-22.
12. Boswell WR, Olson-Buchanan JB, LePine MA. Relations between stress and work outcomes: the role of felt challenge, job control, and psychological strain. J Vocat Behav 2004;64:165-81.
13. Coomber B, Barriball KL. Impact of job satisfaction components on intent to leave and turnover for hospital-based nurses: a review of the research literature. Int J Nurs Stud 2007;44:297-314.
14. Lambert EG, Hogan NL, Barton SM. The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. Soc Sci J 2001;38:233-50.
15. Connors M, Bisogni CA, Sobal J, Devine CM. Managing values in personal food systems. Appetite 2001;36:189-200.
16. Steptoe A, Pollard TM, Wardle J. Development of a measure of the motives underlying the selection of food: the food choice questionnaire. Appetite 1995;25:267-84.
17. Fotopoulos C, Krystallis A, Vassallo M, Pagiaslis A. Food Choice Questionnaire (FCCQ) revisited. Suggestions for the development of an enhanced general food motivation model. Appetite 2009;52:199-208.
18. Prescott J, Young O, O’Neill L, Yau NJ, Stevens R. Motives for food
choice: a comparison of consumers from Japan, Taiwan, Malaysia and New Zealand. Food Qual Prefer 2002;13:489-95.
19. Wądolowska L, Babicz-Zielińska E, Czarnocińska J. Food choice models and their relation with food preferences and eating frequency in the polish population: POPPRES study. Food Policy 2008;33:122-34.
20. Sung KH. A comparison and analysis of job satisfaction between regularly and irregularly employed school foodservice dietitians: based in select areas of Gyeongsangnam-do [master’s thesis]. Changwon: The Graduate School of Education Kyungnam University; 2008.
21. Shin SH. A comparison of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work performance and work satisfaction between nutrition teachers and dietitians at school in Gyeongsangnam-do area [master’s thesis]. Changwon: The Graduate School of Education Kyungnam University; 2015.
22. Ryu DH. The study on factors of having an effect on job satisfaction of industry workers [master’s thesis]. Gyeongsan: The Graduate School of Education Daegu University; 2014.
23. Kim JS. The effects of elderly patients’ dental satisfaction on revisit intention with the application of SEM [doctor’s thesis]. Incheon: The Graduate School Inha University; 2013.
24. Yea JS. A study on dessert choice and consumer behavior depending on consumer value [master’s thesis]. Seoul: The Graduate School Ewha Womans University; 2010.
25. Meiselman HL. The contextual basis for food acceptance, food choice and food intake: the food, the situation and the individual. In: Meiselman HL, MacFie HJ, editors. Food Choice, Acceptance and Consumption. London: Blackie Academic & Professional; 1996. p.239-63.
26. Yan HY. The impact of the academic stress level on sugar food consumption patterns for high school students in Gyeonggi area [master’s thesis]. Seoul: The Graduate School of Education Kyung Hee University; 2012.
27. Bakotić D, Babić T. Relationship between Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Croatian Shipbuilding Company. International Journal of Business and Social Science 2013;4:206-13.
28. Cho MA. A study on the breakfast habits and the maintenance of health affecting the job satisfaction [master’s thesis]. Hongseong-eup: The Graduate School of Information Industry Chungwoon University; 2011.