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Abstract:
This study was conducted to address the issue of disengaged employees in the context of restaurants by determining the underlying factors for its incidence as employee outcomes. This study utilized the exploratory mixed-method approach following a two-phase study design. The first phase consisted of in-depth interviews with six restaurant employees, selected purposively in order to develop a significant statement for the development of factor structure on employee outcomes which will be used in the second phase. The second phase was the development of survey instruments for 420 respondents, selected randomly. In the first phase, exploratory factor analysis was used to identify the salient factors which yielded five dimensions. The five dimensions that characterized employee outcomes, after 12 iterations are an empowered workforce, customer focus, efficient performance, a trusted and confident workforce, and continuing professional development. These dimensions were validated through a quantitative phase utilizing the confirmatory factor analysis in order to identify the best-fit model. Four model configurations were undertaken and model 4 was considered the most parsimonious model, essentials statistical analysis revealed that all of the identified factors were significantly correlated. The model explains 69.6 percent of the variation in employee outcomes.
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1. Introduction

Any organization is susceptible to the effects of incompetence at work and employee disengagement, which is regarded as an epidemic in the business world, to the extent that it cannot deliver a measurable output (Allam, 2017). It is widely accepted that
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disengaged employees do not participate in problem-solving and detach their thought processes from the achievement of the organization’s vision, mission, and values (Sugiera, 2023). Undoubtedly, businesses strive to grow and outperform their rivals on a global scale. To achieve this, organizations must effectively acquire and utilize their human resources (Chong, Lee, Ismail, Yazid, & Ahmad, 2018). Similarly, employee engagement is vital to the growth of such a business; consequently, a company should create a pleasant working environment that fosters trust, dedication, and collaboration as inspiration to embody the entity. This will help organizations maintain their competitiveness and longevity.

The restaurant business is one of the world’s most dynamic and competitive industries. The success of a restaurant depends on several factors, including food quality, service, ambiance, and pricing (Arora and Singer, 2006). However, the most important factor that determines the success of a restaurant is its employees (Parsa et al., 2005; Ottenbacher, 2007). The performance of restaurant employees is crucial to the restaurant’s overall success and profitability (Gagić, Tešanović and Jovičić, 2013; Lashley, 2000; Liu and Yang, 2009).

It is essential to place an emphasis on employee quality outcomes such as job satisfaction, commitment, involvement, and a reduction in role stress, as these variables are associated with employees working in an organization to make them more effective towards the organization’s outcomes and fully engaged in their work (Al-Kahtani et al., 2021; Griffin et al., 2010; Koo et al., 2020; Talukder, 2019); in the absence of these, employees may become disengaged with their work (Ali and Allam, 2016). As a result of increased competition, organizations are training their employees as a means of preparing them to deal with the increased competition and enhancing their performance (Al-omari, Al-omari & Aljawarneh, 2020; Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2019). Increased efforts to strengthen organizational human resources, technological advancements, and a combination of production factors have contributed to this expansion (Nagpal, 2022).

Since the purpose of human resource management approaches is to manage people more effectively, it stands to reason that the results of successful human resource management would first be recognized at the employee level (Quadri, 2019). Consequently, this study will investigate and validate whether the existing characteristics of employee outcomes are still relevant to understanding modern business, enabling companies to design their human resource management to complement their organizational structure and assist them in achieving their goals and objectives. In this premise, this study intends to develop a framework for employee outcomes in a restaurant context using standard procedures and statistical tools to establish reliability, validity, and usefulness. In particular, this study aims to achieve the following research objectives: (1) To investigate the underlying factors that define employee outcomes, (2) To develop a framework illustrating the dimensions of employee outcomes, and (3) To develop the best-fit model on employee outcomes in the context of restaurants. These objectives are consistent with the premise that employee outcomes may be influenced by a number of latent constructs that this study will attempt to identify and quantify.
Exploring the dimensions of employee performance within the context of a restaurant is crucial because it enables restaurant owners and managers to identify areas for improvement and design effective training programs (Pham Thi Phuong and Ahn, 2021; Stylos et al., 2021). By understanding the factors that influence employee performance in a restaurant setting, owners and managers can develop training programs that target specific areas for improvement. This will increase not only the employee’s performance but also customer satisfaction and profitability. Succinctly put, the purpose of this study is to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on employee performance by investigating the unique dimensions of employee performance in a restaurant context. This study will provide restaurant owners and managers with valuable insights to improve employee performance, increase customer satisfaction, and ultimately increase the restaurant’s profitability.

While there is a large body of research on employee performance in general, few studies have explicitly addressed the context of the restaurant industry. Therefore, there is an urgent need to investigate the dimensions of restaurant employee performance. This research will assist restaurant owners and managers in understanding how to enhance employee performance and boost the restaurant’s profitability. In addition, previous research on employee performance has focused primarily on job satisfaction, employee turnover, and productivity. Although these studies are crucial, they do not provide a comprehensive picture of employee performance in a restaurant setting. Unique to the restaurant industry, employee performance includes factors such as customer service, sales, teamwork, and communication.

2. Literature Review

In the context of the restaurant industry, human resource management is quite difficult because the majority of businesses struggle to find qualified employees. In a service-oriented business, particularly restaurants, motivation is a significant issue and a challenge for management because they must retain employees in order to provide quality services to customers. If employees are unhappy, they will not perform as required. Moreover, poor performance and workplace dissatisfaction can lead to a high rate of employee turnover (Shuck, Osam, Zigarmi, & Nimon, 2017). Multiple authors asserted that providing customers with superior service results in long-lasting positive experiences (Lauritzen, Gron, & Kjeldsen, 2021). The individual motivational construct of restaurant staff is crucial and perceptually relevant for achieving positive employee outcomes and customer satisfaction (Kesari, and Verma, 2018). Exploring and validating the constructs of employee outcomes was thus a socially relevant aspect of this research endeavor.

The literature demonstrates that employee outcome is a multidimensional function; consequently, an empowered workforce, customer focus, efficient performance, a trusted and confident workforce, and continuing professional development have emerged as major concepts. An empowered employee is accountable enough to evaluate and contribute to the success of the business. Empowerment is a fundamental aspect of
growth, productivity, efficiency, and performance (Hanaysha & Tahir, 2016). Empowering employees is considered an effective management strategy in certain situations. It requires faith that the authority will be used responsibly and in accordance with the organization's objectives and priorities. It is a method by which a company empowers its employees to make their own work-related decisions (Khan & Hussain, 2023).

Customer-focused restaurant employees have a high level of job knowledge, are able to easily identify customer expectations and desires, and are able to fulfill them effectively. Each customer expands their relationships with organizations and focuses on customer loyalty services that have a positive impact on customer retention and engagement expansion (Alzaydi, Al-hajla, Nguyen & Jayawardhena, 2018). Attracting customers is only one component of the customer perspective; retaining customers is another. Client satisfaction and superior customer service are crucial to the success of a small business (Johnston & Marshall, 2016). In order to ensure organizational success and foster a positive and supportive environment, managers must prioritize the customer. Concurrently, the service staff engages the customers by listening to their feedback about the restaurant's food quality, food price, and atmosphere (Engen & Magnusson, 2015; Koys & DeCotiis, 2015).

Likewise, efficient performance is the responsibility of every organization, and training and development are unquestionably one of the most important steps that the vast majority of businesses must take to achieve this goal. Management must ensure that there is a sufficient number of skilled and technically proficient employees with the potential to advance to management. In addition, organizations must be aware of the need to be more pragmatic regarding human resource management (Memon, Salleh, and Baharom, 2015). Management strategies should have a direct impact on employees, resulting in a variety of positive employee outcomes (Odiaka, 2020). It was stated that a company will be successful in its performance management, in building the skills and confidence of its employees, and in its business as a whole if it places a high value on goal setting (Meijerink, Beijer, and Bos-Nehles, 2017).

The trusted and confident workforce in organizational contexts, such as restaurants, has been studied in relation to multiple referents and levels of analysis, including trusting individuals and groups (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Studies have identified a variety of employee behaviors, conditions, and conditions that foster trust in organizational contexts. This research examined new relationships with no or limited relationship history (van der Werff & Buckley, 2017), existing relationships in which trust is limited or underdeveloped and there is a desire to enhance trust (Sloan & Oliver, 2013), and contexts in which institutional support for trust is underdeveloped. In addition to managerial behaviors such as sharing and delegation of control and communication, emotion regulation and processes, controls, and structural parameters that govern their relationship have been identified as initiating and fostering employee trust (Weibel et al., 2015).

Moreover, continuing professional development is associated with influencing job satisfaction and employee engagement, commitment, motivation, turnover, and
attraction. Furthermore, employees who seek continuous professional development promote a good working environment and workplace culture (Warrick, 2017). The employee utilizes intangible organizational resources, such as the company’s social capital, which should be effectively utilized and facilitated for the development of a competitive advantage that enables performance enhancements (Jogaratnam, 2016). Due to his/her task-related education and experience, also considered the primary resource (Jogaratnam, 2017). There are always influential employees at work who can significantly affect the working environment and culture, either positively or negatively (Yucheng & Frenkel, 2018).

This empirical research endeavor was predicated on certain theoretical premises. Based on Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory of Motivation, this was supported. The Expectancy Theory of Motivation by Vroom (1964) describes how individuals make decisions based on exerted effort and anticipated outcomes. It is a belief-based decision-making theory that begins with the expectation that increased effort will result in enhanced performance. In addition, if an individual believes they are exhibiting desirable behavior, they anticipate receiving rewards (instrumentality). Lastly, this outcome of expected reward is only valued (has valence) if the reward is perceived as significant, equitable, and desired by the individual (Swensen, 2016). The expectation is a person’s estimation of the likelihood that effort will result in a good performance, and expectations influence the perception that effort drives behavior. If a person believes that the company will not value his or her work regardless of effort, he or she will not exert much effort (Chiang & Jang, 2008).

In addition, this study was grounded in Campbell’s Theory of Performance (1999). Since the success of an organization depends on the employee’s creativity, innovation, and dedication, good employee performance is necessary for the organization (Ramlall, 2008). Consequently, an employee’s output is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct consisting of multiple types of behavior. Campbell (1990) believes that performance has behavioral and outcome perspectives as a result of a successful output. Results are partially the result of an individual’s performance, but they are also influenced by other factors. In other words, employee behaviors and actions are not the only factors that determine outcomes. Campbell permits exceptions when defining performance as conduct.

3. Material and Methods

3.1 Research Respondents
This research undertaking was exploratory and utilized both approaches in qualitative and quantitative analysis to address of quandary of this study; thus, a sequential exploratory mixed-method research design was necessary. The study’s qualitative phase was a one-on-one in-depth interview involving six restaurant employees to develop the statements for the quantitative phase. Two respondents held managerial positions, while the other two were supervisory level, and the other two held rank-and-file positions. Creswell (2014) posited that 6 to 12 individuals are adequate informants and ideal
numbers for data saturation. These individuals could be a source of important information on employee outcomes.

The quantitative phase of the research initiative included two surveys to target restaurant employees in the Davao Region. The first round of the survey was conducted to investigate the dimensions of employee outcomes in the context of restaurants. In this study, stratified sampling was used in selecting the respondents. A population was identified based on any number of desired characteristics relevant to the purpose of the study (McLeod, 2015). The final and exact sample size was determined based on the number of items in the developed final scale; the questionnaire contains 50 items. The appropriate sample size was five times the number of identified items (Bryant & Yarnold, 1995). The first round of the surveys was conducted from January 2023 to February 2023. In this study, around 252 respondents were retrieved and submitted for statistical treatment and analysis.

Furthermore, the second round of the quantitative survey was to confirm the explored dimensions. Twenty-four items formed the newly developed dimensions. These were the items that passed the minimum criteria of +.40 coefficients. According to Bryant and Yarnold (1995), the appropriate sample size is five times the total number of items. A total of 168 respondents were retrieved and submitted for confirmatory factor analysis.

This study’s primary criteria for selecting participants were that they are at least college level, regular employees, and employed for at least one year. However, due to the nature of the study and the time consideration, probationary and contractual employees have not been included as respondents because they could not assess how employees perceived the dimensions.

3.2 Materials and Instruments

This study utilized both structured and semi-structured instruments in gathering the data. In the qualitative phase, a semi-structured interview guide was utilized by the researcher to extract the factors that may influence employee outcomes. Both elaborating and clarifying probes were extracted from key informants and the resulting transcripts were utilized to develop the final set of item statements for the quantitative survey.

In the second phase of the study, composed of two distinct survey phases, a structured questionnaire was used for both Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). For EFA, the tool was developed utilizing the significant statements extracted from the qualitative phase. Psychometric measures of both validity and reliability were established. The panel experts validated the questionnaire with an average of 4.6 validation ratings described as highly reliable items in the survey tool. The reliability test provided a Cronbach alpha value of .807. According to Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (1998), a score of 0.70 is required for a highly reliable instrument.

A refined version of the EFA-structured questionnaire was used for Confirmatory Factor Analysis. In this case, only 24 items comprised the final CFA tool. These items formed the five explored dimensions of employee outcomes in the context of restaurants. Before this tool was floated, another round of psychometric measures, specifically
reliability, was established. The tool used to generate the reliability index for the factors was Cronbach alpha. Accordingly, the reliability index ranged from .729 to .926, surpassing Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham requirements. Hence, identifying the dimensions of employee outcomes and the confirmation of the dimensions were initially crafted and supported through a literature review and In-depth-Interview.

Moreover, in responding to the items, this study used the five-point Likert-type attitudinal scale. The five-point Likert scale was hinged and anchored between the semantic differential pairs of “Highly Essential/Important or Not Essential/Important”. The responses were interpreted through the following: 5 score denotes to have a mean range between 4.20 to 5.00 (highly essential/important) which is described to be very high. A score of 4 has a mean range of 3.40 to 4.19 (essential/important) or very high. While a score of 3 with a mean range from 2.60 to 3.39 means somehow essential/important which is interpreted to be less essential/important and lastly a score that garnered 1 has a mean range of 1.00 to 1.79 which is not that essential/important or being a measure to be very low.

3.3 Design and Procedure
The process started by doing desk research on the problem using theoretical studies and other related literature to find works that describe employee outcomes in a restaurant. The research was subjected and submitted to the research adviser and members of the Dissertation Advisory Committee for suggestions, comments, changes, more work, and approval for the proposal presentation. After the proposal of the study was approved, informed consent was sent to six selected informants for in-depth interviews. A guide set of items and questions were used to generate and formulate possible statements to consider and lead to the identification of employee outcomes. Responses were considered and treated in a thematic manner, simplified, numerically placed, and subjected to expert validation and improvement. The questionnaire was also modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Adviser and Thesis Advisory Committee, if necessary. Consequently, request letters were sent to gain approval for the implementation of the study. Upon approval, the proponent of research immediately proceeded with the first phase of the survey to explore the dimensions that characterized employee outcomes in the context of restaurants. The distribution and retrieval of the questionnaire were set in two weeks’ time.

The researcher made use of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) as an approach in the first phase of the survey. Under this method, sampling adequacy was determined using KMO index while factorability was ascertained using Bartlett’s test of sphericity. The dimensionality and reliability of the constructs were generated and attained using principal component analysis, choosing and evaluating an eigenvalue of not less than 1.0. Coefficients less than ±0.40 as suggested by several studies (Taherdoost, Sahubuddin & Jelaliyoon, 2004; Yong & Pearce, 2013), and were suppressed and evaluated upon rotation of the factors using VARIMAX (orthogonal) rotation considering a default minimum 25 iterations. Catell’s scree plot was utilized and used to present the number of generated factors in a graphical manner, and the criterion of the latent root was used to ascertain
the number of dimensions. These parameters were used by the researcher to explore the salient factors that characterize employee outcomes in restaurants. Moreover, the resulting dimensions of employee outcomes were identified and all items that comprised the newly developed dimensions were labeled according to the nature of each item in a single structure.

After employing EFA in the first phase of the research, it is necessary to evaluate and affirm the generated results through the second phase of the survey, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). CFA is a statistical approach that "aims to confirm if the number of constructs and the loadings of observed variables on them adhere to and conform to what is expected on the basis of any theoretical grounds" (Malhotra, Hall, Shaw, and Oppenheim, 2007). Before conducting the CFA, the reliability test of each factor was analyzed, and all indices satisfy the index of reliability. To accurately and reliably perceive the representation of the items and constructs by the observed variables, it is necessary to evaluate and consider the scale’s reliability and validity (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2009). The distribution and collection of the second survey will occur in two weeks. A total of 168 research participants were submitted for statistical analysis in this study.

In order to determine which model of employee outcomes is most applicable to restaurants, a CFA was carried out. Only six of the countless fit measures that may be constructed, all of which are aimed to give information about how well your data fits the data in a particular dataset, will be chosen to be utilized in this investigation:

1) In order to acquire a decent model fit, the chi-square over the degree of freedom (CMIN/df) or relative chi-square, which is significantly an index and measures of how much the fit of data to model has been reduced by removing one or many more routes, must have a number or value that does not exceed 3.0. (Wuensch, 2008);

2) The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) is the proportion of the variance-covariance matrix that is presented and accounted for by the model; for a model to be considered excellent, the GFI value needs to be more than 0.95;

3) Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), which is the change of a certain percentage in the square that denotes the difference between the two models’ chi-squares divided by the value of chi-square for the independent model the desired index is 0.95 (Bentler & Bonett, 1980);

4) Comparative Fit Index (CFI), which can be considered as a measure and gauge of relative non-centrality between the tested model and the independent model, similarly specifies value of 0.95 for an, in fact, CFI and RMSEA are frequently used combined to assess and perceive models. One common measuring criterion is to accept models that have CFI that is greater than 0.90 and RMSEA that is less than 0.05.

5) P of close fit (PCLOSE) is a one-sided null hypothesis test that evaluates and states that the RMSEA of the model equals to 0.05. Hu and Bentler (1999) recommend a more severe CFI > 0.95 and a less strict RMSEA of 0.06. According to Kenny, Kaniskan, and McCoach (2015), this indicates that when the p-value is higher than
0.05, which indicates that the result is not statistically significant, then it may be reasonably stated that the model fit is "close." These parameters were used by the researcher to present the best-fit model of employee outcomes in restaurants. However, in the conduct of statistical analysis, three model configurations were undertaken. Hence, model four was considered to be the best-fit model as it passed the requirements set. The model procedure of the study which the researcher implemented is illustrated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: The Scale Development and Validation Process](image)

In addition, the researcher ensured that the entire ethical requirements were observed and followed, as implemented them when conducting the study. Before distributing the questionnaire and sending it to the chosen restaurants in the selected area in the region, the researcher had the data instrument reviewed and approved by the University of Mindanao Ethics Review Committee (UMERC). Furthermore, the researcher of this study adhered to the study protocol’s assessments and standardized criteria, in particular when it came to the management of the population and the data because the study requires human participation. The protocol number, UMERC 2022-0416, was included on the Certificate of Approval (Appendix G) that was granted by the UMERC. Therefore, the researcher of this study ensured that the respondents of the study were invited to participate in the study by gaining consent, which is a crucial mechanism to guarantee that respect was granted to individuals by offering meaningful assent for a voluntary act. The researcher also made sure that the consent was obtained from the respondents free from any form of conflict of interest.
4. Results and Discussion

This section substantially presents the results and analysis based on the data and responses gathered from the research respondents which includes: (a) identification of the underlying dimensions that characterize employee outcomes in restaurants in the Davao Region (b) confirmatory factor analysis of employee outcomes in restaurants in the Davao Region.

4.1 Dimensions of Employee Outcomes in Restaurants in the Davao Region

The following tests, which include the KMO measure and Bartlett’s test, latent roots criteria, Catell’s scree plot, and principal component analysis displayed in the rotating component matrix, are used to determine whether or not employee outcomes can be factored. The following is a presentation of the findings based on these criteria:

A. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Index of Sampling Adequacy

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Index is utilized to determine whether or not the sampling was enough. It is also used as an index and measurement to compare and evaluate the observed correlation coefficients and partial correlation coefficients to assess and determine if the data are likely to coalesce into components. This is done to determine whether or not the data are likely to consolidate into components. This metric spans from 0 to 1, and it is advised that a minimum value of 0.6 be reached before continuing with a satisfying factor analysis; however, values that are closer to 1 are preferred.

The testing result for Table 1 is 0.963. Because it was more than the minimum acceptable value of 0.6, the outcome suggested that the sample size is adequate and acceptable (Kaiser & Rice, 1974) in its representation of the population considered in the study. This result is a global index suggesting that the data support the use of EFA and may be categorized into smaller groups of underlying factors. This result was obtained and generated via an exploratory factor analysis. The outcome clarifies that the data set may be utilized for factor analysis in the appropriate manner.

| Table 1: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett’s Test |
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | 0.963 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 12656.143 |
| df | 1225 |
| Sig. | .000 |

B. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity

In this study, Table 3 demonstrates that the test value is significant (12656.143) with a degree of freedom (df) of 1225 and a significance level of 0.000. The null hypothesis is therefore denied, and the data set is regarded as suitable for factor analysis (Jones, Silas, Todd, Stewart, Acree, Coulson, and Mehling, 2021). The significance value of Bartlett’s test for sphericity must be less than 0.05 for the hypothesis to be rejected.
C. Latent Roots Criterion
Using the latent roots criterion, the standard result of exploratory factor analysis can be determined by calculating the total variance explained. The total variance explained identifies the value of the factors’ eigenvalues and the variance of each factor to reveal the result. Table 2 reveals that five factors can be extracted from the set of items submitted for factor analysis based on the results of the latent root criterion. These five dimensions or factor structures account for 69.63% of the data variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Proportion Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>27.423</td>
<td>22.106</td>
<td>22.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>3.062</td>
<td>16.895</td>
<td>39.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>15.601</td>
<td>54.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>12.684</td>
<td>67.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>2.347</td>
<td>69.633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Catell’s Scree Plot
In the Catell scree test, the components are shown along the X axis, while the eigenvalues are displayed along the Y axis. As one moves to the right, toward later components, the eigenvalues get less and smaller. (Bartholomew and others’ research, 2008) According to Cattell’s scree test, when the downward slope comes to an end and the curve takes an elbow towards a less steep decline, any following components that come after the component that started the elbow must be eliminated. This includes the component that started the elbow.

When a straight boundary is laid across the bottom section of the roots, as shown in Figure 3, there are five (5) parameters that need to be taken into consideration before the trajectory becomes essentially straight. After looking at all of the elements that had eigenvalues of 1.00 or above, we were able to isolate five (5) different factors that are responsible for employee outcomes in restaurants located in the Davao Region.

![Scree Plot](Scree_Plot.png)

**Figure 3: Scree Plot Showing the Extracted Factors**
E. Rotated Component Matrix

The factor loads of the observed factors are shown in Table 3. Principal component analysis was done on the data to figure out the organization of the factors. Smith and DeCoster (2000) said that principal component analysis (PCA) is used to find out if some things measure the same things. Also, factor rotation makes the rows and columns of the factor matrix easier to understand by putting more of a variable’s weight on a single factor (Hair et al., 2006). Most of the time, the determined factor matrix is explained in terms of an orthogonal rotation (VARIMAX) and an angled rotation (OBLIMIN). In this study, the VARIMAX rotation method was used, which made the structure of the factors more clear in terms of their content validity. Malhotra (2020) says that the coefficient of the factor analysis is set to 0.40. The easiest way to decide which rotation to use is to do the analysis with both types of rotation. If the oblique rotation shows that there isn’t much of a link between the selected factors, it’s probably best to use the orthogonally rotated answer (Patil, Pinto, Govindaraju, Hebbalu, Bhat, & Kannanur, 2020)

The 50 items were loaded and 24 items formed the five factors. The dimensions, or the extracted and generated factors, are then named accordingly to the nature and commonality of each of the items in one structure, namely: (1) Empowered Workforce, (2) Customer Focus, (3) Efficient Workforce (4) Trusted and Confident Workforce and; (5) Continuing Professional Development. The result of the factor analysis excluded twenty-six (26) items including item numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 20, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 46, 47 and 49. These items have factor loadings below the cut-off +/- 0.40. In this study, there are 12 iterations, and themes are generated based on the commonalities of each item in a group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I_43</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_50</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_23</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_6</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_44</td>
<td></td>
<td>.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I_19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Rotated Component Matrix
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>The company praises good performers more than criticizes the others</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>Empowered Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>The company recognizes the best employee of the year</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The company provides incentive mechanisms for performing employees.</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My company gives rewards to employees who do well</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make an organization specifically a restaurant to me more customer-focused, it is essential to evaluate the organization’s mechanism of incentives and even its rewards.
systems and implement them well with the appropriate system, outcome, and fairness. The basic “law of behavior” is that when incentives take in place and will lead to a more productive and great performance. Managers often consider extrinsic incentives as a matter or strategy of behavioral interventions to empower the working force (Tsarenko, Leo, & Herman, 2018). The word “motivation crowding out” present an undermining result of incentive and rewards. When employees are empowered, it denotes a value-based customer orientation employees who will be serious and focus on fulfilling customer desires and needs by being knowledgeable enough about customers’ expectations and creating a better experience in the name of service quality and customer satisfaction (Cheah, Ng, Ting, Memon, & Loo, 2019).

Empowering employees gives them confidence, authority, and the necessary freedom and independence to perform the amount of customer care that is required and needed (Meng & Han, 2014). When employees are given the freedom that is appropriate to make valuable and rightful decisions, they can do a better job to perform, which can make the organization productive and even better (Tripathi et al., 2021). As a result, a number of studies have shown that it helps improve the success and productivity of both individuals and makes employees more engaged and empowered (Bobba, 2019). Empowerment is seen as an important management practice in the restaurant setting, where service is highly demandable and workers need to be skillful (Ma, Zhang, Xu, Wang, & Kim, 2021).

H. Factor 2 – Customer Focus
Table 6 presents that Factor 2 generated and extracted four (4) items. The pattern coefficient of the items ranged from 0.451 to 0.754. The pattern coefficient for the statement "The company prioritizes providing exceptional customer service" is 0.754, while the pattern coefficient for the statement "I greet our customers upon entering the store" is 0.451. The coefficient value of the item exceeds the minimum requirement of +0.40. The four (4) derived items suggest that employees and the organization have projected a remarkable attitude toward customers; therefore, the attribute or factor structure is titled "Customer Focus."

Table 6: Constructs and Loadings under the Second Factor Customer Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>The company prioritizes providing exceptional service to customers</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>Customer Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I provided great service to customers</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I am delighted with the good feedback from customers</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I greet our customers upon entering the store</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a customer-focused culture, workers have the freedom to interact with customers and are given chances to do so they can learn what customers really value. This is similar to a clan culture and is backed by non-monetary rewards. So, the more workers can be guided by a customer-focused culture, the less they need to rely on standard
management controls like rules, policies, procedures, and direct supervision. Organizations with a customer-focused culture are focused on the outside and are competitive. They have a longer-term view of their profit goals, and their business decisions are based on customer-centric measures like market share, growth, and customer connections (Madhani, 2019).

In the restaurant and service industry, service is provided through a process and system that involves contact between people. During the offering and delivery of a service, how workers act and talk to customers and treat them has a big effect on how customers feel about the service. (Saputro & Kurniawan, 2020). Service contact is a key factor in how people see the quality of the service in the context of customer focus. Milliman, Gatling, and Kim (2018) say that "interaction quality" is how a customer perceives and sees the attitudes and knowledge of a service employee, which affects and results in how the customer evaluates and performs their personal interactions with the employee while the employee is providing the service required.

I. Factor 3 – Efficient Performance
Factor 3 took out five (5) things, as shown in Table 7. The items' pattern coefficients were between 0.634 and 0.837. The pattern coefficient was highest for the statement "I do what would be considered acceptable work," which was 0.710, and it was lowest for the statement "I participate in company activities," which was 0.499. The item's coefficient number is more than +0.40, which is the minimum standard. The four things that were taken out show that there is room for growth and that the person is committed to doing what is expected of them. This is why the factor is called "Efficient Performance."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I perform what would be considered acceptable performance</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>Efficient Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I deliver the daily target set by my supervisor</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I perform other tasks when needed</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I participate in company activities</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a business world that is changing quickly specifically in the restaurant industry, it has become a big task for restaurants to find and keep good employees. Since there is a lot of competition between different restaurants to hire people who seem to be skillful and knowledgeable. Even though this is the case, skillful employees still need training and development activities to help them improve and enhance their skills and work more efficiently. This initiative makes it easier for people to do their jobs while keeping in mind the restaurant’s goals and vision. This makes it more likely that a restaurant will have good business success (Hasan, Islam, and Chowdhury, 2020; Seiler, 2010; Vieira and Ortega-Alvarez, 2019). Also, in the context of efficient performance, this helps the group keep learning and improve the restaurant’s success in both the short and long term.
Human resources are just as important to the success of a company in promoting efficiency at work. This is true because a restaurant cannot reach its goals and plans as a whole without a skilled, engaged, and knowledgeable workforce (Hyatt & Miller, 2021). Restaurant supervisors need to get employees involved in activities and even in making decisions if they want to build a skilled staff. This will create a continuous learning setting where restaurant employees can get the skills they need whether in dining, kitchen, and front liners (Osibanjo, Adeniji, Salau, Atolagbe, Osoko, Edewor, & Olowu, 2020; Getahun Asfaw & Chang, 2019). When restaurant workers have a clear idea of what is expected of them on the job, and tasks that are created to meet these goals, this makes workers happier at work and makes them more committed to their own jobs and to the restaurant. Competent, engaged, and loyal employees make a restaurant more likely to succeed because they make work more efficient and productive (Kwizera, 2020).

J. Factor 4 – Trusted and Confident Workforce
Table 8 shows that the fourth factor has five (5) extracted items. The coefficients of the items ranged from 0.513 to 0.708. The statement “I consider myself one of the company’s reliable employees” had the highest coefficient, which is 0.708, while the statement “I tell my friends about the good practices of our company” showed the lowest coefficient value of 0.513. The coefficient value of each item surpasses the minimum requirement of +0.40. The five (5) items extracted suggest that employees show increased loyalty and pride in the company.

Table 8: Constructs and Loadings under the Fourth Factor Trusted & Confident Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I consider myself one of the company’s reliable employees</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>Trusted and Confident Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I consider myself loyal to the company</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I consider this company for employment until I retire</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I consider the issues fronting in this company as my responsibility too</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I tell my friends about the good practices of our company</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholars such as Mukhalipi (2018) have advocated that when employees are engaged in their respective workplaces, they showed authentic confidence and trust in the organization to which they belong. It is essential for organizations to recognize and show the workers that they have put their trust in and this was empirically tested (Durai, Madhanagopal & King, 2018). Transformational leadership also played a key component in this case especially when the management expects their employee to exceed the target outcomes (Ytterstad, & Olaisen, 2023). Thus, it is laudable that transformational leadership will aid the employee to become more engaged and earn organizational trust.

A more engaging work environment allows the promotion of a better employer-employee relationship, promotion of trust and confidence, and appreciation at the very
least (Smith, Boulamatsi, Dimotakis, Tepper, Runnals, Reina, & Lucianetti, 2022). Whenever employees understand that their manager has put enough effort to solve conflicts inside the organization, trust eventually grows which contributes to a positive work attitude (Wang, Luo, & Chang, 2022; Jumady, 2020). Hence, organizations must be able to provide a set of different rewards and recognition incentives to boost the morale of their workforce which can promote opportunity and career advances advancement, trust, and level of confidence (Jena, Pradhan, & Panigrahy, 2018).

K. Factor 5 – Continuing Professional Development. Table 9 shows that the fifth factor extracted seven (7) items. The coefficient values of this factor range from 0.410 to 0.703. The statement “The company gives career opportunities to all qualified employees” had the highest coefficient value of 0.703, while the statement “The company looks at the professional growth of the people” had the lowest value of the pattern coefficient which is 0.651. All the coefficient value fall within the minimum requirement of +0.40. All seven (7) items extracted suggest employees were given enough training and opportunities to improve skills that will more likely result in improved professional competence, hence, the element structure is named “continuing professional development”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Statement</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The company gives career opportunities to all qualified employees</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>Continuing Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The company gives people chances to grow professionally</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The company provides training to improve customer loyalty</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The company invites in enhancing team development</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The company adheres to statutory wages and benefits</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The manager provides cross training among the employees</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The company looks at the professional growth of the people</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ever-growing and changing workplace nowadays brought by the continuous innovation among organizations forces business entities to adopt the changes required especially in meeting the professional and development standards of the restaurant industry. In order to achieve this, organizations are requiring their employees the acquisition of a new set of skills through continuing professional development (CPD). The professional training under CPD, keeps the employee updated to the current standards of professional services one has to show to the clients (e.g. crew to customer engagement/ interaction). Thus, CPD can be defined as the unending acquisition of knowledge and technical skills required for better performance at work (Alemayehu, 2021).
Continuing professional development (CPD) allows workers to earn the experience, knowledge, as well as skills necessary for the performance of someone’s duties and responsibilities. CPD captures all the requirements from the inception to the retirement stage of a worker’s career (Dharmagunawardene & Samaraweera, 2019). It is a lifelong process that is normally regulated and governed by functional principles. CPD does not only provide growth in professional development, but it also provides personal growth as it is a holistic approach (Kwofie, Aigbavboa, & Mpambela, 2018). It can be regarded as continuing education and is normally monitored by certain agencies as it needs to follow strict regulations and guidelines. In other countries, professionals are required to achieve particular CPD points as it follows a strict pointing system. The purpose is to make sure that workers really gained the required skill and level of knowledge so that when they perform their tasks, they contribute to an improved and better level of performance (Collin, Van der Heijden, & Lewis, 2012).

Continuing professional development may be done through structured coursework, training, or professional mentoring. It does not only aim to contribute to the overall achievement of organizational goals but also aims to develop an individual on a personal level. There are five stages in the CPD, first is the appraisal of self, second if the personal plan, the third is the implementation of the action stage which is followed by documentation and the last one was the evaluation phase (Austin, 2013).

The exploratory factor analysis yielded five dimensions that characterize employees’ outcomes. These five factors are thematically labeled as follows: (1) Empowered Workforce, (2) Trusted and Confident Workforce, (3) Efficient Performance, (4) Customer Focus, and; (5) Continuing Professional Development. These dimensions are the components that employee outcomes among employees in restaurants in Davao Region. This framework explains 69.60% of the variations of the data extracted from the lenses of the respondents. As such, the five (5) key factors are suggested to be considered by the human resource and administration to ensure that favorable employee outcomes will be surely achieved. Statistically, it is also a requirement to determine the reliability index of each factor before it will be tested for confirmatory factor analysis. For the factor, empowered workforce the reliability index is .807, (2) Trusted and Confident Employees is .729, (3) Efficient Performance has a reliability index of .790, (4) Customer Focus, and (5) Continuing Professional Development has .842 and .926 respectively. The tool used to determine the reliability index for these factors is Cronbach Alpha.

L. Confirmatory Factor Analysis
Before the CFA was accomplished, the reliability test of each factor was analyzed and all indices pass the reliability index of .70 as considered to be acceptable. In this study, the researcher’s idea is to refine an existing theoretical perspective, support an existing structure, or test a known dimensional structure in an additional population. Although there are dimensions already that characterize employee outcomes, constructs that are contextualized in the local setting, in this case, employees among restaurants in the Davao region were not yet identified and published.
In the statistical aspect, several guidelines have been published to determine the fit indices that are considered to be acceptable. Authors suggested that values above .95 represent adequate fit, as well as using combinations of indices to support a good-fitting model (Russell, 2002). Also, any modification and or reconfigurations in the model should be evaluated through the lenses of both statistical and theoretical perspectives (Zhang, Dawson, & Kline, 2021). Moreover, it is also essential to report the value of AIC and BIC aside from chi-square difference test for model comparisons.

Before the best-fit measurement model was developed, three configurations were tested. Confirmatory factor analysis model 1 showed index values outside the acceptable range. This model highlights the correlation of all the five (5) extracted factors, number of all items per factor was retained. The fit indices are all outside the acceptable value specifically for NFI (.803), TLI (.764), CFI (.793), cmin/df (4.990), p (.000), RMSEA (.126). Measures of forecasting error were also obtained in the model, specifically Akaike Information Criterion (1323.487) and BIC (1528.193) respectively.

The confirmatory factor analysis model 2 still showed index values outside the unacceptable range. This model highlights the correlation of all the five extracted factors, the number of all items per factor was retained. Moreover, a modification was established removing item 18 as an indicator for continuing professional development factors and increasing the fitness indices which are still outside the acceptable ranges. Specifically, for NFI (.948), TLI (.931), CFI (.954), cmin/df (9.141), p (.000), RMSEA (.117). Measures of forecasting error were also obtained in the model, specifically a dropped of the Akaike Information Criterion (261.386) and Bayesian Information Criterion (353.721) respectively.

The confirmatory model 3 was analyzed by the removal of item numbers 18 and 29 on the factor of continuing professional development. Measures of fitness index are still outside the acceptable range. Specifically, for NFI (.754), TLI (.755), CFI (.789), cmin/df (5.353), p (.000), RMSEA (.117). Measures of forecasting error were also obtained in the model, specifically a drop of the Akaike Information Criterion (1173.263) and Bayesian Information Criterion (1363.853) respectively.

The confirmatory factor analysis model 4 as presented in Figure 4 is considered to be the best measurement model considering its theoretical and statistical soundness. The number of factors was retained, and the factors were all correlated. The modification employed was the removal of item number 18 which speaks about company adherence to statutory wages and benefits and theoretically decided to be not fit under continuing professional development construct. Moreover, additional constraints must be established to increase model fitness. Item numbers 22 and 41 directly depict loyalty to the company. Hence, in this study item, number 41 was chosen to be deleted, and retained item number 22 was instead. This configuration increases the fitness index of the model. This was also strongly supported by RMSEA index of 0.031, which was less than 0.05, a level of significance with its corresponding P-close value > 0.05. Likewise, the other indices such as NFI (.982), TLI (.973), CFI (.969), cmin/df of 1.207 with a p-value of .065 were found to be consistently indicating a very good fit model as their values, fall within each acceptable range.
Table 10: Model Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-Close</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>0 &lt; value &lt; 2</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>9.141</td>
<td>5.353</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.95</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>Relatively Lower Value</td>
<td>1323.487</td>
<td>261.386</td>
<td>1173.263</td>
<td>148.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>Relatively Lower Value</td>
<td>1336.318</td>
<td>353.721</td>
<td>1363.853</td>
<td>238.789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
CMIN/DF - Chi-Square/Degrees of Freedom; NFI - Normed Fit Index; TLI - Tucker-Lewis Index; CFI - Comparative Fit Index; GFI - Goodness of Fit Index; PCLOSE - P of Close Fit; RMSEA - Root Means Square of Error Approximation.
Measures of forecasting error were also obtained in the model, specifically a drop of the Akaike Information Criterion (148.199) and BIC (138.789) respectively. Results of the estimates also revealed that all the items are significantly related to the extracted factor. This suggests that all the indicators or items extracted that fall under a specific construct are significantly associated with a specific factor. Specifically for continuing professional development factors, item numbers 36, 29, 19, 12, 10, and 27 were all statistically significant. A trusted and confident workforce has the following set of items: 44, 48, 5, and 31. Item numbers 42, 25, 9, and 7 for efficient performance, factors, 23, 6, 50, and 43 for the empowered workforce, and 26, 24, 22, and 21 for customer focus.

5. Recommendations

It is highly suggested that restaurant owners may devise a comprehensive human resource plan based on the generated dimensions.

First, in order to establish an empowered workforce, restaurants may increase the intrinsic rewards and recognitions, especially in incentivizing their good working habits, practices, and values at work.

Second, on the aspect of customer focus, restaurant owners may reinforce this element by sending frontline employees to training and apprenticeship relating to quality customer service in the modern business environment. Also, integrating the importance of the SERVQUAL model in operation would create an opportunity for employees to value the purpose of 'quality' customer service, which will later transform into 'customer delight.'

Third, the dimension of efficient performance may be reinforced by developing a comprehensive performance management system that sets the metrics of performance requirements, evaluation, and rewards for hitting the target (be it sales, number of customers, or quota). Aside from this, employees may also be exposed to a regular orientation on the quality practices of the restaurant, most especially on achieving the desired monthly or quarterly targets.

Fourth, for the dimension of a trusted and confident workforce, restaurateurs may conduct a comprehensive audit on the number of employees who have been in the company for a while and include in their plan the retirement/loyalty packages to incentivize their enormous dedication to be with the company. This is also an excellent way to entice the existing employees to remain loyal to the organization and build a two-way trust with the employers.

Lastly, for the generated variable, continuing professional development, restaurant owners may consider instilling the roots and history of the company that will pave the way to establishing a sustainable corporate culture. Instilling the corporate values throughout the team, from frontline operations (through service crews, cashiers, attendants) to back-office operations (cooks, office workers, cleaners), may lay the foundation to develop the teams into becoming professionally oriented in doing their tasks, hitting targets, and above all sustaining the restaurant operation.
6. Conclusion

Five (5) distinct factors extracted were extracted using the exploratory factor analysis: (1) Empowered Workforce, (2) Trusted and Confident workforce (3) Efficient Performance (4) Customer Focus, and; (5) Continuing Professional Development. It can also be noted from the statistical analysis that the model explains 69.60 percent of the variation in employees’ outcomes.

As to the confirmatory factor analysis, the fourth model was considered to be the best-fit model for employee outcomes as indicated by the strength of the relationship of the factors that were retained. As shown in the final generated model, factors such as empowered workforce, trusted and confident workforce, efficient performance, customer focus, and; continuing professional development were all correlated which signifies that these elements are the best predictors, hence, they are significant in understanding employees’ outcome in case of restaurant operation.
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