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Abstract
The importance of developing and maintaining employees’ job satisfaction has been emphasized throughout previous related literature and studies due to its significance for both employees’ career and establishment’s success. To understand what causes people to be satisfied with their jobs, the nature of the work itself is one of the first issues for practitioners to focus on. Work environment influences service climate, which in turn influences employee job satisfaction. This study’s aim is to examine how the various components of positive work environment (PWE) would influence job satisfaction (JS) dimensions of hotels’ employees. The current study targeted the employees of four- and five-star hotels in Hurghada. A survey 5-point Likert scale questionnaire has been used to elicit the required data from respondent employees concerning supervisory and managerial support, peers’ support, management crew performance, role clarity and job description and resources’ availability, and employees’ job satisfaction. Results indicated that employees’ job satisfaction is affected by the positive work environment and its chosen, hypothesized constituents. The result of this research recommended how to develop and maintain a positive work environment through providing managers’ and supervisors’ support, peers’ supports, management crew diligence and success, and role clarity. In addition, measures should be taken to increase employees’ job satisfaction. This will eventually and directly lead hotels to better perform sustainably concerning employees, being the most valuable asset and capital, and consequently succeed in terms of profitability, productivity and customer satisfaction and loyalty.
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Introduction
The Egyptian hospitality industry is experiencing a remarkable recession and serious business valleys. This yielded unfortunate organizational circumstances that are acting often against employees’ job satisfaction (JS). Therefore, duly unfortunate consequences would rise in the workplace. Therefore, it is essentially dictated to determine the exact practices and procedures concerning the positive work environment (PWE) leading to the most satisfied employee.

Although JS is a widely researched area, the continuing changes and diversifying economic, geographical or social, and most significantly, operational contexts, often urge the need for further future research. That is, the body of existing research on JS may be thought abundant, and research questions and hypotheses might appear alike. However, both focal points and results are highly diverse in different professional and geographical settings. Due to its significance, several recent, renowned studies have been conducted concerning JS, particularly in the hospitality industry (Wanda and John, 2011; DiPietro et al., 2014; Ozturk et al., 2014; Santa Cruz et al., 2014; Guchait et al., 2016).

The common-sense-based argument assuming that factors leading to employee JS are simply the opposite of factors leading to employee turnover is not applicable to the very context of the Egyptian hotel industry in the time of conducting the study. That is, hospitality business has been, and still, suffering a substantial recession, meaning that unsatisfied employees would not have the luxury or opportunity to quit and work elsewhere. They have to work for that unsatisfactory employer, with the guaranteed
negative consequences. Thus, it is almost necessary to research what are the most likely variables that can eradicate, minimize, or at least neutralize the unfavorable impacts of the contemporary business decline.

**Review of Literature**
The next part presents review of relevant available literature concerning JS importance for organizations’ survival and prosperity, and JS concept, definitions and relationship to other variables. Afterward, the various components of PWE are demonstrated, and how they would influence employees’ JS.

**Job Satisfaction Importance**
Previous related literature and studies asserted the importance of developing and maintaining employees’ JS due to its significance for both employees’ career and establishment’s success. Certainly, the growing interest in JS exists both from the standpoint of employees, managers and scientists. On the one hand, employees have their own expectations and attitudes, and they want to be treated in a fair and respectful manner, and as a result they will be satisfied at their work. On the other hand, managers want satisfied workers, who will have a positive attitude to the job, who will be committed, and emotionally involved with their job (Bakotić and Babić, 2013).

One of the greatest problems currently facing hotels, as reported by Fitzenz (1984), is the flow of human resources, that is, hotels have to develop and maintain employee JS by enhancing the quality of internal service to reduce turnover and support the organization’s performance. In the tourism and hotel industry, studying JS is of substantial interest for guaranteeing customer satisfaction (Smith et al., 1996; Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007; Santa Cruz et al., 2014).

From a personnel-related perspective, as an independent variable, JS is a consistent predictor of worker behaviors such as turnover, absence, rate of accidents, deterioration of emotional and physical health, morale, motivation, goal-achievement and value, and commitment to the organization (Hackett and Guion, 1985; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Kohler and Mathieu, 1993; Smith et al., 1996; Harter and Schmidt, 2002; Chiang et al., 2005; Karatepe and Sokmen, 2006; Karatepe et al., 2006; Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007; Anton, 2009; DeMoura et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2010; Yang and Jen-Tê, 2010; Ram et al., 2011; Wanda and John, 2011; Arokiasamy, 2013; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015).

From an operational viewpoint, the value of hotel product is reflected in the satisfaction of the hotel employee providing service (Sisson, 2002). Whenever a business desires to provide good-quality external services, it must first offer satisfying internal services that meet employees’ needs (Hallowell et al., 1996; Goldstein, 2003), particularly in hotels (Zhou, 2011; Mokaya et al., 2013). That is, JS represents a worker’s attitude toward his/her work as a whole, thus, the more satisfied the worker is; the more positive an attitude he/she assumes toward work (Robbins, 2003; Arokiasamy, 2013).

Several studies (Bernhardt, 2000; Harter and Schmidt, 2002; Sisson, 2002; Patterson et al., 2003; Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007; Ram et al., 2011; Arokiasamy, 2013; Mokaya et al., 2013; Santa Cruz et al., 2014) reported that the more satisfied workers are with their jobs; the better the company is likely to perform in terms of profitability, productivity and customer satisfaction and loyalty. Satisfied employees are claimed to be loyal, and the service provided by these employees will contribute to customer satisfaction and loyalty, in turn (Heskett et al., 1994; Ineson et al., 2013). Yee and Yeung (2011) also provided strong empirical evidence regarding the significant roles that employee satisfaction play in enhancing the operational performance of organizations in the ‘high-contact’ service sector.
Even on upper hierarchy levels, managers’ JS measurement and maintenance, too, has often been considered an important dimension of workplace productivity and job performance (Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985; Okpara, 2007; Patterson et al., 2004; Hosie et al., 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013). Satisfied people create and deliver value out of other organizational resources, e.g., financial, physical and technology (Mokaya et al., 2013). Satisfied employees also form a source of competitive advantage. Any progressive organization must therefore not only attract the right staff; it must create and sustain their satisfaction to work in continuously changing circumstances (Bakotić and Babić, 2013; Mokaya et al., 2013). Most recently, Guchait et al. (2016) stated that JS mediates the impact of behavioral integrity on error recovery performance.

**Job Satisfaction Concept, Definitions and Relationship to Other Variables**

Heartfield (2012) argued that in order to create an environment for employee JS, it is vitally important to primarily know which factors most affect it. In order to rationalize the current research’s choice of interdependent variables, this part illustrates JS concepts and relationship to other variables as spotted in relevant literature. A group of interconnected attitudes towards different work aspects constitute JS. Consequently, JS definitions and discussion should include a variety of factors such as nature of work, salary, stress, working conditions, colleagues, superiors, working hours (Rollinson, 2008).

The concept of employee JS was initially introduced as the subjective physical and mental reactions or attitude displayed by employees with regard to the work-related dimensions (Hoppock, 1935; Locke, 1973; Carlino and DeFina, 1995; Smith et al., 1996), including the variation and nature of work tasks, feedback, inter-colleague relationship, opportunities to perform tasks, employee’s position on job, incentive/control mechanism, work environment and management system (Szilagyi and Walace, 1980; Arnett et al., 2002; Ozturk et al., 2014). In a relevant context, JS is the general attitude of the employee towards the job and it includes five components: attitude toward work group, general working conditions, attitude towards the organization, monetary benefit and attitude toward supervision and it is connected with the employee mindset regarding the work itself (Fajana, 2002).

Satisfaction has been also denoted as the fulfillment of a need or desire and the pleasure obtained by such a fulfillment. JS has been determined as a good yardstick to assess personal attitude to the professional activity of the organization, and as being a critical success factor for organizations (Arokiasamy, 2013). To understand what causes people to be satisfied with their jobs, the nature of the work itself is one of the first places for practitioners to focus on (Hackett and Guion, 1985; Kohler and Mathieu, 1993). Work environment influences service climate, which in turn influences employee JS (Bjerker et al., 2007; Liang, 2010; Ram et al., 2011; Arokiasamy, 2013).

A study by Roelofsen (2002) indicates that improving the working environment reduces complaints and absenteeism while increasing productivity. Work environment variables, including working conditions, training and development opportunities, are a chief predictor of employee engagement and JS (Lam et al., 2001; Ostroff et al., 2002; Deery, 2008; Gu and Chi, 2009; Gallardo et al., 2010; Mokaya et al., 2013). The factors that affect work satisfaction can be discussed as “individual” and “organizational” (Şahin and Şahingoğz, 2013). Good organizational culture and internal service quality, involving workplace equipment, training, job promotions, teamwork, employee welfare measures, internal communication channels, the degree of autonomy, and respect for the boss have significant interactive influence on employee JS (Heskett et al., 1994; Hallowell et al., 1996; Chen, 2001; Lam et al., 2001; Cai, 2003; Tsai, 2004; Chathoth et al., 2007; Sledgea
et al., 2008; Lee and Way, 2010; Mahsud et al., 2010; O’Fallon and Rutherford, 2010; Jawahar and Stone, 2011; Wang, 2012; Ozturk et al., 2014).

Psychosocial work environment factors, like social involvement, affective factors, information about decisions concerning the work place, and support from superiors and colleagues have been shown as important and significantly contributing to JS (Gu and Chi, 2009; Yang and Jen-Te, 2010; Sell and Cleal, 2011; Ineson et al., 2013). JS has also been directly related to positive experiences and emotions, involving a fulfilling, positive work-related experience and state of mind, good health and positive work affect (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Sonnenstag, 2003). Robbins (2003) also argued that organizational culture would have a considerable effect on what behavioral role an employee chooses to take on. In other words, whether organizational culture is an influential or extraneous factor behind employee JS is a topic worth discussing. Thus, representing the PWE, the primary variables to be tested have to be supportive supervisory and managerial attitude and behavior, and positive and productive peers’ support.

It is also imperative that an organization provide satisfying tools, policies and procedures, teamwork, management, goal-oriented cooperation and training, and further increase employee JS (Hallowell et al., 1996). Hartline et al. (2000) believed that the tremendous influence of organizational culture on employees’ behavior and performance is clearly reflected in employee-customer interactions. There is a causal chain linking employee satisfaction to financial performance through the mediating constructs of employee loyalty, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty (Ram et al., 2011). Therefore, it was dictated to assess the correlation of the existence of diligent, successful management crew. Job description and duties’ clarity, and resources’ availability have been also chosen to scrutinize their relationship to JS, based on Lee and Way (2010) and Ineson et al. (2013), who stated that individual job characteristics should receive special consideration as they appear to have a highly significant but at the same time considerably varying role in the JS in different employment contexts.

Managerial and Supervisory Support (MSS)

According to Israeli and Barkan (2003) and Şahin and Şahingoz (2013), the social context and views of the particular establishment affect JS. Quality of supervision, quality of social relationships, and level of support in the workplace stimulate JS (Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007; Chuang et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2010; Arokiasamy, 2013; Yeh, 2015). Results suggest that supervision have significant positive effects on the JS of frontline employees (Karatepe et al., 2003).

Thus, the prime variables to be discussed in this study among other JS antecedents are support from supervisors, managers, and peer colleagues. In this context, is would not be uncommon to commence with a suggestion set by Poe (2003); that is, “treat people the way you expect hotel guests to be treated”. Various studies underscored the role and importance of the human interactions occurring in working environment both with managers or supervisors (Bloemer and Odekerken-Schröder, 2006; Chen, 2001; Mahsud et al., 2010; Milman, 2003; Moncarz et al., 2009; Ng et al., 2006).

Organizational, managerial and supervisory support and a feeling of close affiliation with the company are of critical importance to develop and maintain JS (Gon et al., 2005; Karatepe and Uludag, 2008; Ineson et al., 2000, 2013). JS is affected by organizational encouragement, manager support and mentoring, and supervisory encouragement (Amabile, 1996; Øgaarda et al., 2008; Arokiasamy, 2013). Such interpersonal role encourages positive relations and increases employees’ self-confidence (Chandrasekar, 2011). Surveys conducted by Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) (2011) revealed that employees value relationships with their supervisors more than benefits and
compensation. More recent study conducted by Arokiasamy (2013) indicated that supervisors play an important role in forming their employees’ JS, and influencing their perception about the organization.

In order to more specifically determine and target practices that enhance JS, the following section elucidates that particular areas and concerns which managers and supervisors need to spot to better address their employee JS-related needs. Primary satisfaction-leading practice is letting employees discuss work issue, providing them a clear mutual goal, and participation in daily decision-making processes (Amabile, 1996; Spinelli and Canavos, 2000; Ineson et al., 2013; Şahin and Şahingož, 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014). Amabile (1996), Yang and Jen-Te (2010) and Ozturk et al., (2014) stated that employee should be given due a sense of autonomy and control over their work; that is, discretion to determine what to do or how to do it.

Another equally important concern is respect and fairness. Satisfied employees need to be relayed the feeling of fair, supportive evaluation and recognition of new ideas and suggestions (Amabile, 1996 and Lam and Qiu, 2003). Employees’ JS is affected by respecting and appreciating their job-related suggestions, input and accomplishments (Spinelli and Canavos, 2000; Arokiasamy, 2013; DiPietro et al., 2014).

Nature and fairness of workload have been also identified as a building block of JS (Yang and Jen-Te, 2010; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015; Yeh, 2015). Jobs need to provide challenging objectives, but excessive workload undermines employees’ performance (Amabile, 1996). In addition, a cost-effective way of increasing employees’ morale, competitiveness and productivity is management’s recognition and acknowledging their performance through praise, awards and incentives (Poe, 2003; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014; Arokiasamy, 2013; Ineson et al., 2013), which is often well valued as an element of employee JS with over 80% (SHRM, 2011).

Supervisors also needs to serve as an on-the-job role model, setting appropriate goals, valuing individual contributions, supporting and showing confidence in the workgroup, and providing open interaction with subordinates (Amabile, 1996). The same author also assured the significance of supervisors developing and maintaining healthy workgroup communication, openness to new ideas, and mutual commitment.

Moreover, operationally, employees need to experience job flexibility and suitable working hours (Ineson et al., 2013 and Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015). Flexible scheduling arrangements, family-friendly policies and suitable sick leave and paid vacation policies are valued by employees as a stimulus for their JS (Deery, 2008; Chuang et al., 2009; Santa Cruz et al., 2014; Yeh, 2015).

At the individual level, much can be done to satisfy employees. Managers and supervisors should enable employees’ self-actualization, permitting high levels of creativity, empowerment, and ability utilization. Employees should be allowed due opportunities for training, promotion and development, personal growth, worthwhile accomplishment, career opportunity, skill variety and skill utilization (Lam et al., 2001; Lam and Qiu, 2003; Yu, 2003; Chiang et al., 2005; Hechanova et al., 2006; Youngsoo and Duncan, 2009; Gallardo et al., 2010; Wanda and John, 2011; Frye, 2012; Ineson et al., 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014). Employee recognition, reward for effective efforts, and growth opportunity have been spotted by Chuang et al. (2009), Gallardo et al. (2010) and Kiruthiga and Magesh (2015) to contribute to ultimate employees JS.

The creation and practice of a fair, equitable and satisfactory promotion system positively influences employee JS (Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007; Mokaya et al., 2013). If an organization does not recognize the individual needs and desire to grow, then “development” becomes a primary reason for resignation or else poor performance levels. Effort at career guidance are directed towards organizational goals, thus, each employee
should take some initiative in planning his or her career. Contributing to employee development is associated with employee commitment, increased productivity, decreased absenteeism and turnover, and, accordingly, JS (Arokiasamy, 2013). Therefore, support provided by managers and supervisors should enhance employees’ JS, and the following hypothesis can be formulated:

H.1 The more the managerial and supervisory support, the more satisfied will be employees.

Peers’ Support (PS)
It has been settled that JS is better developed and maintained through mutual workgroup support and encouragement, through creativity reinforcement, constructive challenge, and shared commitment (Amabile, 1996). Studies stated that the existence and quality of interpersonal relationships, and commitment to work groups influence employee JS (Spinelli and Canavos, 2000; Becker, 2002; Liang, 2010; Frye, 2012; Ineson et al., 2013). Co-workers’ kindness has been detected as a motivational and satisfaction factor (Bjerker et al., 2007; Arokiasamy, 2013). It also emerged that building allies across the organization helps employees accomplish their work and organizational goals; making the workplace more enjoyable, thus increasing JS (SHRM, 2011). In addition, coworkers’ mutual and cooperative devotion toward achieving common organizational goals and securing operational business needs results in overall better JS (Ineson et al., 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014). Teamwork has also been identified as a cornerstone for employees JS (Arokiasamy, 2013; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014). Therefore, peers support can improve employees’ JS, and the second hypothesis would thus be formulated:

H.2 The more the peers support, the more satisfied will be employees.

Diligent, Successful Management Crew (DSM.)
Employees’ perceptions of management affect their JS (Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015). A feeling of close affiliation with the company is stated to be of critical importance to JS (Ineson et al., 2000, 2013). Varela and García (2006) indicated that organizational effectiveness improves employee JS in the hospitality industry. In Frye’s study (2012), corporate culture concerns have had the greatest impact on front office managers’ JS among other investigated variables. Deery (2008) enlisted the need for good role models at the workplace as an important factor to enhance employees’ JS. Employees’ pride and respect in the company, the boss, and organization’ professional corporate culture enhances their JS (Chen, 2001; Milman, 2003; Bloemer and Odekerken-Schroder, 2006; Ng et al., 2006; Ineson et al., 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014). In a case study of hotels in Hong Kong, JS has improved through a total quality management approach (Lam et al., 2001). Employees become more easily satisfied with their jobs if their hotels enjoy strong reputation (Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015). Arokiasamy (2013) reported that JS is expanded by a positive management crew, equipped with a success framework of goals, measurements, and expectations. Lan (2003) and Yu (2003) underscored the essential role of the innovation-supporting, aggressive organizational culture to employees’ JS; the culture that is positively directed toward leadership satisfaction, administration, and employees’ advanced learning. On the other hand, a conservative, bureaucratic culture is negatively related to JS; that is, the one that hinders creativity, avoids risks, criticizes new ideas, overemphasizes the status quo, and allows destructive internal competition (Amabile, 1996; Lan, 2003).
Therefore, the diligence and success of the managerial crew would be up to increase employees’ JS, and the third hypothesis can be formulated:

\[ \text{H.3 The more the management diligence and success, the more satisfied will be employees.} \]

**Role Clarity: Job Description and Resources’ Availability (RC.)**

The findings of multiple studies, such as Lam et al. (2001), Tutuncu and Kozak (2007); Chuang et al. (2009); Ozturk et al. (2014); and Yeh (2015), have showed that job itself is a critical factor in predicting JS. Job characteristics are related to satisfaction among employees in the fast food industry in Hong Kong (Lam and Qiu, 2003). JS is found to arise among employees who enjoy their position (Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015). Ultimate employees JS is determined in part by the job and work itself and diversity of related tasks (Bjerker et al., 2007; Liang, 2010; Arokiasamy, 2013; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015). It has been indicated that improving the working settings reduces complaints and absenteeism while increasing productivity (Roelofsen, 2002). Leblebici (2012) stated that workplace satisfaction has been associated with JS.

Among the job-related variables affecting JS are task identity, task significance, feedback, and the level of role ambiguity (Chen et al., 2010; Yang and Jen-Te, 2010; Frye, 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013; Ozturk et al., 2014). In the Turkish hotel industry, frontline employees’ JS has been negatively related with role stressors (Karatepe and Sokmen, 2006). Personnel should be clearly and explicitly informed with their job definitions, duties, responsibilities, and what they are authorized to do. Such information should consider employees’ individual knowledge level and limitations, since work JS is influenced by the overall work’s nature, difficulty level, and workload (Şahin and Şahingo, 2013; Yeh, 2015).

In addition to the job itself, resources availability, sufficiency, adequacy and proper allocation are among the factors that in-build employees’ JS. Work-related resources include funds, materials, facilities, and information (Amabile, 1996; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015). Alike, several studies have proven that employees’ mood, attitude, and JS is increased by comfortable, operational, easy-controlled and safe working conditions and job settings (Leaman, 1995; Leather et al., 1998; Wells, 2000; Brill et al., 2001; Newsham et al., 2004, 2009; Kinzl et al., 2005; Veitch et al., 2005; Bockerman and Ilmakunnas, 2006; Frye, 2012; Leblebici, 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013; Bakotić and Babić, 2013; Şahin and Şahingo, 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014).

Bockerman and Ilmakunnas (2006) and Bakotić and Babić (2013) have added that employees JS is also influenced by physical factors, such as lighting, noise, dust, smoke and other harmful factors, and by the safety and functionality of equipment. In addition, workplace design and layout should be safe, comfortable, and considered around employees working needs in order to improve their JS (Stallworth and Kleiner, 1996; Leblebici, 2012; Design and Index, 2006, 2013).

Hence, employees’ role clarity and availability of job descriptions and resources can raise their JS, and the fourth hypothesis can be formulated:

\[ \text{H.4 The more the role clarity, the more satisfied will be employees.} \]

In addition to testing the previous four hypotheses as part of the research objectives, it has been researcher’ intuition to strengthen his findings through testing the collective nature of correlation of the four dependent variables upon the JS, in the name of a fifth dependent variable; positive work environment (PWE), forming the following hypothesis:

\[ \text{H.5 The more positive the work environment, the more satisfied will be employees.} \]

Finally, it has been clear throughout reviewing relevant studies that research variables, which are MSS, PS, DSM, and RC have been viewed by employees as being significant enough to be neither reliant upon hotels’ nor employees working profile. Therefore, the sixth research hypothesis is stated as follows:
There is no significant correlation between the hotels'/employees' profile with positive work environment.

Research Methods
After pinpointing the significance of the chosen research variables via discussing relevant previous studies, the field study is intended to complement and further explores the concepts cited in the theoretical demonstration.

Characteristics of the Population
The current study targeted the employees of four- and five-star hotels in Hurghada that neither have supervisory nor managerial positions. They totaled 73 hotels at the time of conducting the study, 49 four-star hotels and 24 five-star hotels (Egyptian Hotel Guide-31st edition, 2012).

As for the population community, Hurghada has been selected due to its hospitality environment richness; with various hotels’ operational contexts, affiliation, and grades. In addition, Hurghada hotels represent extended shifts and a demanding and tough working environment; and employees are not from Hurghada itself, thus lacking family support. Thus, staff members would much greatly appreciate and seek encouraging working environment than in other comparable city-hotel settings. Eventually, results homogeneity, better generalizability and applicability of results to similar contexts are much guaranteed through surveying individual city.

Moreover, selecting five and four-star hotels was due to that they operate multiple operations and sales outlets and mostly enjoy higher business volumes than lower-grade hotels, necessitating the development and maintenance of a positive work environment for employees. These considerations would help obtain meaningful results and implications, and ensure that field study efforts are not in vain.

Scale Development and Data Collection Techniques
To assess employees’ perceptions regarding the independent research variables, the researcher has examined related studies to design a proper tool for questioning employees. Individual statements have been furthermore added to enrich the relevant, previously used questionnaires and broaden their scope.

Basically, in order to thoroughly measure JS, a multi-dimensional approach has to be used (Zhong, 1986). Primarily, five dimensions of JS have been proposed; the job itself, job promotions, salary, supervisors and co-workers (Smith et al., 1969), which is adopted by this present study. This approach was also adopted in Wang’s study (2012) to assess the impact of internal service quality and organizational culture on employees JS in Taiwanese hotels. In addition, satisfaction questionnaire main sets and statements have been based upon the work by (Ineson et al., 2013), since it provided a compact, precise grouping of the contributors to job satisfaction, upon which the researcher could have inserted additional items derived from relevant literature to enrich the questionnaire.

In addition to questions regarding hotels’ profile and employees' personal and job related data, a 5-point Likert scale has been used, where "1" indicates strongly disagree; and 5 indicates strongly agree, to ask employees to provide data regarding:
- Supervisory and Managerial Support
- Peers’ Support
- Diligent, Successful Management Crew
- Role Clarity; Job Description and Resources’ Availability
- Employees’ Job Satisfaction
Scale’s Validity
The questionnaire was first reviewed and evaluated for clarity and content by a panel of consultants, consisting of convenience-sampling-based academic staff members of Hotel Studies Department, Faculty of Tourism and Hotels, Alexandria University, possessing both the academic and the practical experience. The following outcomes have been attained from this introductory step:

- Assuring face validity.
- Ensuring the clarity of questionnaire statement, and drawing out comments concerning any difficulties they had in completing the questionnaire accurately.
- Bringing about experts’ opinions and emotional responses, known as test concepts, to different components and concepts stated in the questionnaire.
- Possible improvements and rephrasing of the questionnaire statements to avoid ambiguity and misunderstanding, academic expressions were changed to common business terms, repeated and similar questions were either deleted or integrated, and some double-barreled and leading questions were adjusted to ensure complete avoidance of bias.
- The introduction needed some slight adjustments.
- Seeking after panel members' experience in conducting surveys and field studies.

Pilot Study
In the second stage, the questionnaire was piloted by a convenience-sample of survey respondents. These respondents were employees in a four-star hotel in Alexandria. The following outcomes have been attained from this step:

- The content validity; and the extent to which the questionnaire statements represent all facets of PWE and JS, have been ensured.
- Technical output; that is, discussing and reasoning the importance and actual impact of questionnaire items on employees’ JS, and arguing the researcher’s rationale and how realistic is the phrasing of various aspects and forms of support from management, supervisors, and peer employees, in addition to slight rephrasing of statements.
- Determining the time required to fill in the questionnaire.
- Expecting, and being ready for side talks that might arise between the researcher and respondents, if any.

Sampling and Questionnaire Distribution
The researcher targeted all four and five-star hotels in Hurghada. At November, 2013; the time of distributing questionnaires, an average of 100 staff members were working in each hotel, according to a pre-questionnaire-distribution conversation with hotels’ human resources and training managers; among which, 30 questionnaires were distributed, totaling 2190 distributed questionnaires. The sample thus represents 30% of the total population, as required for the sake of further reasonable, reliable generalization attempts (Gay & Diehl, 1992). Questionnaires were submitted to be randomly distributed to employees in the employees catering cafeteria. 1440 questionnaires were returned and valid, with response rate representing 65.7 %.

Reliability Analysis
The reliability coefficient, Cronbach’s Alpha, was calculated to investigate the reliability of the data collection instrument; the questionnaire, after being distributed, and before being further analyzed. The Cronbach’s Alpha correlation coefficient for individual
variables, and for the whole questionnaire, was safely and sufficiently higher than the cut point of 0.70, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Alpha Coefficient of internal reliability for each Section of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>MSS(^1)</th>
<th>PS(^2)</th>
<th>DSM(^3)</th>
<th>RC(^4)</th>
<th>JS(^5)</th>
<th>The whole(^6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.909</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Variables</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 MSS: Managerial and Supervisory Support  
2 PS: Peers’ Support  
3 DSM: Diligent, Successful Management Crew  
4 RC: Role Clarity  
5 JS: Job Satisfaction  
6 The whole scale: The Cronbach’s Alpha calculated for the questionnaire as a whole, in addition to calculating it for each construct

Source: Field Study Results Analysis

Results and Discussion

This part first demonstrates the respondents' profiles and hotel characteristics. The research hypotheses and related variables are then comprehensively analyzed and discussed descriptively and inferentially. Interpretation and discussion of results are provided along with results.

Respondents’ Profile Characteristics

A descriptive analysis of employees’ and hotels’ profile characteristics is provided in Table 2, showing the number (No.) and percentage (%) of respondent employees according to affiliation, grade, gender, job nature, social status, years spent in hotel, and age. Regarding the demographics of employees, data indicated that male employees represented (91.7%), while 8.3 % of respondents were females. This is clearly attributable to that the field study has been conducted in Hurghada, where employees are recruited from other cities and towns, and are accommodated in employees’ housing provided by the hotel, which is inconvenient for female workers. As for the social status of the respondents, the highest percentage went for single employees (36.1%), followed by married (63.9%). By studying the age of respondents, it was apparent that most employees (47.2%) were in the age category of “from 30 to less than 35”. The least proportion reported (8.3%) was for the category of “from 21 to less than 25”.

In view of their job-related profile, guest-contact employees (52.8%) were slightly higher than non-guest-contact (47.2%). As for years spent in hotel, the largest proportion of employees (55.6%) worked for 5-10 years. Concerning hotels’ grade, most employees (58.3 %) were working in 4-star hotels. Regarding hotels’ affiliation, most employees were working in chain-affiliated hotels (58.3%).
Table 2: Respondents' Profiles and Hotel Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotels' Profile Characteristics</th>
<th>Employees' Profile Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees working in:</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Star hotels</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent hotels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Study Results Analysis

Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables
A descriptive analysis of research variables is provided in Table 3, based on the scores reported by employees, where questionnaire statements have been rearranged in descending order per means of scores. Means of scores of all variables; either dependent or independent, were noted to be moderate. This indicates that more efforts and endeavors are definitely required from employees, supervisors, and managers to improve and maintain a positive work environment.

Table 3: Summary of Descriptive Analysis Results of Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managerial and Supervisory Support (MSS) Overall Mean</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Role Clarity (RC) Overall Mean</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mss. 11</td>
<td>Managers and supervisors are flexible in personnel-related matters.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>There is no unnecessary paperwork involved in doing my job.</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and supervisors give concern to and help solve my personal problems.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>I have all the equipment and resources I need to do my job effectively.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is flexible to arrange my work schedule to meet my personal/family responsibilities.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>I can easily obtain the information I need to do my job.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and supervisors are keen to maintain a positive, productive work environment.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>I have adequate technology to do my job.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor-manager strongly considers my professional development goals and values.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>My job description matches my actual job duties.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and supervisors always discuss works issues, concerns and problems with us.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>There is no hindering overlap/duplication in tasks between me and my colleagues.</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints processing is a fair way to resolve disputes between employees and management.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>I have a clear idea of my job responsibilities.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor-manager allocates work load fairly and effectively.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>I have all the information I need to do my job well.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor-manager is available to me when I have questions or need help.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>I am satisfied with working shifts and scheduling patterns.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ suggestions are welcomed, valued, applied where feasible, and credited to them.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>I am satisfied with working shifts and scheduling patterns.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my immediate supervisor/manager</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction (JS) Overall Mean</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ morale is considered by managers and supervisors.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees’ skills and abilities are well-utilized and credited by</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my worksite safety.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managers/supervisors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and supervisors have a good working relationship with employees.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>I am satisfied with communication in the work environment.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers/supervisors consider employees’ interests while realizing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>I am satisfied with job security.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hotels’ values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees can readily acquire due expertise and skills to improve promotion</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my supervisor from a personal perspective.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and supervisors openly transfer skills to employees to perform</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>I am satisfied with benefits package.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers’ Support (PS)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>I am satisfied with pay.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work group is focused and keen on reducing job-related expenses.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>I am satisfied with career advancement &amp; development opportunities and</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and are dependent upon one another to achieve a common goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fairness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees work together and are dependent upon one another to achieve a</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>I am satisfied with level of opportunity to supervise others.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees promote a professional work environment.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>I am satisfied by my importance in the hotel.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the productivity and efficiency of my team.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>I understand how my job aligns with the company’s mission.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my work group, we participate in deciding how the work gets done.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my supervisor from an operational perspective.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workgroup looks for ways to change processes to improve productivity.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>I am proud to work for this hotel.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.10</td>
<td>At this hotel, work groups cooperate with each other to minimize unnecessary work.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>js.2</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the work accomplishment of my department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.6</td>
<td>My work group focuses on fixing the problem rather than finding someone to blame.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>js.16</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.11</td>
<td>I have seen improvement in the quality of work as a result of emphasis on teamwork.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>js.6</td>
<td>I feel that the goals setting for my task are achievable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.4</td>
<td>The meetings that I have with my co-workers and supervisors help me to get my job done.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>js.18</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the feeling of achievement and challenge of my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.9</td>
<td>My fellow-workers inspire for a high-performing-environment.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>js.19</td>
<td>I am satisfied level of different work duty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ps.12</td>
<td>I have colleagues to whom I can go for help when I have work-related problems.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>js.9</td>
<td>I am satisfied with training for daily tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diligent, Successful Management Crew (DSM) Overall Mean</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>js.5</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my overall relationship with my colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 1</td>
<td>The hotel’s business strategy leads to success in the market place.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>js.10</td>
<td>Performance Appraisal is fair and reflects performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 3</td>
<td>Hotel management is making the operational changes necessary to compete effectively.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>js.22</td>
<td>I feel appreciated when I achieve or complete a task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 5</td>
<td>Management has the hotel’s and organizations best interests in mind.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 10</td>
<td>Hotel management is keen on providing the necessary resources to implement new ideas.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 9</td>
<td>Hotel management is innovative in developing new ways to serve customers.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 4 Hotel’s management does not sacrifice quality in order to meet schedules or deadlines.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 2 Hotel management is committed to providing competitive products and services.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 6 Management is keen on maintaining hotel’s image as that of a high quality company.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 7 Hotel management sets and maintains high standards for business ethics.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dsm. 8 Compared to other hotels, management keeps work environment welcoming and joyful.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Study Results Analysis

Employees have been lacking various forms and aspects of supervisory and managerial support (3.20), which is mainly attributed to the prevailing business recession. That is, workload being distributed on less employees, cases of layoffs, guests with less-than-usual spending patterns, decreased overall income, management’s inability to guarantee job security and stability for employees, among many other negative recession consequences, caused general, unavoidable degrading in managers’ and supervisors’ ability to exert and improve various forms and aspects of support to their employees.

Similarly, due to these operational circumstances and expected, consecutive decline in employees’ morale, it is thus predictable that employees’ focus and efforts would not rather be concerned about peers’ support (3.22). Instead, focus would be directed to work itself, conformity to operational instruction, and securing the job as much as possible, rather than to group achievements, improvement and change. Considerations accordingly start to become more individual-directed rather than group-directed. There thus would not be positive forms of peer support, unless dictated by management to smooth and streamline operations, or else derived from employees’ socialization and daily mingling.

Particular attention should also be drawn to management crew diligence and success, since this construct reported the least mean (2.91), mostly attributable to that the field study has been conducted in a period of a relative recession, where basically policies and tactics are directed to survival, rather than to uniqueness and being distinguished in the marketplace. Normally in such settings, emphasis is on traditional and conventional operational techniques, while changes and new ideas are aimed at dealing with recessions’ outcomes, such as inventory management, controlling and decreasing operational, overheads, and labor costs, and maintaining loyal guests wherever possible. Hence, such working environment would likely be tensioned and frustrating, with the subsequent diminished feeling of achievement, and, accumulatively, employees are less considering their management crew as being diligent and successful.
Moreover, among the consequences recession and decreased workforce is less than desired role clarity (3.19). This might have been due to that the pattern of distributing work tasks differs, where employees are sometimes assigned more varied duties rather than their usual job requirements according to which they have been hired, with some of them being overlapping. Therefore, due to their additional, varied tasks, employees’ job descriptions become meaningless, as well as that related information and required resources might not be clearly and readily available.

Finally, and logically expected, employees job satisfaction was also moderate (3.16). With moderate levels of supervisors’, managers, and peers’ supports, management crew diligence, and role clarity, then it is not uncommon to experience negative consequences, mainly including job satisfaction. The importance and vital role of improving managerial and supervisory support, peers’ support, management crew diligence and success, and role clarity to enhance employees job satisfaction is further spotted and proven in the inferential analysis of research hypotheses.

Inferential Analysis of Research Hypotheses

Inferential analysis results of research variables are provided in Table 4.

Table 4: Summary of the Inferential Analysis of Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Managerial and Supervisory Support</th>
<th>Peers’ Support</th>
<th>Diligent, Successful Management</th>
<th>Role Clarity</th>
<th>Positive Work Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Study Results Analysis

H.1 The more the managerial and supervisory support, the more satisfied will be employees.

MSS is positively correlated with JS. The first hypothesis was supported (Sig. < 0.01, β = 0.933), indicating that the more the managerial and supervisory support, the more satisfied will be employees.

Such inferences typically go in line with previous related studies that stated that quality and attitude of supervision, organizational, managerial and supervisory support, mentoring and a feeling of close affiliation, and human interactions occurring in working environment both with managers or supervisors contribute to maintaining and enhancing employees’ JS (Amabile, 1996; Chen, 2001; Karatepe et al., 2003; Milman, 2003; Gon et al., 2005; Bloemer and Odekerken-Schröder, 2006; Ng et al., 2006; Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007; Karatepe and Uludag, 2008; Øgaarda et al., 2008; Chuang et al., 2009; Moncarz et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2010; Mahsud et al., 2010; Chandrasekar, 2011; SHRM, 2011; Arokiasamy, 2013; Ineson et al., 2000, 2013; Yeh, 2015).

More specifically, concerning the specific practices that enhance JS, satisfied employees need managers and supervisors to let them discuss work issue, provide them a clear mutual goal and a sense of autonomy and control over their work, and allow participation in daily decision-making processes (Amabile, 1996; Spinelli and Canavos, 2000; Yang and Jen-Te, 2010; Ineson et al., 2013; Şahin and Şahingoz, 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014, Ozturk et al., 2014).
Moreover, JS is influenced by management’s and supervisors’ efforts to establish a culture of respect, fairness, supportive evaluation and recognition of new ideas and suggestions, and job flexibility (Amabile, 1996; Spinelli and Canavos, 2000; Lam and Qiu, 2003; Poe, 2003; Deery, 2008; Chuang et al., 2009; Yang and Jen-Te, 2010; Arokiasamy, 2013; Ineson et al., 2013; DiPietro et al., 2014; Santa Cruz et al., 2014; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015; Yeh, 2015).

Besides, various studies assured JS is more stably developed and maintained via managers' supervisors' keenness on empowerment, employees' training, self-actualization, ability utilization, creativity, promotion and development, and personal growth (Lam et al., 2001; Lam and Qiu, 2003; Yu, 2003; Chiang et al., 2005; Hechanova et al., 2006; Chuang et al., 2009; Youngsoo and Duncan, 2009; Gallardo et al., 2010; Wanda and John, 2011; Frye, 2012; Ineson et al., 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015).

**H.2 The more the peers support, the more satisfied will be employees.**

PS is positively correlated with JS. The second hypothesis was supported (Sig. < 0.01, β = 0.891), indicating that the more the peers support, the more satisfied will be employees. This result further ascertained the basic understanding to the importance of PS as determined by many previous studies (Amabile, 1996, Spinelli and Canavos, 2000; Becker, 2002; Bjerker et al., 2007; Liang, 2010; SHRM, 2011; Frye, 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013; Ineson et al., 2013; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015) that confirmed that JS is better developed and maintained through mutual workgroup support and encouragement, teamwork, creativity reinforcement, constructive challenge, shared commitment, and the existence and quality of interpersonal relationships. Moreover, Ineson et al. (2013) and SHRM (2009, 2011, 2012, 2014) have also spotted the significance of coworkers’ mutual and cooperative devotion toward common organizational goals and business needs.

**H.3 The more the management diligence and success, the more satisfied will be employees.**

DSM is positively correlated with JS. The third hypothesis was supported (Sig. < 0.01, β = 0.748), indicating that the more the management diligence and success, the more satisfied will be employees. Examining available literature further supported the results. Employees' JS is affected by organizational effectiveness, corporate culture, strong reputation, the existence and quality of good role models, successful framework of organizational goals, measurements, expectations, employees’ perceptions of management, feeling of close affiliation, pride, and respect with the company, and organization’ professional corporate culture (Chen, 2001; Milman; 2003; Bloemer and Odekerken-Schroder, 2006; Ng et al., 2006; Varela and García, 2006; Deery, 2008; Frye, 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013; Ineson et al., 2000, 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015). In addition, Lam et al. (2001), Lan (2003) and Yu (2003) determined that employees’ JS has improved through applying total quality management approach, and innovation-supporting, leadership-directed culture.

**H.4 The more the role clarity, the more satisfied will be employees.**

RC is positively correlated with JS. The forth hypothesis was supported (Sig. < 0.01, β = 0.840), indicating that the more the role clarity, the more satisfied will be employees. This result typically conforms to the findings of multiple studies (Lam et al., 2001; Roelofsen, 2002; Lam and Qiu, 2003; Bjerker et al., 2007; Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007; Chuang et al., 2009; Liang, 2010; Leblebici, 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013; Ozturk et al., 2014;
Yeh, 2015; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015), that have showed that job itself, its characteristics, diversity of related tasks, and improved working settings are a critical factor in predicting JS.

More particularly, among the job-related variables affecting JS are task identity, task significance, feedback, and the level of role ambiguity and stressors (Karatepe and Sokmen, 2006; Chen et al., 2010; Yang and Jen-Te, 2010; Frye, 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013; Şahin and Şahingož, 2013; Ozturk et al., 2014; Yeh, 2015).

Furthermore, employees’ JS is maintained through work resources’ availability, sufficiency, adequacy and proper allocation (Amabile, 1996; Kiruthiga and Magesh, 2015); as well as the availability of comfortable, operational, easy-controlled and safe working conditions and job settings (Leaman, 1995; Leather et al., 1998; Wells, 2000; Brill et al., 2001; Newsham et al., 2004, 2009; Kinzl et al., 2005; Veitch et al., 2005; Bockerman and Ilmakunnas, 2006; Frye, 2012; Leblebici, 2012; Arokiasamy, 2013; Bakotić and Babić, 2013; Şahin and Şahingož, 2013; SHRM, 2009, 2011, 2012, 2014). Additionally, physical factors, such as lighting, noise, dust, smoke and other harmful factors, and the comfort and functionality of workplace design and layout, essentially affect employees JS (Stallworth and Kleiner, 1996; Bockerman and Ilmakunnas, 2006; Leblebici, 2012; Bakotić and Babić, 2013; Design and Index, 2006, 2013).

H.5 The more positive the work environment, the more satisfied will be employees.

The previous part has been focusing on scrutinizing the individual effect of MSS, PS, DSM, and RC on employees’ JS. Though supported, such correlations assume that every dependent variable acts in isolation of other variables. Therefore, the researcher has been keen on assessing the collective impact of the four forms of a positive work environment on JS.

The fifth hypothesis was supported, showing a high correlation magnitude (Sig. < 0.01, β = 0.920), indicating that a more positive work environment is proved to stimulate higher employees JS.

Such a result involves that more understanding, concern, and appreciation should be directed to assure that the working environment is positive, through mutually enhancing managers’, supervisors’, and peers support, institutional success and diligence, and role clarity. Not only hospitality operators need to praise individual positive practices, but they have also to exert due efforts to systematically develop and maintain various axes of a positive work environment.

This coincides with several studies (Roelofsen, 2002; Bjerker et al., 2007; Liang, 2010; Ram et al., 2011; Arokiasamy, 2013) confirming that work environment influences service climate, which in turn influences employee JS, reduces complaints and absenteeism while increasing productivity. Further, work environment variables, such as working conditions, training and development opportunities, are a chief predictor of employee engagement and JS (Lam et al., 2001; Ostroff et al., 2002; Deery, 2008; Gu and Chi, 2009; Gallardo et al., 2010; Mokaya et al., 2013).

As well, good organizational culture and internal service quality, involving workplace equipment, training, job promotions, teamwork, employee welfare measures, internal communication channels, the degree of autonomy, and respect for the boss have significant interactive influence on employee JS (Heskett et al., 1994; Hallowell et al., 1996; Chen, 2001; Lam et al., 2001; Cai, 2003; Robbins, 2003; Tsai, 2004; Chathoth et al., 2007; Sledgea et al., 2008; Lee and Way, 2010; Mahsud et al., 2010; O'Fallon and Rutherford, 2010; Jawahar and Stone, 2011; Wang, 2012; Ozturk et al., 2014).
Contingency Analysis
Results for contingency variables are provided in Table 5, followed by due analysis and discussion.

Table 5: Summary of the Contingency Analysis Results for Research Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Positive Work Environment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Study Results Analysis

H.6 There is no significant correlation between the hotels'/employees' profile with positive work environment.
Investigated characteristics of employees’ personal and professional profile have been age, guest contact, and tenure (years of experience in the current hotel). Hotels’ profile's characteristics were chosen to be their grade, and affiliation.
The correlation between hotel affiliations, hotel grade, and job nature with PWE have been tested through using ANOVA, whilst employees’ age and tenure has been correlated using Linear Regression. This hypothesis has been supported; that is, the determined contingency variables are not correlated to PWE.

As derived from this result, working environment has been proven to be independently perceived, regardless of neither hotel profile nor employees' working context. This coincides with previous relevant studies, which acknowledged working environment as being a stand-alone variable, apart from hotel's/employees' profile. Positive work environment's importance emerges from employees' eagerness for, and management need to provide healthy, effective operational context, rather than being affected by or related to hotels'/employees' profile.
Furthermore, common operational differences between guest- and non-guest contact jobs were not enough to affect employees' perception of the vital role of positive work environment to their job satisfaction. Besides, it did not take much time from employees to appreciate the positive work environment. Therefore, employees' tenure was also irrelevant to research variables.

Conclusion and Recommendations
Positive work environment has been investigated concerning its impact on employees’ job satisfaction, particularly the work environment components of supervisory and managerial support, peers’ support, management crew performance, and role clarity and job description and resources’ availability. Descriptively, all the research variables were reported to be moderate, which is generally attributable to the prevailing Egyptian tourism recession, typically resulting in management and employees being engaged in operational basics and cost-cutting measures, rather than organizational luxuries, mutual support, improvements, and group-related teaming efforts.
Inferentially, hypothesized correlation between the components of positive work environment and job satisfaction have been supporting, conforming to previous relevant studies, and proving that researchers’ choice of the determinants of supervisory and managerial support, peers’ support, management crew performance, and role clarity were
those that were most reliable to positively impact job satisfaction. Moreover, further ascertaining these outcomes, contingency analysis proved the significance of positive work environment and its components, regardless characteristics of employees’ personal and professional profile. Support, trust and good working relationships with employees have to be maintained by managers and supervisors. They should maintain a productive work environment, discussing works issues, concerns and problems with staff, welcoming and valuing employees’ suggestions, and applying them where feasible. Fairness should be the basis for treating employees, handling their complaints and disputes, and allocating workloads. Managers and supervisors should consider employees’ interests, their morale, be flexible in scheduling and other personnel-related matters, and be available for help in work-related and personal problems. Supervisors/Managers should additionally strongly consider employees’ professional development goals and values, through utilizing and crediting their skills and abilities, and transferring due, upscale expertise and skills to improve employees’ promotion opportunities. As for employees, they should supports each other and work together to achieve common goals, promote a professional work environment, enhance their own collective productivity and efficiency as a team. Employees should support one another for making meetings more fruitful, participating in deciding how the work gets done, fixing problems rather than finding someone to blame. They should coordinate and cooperate to reduce job-related expenses, minimize unnecessary work, and change processes to improve productivity. Employees’ mutual support and teamwork should result in clear improvement in the quality of work, as well as neutralizing, reducing, and providing help for personal- and work-related problems. Employees should feel and be conveyed the success and diligence of management crew. The hotel’s business strategy should be committed to and keen on success, providing competitive products and services, maintaining hotel’s image as that of a high quality company, providing the necessary resources to implement new ideas, and setting and maintaining high standards for business ethics. Due operational changes should be performed to compete effectively, while not sacrificing quality to cut costs, meet schedules or deadlines, or else provide competitive pricing. Ultimately, role clarity should be prevailing among employees. Management should provide employees a clear idea of their definite job responsibilities, and a job description that matches actual job duties, with no unnecessary steps, paperwork, or duplication in tasks with coworkers. Employees should have available and safe all the equipment, technology, information, and other resources needed to do their job effectively. Utilities provided and departments design should be facilitating work and fulfilling customers’ requirements. Moreover, this research can well be used to derive many ideas for possible future researches, depending mainly on investigating the hypothesized relationship in more different settings than those of the present research. That is, the current research’s limitations are that the field study has been conducted in one city, Hurghada, whose hospitality business and establishments are resort hotels. Thus, future researches should also investigate samples drawn from different cities to be able to draw more meaningful generalizations concerning commercial city hotels rather than just vacation resorts. Moreover, the current research has drawn responses only from employees. Further research attempts should aim at investigating those variables, and others, using a sample of supervisors and department managers. This is very important to authenticate the results of this research, and to verify that managers’ and staff members’ visions are the same, and that
there is a reasonable consensus regarding the importance of positive work environment and its related variables and determinants. Additionally, standard operating procedures in the hospitality industry are usually developed for pure operational and technical issues. Thus, researchers and practitioners are encouraged to attempt to develop a standardized instrument for organizational concerns, guiding and measuring managers’, supervisors’, and employees’ efforts to develop and maintain a positive work environment, and employees’ job satisfaction.
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