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

1. Introduction

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

2. Journals reviewed

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

2.1. Connotation Analysis of Employee Satisfaction

Employee satisfaction was first proposed and studied by American psychologist Hoppock in 1935. The concept mainly includes employees' physiological and psychological sense of job satisfaction and environmental satisfaction (Kuang Jiaqing, 2013). Xu Qin (2015) believes that employee satisfaction
is the difference between the actual value of employees and the expected value of that in the working environment. Chen Shan (2016) believes that employee satisfaction refers to the degree to which employees compare their actual feelings and expectations in terms of salary and benefits, working environment, promotion mechanism, vocational training and other labor conditions provided by enterprises.

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

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

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

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

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

The content of the questionnaire is mainly composed of basic personal information and main information. Personal information includes gender, age, educational background, length of service and position, which are the reference indicators. The main information includes 27 evaluation indicators, specifically: Basic wage $X_1$, allowance and bonus $X_2$, board and lodging $X_3$, rest time $X_4$, working environment safety $X_5$, health protection $X_6$, facility and equipment safety $X_7$, occupational security $X_8$, occupational security $X_8$,
fringe benefits $X_9$, punctuality of wage payment $X_{10}$, fairness of wages $X_{11}$, overtime pay $X_{12}$, relations with superiors $X_{13}$, relationship with peers $X_{14}$, relationship with customers $X_{15}$, relations with other store colleagues $X_{16}$, self-confidence $X_{17}$, self-respect $X_{18}$, superior recognition $X_{19}$, coworkers’ affirmation $X_{20}$, guests’ praise $X_{21}$, collaboration among employees $X_{22}$, ability of interpersonal communication $X_{23}$, the pertinence of training content $X_{24}$, effect of training $X_{25}$, clarification of promotion mechanism $X_{26}$, fairness of promotion system $X_{27}$.

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

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

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

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure | Bartlett Examination | Approximate chi square | df | Sig. | .853 |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----|------|------|

| Cronbach's Alpha | Item number |
|------------------|-------------|
| .923             | 32          |

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

| Table 3 Total variance explained |
|----------------------------------|
| Initial eigenvalue | Variance | accumulate | Total | Variance | accumulate | Total | Variance | accumulate |
|-------------------|----------|------------|-------|----------|------------|-------|----------|------------|
| 1                 | 9.145    | 33.871     | 33.871| 9.145    | 33.871     | 33.871| 3.688    | 13.657     |
| 2                 | 2.834    | 10.496     | 44.367| 2.834    | 10.496     | 44.367| 3.681    | 13.632     |
| 3                 | 1.739    | 6.442      | 50.809| 1.739    | 6.442      | 50.809| 3.679    | 13.627     |
| 4                 | 1.574    | 5.830      | 56.640| 1.574    | 5.830      | 56.640| 3.074    | 11.386     |
| 5                 | 1.334    | 4.942      | 61.581| 1.334    | 4.942      | 61.581| 2.505    | 9.279      |
| 6                 | .998     | 3.698      | 65.279| .998     | 3.698      | 65.279| .864     | 3.216      |
| 7                 | .868     | 3.216      | 68.495| .868     | 3.216      | 68.495| .806     | 2.984      |
| 8                 | .806     | 2.984      | 71.479| .806     | 2.984      | 71.479| .806     | 2.984      |
Five main factors were analyzed. The first main factors include: basic wage $X_1$, allowance and bonus $X_2$, rest time $X_4$, fairness of wages $X_{11}$, fringe benefits $X_9$, board and lodging $X_3$. It was named as the factor of work treatment, and the contribution rate was 33.871%. The second main factors include: guests’ praise $X_{21}$, self-confidence $X_{17}$, working environment safety $X_5$, self-respect $X_{18}$, ability of interpersonal communication $X_{23}$, coworkers’ affirmation $X_{20}$, facility and equipment safety $X_7$. It was named work atmosphere and environment factor, and the contribution rate was 10.496%. The third main factors include: effect of training $X_{25}$, the pertinence of training content $X_{24}$, clarification of promotion mechanism $X_{26}$, superior recognition $X_{19}$, fairness of promotion system $X_{27}$. It was named personal development factor with a contribution rate of 6.442%. The fourth main factors include: collaboration among employees $X_{22}$, relations with other store colleagues $X_{16}$, relationship with customers $X_{15}$, relationship with peers $X_{14}$, and relations with superiors $X_{13}$. It was named as interpersonal relationship factor with a contribution rate of 5.830%. The fifth main factors include: punctuality of wage payment $X_{10}$, health protection $X_6$, overtime pay $X_{12}$, and occupational security $X_8$. It was named as work stability factor with a contribution rate of 4.942%. See Table 4.

Table 4 Rotating Component Matrix

| Ingredients | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| $X_1$      | .871 | .031 | -.016| .036 | .055 |
| $X_2$      | .833 | .130 | -.063| .068 | .159 |
| $X_4$      | .748 | .131 | .301 | -.052| .066 |
| $X_{11}$   | .714 | -.045| .242 | .266 | .058 |
| $X_9$      | .538 | .315 | -.036| .179 | .418 |
| $X_5$      | .400 | .312 | .308 | -.324| .045 |
| $X_{31}$   | .030 | .764 | .115 | .146 | .026 |
| $X_{17}$   | .075 | .711 | .033 | -.007| .278 |
| $X_6$      | .147 | .658 | .123 | .465 | .154 |
| $X_{18}$   | .059 | .575 | .234 | .432 | .006 |
| $X_{33}$   | .278 | .551 | .519 | .125 | -.039|
| $X_{50}$   | .055 | .501 | .257 | .344 | .138 |
| $X_7$      | .209 | .484 | .437 | .050 | .222 |
| $X_{35}$   | .020 | .323 | .743 | .285 | -.009|
| $X_{24}$   | .084 | .332 | .695 | .059 | .342 |
Method of extraction: principal component. The rotation converges after 12 iterations.

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

### Table 5 Component Score Coefficient Matrix

| Ingredients | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4        | 5        |
|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| X1          | .293     | -.042    | -.079    | .024     | -.062    |
| X2          | .267     | .005     | -.130    | .029     | -.008    |
| X3          | .091     | .107     | .141     | -.275    | -.022    |
| X4          | .222     | -.032    | .092     | -.100    | -.059    |
| X5          | -.006    | .215     | -.158    | .139     | -.022    |
| X6          | -.019    | -.065    | -.072    | .028     | .338     |
| X7          | -.006    | .121     | .108     | -.135    | .041     |
| X8          | .009     | -.073    | .088     | -.018    | .186     |
| X9          | .129     | .076     | -.165    | .035     | .138     |
| X10         | -.123    | .030     | -.065    | -.067    | .398     |
| X11         | .230     | -.141    | .033     | .107     | -.075    |
| X12         | .020     | -.071    | .082     | -.114    | .287     |
| X13         | .019     | -.148    | .114     | .174     | .003     |
| X14         | -.058    | .047     | -.024    | .188     | .006     |
| X15         | .118     | -.034    | -.131    | .281     | -.070    |
| X16         | -.007    | -.057    | -.085    | .247     | .116     |
| X17         | -.046    | .310     | -.124    | -.122    | .098     |
| X18         | -.024    | .175     | -.066    | .122     | -.091    |
| X19         | -.011    | -.131    | .215     | -.015    | .111     |
| X20         | -.037    | .139     | -.031    | .066     | -.008    |
| X21         | -.043    | .320     | -.103    | -.038    | -.055    |
| X22         | -.042    | .007     | -.068    | .296     | -.058    |
| X23         | .035     | .142     | .134     | -.093    | -.123    |
| X24         | -.068    | .004     | .268     | -.174    | .112     |
| X25         | -.055    | -.010    | .274     | -.027    | -.094    |
| X26         | -.072    | -.177    | .267     | .144     | -.073    |
| X27         | .057     | .102     | .150     | -.061    | -.137    |

The function that can express the factor score is: $Y_n = \sum_{m=1}^{27} a_{mn} X_m \quad n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \quad \text{formula (4.1)}$
Among them, $Y_n$ represents the $n$th common factor score in grass-roots employee satisfaction. $\alpha_{mn}$ denotes the coefficients of the $n$th column in the $m$ row of the coefficient matrix. According to SPSS analysis, it can be concluded that Jinan Rujia Hotel grassroots employee satisfaction score expression:

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

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

5. Conclusion

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

| Table 6  | Score Table of Employee Satisfaction for Each Factor |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| factor   | Score of factors                                    |
| work treatment $Y_1$ | 0.2957                                   |
| work atmosphere and environment $Y_2$ | 0.0860                                   |
| personal development $Y_3$ | 0.0428                                   |
| interpersonal relationship $Y_4$ | 0.0373                                   |
| work stability $Y_5$ | 0.0430                                   |

5.1 Analysis of the factors of job treatment

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

5.2 Analysis of working atmosphere and environmental factors

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

5.3 Analysis of Personal Development Factor

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

5.4 Analysis of interpersonal relationship factors

Interpersonal relationship factor employee satisfaction is the lowest, the main reasons are as follows: firstly, hotels rarely provide a platform for employees to establish harmonious interpersonal
relationship, and departments only communicate when they are working. Secondly, from the personal point of view, employees tend to be more willing to solve problems by themselves rather than relying on the cooperation between departments. It lacks of initiative communication awareness, which is mainly caused by the personality of employees and their communication skills.

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