Comparison of Work Values of Undergraduate-level Foodservice Major Students

Ji-young Yoon

Division of Culture and Tourism, Sookmyung Women's University, Seoul 140-742, Korea

외식·급식경영 전공 학생들의 근로 가치관 비교

윤 지 영

숙명여자대학교 문화관광학부 르꼬르동블루 외식경영전공

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the work values of undergraduate-level foodservice major students. In order to assess work values of the participating students, this study adopted 'Maryland Work Values Inventory'. Data from a total of 290 surveys were collected. The participants consisted of 146 commercial foodservice major students and 144 institutional foodservice major students. Among the seven work values, both groups ranked 'job advancement' as the most important work value. Commercial foodservice major students rated 'altruism' as the least important work value, whereas it was 'stimulation' for institutional foodservice major students. 'Need for work' was evaluated statistically higher by junior and senior students compared to sophomore students of commercial foodservice major (p < 0.05). In both foodservice majors, a positive relationship was found between work value scores and grade levels. All work value scores tended to be higher for students in higher grades. This tendency was especially statistically clear for the value 'need for work' for commercial foodservice major students and 'money and prestige' for institutional foodservice major students (p < 0.05). There were some gaps in the work values between students with different career field choices. For the commercial foodservice majors, those interested in fine dining perceived 'satisfaction and accomplishment' and 'altruism' as more important [4.33 (p<0.05) and 4.05 (p<0.01), respectively] compared to students who had interests in fast food restaurants (4.06 and 3.67 respectively). Scores for 'satisfaction & accomplishment' (p < 0.05), 'money & prestige' (p < 0.001), and 'stimulation' (p < 0.001) were significantly different among institutional foodservice major students. In addition, students more interested in industrial foodservice field regarded 'money & prestige' and 'stimulation' as less important as indicated by noticeably lower scores (3.74, 3.55 respectively) in comparison to the other group (p < 0.001). The results of this study, which explored foodservice major students' work values, suggest that there is an increased need for the students to build up their work values as well as for the foodservice industry to offer appropriate work values to future foodservice employees.

Key words : Commercial foodservice majors, institutional foodservice majors, work value.

Introduction

The concept of work values is defined and measured in a variety of ways, depending on the research objectives and theoretical background (Furnham *et al* 1999, Meglino & Ravlin 1998, Mietus WS 1977). Some authors consider work values as broad tendencies to prefer certain job characteristics, outcomes or features of work environments (Furnham *et al* 1999, Pryor RL 1982), whereas others define them as desirable modes of behavior (Meglino & Ravlin 1998). In his Maryland Work Value Inventory (MWVI), Mietus WS (1977) originally identified specific eight work values such as economic, altruism

toward society, altruism toward employer, status, achievement, skill development, personal satisfaction and work avoidance (Mietus WS 1977). However, Wu TY (1985) combined two of Mietus' work values through principal factor analysis to create seven distinct work values including 'satisfaction and accomplishment', 'money and prestige', 'contribution to society', 'status with employer', 'need for work', 'avoidance', and 'job advancement' (Wu TY 1985).

Work values are supposed to play a functional role in workrelated process and outcomes, such as job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment and vocational streaming (Dose JJ 1997, Roe & Ester 1999). They are assumed to be predictors of these criteria and they are further ascribed to a central role in determining the fit between the individual and the

Corresponding author : Ji-young Yoon, Tel : +82-2-2077-7372, E-mail : yjy0823@sookmyung.ac.kr

employment organization. The underlying assumption is that people would be more motivated and satisfied when the individual's work values are congruent with the values which are emphasized in the organization. Because the previous criteria are valued outcomes by both organization and employees, organizations hire individuals with compatible values, and people prefer organizations, jobs and vocations which present opportunities to work in line with their values (Judge & Bretz 1992). Central elements in youngsters' anticipation about future work life are general ideas about what characteristics of work and work environment will be important to be satisfied, successful and self-accomplishment (Berings et al 2004). Examination of the relationship between such general work values and specific vocational preferences can reveal aspects of their implicit expectations about job and job categories. Since work values are aligned to career choice, job outcomes and job satisfaction, factors that correlate to work values should be identified (Judge & Bretz 1992, Shapira & Griffith 1990, Rounds JD 1990). In this point of view, it is critical to identify the work values of foodservice major students because it is important to understand why students jump into the foodservice industry and how the industry fulfills their desires as a foodservice expert. Unfortunately, many foodservice major students have been disappointed in work condition such as bad work environment, lack of motivation element, and work intensity (Jenkins AK 2001). This fact could cause the competent students' evasion of getting a job in foodservice area. Foodservice has high level of dependence on human resource; securing talented personnel would be the main key for success. In order to procure new qualified individual, foodservice industry should try to provide and to promote attractive and positive job aspects of foodservice. In addition, proper competencies and skills which are required to operate foodservice should be clearly asked from potential employees. On the other hand, it is necessary to evaluate foodservice itself whether the proper work environment can be provided for future employees to meet their expectation. From this point of view, it is time to know foodservice students' perceived work values which they would like to acquire from their future job in foodservice areas. While many area studies focusing on work values have been conducted, scarcely any were specifically focused on major and career path differences within the foodservice context. Therefore, this study was intended to identify major differences in work values among students of two different foodservice majors. The purpose of this study was to address the work values of undergraduate-level foodservice major students. The main objectives were to (1) identify the ranking of importance of work values perceived by students between commercial and institutional foodservice major; (2) determine whether there were differences of work values between two foodservice majors.

Methodology

This study adopted 'Maryland Work Values Inventory (MWVI)' developed by Mietus WS(1977) which was later modified by Wu TY(1985) to assess the work values of participating students (Mietus WS 1977, Wu TY 1985). The work values of the questionnaire consisted of forty-eight statements representing 7 work values (Wu TY 1985).

Each statement asked the respondents to indicate how important the subject item was, using Likert type five-point scale, where 1 -not at all important and 5 -very important. Six foodservice managers (including three institutional foodservice managers and three commercial foodservice managers) were invited to review the initial questionnaire. Even though MWVI has been tested and proven its reliability and validity by other researchers, Cronbach's alpha was also analyzed to prove internal consistency. The sample consisted of 290 foodservice education women students (146 commercial foodservice majors & 144 institutional foodservice majors).

The analysis of the data was both descriptive and relational. Descriptive statistics were used, such as means, standard deviations, frequency distribution and percentages to determine general characteristics and the ranking order of participants' important work value. The repeated measures ANOVA was also used to test the equality of importance of each work value.

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed to determine whether the MWVI sub scale scores differed for those selecting different foodservice major, grade, the expected career and the expected career field. Separate oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) was subsequently performed on the MWVI to identify the nature of differences among groups. If ANOVA results were significant, post hoc test (Scheffe) was performed to compare the differences among variables. Pearson's correlation was also performed to investigate the relationship among MWVI sub scale scores.

All tests were conducted using the computerized statistical package, SPSS 12.0. A 5% probability level was designated as the level of significance, but higher levels of significance

(p < 0.01 and p < 0.001) were also indicated.

Results and Discussion

Data were collected from 290 foodservice education students in 6 different programs. Demographic information can be seen in Table 1. Respondents consisted of 49.7% of sophomore, 37.6% of junior and 12.8% of senior. Most of them (89.3%) did not have internship experience. Students were asked to choose one expected career path and one expected career field in terms of their likelihood to accept a managerial position. The order of the preferred careers for commercial foodservice major students were consultant (39.0%), restaurant employee including FOH and BOH (35.6%) followed by restaurant entrepreneur (25.0%) respectively. The order of the preferred careers for institutional foodservice major students were dietitian (39.6%), F&B company employee (36.8%), uncommitted including 20 others such as food researcher (21.5%). In Korea, the education related to foodservice is usually performed at food and nutrition department. Therefore, institutional foodservice major students can get a chance to experience other fields including food science and nutritional aspects. These facts might lead students to think various job positions besides being a dietitian.

1. Work Values of Foodservice Major Students

The frequency analysis was performed on the seven work values to determine the order of importance from two categories of participants. Table 2 tabulates the results of ranking with the mean and standard deviation scores. The use of mean scores in ranking items measured with Likert scale has been a common practice among researchers. These findings indicate that all seven work values studies tend to be somewhat important for all the students. None of the work values studied stands out as 'very important' or 'not at all important' to the students.

Table 1. Demographic information of participants

N(%)

		Commercial foodservice major	Institutional foodservice major	Total
	Sophomore	80(54.8)	64(44.4)	144(49.7)
Grade	Junior	60(41.1)	49(34)	109(37.6)
	Senior	6(4.1)	31(21.5)	37(12.8)
Internalia annonionae	Yes	21(14.4)	10(6.9)	31(10.7)
Internship experience	No	125(85.6)	134(93.1)	259(89.3)
	Restaurant employee	52(35.6)	_	52(17.9)
	Restaurant entrepreneur	37(25.0)	_	37(12.8)
F (1	Restaurant consultant	57(39.0)	_	57(19.7)
Expected career	Dietitian	_	57(39.6)	57(19.7)
	F & B company employee	_	53(36.8)	53(36.8)
	Uncommitted	_	31(21.5)	31(10.7)
	Fine dining	104(71.2)	_	104(35.9)
	Casual restaurant	23(16.4)	_	23(8.0)
	Fast food restaurant	19(2.7)	_	19(6.6)
Expected career field	School foodservice	_	24(16.7)	24(8.3)
•	Industrial foodservice	_	19(13.2)	19(6.6)
	Hospital foodservice	_	51(35.4)	51(17.6)
	Concession	_	50(34.7)	50(17.2)

137

Among the seven work vales, 'job advancement' ranked as the most important work value by two groups. This result was similar to previous research which was conducted on hotel major students about what they believed made a job good or bad by Blumenfeld et al (1987). They found that the most important characteristics that make a job a "good" job were 'type of work' followed by 'advancement'. When considering 'job advancement' as the relative extent people work to be rewarded with a more prestigious or higher paying job (Wu TY 1985), job advancement has been an important value for most students regardless of their major field. 'Satisfaction & accomplishment' and 'money & prestige' ranked as second and third priorities by two groups. Commercial foodservice major students ranked 'status with employer' higher (Rank 4) than that of institutional foodservice major students (Rank 5). Institutional foodservice major students viewed 'need for work' higher (Rank 4) compared to the other group (Rank 5). Commercial foodservice major students ranked 'altruism' as the lowest work value. On the other hand, 'stimulation' was ranked as lowest work value by institutional foodservice major students. These results were supported by other study on cooperative education students' work values that showed the ranking of 'altruism' and 'stimulation' relatively lower than other values by the marketing education students of secondary schools (Spence J 2003).

In order to identify the differences of important degree among each work value, repeated measures ANOVA was used and the result is shown in Table 3. Due to the violation of sphericity assumption, Greenhouse-Geisser was used to correct the univariate tests results. The analysis identified that there was statistically significant difference among importance of work value (F=35.187, p<0.01). Tests of within-subjects contrasts showed that students considered 'job advancement', 'satisfaction & accomplishment', 'money & prestige' as important factors when deciding their future job. On the other hand, 'altruism' and 'stimulation' were relatively treated as unimportant factors to be a foodservice employee. Especially, highly valuing 'satisfaction & accomplishment' allows students not only to attain external compensation but also suggests a way to use their time most effectively. This also might imply that students have great amount of interest towards physiological compensation.

'Altruism' is a value that is often treated lightly, nevertheless service is regarded as a critical factor in the foodservice industry. 'Altruism,' referring to consideration of others, is a crucial requirement for employees in this field (Chen & Choi 2008). Therefore, methods that can change students' perception and making them to realize the importance of 'Altruism' are necessary.

2. Work Value Differences by Grade

The work vales of lower grade (sophomore) and higher grade (junior & senior) are reported in Table 3. In general, there was statistically significant difference between the lower grade and higher grade students' mean work value (Wilks' lambda= 0.965, F=1.462, p<0.05). In detail, 'need for work' for commercial foodservice major and 'money and prestige' for institutional foodservice major' (p<0.05) were significantly higher by

Table 2. Work value rank order of importance from two major students

Т	otal		Commercial foodserv	ice major	Institutional foodservice major		
Rank	Mean±S.D.	Cronbach's α	Rank	Mean±S.D.	Rank	Mean±S.D.	
1 Job advancement	4.21±0.57	0.74	1 Job advancement	4.27±0.57	1 Job advancement	4.21±0.50	
2 Satisfaction & accomplishment	4.11±0.59	0.86	2 Satisfaction & accomplishment	4.12±0.54	2 Satisfaction & accomplishment	4.14±0.35	
3 Money & prestige	4.01±0.69	0.81	3 Money & prestige	3.99 ± 0.45	3 Money & prestige	3.99 ± 0.40	
4 Need for work	3.92±0.68	0.65	4 Status with employer	3.90 ± 0.51	4 Need for work	3.98 ± 0.54	
5 Status with employer	3.89±0.66	0.68	5 Need for work	3.86±0.49	5 Status with employer	3.88±0.51	
6 Altruism	3.82±0.78	0.59	6 Stimulation	3.84±0.58	6 Altruism	3.82±0.62	
7 Stimulation	3.80±0.69	0.75	7 Altruism	3.74 ± 0.68	7 Stimulation	3.79 ± 0.46	

¹⁾ Descriptors: 5: very important~1: not at all important.

	-								
		Satisfaction & accomplishment	Money & prestige	Altruism	Status with employer	Need for work	Stimu- lation	Job advancement	
	Sophomore (80)	4.14±0.42	3.95±0.42	3.75±0.68	3.96±0.50	3.80±0.41	3.83±0.55	4.24±0.51	
Commercial foodservice major $(n_1=146)$	Junior & senior(66)	4.21±0.10	4.03±0.49	3.94±0.64	3.83±0.54	4.07±0.37	3.60±0.36	4.32±0.65	
		F=0.362,	F=0.900,	F=1.601,	F=2.157,	F=3.186 [*] ,	F=0.676,	F=0.484,	
		ŋ ² =0.003	ŋ ² =0.006	ŋ²=0.022	ŋ ² =0.016	ŋ ² =0.076	ŋ ² =0.009	ŋ ² =0.003	
			W	Vilks' lambda	: 0.907 (F=2.01	8, <i>p</i> =0.047 ^{**})			
	Sophomore(64)	4.12±0.37	3.82±0.40	3.75±0.63	3.84±0.52	3.93±0.52	3.76±0.41	4.16±0.54	
Institutional foodservice	Junior & senior(80)	4.16±0.34	4.07±0.37	3.87±0.61	3.95±0.53	4.07±0.42	3.83±0.51	4.26±0.47	
major		F=0.293,	F=2.835 [*] ,	F=1.158,	F=0.764,	F=1.003,	F=0.779,	F=1.072,	
$(n_2=144)$		ŋ ² =0.002	ŋ ² =0.020	ŋ ² =0.008	ŋ²=0.005	ŋ²=0.014	ŋ²=0.005	ŋ ² =0.007	
(2)		Wilks' lambda : 0.971 (F=1.587, p=0.029 [*])							
	Sophomore(144)	4.13±0.40	3.98±0.41	3.75±0.65	3.90±0.51	3.86±0.47	3.80±0.49	4.20±0.52	
Total (n=290)	Junior & senior 146)	4.15±0.33	4.00±0.44	3.80±0.65	3.88±0.51	4.07±0.56	3.78±0.45	4.27±0.54	
		F=0.026,	F=0.138,	F=0.454,	F=0.211,	F=4.185 [*] ,	F=0.448,	F=1.227,	
		$\eta^2 = 0.000$	$\eta^2 = 0.000$	$\eta^2 = 0.002$	$\eta^2 = 0.001$	$\eta^2 = 0.014$	$\eta^2 = 0.002$	$\eta^2 = 0.004$	

Table 3. The perceived work value differences by grade

1) Descriptors: 5 5: very important~1: not at all important.

* *p*<0.05.

higher grade than by lower grade students. For commercial foodservice major, the higher grade students' means for each of the work values except 'status with employer' and 'stimulation' were tend to be higher than the lower grade students. In terms of institutional foodservice major, all of work value scores were tend to be higher by higher grade students than by lower grade students.

These results contradicted the previous studies which found that the older students place less value on prestige and money compared to that of the students in lower grades ($\circ |\mathcal{A}| \stackrel{\circ}{\uparrow}$ 1994, Walsh *et al* 1996). According to several researches about work values, some authors divided work values into internal and external values (Wollack *et al* 1971, Madigan MJ 1985, DePoy & Merril 1988). Internal work values represented the psychological compensation from work itself including accomplishment and satisfaction (Wollack *et al* 1971, Madigan MJ 1985, DePoy & Merril 1988). On the other hand, external work values implied the extra compensation through getting a job such as money and job security (Wollack *et al* 1971, Madigan 1985, DePoy & Merril 1988). In this point of view, $\circ |\mathcal{A}| \stackrel{\circ}{\rightarrow}$ (1994) insisted that the university students valued more internal traits such as achievement more than external traits as they get older $(\circ | \mathbb{Z} | \stackrel{\circ}{\uparrow} 1994)$. The researcher also stated that this reason was due to the university education which emphasized the importance of internal work values $(\circ |\mathbb{Z} | \stackrel{\circ}{\uparrow} 1994)$. However, current study indicated that the students did not undervalue the external work values such as 'money and prestige' for institutional foodservice majors and 'need for work' for commercial foodservice majors as they grew older. This result was supported by previous research in which 'pay and advancement value potential' was shown as important determinants of job attractiveness on job seekers' decision (Judge & Bretz 1992). Moreover, the current problem of unemployment situation under the worse economic outlook among young people may be the reason why students consider economic value and job security importantly.

3. Work Value Differences by The Expected Career

The work value differences by the expected career are shown in Table 4. There were no significant differences among the expected career by commercial foodservice major. However, students who wanted to be a consultant had tendency to perceive that all of work values except 'Stimulation' and 'Job advancement' were more important than other groups did.

	Status with Need for employer work	Stimulation	Job advancement
Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12\pm0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 $3.$ Restaurant consultant(57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.46 $3.$ Restaurant consultant(57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.46 $3.$ Image: transmitted on the properties of the state of the st	3.87±0.61 3.80±0.53	3.79 ± 0.61	4.18 ± 0.72
Restaurant consultant(57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.46 $3.$ $F=1.213$, $F=1.230$, $\eta^2=0.021$ $\eta_1^2=0.021$ $\eta_1^2=0.022$ $\eta_1^2=0.022$ $\eta_1^2=0.022$ $\eta_1^2=0.021$	3.91 ± 0.40 3.84 ± 0.43	3.90 ± 0.52	4.34±0.44
$F=1,213$, $F=1,230$, h $\eta^2=0.020$ $\eta^2=0.021$ η Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31^a 4.04 ± 0.38 $3.$ F&B company employee(53) 4.03 ± 0.35^b 3.93 ± 0.39 $3.$ F&B company employee(53) 4.03 ± 0.35^b 3.93 ± 0.38 $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 $3.$ Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 $3.$ Restaurant consultant (57) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.93 ± 0.27 $3.$ Restaurant consultant (57) 4.13 ± 0.36 $3.$ $3.$ Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.03 ± 0.35 $3.$ $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.03 ± 0.37 $3.$ <td>3.93±0.47 3.93±0.50</td> <td>3.86 ± 0.58</td> <td>4.30±0.47</td>	3.93±0.47 3.93±0.50	3.86 ± 0.58	4.30±0.47
Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31^a 4.04 ± 0.38 3.93 ± 0.38 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 F&B company employee(53) 4.03 ± 0.35^b 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.57 3.93 ± 0.57 3.3 Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 3.98 ± 0.34	F=0.249, $F=1.042$, $r_{\rm j}^2=0.000$ $r_{\rm j}^2=0.017$	F=0.378, ŋ ² =0.003	$F=1.083$, $IJ^2=0.012$
Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31^a 4.04 ± 0.38 3.32 ± 0.39 3.3 F&B company employee(53) 4.03 ± 0.35^b 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.57 3.93 ± 0.57 3.3 Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 3.3 Restaurant employee(52) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 3.3 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 3.3 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 3.3 Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 3.3 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 Restaurcher(51) 4.02 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 4.02 ± 0.37 3.3	a : 0.852 (F=0.489, p=0.938)		
F&B company employee(53) 4.03 ± 0.35^b 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3 Researcher(51) $7=4.236^{**}$ $F=0.928$ $F=0.928$ $F=0.928$ Restaurant employee(52) $\eta^2=0.057$ $\eta^2=0.013$ η^2 Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 3.3 Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 3.3 Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 3.3 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 3.3 Dicititian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 3.3 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.3 Restaurant consultant (51) 4.02 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 3.3	3.93±0.48 3.91±0.67	3.92 ± 0.45^{a}	4.16±0.56
Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37^a 4.00 ± 0.43 $3.$ $F=4.236^{**}$, $F=0.928$, $F=0.928$, $F=0.928$, $T=0.928$, $T=0.013$ T	3.81±0.52 3.92±0.50	3.67±0.44 ^b	4.20±0.45
F^{\pm} 4.236*, F^{\pm} 0.057 η^{2} =0.013 η η^{2} =0.057 η^{2} =0.013 η Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 $3.$ Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 $3.$ Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 $3.$ Restaurant consultant (57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 $3.$ Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 $3.$ $F^{\pm}1.717$ $F^{\pm}0.882$ 4.00 ± 0.43 $3.$	3.91±0.53 4.10±0.45	3.83 ± 0.48^{ab}	4.26±0.50
Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 $3.$ Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 $3.$ Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 $3.$ Restaurant consultant (57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 $3.$ Dietitian(40) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 $3.$ Dietitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 $3.$ Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 $3.$	F=0.753, $F=1.533$, $\eta^2=0.011$ $\eta^2=0.021$	F=3.447**, ŋ ² =0.047	F=0.506, ŋ ² =0.007
Restaurant employee(52) 4.03 ± 0.59 3.93 ± 0.57 3.73 ± 0.67 Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 3.70 ± 0.65 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 3.77 ± 0.71 Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 3.87 ± 0.60 F&B company(53) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.80 ± 0.60 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 3.80 ± 0.67 F=1.717.F=0.882. $F=0.325.$	Wilks' lambda : 0.939 (F=2.018, p=0.049*)		
Restaurant entrepreneur(37) 4.12 ± 0.56 3.98 ± 0.34 3.70 ± 0.65 Restaurant consultant (57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 3.77 ± 0.71 Dietitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 3.87 ± 0.60 F&B company(53) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.80 ± 0.60 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 3.80 ± 0.67 F=1.717.F=0.882. $F=0.325.$	3.87±0.61 3.80±0.53	3.19±0.61	4.18±0.72
Restaurant consultant (57) 4.19 ± 0.46 4.06 ± 0.39 3.77 ± 0.71 Dictitian(40) 4.18 ± 0.31 4.04 ± 0.38 3.87 ± 0.60 F&B company(53) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.80 ± 0.60 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 3.80 ± 0.67 $F=1.717$ $F=0.882$ $F=0.325$	3.91 ± 0.40 3.84 ± 0.43	3.90 ± 0.52	4.34±0.44
Dictitian(40)4.18±0.314.04±0.38 3.87 ± 0.60 F&B company(53)4.03±0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.80 ± 0.60 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 3.80 ± 0.67 F=1.717F=0.882. $F=0.325.$	3.93±0.47 3.93±0.49	3.86 ± 0.58	4.30±0.47
F&B company(53) 4.03 ± 0.35 3.93 ± 0.39 3.80 ± 0.60 Researcher(51) 4.22 ± 0.37 4.00 ± 0.43 3.80 ± 0.67 F=1.717.F=0.882.F=0.325.	3.93±0.48 3.91±0.67	3.92 ± 0.45	4.16 ± 0.56
$4.22\pm0.37 \qquad 4.00\pm0.43 \qquad 3.80\pm0.67$ $F=1.717, \qquad F=0.882, \qquad F=0.325.$	3.81±0.52 3.92±0.50	3.67±0.44	4.20 ± 0.45
F=0.882. $F=0.325$.	3.91±0.53 4.10±0.45	3.83 ± 0.48	4.26 ± 0.50
$\eta^2 = 0.015$ $\eta^2 = 0.006$	$F=0.436$, $F=1.787$, $\eta^2=0.008$ $\eta^2=0.116$	$F=1.360$, $\eta^2=0.023$	$F=0.821$, $\eta^2=0.014$

21(1): 134~145 (2011)

Work Values of Foodservice Major Students

139

) Descriptors: 5: very important~1: not at all important. * p < 0.05.

Students who wanted to be a restaurant consultant were more likely to rank 'job advancement' (4.30) and 'satisfaction & accomplishment' (4.19) higher than other values. This result indicated that students wanted to be a restaurant consultant with great expectation of their work values. The important thing is that this high achievement degree of work values would come from constant exertion and a lot of experiences in this field. According to Walsh K(2002), restaurant consultant is defined as a job which is based on abundant knowledge and experience in the restaurant industry (Walsh K 2002). However, students seemed to overlook this tough procedure in order to be a consultant. Therefore, it is necessary for students to keep an accurate view of the future job through in-depth major study and internship programs. Young JM's study (1978) of work values found that the co-operative experience had a significant affect on the achievement work value scores for the secondary students. Moreover, professors and field mentors should lead students to have a clear understanding about the job and proper work values (Young JM 1978).

Students who chose to be a restaurant entrepreneur as their future job perceived 'job advancement' (4.34) as the most important value and ranked it more higher than other groups. Restaurant entrepreneur might be fitted to the person who has challenging spirit, creativity, and multi function ability (Walker JR 2007). Therefore, students who want to be an entrepreneur were likely to be interested in being rewarded by tangible results. In other words, they seemed to focus on external achievements with a more prestigious or higher paying job.

In terms of institutional foodservice major, 'satisfaction and accomplishment' and 'stimulation' were significantly different among three expected career. In detail, students who are interested in researcher and dietitians perceived 'satisfaction and accomplishment' more important (4.22, 4.18 respectively) than the students who chose food & beverage related company employee (4.03) (p<0.01). In 'stimulation' variable, students who chose dietitian (3.92) perceived it more important than the students who wanted to be a company employee (3.67) (p < 0.01). This indicates that students who wanted to be a dietitian seemed to anticipate dynamic work from their future job. In a rapid changing environment, a new dietitian as a manager must be a dynamic individual who can be a visionary person for the organization and subordinates (Yoon & Joo 2005). Therefore, students' attitude toward dietitian such as this is very encouraging.

4. Work Value Differences by The Expected Foodservice Career Field

Table 5 shows the perceived work value differences by the expected foodservice career field. For commercial foodservice major, 'satisfaction and accomplishment' (p<0.05) and 'altruism' (p<0.01) were significantly different by the expected career field. Both values were perceived more important to those students who chose fine dining (4.33, 4.05 respectively) than the others who were interested in fast food restaurants (4.06, 3.67 respectively). This result was supported by other research in which students who chose fine dining as their career path rated 'self-development' and 'altruism' higher than those who chose quick service (Wilkinson R 2005).

On the other hand, 'satisfaction & accomplishment' (p<0.05), 'money & prestige' (p<0.001), and 'stimulation' (p<0.001) scores were significantly different by institutional foodservice majors. In detail, students who were interested in school foodservice perceived 'satisfaction & accomplishment' more important (4.16) than the students who chose industrial foodservice field (3.99) (p<0.05). In terms of 'money & prestige' and 'stimulation', the score of industrial foodservice field was noticeably lower (3.74, 3.55 respectively) than other groups (p<0.001). As a whole, students who chose fine dining perceived the 'satisfaction & accomplishment' and 'altruism' more important than students who were interested in fast food restaurants, or industrial foodservice (p<0.05). In terms of 'money & prestige', students who selected industrial foodservice perceived less important (3.74) than other groups (p<0.01)

5. Correlation of Work Values

The correlation matrix of work values used in the analysis is reported in Table 6. All of work values were positively related to each other (p<0.01). Especially 'money & prestige' was highly related to 'status with employer' (r=0.66). In terms of 'satisfaction & accomplishment' was shown relatively high relationship with other work values, especially with 'job advancement' (r=0.64). This result shows that 'job advancement' could not only brings satisfaction but also self accomplishment for individuals. Moreover, the satisfaction and accomplishment might positively affect on high productivity for organization (신구범 2010). In other words, job advancement could make each individual feel the sense of stronger responsibility, and try to perform better than before. These individual efforts can create sound organizational environment which is good

Fine dining(104)CommercialCasual restauranfioodserviceFast food restaumajorFast food restau(n ₁ =146)School foodserviInstitutionalIndustrial foodserviceInstitutionalIndustrial foodservicefioodserviceHospital foodservicemajorConcession(50)	Fine dining(104) Casual restaurant(23)		Sucord		tordino.			
	staurant(23)	4.33 ± 0.42^{a}	4.11 ± 0.36	4.05 ± 0.65^{a}	4.04±0.42	3.94±0.44	3.83±0.58	4.34±0.47
		4.20 ± 0.50^{ab}	4.12 ± 0.40	3.80 ± 0.66^{ab}	3.97±0.45	3.80±0.47	3.94±0.61	4.34±0.46
	Fast food restaurant(19)	$4.06\pm0.55^{\rm b}$	3.94±0.47	3.67±0.67 ^b	3.87±0.53	3.86±0.51	3.80 ± 0.53	4.24±0.60
		$F=2.422^{*}$, $\eta^{2}=0.033$	$F=2.278$, $rg^2=0.031$	$F=2.795^{**}$ $\eta^2=0.038$	$F=1.171$, $rg^2=0.016$	$F=0.403$, $\eta^2=0.006$	F=0.411, ŋ ² =0.006	$F=0.477$, $rg^2=0.007$
				Wilks' lambda	$a : 0.896 \ (F=2.106, \ p=0.049^*)$	06, <i>p</i> =0.049 [*])		
	School foodservice(24)	4.16±0.34 ^a	4.12±0.41 ^a	4.03 ± 0.53	4.02 ± 0.53	4.01±0.47	4.00±0.51 ^a	4.34±0.43
	Industrial foodservice(19)	3.99±0.31 ^b	3.74±0.35 ^b	3.67 ± 0.70	3.82 ± 0.42	3.89 ± 0.28	3.55±0.33 ^b	4.07±0.46
	Hospital foodservice(51)	4.12±0.33 ^{ab}	4.02 ± 0.37^{a}	3.74 ± 0.60	3.90 ± 0.52	3.99±0.68	3.80 ± 0.48^{a}	4.19 ± 0.44
	n(50)	4.14±0.35 ^{ab}	3.98 ± 0.41^{a}	3.84±0.64	3.82 ± 0.53	3.98 ± 0.50	3.79±0.43ª	4.23 ± 0.58
		$F=2.179^*$, $\eta^2=0.045$	$F=3.627^{***}$, $\eta^2=0.072$	$F=1.625$, $\eta^2=0.034$	F=0.896, ŋ²=0.019	$F=0.178$, $\eta^2=0.004$	$F=3.548^{***}$, $\eta^2=0.071$	$F=1.192$, $\eta^2=0.025$
				Wilks' lambda	la : 0.803 (F=2.458,	58, <i>p</i> =0.038 [*])		
Fine dining(104)	ıg(104)	4.33±0.42 ^b	4.11 ± 0.36^{a}	4.05 ± 0.65^{a}	4.04±0.42	3.94±0.44	3.83±0.58	4.34±0.47
Casual re	Casual restaurant(23)	4.20±0.51 ^{ab}	4.12 ± 0.40^{a}	3.80 ± 0.66^{ab}	3.97±0.45	3.80±0.47	3.94±0.61	4.34±0.46
Fast food	Fast food restaurant(19)	4.06 ± 0.55^{a}	3.94 ± 0.47^{ab}	3.67±0.67 ^b	3.87 ± 0.53	3.86 ± 0.51	3.80 ± 0.53	4.24 ± 0.60
School fo	School foodservice(24)	4.16 ± 0.34^{ab}	4.12 ± 0.41^{a}	$4.03\pm0.53^{\rm ab}$	4.02 ± 0.53	4.00 ± 0.51	4.00 ± 0.51	4.34 ± 0.43
Total(290) Industrial	Industrial foodservice(19)	3.99 ± 0.31^{a}	3.74 ± 0.35^{b}	3.67±0.70 ^b	3.82 ± 0.42	3.89 ± 0.28	3.55 ± 0.33	4.07±0.46
Hospital f	Hospital foodservice(51)	4.11 ± 0.39^{ab}	4.02 ± 0.37^{a}	3.74 ± 0.60^{ab}	$3.90{\pm}0.51$	3.99±0.69	3.80 ± 0.48	4.19±0.44
Concession(50)	n(50)	4.22 ± 0.33^{ab}	3.98 ± 0.41^{a}	3.85 ± 0.64^{ab}	3.82 ± 0.53	3.98 ± 0.50	3.79 ± 0.43	4.23 ± 0.58
		$F=1.810^{*}$ $rg^{2}=0.037$	$F=2.425^{**}$, $\eta^2=0.049$	$F=1.923^{*}$, $rg^{2}=0.039$,	$F=0.868$, $\eta^2=0.018$	$F=0.822$, $J^{2}=0.017$	$F=1.611$, $rg^{2}=0.033$	$F=0.825$, $\eta^2=0.017$
				Wilks' lambo	Wilks' lambda : 0.828 (F=2.278,	78, <i>p</i> =0.042 [*])		

Table 5. The perceived work value differences by the expected foodservice career field

141

¹⁾ Descriptors: 5: very important~1: not at all important. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001.

	Satisfaction & accomplishment	Money & prestige	altruism	Status with employer	Need for work	Stimulation
Money & prestige	0.51**					
Altruism	0.51**	0.32**				
Status with employer	0.42**	0.66**	0.34**			
Need for work	0.41**	0.45**	0.25**	0.38**		
Stimulation	0.45**	0.35**	0.31**	0.41**	0.31**	
Job advancement	0.64**	0.50**	0.35**	0.52**	0.40**	0.49**

Table 6. Correlation of work value sub scales

** *p*<0.01.

enough in attaining positive outcomes.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine work values held by undergraduate foodservice major students. A total number of 290 Survey data were collected and the participants were composed of 146 commercial foodservice major and 144 institutional foodservice major students. Among the seven work values, 'job advancement' was ranked as the most important work value by both groups. Commercial foodservice major students rated 'altruism' as the least important work value, while it was 'stimulation' for institutional foodservice major students. All work values scores were tended to be higher as the students were in higher grades except 'status with employer'. This tendency was especially statistically clear for the values 'need for work' for commercial foodservice and 'money and prestige' for institutional foodservice major (p < 0.05). While results did indicate statistically significant differences among students with different grade and with different career path interests, the practical differences are not great. Partial eta squared, used as a test of association, indicated that below 7% of the variances was accounted for by the work values. As displayed in Table 3, 4, and 5, only two or three work values were found to differ significantly at p < 0.05 or p < 0.01. Money tended to be more important for student with a career choice in institutional foodservice than that of the students with a choice in commercial foodservice. One possible explanation might be that students who majored in institutional foodservice career field perceived higher salary as one of the main reasons for choosing the preferred career.

There were some gaps found in the work values among

students with different career choices. For commercial foodservice majors, those who were interested in fine dining perceived 'satisfaction and accomplishment' and 'altruism' as more important [4.33 (p<0.05), 4.05 (p<0.01) respectively] compared to the students who had interests in fast food restaurants (4.06, 3.67 respectively). The scores of 'satisfaction & accomplishment' (p<0.05), 'money & prestige' (p<0.01), and 'altruism' (p < 0.05) were significantly different within institutional foodservice major students. The reasons for such results were due to the students who were interested in school foodservice (4.16) rather than industrial foodservice (3.99) (p<0.05) perceived 'satisfaction & accomplishment' more important. In addition, for the students who were more interested in industrial foodservice field regarded 'money & prestige' and 'stimulation' less important as indicated by the noticeably lower scores (3.74, 3.55 respectively) in comparison to the other group (p < 0.001). In terms of correlation results among work values, all of work values were positively related to each other (p <0.01). In general, foodservice major students' work values differ from reinforcement career patterns. Within specific career fields for commercial foodservice major, differences were greatest for students with a career interest in fine dining and least for students with a career interest in fast food restaurants. This conflicts with the fact that fine dining was chosen as the most preferred career path and fast food restaurants the least. In addition, in terms of the expected career fields for institutional foodservice major, students who chose industrial foodservice field rated relatively lower in three work values ('satisfaction & accomplishment', 'money & prestige', 'stimulation'). With these two results, it is concluded that whether or not work values change as individuals progress through their future career is unclear, but fast food restaurants and industrial foodservice

operators should be able to emphasize to students that their career option provides the qualities which are important to students who are about to being their career.

This research was only focused on the perceived importance of work values of students who might be future foodservice workers. It is important to discover how individuals' work values change when they participate in real work environment. Several researches showed changes in some of the work values of students over time and the relationship between the referent power of the work site manger and changes in the students work values (Walsh et al 1996, Weiss M 1978, Wilkinson R 2005, Young JM 1978). According to these researches, individuals change their work values when they are confronted with an experience that does not fit into their existing value scheme. During the entry level work experience, students' work values may be challenged if their work values are not similar to the perceived work values of their work site. Therefore, students' work experiences through co-operative experience such as internship might be very important to establish proper work values for an individual. It also indicates that students' experiences in their foodservice education program may help them to develop a more realistic understanding of the work environment by the time they reach the senior level. Chuang et al (2005) stated that undergraduate program could assist students with their career exploration and encourage students to have realistic enthusiasm about the industry and build confidence in their career planning (Chuang et al 2005). Identifying what foodservice students expect from their work should be one part of this career exploration. Therefore, educators should put efforts to provide students with precise and realistic information about foodservice field including job condition, work intensity, or possibility of job advancement. Foodservice educators must also try to develop students' sound work values through various courses. For example, this research found that 'altruism' was rated relatively lower than other work values, but 'Altruism' is a very important trait which foodservice people should acquire when providing service. Hence, foodservice educators should coach students to obtain such desirable work values as well as job skills that are needed for their future job.

According to the theory of work adjustment, a better match between student preferences and work environment should lead to more highly satisfied managers, and a lower manager turnover rate (Wilkinson R 2005). Recently, lots of researches on foodservice industry have focused on employee satisfaction (Cho & Yoon, 2006, Yoon *et al* 2006, Silva P 2006). However, real foodservice business is notorious for long work hours, bad work environment and low job satisfaction which cause the lack of self-confidence and self-development. Furthermore, this leads to high turnover and waste of education cost (Aksu & Koksal 2005, Jenkins AK 2001). It is hoped that the results of this study would help to provide foodservice recruiters a more accurate perception of foodservice students' expectations towards foodservice industry, because individual work values might take an important role for students when choosing a job. If employees can achieve the expected work values from their job, they can be satisfied and more likely to become dedicated and loyal employees in the future.

It is important to remember that generalization of the findings of this study is limited due to a small sample size of which it is based on. Despite the fact that this is a small sample of a small population, there were some statistically significant results. However, a study based on a larger sample of a larger but similar population would possibly uncover new findings, as well as increasing the statistical significance of the findings in this study.

국문 초록

본 연구의 목적은 향후 푸드 서비스 산업의 전문 인력이 될 외식 · 급식 경영 전공 대학생들이 전공에 따른 직업 선택에 있어 중요하게 여기는 근로 가치관에 차이가 있는지 비교해 보고, 전공 관련 진로 및 푸드서비스 산업 내 희망 직업 분야에 따른 차이도 함께 살펴보았다. 조사 결과, '지위 향상'(4.21) 이 두 그룹 모두에서 가장 중요한 근로 가치관으로 나타났 다. 외식경영 전공의 경우 '이타심'(3.74)이 가장 덜 중요한 근로 가치관으로 조사되었으며, 급식 경영 전공의 경우 '직무 다양성에 따른 동기 부여'(3.79)에 가장 낮은 점수를 주었다. 두 그룹 모두 학년에 따라 근로 가치관의 중요성이 달라지는 것으로 나타났는데, 외식경영 전공은 '직무 안정성', 급식 경 영 전공은 '경제적 보상 및 권한' 항목에서 저학년보다는 고 학년이 더 중요하게 여기는 것으로 조사되었다 (p<0.05). 또 한 희망하는 전공 관련 직무에 있어서 외식경영 전공의 경우 외식 종사원, 외식 창업, 외식 컨설턴트 사이의 근로 가치관 의 중요성 인식에는 유의적 차이가 없었으나, 급식 경영 전공 에서는 '직무 다양성에 따른 동기 부여' 항목에서 영양사를 원하는 학생(3.92)과 식품회사 종사원을 원하는 학생(3.67) 사이에 유의적 차이가 있었다(p<0.01). 향후 직업을 얻고 싶 은 관심 푸드 서비스 분야에 따른 근로 가치관 비교에 있어 서는 외식경영 전공의 경우 파인다이닝 분야를 원하는 학생

이 패스트푸드 서비스 분야를 원하는 학생보다 '만족 및 성취 도' (p< 0.05)와 '이타심'(p<0.01)의 중요성을 유의적으로 높 게 생각하는 것으로 조사되었다. 급식경영 전공의 경우 '만 족 및 성취도'(p<0.05), '경제적 보상 및 권한'(p<0.001), '직 무 다양성에 따른 동기 부여'(p<0.001) 항목에서 희망 푸드 서비스 분야별로 근로 가치관에 대한 유의적인 차이를 보였 다. 본 연구 결과는 외식 · 급식전공 학생들의 교육에 있어서 외식 · 급식업 직무를 수행하는데 필요한 기술 이외에도 바 람직한 근로 가치관을 형성할 수 있도록 지도하는데 도움을 줄 수 있을 것으로 사료되며, 업계에는 미래의 종사원들의 근로 가치관을 정확히 파악하고 그들이 얻고자 하는 근로 가 치를 성취할 수 있도록 조직 정책 및 문화를 형성하는데 필 요한 기초자료로 사용될 수 있을 것으로 기대된다.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was supported by Sookmyung Women's University 2009 Research Grant.

REFERENCES

- 신구범 (2010) 서비스기업 종업원의 셀프리더십이 자기효능 감 및 직무성과에 미치는 영향. 인적자원 관리연구 17(1): 91-104.
- 이지우(1994) 우리나라 대학생들의 근로 가치관에 관한 연 구. 계명대학교 산업경영연구소 경영경제 1: 135-146.
- Aksu AA, Koksal CD (2005) Perceptions and attitudes of tourism students in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 17: 436-447.
- Berings D, De Fruyt F, Bouwen R (2004) Work values and personality traits as predictors of enterprising and social vocational interests. *Personality and Individual Differences* 36: 349-364.
- Blumenfeld W, Kent W, Shock P, Jourdan L (1987) Job attribute preferences of a group of potential hospitality industry manager (what makes a job good or bad?). *Hospitality Education and Research Journal* 11: 79-91.
- Chen P, Choi Y (2008) Generational differences in work values: A study of hospitality management. *International Journal* of Contemporary Hospitality Management 17: 436-447.
- Cho KW, Yoon JY (2006) TQM performance and job satisfaction of dietitians in institutional foodservice. *Korean J Community Nutrition* 11: 750-760.
- Chuang N, Goh B, Stout B (2005) Factors that affect hospitality undergraduate students' career intentions in the hos-

pitality industry after graduation. In J. Mills (Ed.), *Procee*dings of the Tenth Annual Hospitality and Tourism Graduate Student Education Research Conference: Volume X. Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research 235-239.

- DePoy E, Merril SC (1988) Value acquisition in occupational therapy curriculum. *The Occupational Therapy Journal of Research* 8: 259-275.
- Dose JJ (1997) Work values: An integrative framework and illustrative application to organizational socialization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 70: 219-240.
- Furnham A, Forde L, Ferrari K (1999) Personality and work motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences* 26: 1035-1043.
- Jenkins AK (2001) Making a career of it? Hospitality students' future perspectives: An Anglo-Ditch study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 13: 13-20.
- Judge TA, Bretz RD Jr (1992) Effect of work values on job choice decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77: 261-271.
- Madigan MJ (1985) Characteristics of students occupational therapy educational programs. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 39: 41-48.
- Meglino BM, Ravlin EC (1998) Individual values in organizations: concepts controversies, and research. *Journal of Management* 24: 351-389.
- Mietus WS (1977) The development of an instrument measuring values associated with work. *Journal of Industrial Teacher Education* 14: 63-72.
- Pryor RL (1982) Values, preferences, needs, work ethics and orientation to work: Toward conceptual and empirical integration. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 20: 40-42.
- Roe RA, Ester R (1999) Values at work: Empirical findings and theoretical perspective. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 48: 1-21.
- Rounds JD (1990) The comparative and combined utility of work value and interest date in career counseling with adults. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 37: 32-45.
- Shapira Z, Griffith TL (1990) Comparing the work values of engineers with managers, production and clerical workers: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 11: 281-291.
- Silva P (2006) Effects of disposition on hospitality employee job satisfaction and commitment. *International Journal of*

Contemporary Hospitality Management 18: 317-328.

- Spence J (2003) The relationship between cooperative education student work values and work site manager's referent power. *Doctoral dissertation*. The Ohio State University.
- Walker JR (2007). *The Restaurant: From Concept to Operation* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons Inc. NJ. pp 7-9.
- Walsh BD, Kapes JT, Vacha-Haase T (1996) The values scale: Differences across grade levels for ethnic minority students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 56: 263-275.
- Walsh K (2002) Service-delivery strategies: three approachers to consulting for hospitality. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 43: 37-48.
- Weiss M (1978). Social learning of work values in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 63: 711-718.
- Wilkinson R (2005) A comparison of work aspect preferences and reinforcement patterns in foodservice career path. *Jour*nal of Foodservice Business Research 8: 39-54.
- Wollack S, Godale J, Wijting J, Smith P (1971) Development of the survey of work values. *Journal of Applied Psycho-*

logy 55: 331-338.

- Wu TY (1985) Relationships among characteristics of postsecondary vocational students and their work values. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Pennsylvania State University.
- Yoon JY, Joo NM (2005) Perceived leadership style of Korean dietitians: Focusing on the transformational and transactional leadership styles. *Korean Journal of Community Nutrition* 7: 207-214.
- Yoon JY, Yoo YJ, Hong WS (2006) An investigation of the employee job satisfaction according to leadership style in family restaurant. *Korean Journal of Food & Cookery Science* 22: 259-269.
- Young JM (1978). Effects of school supervised work experience on work values, school attitudes, and the relationship between the two. *Dissertation Abstracts International* 39: 129.

접 수: 2010년 12월 16일 최종수정: 2011년 1월 31일 채 택: 2011년 2월 21일