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ABSTRACT:

Temporary employees are important to organizations, but they do not feel the same way as do traditional workers. To maximize efficiency at work, organizations need to help temporary employees develop a sense of belongingness and improve productivity by investing in training. This study explores the causal relationship among temporary employees’ training, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and employee perceived service quality based on Kirkpatrick’s four-level training model. Through training reaction and training learning, trainees would modify their behaviors and change their results accordingly. Job satisfaction was used to indicate training behavior, and affective commitment and employee perceived service quality were used to measure training results. The hypotheses were tested on a sample of 114 college students interning at an American hospitality company for a six-month period. Exploratory factor analysis was performed to identify five factors, and confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to analyze whether the factorial structure could be retrieved in the college intern sample. The findings from structural equation modeling supported that training was positively related to affective commitment and employee perceived service quality respectively. In addition, job satisfaction was positively associated with affective commitment. The research results highlighted that employers should implement training and use it as a strategic practice to improve the outcomes for both temporary employees and organizations.
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INTRODUCTION

In today’s highly competitive environment and tight labor market, temporary employees are considered as salient assets in achieving organizational effectiveness. According to U.S. Department of Labor, 2.87 million temps were employed in 2014, compared to only 20,000 in 1956 (Greenhouse, 2014; Olson, 2011; Villarreal & Swanson, 2011). Although they are expected to leave after a certain period of time, temporary workers make substantial contributions to their organizations by offering flexibility to match fluctuations in production and service requirements (Connelly, Gallagher, & Gilley, 2007) and saving their employers huge labor costs since normally they are provided with little or no fringe benefits.

Managing temporary employees has become a significant challenge. Temporary workers do not necessarily go above and beyond due to the psychological contract, as they are discouraged by the lack of insurance, benefits and job security (Feldman, Doerpinghaus, & Turnley, 1994). And they often find themselves being treated in an impersonal way and assigned least challenging tasks and worst work schedules (Feldman et. al, 1994; Geber, 1993). Compared to traditional regular employees, temporary workers are found to be less satisfied with their jobs (Aletraris, 2010; De Graaf-Zijl, 2012) and less committed to their organizations (Felfe et al., 2008). However, as the nature of temporary workers and temporary workforce has changed overtime, now companies have realized the importance of valuable temporary workers who can undertake any professional and technical positions (Chambel & Sobral, 2011; Peck & Theodore, 1998; Melchionno, 1999) and thus make a huge impact on maintaining a competitive advantage.

However, temporary employees often complain about lack of training. Compared to 40.7 training hours per permanent employee reported in the 2014 Training Industry Report, temporary workers, in some cases, may only receive 10 minutes of training, which often leads to high rates of workplace injuries or even deaths (Greenhouse, 2014; Training, 2014). Proper training not only provides employees with a safe work environment, but also positively affects organizational performance and effectiveness (Burke et al., 2011; Van Iddekinge et al., 2009). If temp workers experience positive outcomes, they may start to enjoy work more and foster organizational commitment (Finegold et al., 2005). This could potentially lead to a path for a permanent job when both parties have the intentions. As a matter of fact, 49 percent of temp workers surveyed by a staffing association claimed that temping help them land a full-time job (Greenhouse, 2014). Therefore, organizations need to reevaluate their training strategies towards temp employees, which can turn their part-timers into productive full-timers once adequate training is provided (Chambel & Sobral, 2011; Finegold, Levenson, & Van Buren, 2005).

This study seeks to contribute to the body of research of training and its effects on temporary employees’ performance and job satisfaction mediated by affective commitment. Opinions from the paid interns who worked at an American hospitality organization for a period of six months are assessed. Paid interns are normally considered as temporary employees, if the internship is less than a year (Paul, Plevin, Sullivan & Connaughton LLP, 2011).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Training

Training is defined as a planned learning experience designed to bring about permanent change in an individual's knowledge, attitudes, or skills (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, & Weick, 1970).
Studies show that organizations committed to training have facilitated their employees to improve their skills, enhance job satisfaction, and develop organizational commitment (e.g., Burke, 1995; Chambel & Sobral, 2011; Costen & Salazar, 2011; Mathieu, Tannenbaum, & Salas, 1992; Roehl & Swerdlov, 1999). The benefits and value of training are undeniably pivotal to an organization’s success through maintaining high standards and consistency as well as keeping abreast of the fast-changing external environment. Efforts are required for organizations to make training accessible to employees, such as hiring training professionals, providing training materials, allowing employees to participate in training and making changes in scheduling, and so forth. Training positively affects trainees’ attitudes and behaviors at workplace if they apply newly learned knowledge and skills on the job. When employees feel they are valued by their organizations, they are motivated to do their best at work (American Psychological Association, 2012) and obliged to reciprocate through means, such as modifying their behaviors and performing the tasks the way they are trained (Bulut & Culha, 2010; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986).

Kirkpatrick (1959, 1967) developed the four-level model to evaluate training: (1) Reaction: measuring what the trainees feel about various aspects of a training program, such as speaker, schedule, topic, etc.; (2) Learning: measuring knowledge acquired, skills improved, or attitudes changed due to training; (3) Behavior: measuring on-the-job behavior changed due to training; and (4) Results: measuring the final results due to training, including increased sales, higher productivity, bigger profits, reduced costs, less employee turnover and improved quality. Due to its complexity, evaluation of training has been normally limited to the first two levels (Blanchard, Thacker, & Way; 2000; Bramley & Kitson, 1994). The other extreme is that many practitioners skip level 1, 2 and 3 and only measure the ultimate fourth level (Kirkpatrick, 1996).

Even though training has been accredited for contribution in productivity and organizational performance (Scott & Meyer, 1991), very little research has evaluated the effect of training on temporary employees’ outcomes. This research intends to investigate all the four levels in the Kirkpatrick’s training model. The conceptual model identifies the relationships among four constructs: training, job satisfaction, affective commitment, and employee perceived service quality. Training here covers reaction (level 1) and learning (level 2), with ‘reaction’ indicating trainees’ perception of trainer and training program, and ‘learning’ indicating knowledge and skills obtained through training. In terms of behavior (level 3), defined as a person’s intention to act toward someone or something in a certain way (Gibson et al., 2006), job satisfaction is used. In measuring the results of training (level 4), two constructs are introduced, i.e., affective commitment and employee perceived service quality.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is defined as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (Locke, 1969, p. 316). Howard and Frick (1996) suggested that job satisfaction is a multifaceted construct that includes both intrinsic and extrinsic job factors: the intrinsic factors are associated with ability utilization, achievement, authority, responsibility, etc., and extrinsic factors are related to compensation, advancement, workplace relationships, etc. When employees are unhappy about their jobs, it can lead to absenteeism and turnover, creating both economic and moral issues to their organizations (Porter & Steers, 1973; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Vroom, 1964). George and Jones (1996) proposed that employees were less likely to withdraw if they could attain terminal
values at work. Here, values are referred to the desirable end-state of existence, which help people shape and give meaning to their work experience (Rokeach, 1973).

Training, as part of the human resource management (HRM) practices, is utilized to achieve both organizational goals and individual values. Tannenbaum and colleagues (1991) noted that training can induce positive or negative impressions and attitudes that will be carried into the workplace by employees. Many individuals find the psychological values resulted from workplace learning are more satisfying than financial rewards (Rowden & Conine, 2005). With newly-learned skills and knowledge, employees can actively participate in the decision making process, substantially enhance job performance and greatly increase job satisfaction (Byrne, Miller, & Pitts, 2010; Rowden & Conine, 2005; Schmidt, 2007). It should be pointed out that employees are more likely to experience job satisfaction when they are provided with well-designed training courses conducted by knowledgeable and professional trainers (Choos & Bowley, 2007). Thus, with effective training, employees exhibit proper behavior on the job following training instructions and produce higher job satisfaction. Even though job satisfaction is not behavior per se, but it is a direct indicator which reflects behavioral change.

In the service industry, training is an important factor which helps service employees increase their self-efficacy and find the purpose and meaning in their work. The customer-contact employees understand how to serve customers proficiently and handle their complaints promptly by following the instructions and repertoires informed in the training. Customers will have positive perceptions of their service encounters when their needs are met and problems are solved (Bitner, 1990). Thus, service employees will build up their confidence levels, believe in their abilities to perform the tasks, and truly enjoy their jobs (McDonald & Siegall, 1992). Kim and colleagues (2009) studied Thai hotel workers and concluded that training is positively related to job satisfaction. Costen and Salazar (2011) surveyed employees with four American lodging companies and found employees are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs if they can develop new skills. Despite there is a fundamental difference which motivates individuals to work as temporary employees, we argue that temporary employees, like their full-time counterparts, will achieve high job satisfaction level through training.

Hypothesis 1: Training reaction positively affects temporary employees’ job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: Training learning positively affects temporary employees’ job satisfaction.

Affective Commitment

Organizational commitment, defined as relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Porter & Smith, 1970), was considered as a unidimensional behavioral construct (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Porter et al. 1974). Meyer and Allen (1991) further conceptualized organizational commitment as a multidimensional construct consisting of three components: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Employees with continuance commitment need to stay with their organizations if the costs of leaving the organization are to be avoided. Some employees feel that they are obliged and ought to remain once normative commitment dominates. Affective commitment, defined as “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 67), is the type of organizational commitment to be most beneficial and the ‘right kind’ of commitment for an organization (Iverson & Butiggieg, 1999; Meyer et al., 1989).
Training has been linked to organizational commitment. Some suggest organizational commitment motivates employees to participate in training (e.g., Naquin & Holton, 2002; Tannenbaum, Mathieu, Salas, & Cannon-Bowers, 1991); others study organizational commitment as an outcome resulted from training (e.g., Bartlett, 2001; Bult & Culha, 2010; Lang, 1992; Newman, Thanacoody, & Hui, 2011). Bartlett (2001) argued that We agree with the latter that training is an effective HRM practice to retain committed employees (Gaertner & Nollen, 1989; Jex & Britt, 2008; Meyer & Smith, 2000). Employees, who are adequately trained, will develop positive feelings toward their organizations, especially when they perceive training is designed to attract and retain good employees (Choos & Bowley, 2007; Koys, 1988).

According to the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), employees perceive training as an investment by organizations to foster good employment relationships and in return contribute to their organizations by demonstrating desirable behaviors and outcomes (Farrell & Rusbult, 1981). Roehl and Swerdlow (1999) surveyed employees from five hotels in four cities and found training improves organizational commitment regardless of the employee’s background. However, Felfe and colleagues (2008) reported that temporary employees display lower level of commitment than do traditional employees. Since training was not a factor analyzed in the study by Felfe and colleagues, we argue that the result could have turned out differently had the temporary employees been given the training opportunities to learn how to perform their jobs better. Since there are mixed perceptions of temporary workers’ commitment level, we aim to clear the confusion through the findings from this study. We propose that temporary employees will develop affective commitment if they have access to training.

**Hypothesis 3:** Training reaction positively affects temporary employees’ affective commitment.

**Employee Perceived Service Quality**

Borman and Motowidlo (1993, 1997) suggested an employee’s overall performance has two facets: task performance and contextual performance. While contextual performance facilitates social and psychological relations with an organization, task performance “reflects how well an individual performs the duties required by the job” (Christian, Garza, & Slaughter, 2011, p. 100). In the service industry, employees strive to satisfy customers’ needs by delivering service which is considered as a performance being rendered by one party to another (Berry, 1984; Mills & Morris, 1986). Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) developed SERVQUAL to measure service quality which is a perceived judgment (Grönroos, 1984). While many studies have focused on customers’ perceptions of service quality (e.g., LeBlanc, 1992; Parasuraman, Berry, & Zeithaml, 1991; Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998; Wall & Berry, 2007). Steers and Porter (1991) argued that feedback from employees is more direct and employee perceived service quality is a suitable construct in evaluating service quality. In this study, we focus on task performance which is the technical part of overall performance and measured by employee perceived service quality. Employee perceived service quality here is defined as “an employee’s personal evaluation of the service quality that he or she delivers to customers” (Slåtten, Svensson, & Svari, 2011, pp. 207).

Training is strongly related job performance (Saks, 1995). Service employees will demonstrate better performance outcomes when they perceive that management is committed to service quality manifested by training and other HRM practices (Babakus, Yavas, Karatepe, & Avci, 2003). Even though training is widely acknowledged, some organizations do not
necessarily fully support or develop adequate training programs due to the high cost of training. For example, companies may not allow time off for employees to partake the training program, or simply just focus on productivity and efficiency but no customer service training (McColl-Kennedy & White, 1997). Implementing a well-balanced training program covering every aspect of the service encounter will help organizations obtain competitive advantage, since service quality is evaluated based not only on the technical dimensions such as tangibles, reliability and assurance, but also on the intangible aspects such as responsiveness and empathy (Parasuraman et al., 1985). McColl-Kennedy and White’s (1997) study on five-star hotel employees indicates that service quality is rated higher when employees are trained to go above and beyond to provide personalized service and individualized attention.

In the service industry, temporary employees are as important as full-time employees, as attitudes and behaviors from both employee groups will equally affect customer retention and organizational goals. Therefore, training is a relevant solution for temporary employees to achieve better job performance.

_Hypothesis 4:_ Training learning positively affects temporary employees’ perceived service quality.

**Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment and Employee Perceived Service Quality**

Job satisfaction is positively related to affective commitment. Employees with a higher level of job satisfaction exhibit greater organizational commitment (Alexandrov et al., 2007; Brown & Peterson, 1993; Chen, 2007; Magnini, Lee, & Kim, 2011; Marsh & Mannari; 1977; Scott-Ladd et al., 2006). Furthermore, job satisfaction is also the antecedent of service quality (Molhatra & Mukherjee, 2004). Employees with high job satisfaction are more likely to deliver exceptional customer service than their unhappy counterparts (Bitner, Booms, & Tetreault, 1990; Rogers, Clow, & Kash, 1994).

Employees with strong affective commitment towards their organizations work harder and perform better (Babakus et al., 2003; Meyer et al., 1989). Malhotra and Mukherjee (2004) studied bank employees and found that affective commitment is a significant drive of service quality; therefore, affective commitment deserves management’s priority as it has a strong impact on service quality (Babakus et al., 2004). However, Vandenberghhe and colleagues (2007) surveyed service employees and customers from 12 Belgian fast-food restaurants and found there is a negative relationship between affective commitment and service quality. Needlessness to say, the finding contradicts the foundations of commitment theory. The researchers asked employees to rate their affective commitment and customers to report their perceptions on service quality. It is possible that employees and customers are two distinct groups with incompatible goals and expectations. Hence, in our study, the temporary service employees were the only subjects to be surveyed to avoid potential incompatibility. We support the commitment theory and propose that temporary employees with high affective commitment deliver better customer service.

_Hypothesis 5:_ Job satisfaction positively affects temporary employees’ affective commitment.

_Hypothesis 6:_ job satisfaction positively affects temporary employees’ perceived service quality.

_Hypothesis 7:_ Affective commitment positively affects temporary employees’ perceived service quality.
Figure 1. A Conceptual Model of Training and Its Outcomes

METHODOLOGY

Sample and Procedure

The study was conducted among the college student interns who were working at a major American amusement park and hotel operator for a period of six months. The students were enrolled with an American university as full-time students, while taking classes and completing internships at the same time. A group of 39 students participated in the program in the fall semester of 2011, 26 students in spring 2012, and another 26 students in fall 2012. Data was collected from these three groups of students from August 2011 to January 2013. A total of 93 students took the survey, and some of them asked their friends who were doing the same program but affiliated with other universities to take the survey as well. In the end, 114 respondents returned their questionnaires. Of the 114 subjects, 28.9% were male and 71.1% were female.

The studied students worked various locations after receiving 60 to 80 hours of training depending on the complexity of the jobs, such as positions with the merchandise, food and beverage, hotel front desk, theme park, costuming, or lifeguard, etc. Participants normally worked 30 hours per week with a maximum of 37.5 hours per week for the duration of the program.
Measurement

Training reaction and training learning were measured with the items developed by Choo and Bowley (2007). A total of 14 items were used to measure training program and training experience. A nine-item scale to measure employee perceived service quality was adapted from Servqual developed by Parasuraman et al. (1985) to analyze its five dimensions, i.e., reliability, assurance, tangibility, empathy, and responsiveness. Affective commitment was measured with a four-item scale respectively adapted from Mowday et al. (1979). Four general items similar to Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire satisfaction subscale (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1979) was used in measuring employee job satisfaction. Responses to the scale items were elicited on 7-point Likert scales, with 1 indicating “strongly disagree or not at all satisfied” and 7 indicating “strongly agree or extremely satisfied”.

Results

The data were analyzed with SPSS version 23 and LISREL 9.2 version (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). Descriptive statistics identified the respondents’ demographic profiles. Later, exploratory factor analysis was performed to identify the relevant factors which were then verified with confirmatory factor analysis, finally structural equation modeling was used to test the proposed hypotheses.

Of the 114 total respondents, 28.9 percent were male and 71.1 percent were female. When broken down to nationalities, 43.9 percent of the studied subjects came from Vietnam, 28.1 percent from Columbia, 17.5 percent from Germany, the remaining 10.6 percent from the Netherlands, Russian, China, Portugal and India.

Reliability was confirmed by calculating Cronbach’s alphas. The results (see Table 1) showed that the Cronbach’s alphas exceeded the 0.7 threshold (Nunnally, 1978), indicating reliability was satisfactory.

Exploratory factor analysis identified five factors as expected, i.e., training reaction, training experience, job satisfaction, affective commitment and employee perceived service quality (see Table 1). In terms of training, the 14-item scale used in the study by Choo and Bowley (2007) were used. Originally Choo and Bowley developed three factors, i.e., trainer quality, course design, and learning experience. However, our test produced only two factors after one item was removed due to low factor loading and another item was moved from course design to learning experience. In the end, training reaction was measured by nine items combining trainer quality and course design, and training experience was measured by four items associated with learning experience. Another change was made on the measurement scale for employee perceived service quality. The nine-item scale was eventually reduced to eight items because one item’s factor loading was significantly lower than .50.

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed to analyze whether the factorial structure could be retrieved in the college intern sample. The results in Table 1 showed that the items representing each construct emerged with significant factor loadings. The five-factor measurement model indicated a good data-to-model fit, thus confirming the proposed model (e.g., RMSEA=.000, GFI=.952, NFI=.905, CFI=1.000). More specifically, RMSEA provides information regarding the model fit unknown but optimal parameter values used as the population covariance matrix if available. RMSEA value of below .05 indicate good fit. The goodness-of-fit index (GFI) is based on the ration of the sum of the squared differences between
the observed and reproduced matrices to the observed variance. GFI value close to .95 reflects a good fit (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). In our model, GFI = .952, so 95.2% of the S matrix is predicted by the reproduced matrix \( \hat{S} \). The normed fit index (NFI) is a measure that rescales chi-square into a 0 (not fit) to 1.0 (perfect fit) range (Bentler & Nonett, 1980). A value close to .95 reflects a good fit. The comparative fit index (CFI) measures improvement in noncentrality (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). In our model, a value of 1.0 indicates a good fit.

Structural equation modeling was carried out at the next stage. The model fit statistics collectively indicated that the proposed model fit the data well (RMSEA = 0.000, GFI = 0.95, NFI = 0.902, CFI = 1.000). The results of the path coefficients (see Table 2) showed that training reaction was positively related to affective commitment (\( \gamma_{21} = .33, t = 1.89 \)), job satisfaction was positively related to affective commitment (\( \beta_{11} = .60, t = 3.27 \)), and training learning was positively related to employee perceived service quality (\( \gamma_{32} = .38, t = 2.53 \)). Therefore, H3, H4, H5 were supported. However, H1, H2, H6 and H7 were not supported due to non-significant t-values.

**DISCUSSIONS**

This research explored the relationships between training and its outcomes. Training was broken down to training reaction and training learning. Results showed the outcomes were positively related to training to some extent mediated by job satisfaction. It is worth mentioning that the participants indicated that they enjoyed being part of the once in a lifetime experience, interning at a major American theme park and hotel company. The access to training made it possible for the temporary interns to dive right into a happy world surrounded by the aurora of the company and the happy customers. Because of the high standards and favorable reputation held by the company, evidently, those interns rated high on training reaction, affective commitment, and employee perceived service quality.

However, the participants scored low in job satisfaction and learning experience, citing the training program and the job itself were not challenging enough. Some interns stated that they liked to work for the company, but just did not fully anticipate the simple boring tasks and unfavorable work schedules such as night shifts. The reason may be obvious that the participants were international college students performing entry-level service jobs in the U.S. The fantasies and realities finally clashed when those interns started to work night shifts and repeat simple tasks.

Even though this research shows mixed results, it still provides some insights in training. Companies can gain competitive advantage over their opponents by investing in training, as training can enhance employee commitment (Bartlett, 2001). To alleviate workplace boredom, maybe companies can design their training programs to equip their employees with transferable skills to take on new challenges later on.

**LIMITATIONS**

Although this study sheds some insights in the theory of training, it does have a number of limitations. First, the studied subjects were international students participating in an internship program in the U.S. Their expectation and understanding of the American real world work experience might be very different from their American counterparts. Language barriers and cultural differences might have prevented them from thoroughly enjoying their jobs. Second, this
The effects of training study was based on data collected at one American resort company. Third, the questionnaire was worded in English. Even though all the respondents spoke English as a foreign language, they might interpret the questions differently. Therefore, the analytical results from this study may not be used to generalize the population. However, future studies may expand to other demographics and sectors to produce fruitful results.

Table 1 Results from EFA and CFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>EFA Factor Loading</th>
<th>CFA Factor Loading</th>
<th>t-Value***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Reaction (TA) (Cronbach α=.94)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training was well prepared.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trainer was very helpful.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was satisfied with the support offered to me by my trainer.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives of the training program was relevant to my job.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was well informed of the requirements for the training program.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very confident that I had the knowledge and skills required to successfully complete the training.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was well informed of how to complete each module of the training program.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accomplished all the objectives of the training course.</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be able to apply what I learned on a regular basis in my job.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Experience (TE) (Cronbach α=.85)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had plenty of time to complete all the modules of the training program.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activities in the training program gave me sufficient practice and feedback.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found the training program overall to be very challenging.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training program exceeded my expectations.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction (JS) (Cronbach α=.93)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the kind of work I am currently doing.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the level of challenge in my job.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to come back to work.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Commitment (AC) (Cronbach α=.94)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would recommend (the company) to my friends as a great place to work. I am proud to tell others that I work for (the company). (The company) inspires me to do my best work. I am pleased with my decision to work for (the company).

**Employee Perceived Service Quality (EPSQ)**
*(Cronbach α = .91)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Perceived Service Quality (EPSQ)</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of physical facilities</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of employees</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to solving guest problems</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing services right the first time</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of employees to help guests</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteousness of employees</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of employees to answer questions</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability of employees to meet guest needs</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goodness-of-Fit Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>76.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on two-tailed tests, for t-values greater than 2.33, p<.01 (***)

Table 2 The Results of Conceptual Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized Path</th>
<th>Estimated Coefficient</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Training Reaction → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Training Learning → Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Training Reaction → Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.89 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Training Learning → Employee Perceived Service Quality</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2.53 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Job Satisfaction → Affective Commitment</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.27 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Job Satisfaction → Employee Perceived Service Quality</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Affective Commitment → Employee Perceived Service Quality</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Based on two-tailed tests: for t-values greater than 1.65, p<.10 (*); for t-values greater than 1.96, p<.05 (**), for t-values greater than 2.33, p<.01 (***)
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