

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Thomas F. Gaddis entitled "College and University Administrators' Attitudes Concerning Contract-Managed and Self-Operated Food Service". I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Food Systems Administration.

Carol Costello
Carol Costello, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Joussni Allam
Wayne Quinton

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of the Graduate School

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS' ATTITUDES CONCERNING
CONTRACT-MANAGED AND SELF-OPERATED FOOD SERVICE

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Thomas F. Gaddis
December 1992

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest thanks to Dr. Carol Costello, my major professor, for her direction, support, and encouragement as I labored to complete my thesis. I will be forever grateful for her commitment to ensure that I was aware of and able to meet my necessary deadlines.

To my committee members, Dr. Youssri Allam and Dr. Wayne Quinton for their time and valuable insights. I also thank Dr. Jeanne Sneed for her help in kindling my interest enough to return to school.

To the participating administrators from the member schools of the National Association of College Auxiliary Services.

To my loving wife for her incredible support through numerous long days and weekends.

To my parents who gave me the gift of believing anything is possible if enough energy is expended.

To my employers who have supported my continuing educational development.

To God for granting me the abilities and perseverance to complete this thesis.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to ascertain factors which influence college and university administrators' decisions to change the management format of their food service operation. Specifically this included 1) developing a list of potential factors which could influence an administrator's decision in this area, 2) determining administrators perceived importance of the factors, 3) determining the attitudes of administrators toward contract companies and the services provided, and 4) determining if significant differences existed between attitudes toward contract companies as they related to size and type of institution (public or private).

A list of potential decisional factors was developed by both a telephone survey and a review of literature. The accumulated list was transformed into a survey instrument, pilot tested, and mailed to the research sample. After sufficient data was returned, statistical analysis was performed to determine where significant differences existed as related to the size and type of institution.

In general, administrators who had experience with contract-managed food services felt that the decisional factors that favored contractors were significantly more important than did administrators who had more experience

with self-operated food service. Similarly, administrators who were more versed with contract-managed food service felt that contractors performed the subject of the decisional aspects significantly more than did administrators who were more familiar with self-operated food service. The effects the different demographic characteristics had on the decisional factors could be attributed to the type of food service. When a factor was significantly different, it was found that the different demographic characteristic coincided with the administrators' preference for either contract-managed or self-operated food service. This relationship was true for current managerial format, preferred managerial format, and enrollment size. In essence, the ratings for importance of and compliance with the relevant decisional factors were a function of the administrator's most familiar managerial format.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Contract-managed Food Service Corporations	5
Changing from Self-operated to Contract-managed Food Service	8
Food Service Operation in the Healthcare Segment ..	9
Food Service Operation in the Business and Industry Segment	10
Food Service Operation in the Recreational Segment	11
Food Service Operation in the College and University Segment	12
III. METHODS	15
Sample	15
Instrument Development	15
Data Collection	17
Data Analysis	17
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	19
Demographics	19
Effect of Current Managerial Format on Importance Ratings	28
Effect of Institution Type on Importance Ratings...	32
Effect of Institution Enrollment on Importance Ratings	35
Effect of Meal Plan Participation on Importance Ratings	38
Effect of Demographic Characteristics on Combined Relevant Decisional Factors	39
Effect of Current Managerial Format on Agreement Ratings	42
Effect of Institution Type on Agreement Ratings ...	45
Effect of Institution Enrollment on Agreement Ratings	48
Effect of Meal Plan Participation on Agreement Ratings	51
Effect of Demographic Characteristics on Agreement Ratings of Combined Factors	51

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY	55
Limitations and Applications	56
REFERENCES	58
APPENDICES	61
Appendix A. Research Questionnaire	62
Appendix B. Instrument Participation Cover Letter ..	67
VITA	69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Demographic characteristics of the institutions in the sample	20
2.	Demographic characteristics of the institutions in the sample by current food service operation style	25
3.	Effect of current type of operation on the mean scores for importance of relevant decisional aspects	29
4.	Effect of institution type on the mean scores for importance of relevant decisional aspects	33
5.	Effect of institution enrollment on the mean scores for importance of relevant decisional aspects	36
6.	Effect of demographic characteristics on the mean scores for importance of combined relevant decisional factors	40
7.	Effect of current type of operation on mean scores for agreement with performance of relevant aspects	43
8.	Effect of institution type on mean scores for agreement with performance of relevant aspects	46
9.	Effect of institution enrollment on mean scores for agreement with performance of relevant aspects	49
10.	Effect of demographic characteristics on the mean scores for agreement with performance of combined relevant factors	52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One current trend in college and university food service has been the change in management from self-operated to contract management. Like many other markets, colleges and universities have been investing in and refocusing on their areas of proficiency and discontinuing services that are either not profitable or not a part of their long range plan (Schuster, 1988). Once this industry was allowed to operate at a deficit under the pretense of community service, but recently college food services have had to become a profitable, or at least, a break-even venture (Schuster, 1988).

Contract management companies showed increased sales of 10.8% in the college and university segment between 1988 and 1990 (Knapp, 1990). It had been forecasted that the percentage of real growth for contract management in this segment would increase 6.0% in 1991 (Knapp, 1990). When compared to the predicted growth of the college and university market of 0.0%, this substantiates the trend that contractors are increasing penetration in this market area (Stephenson, 1990).

The reason why administrators consider changes in the format of management in their food service have varied with differing types of industry. Contract management companies have claimed to provide greater efficiency and quality for their clients as well as alleviate the management burden

from the administrator (Soat, 1986). Contract management companies also have claimed to provide greater profits or lessened costs to their clients while attaining increased value and improved service standards for their clients' customers (Soat, 1986).

Conversely, it is important to note that once a food service operation has been placed in the care of a contractor, there exists very little possibility of reverting back to self-operation. By converting to a contracted operation, there often has been a loss of control by administrators and downward communications have become awkwardly slower than if the food service were self-operated (Becker, 1989). Another drawback to contracted food service management has occurred when administrators question the logic of paying a contractor a percentage of sales (Souhrada, 1990).

The purpose of this research was to ascertain factors which influence college and university administrators' decisions to change their food service operation from self-operated to contract-management operated. Specifically, the objectives were to: 1) develop a list of potential factors which could influence an administrators' decision for changing from self-operated to contract-managed food service, 2) determine administrators' perceived importance of the factors, 3) determine the attitudes of administrators

toward contract companies and the services they provide, and
4) determine if significant differences exist between
attitudes toward contract companies as they related to size
and type of institution (public or private).

CHAPTER II

THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The food service industry has been a highly competitive and often lucrative venture for many years (Knapp, 1990). The contract management portion of this industry is no exception. Contract management is a form of business that operates a portion of another companies' business for an agreed compensation arrangement. When working in conjunction with the food service industry, different contractors operate a number of business agreements with the parent company. Some of the most common agreements are: 1) the contractor provides all labor, equipment, and expertise for the food service operation of the customer company. In return, the contractor pays a percentage of sales or profits to the customer company, 2) the contractor assumes an existing food service operation and provides management personnel to operate the business. In return, the contractor pays a fixed percentage of the sales or profits back to the parent company, or 3) the contractor is paid a flat fee to operate the food service portion of the business. Standards of operation are agreed upon and profit made is a direct function of the contractors ability to manage. An example of this relationship would be the college that pays a contractor a set fee for each student registered on a board plan.

By no means are these examples conclusive. There are numerous strategies that are mutually beneficial to each party. To have a successful contract arrangement, there are several decisional aspects to be accounted for by both parties. Development of a good contract is critical for the success of both parties. Great care should be taken in developing the request for proposals. Citing clear specifications and details that emphasize significant performance aspects will leave both parties with a complete understanding of each party's expectations (Gordon & Lefever, 1990).

The change in food service operations from self-operated to contract-managed has been occurring in different business areas. This type of managerial switch has been evident in the recreational, healthcare, corporate, and educational area of the food service industry. Each of these areas of business has witnessed a growth of contract-management companies in their respective food service operations (Knapp, 1990). Many of the contract-management companies taking over food service responsibilities are largely the same contractors for the different types of business (Souhrada, 1990).

Contract-managed Food Service Corporations

Four corporations comprise the majority market share

for contract-managed food service operators. These four include: Morrison's, Marriott, ARA, and Canteen. Each of these companies has a unique operating system with a high degree of flexibility that allows them to fill much needed niches in the food service market.

Marriott has a history dating back to 1927 when Willard Marriott opened his first root beer stand (Kennedy, 1988). Later acquisitions and expansions included full service restaurants in the Washington D. C. area, airline catering in 1937, governmental department catering, and hotels in 1957. Later ventures included buyouts and takeovers of other companies and a firm foothold in contract management by the early 1970's (Kennedy, 1988).

Marriott estimated that 40% of colleges and universities are contract-managed (Schuster, 1988). It is unknown what portion of this business belongs to Marriott, but Marriott does expect to grow by acquisition in this sector, as they predict a continued 4-5% increase in this business sector throughout the nineties (Kennedy, 1988). The magnitude of these growth plans in this area were realized through the acquisition of SAGA corporation. This 1988 acquisition increased Marriott's market share by more than 800 million dollars a year in sales.

ARA services has a rich history that includes a diverse food service foundation. The portions of the food service

industry where ARA is prominent include business and industrial catering, contract food service management in the healthcare and educational areas, and vending in both corporate snack areas as well as sports arena concessions.

Morrison's is primarily known to the general public as a restaurant operator. These operations include their namesake cafeterias, Ruby Tuesdays, Silver Spoon Cafe's, and the L&N Seafood Grills. However, by the mid 1970's, Morrison's had become a legitimate player in the contract-management sector in both the healthcare and educational segments.

Canteen's prime business is in the vending area of contract-managed food service. It is important to note that Canteen is primarily involved in the area of industrial and business food service operations in production plants and office buildings, as well as in the break areas of hospitals, universities, and many other businesses. Even though this member is more concentrated in contract-managed vending, they are worthy of recognition as they are considered the largest contract operator in a 24 billion dollar vending industry (Stephenson, 1989).

Although there are several other contract-management companies, these four have controlled the market majority by filling immediate market needs and carefully planning for future market needs. For the college and university food

service industry, this amounts to at least a 40% portion of a 7.22 billion dollar business (Stephenson, 1990).

In the college and university segment, there is one other noteworthy contractor participant. This participant is a combination of both self-operation and contract-managed food service. This situation arises when one campuses' self-operated food service department wins a contract to operate the food services of another campus. This was the case in 1991 when California State University at Fullerton won a contract against the big name contract feeders to operate the food services at California State University at Diminguez Hills (Martin, 1991). Quite often, an arrangement of this sort will be accomplished by the bidding self-operated organization utilizing the brand names of several other national and regional restaurant chains on a cooperative basis where the self-operated organization becomes the franchise operator of the other known services. It is certain that this type of combination signals future trends for cooperative campus feeding ventures (Martin, 1991).

Changing from Self-operated to Contract-managed Food Service

A broad spectrum of reasons for changing from a self-operated to a contract-managed food service have been identified in food service areas from the healthcare,

recreational, corporate, industrial, and college and university segments. Each sector identified factors that were unique to their types of business as well as factors that were common amongst most other segments.

Food Service Operation in the Healthcare Segment

Food service departments in the healthcare field were one of the strongest growth areas for contract management through 1988. By the end of 1988, ten contract-management firms provided food service for 1127 hospitals. This figure was an increase of 50.9% from the previous year (Lutz, 1989). Primary reasons given for these increases include: 1) contractors were able to obtain bottom line savings of approximately 10% during their first year (Souhrada, 1990), 2) contractors were able to alleviate the management burden from healthcare administrators, and 3) contractors were better at managing large groups of unskilled employees (Lutz, 1989).

It is worthy to note that there are still many self-operated healthcare food services. A reason found for remaining self-operated included that many administrators have owned up to their responsibility to manage all areas including food service (Souhrada, 1990). In addition, administrators have found they have less immediate control with a contractor than they would have with self-operation (Eyster, 1988).

Food Service Operation in the Business and Industry Segment

Food service departments in the business and industry segment are likely the most diverse in the food service industry. Their services range from offering vending in break areas, to cafeteria service, to full scale corporate catering.

The business and industry market has grown at approximately 1.3% yearly (Bakos & Karrick, 1989). Due to the IRS Tax Reform Act of 1985, corporate food services have had to become break-even or profitable ventures (Bakos & Karrick, 1989). For this reason, corporate food service has been an attractive segment for contractors. The main reason found for this constant growth of contract management was that contractors do not pay corporate wages to food service employees (Bakos & Karrick, 1989). In addition, the corporate account can concentrate on what it does best, which is not food service (Bakos & Karrick, 1989).

Drawbacks against switching management format also have been identified by the corporate sector. Bakos & Karrick (1989) reported that corporate administrators envision themselves as having more control over a self-operated food service and that employees of a self-operated food service demonstrate more dedication and loyalty to company goals. Administrators also envision that

the management fee often associated with contractors decreases the profits they might enjoy utilizing self-management (Eyster, 1988).

Food Service Operation in the Recreational Segment

The recreational food service segment includes the food-related operations at summer camps and private clubs. A unique characteristic of recreational food service is the fact that it is normally highly seasonal with the bulk of business occurring in the summer months (Becker, 1989). Reasons that most of these food service operations switched from self-operated to contract managed included contractors provide improvement in the level or quality of service at no additional expense and contractors offer expertise, such as dietetic training, not commonly found in smaller operations (Becker, 1989).

However, there were contributing factors that kept some recreational food services self-operated. Becker (1989) cited that the contractor may not offer all of the services the customer desires and the low bid contractor may not meet the standards expected by administration or customers. It also was reported that once the managerial switch was made, converting back to self-operation was difficult (Becker, 1989).

Food Service Operation in the College and University Segment

The review of factors concerning contractual management for other food service segments was included due to the wide variety of college and university situations that closely parallel those of the other segments. Through these reports, it can be better understood what some of the alleged strengths and weaknesses of contractors are in relation to the managerial decision in college and university food service.

The college and university food service segment posted sales in excess of \$222 million in 1990 (Knapp, 1990). With a total of 3350 units in 1990, the real growth in sales was 0.0% (Stephenson, 1990). Along with all the other reasons for switching managerial format, the following reasons are inherent to the college and university food service segment: 1) a contractor can help fund renovation of facilities so that the expectations of the college consumer can be met (Stephenson, 1990), 2) funds tied up in inventory in a self-operated food service become available for other purposes (Stumph, 1982), 3) contractors have the ability to solve management and personnel problems quickly and efficiently (Storm, 1983), and 4) contractors can utilize economies of scale to purchase more efficiently than the small operation (Stumph, 1982). The negative aspects of converting to a contractor are essentially the same as those

identified in the previous food service segments.

It was important to note that the prime reason cited by education segments for switching was for financial gains (Allen, 1992). In 1990-91, secondary schools reported an increase in contracted food service due primarily to concerns for cost reduction (Allen, 1992). Similar figures for the college and university segment have been shown to be 8% to 11% on an annual basis (Knapp, 1990).

The following list of reasons why administrators choose either self-operation or contracted food service was developed by Rose (1984). The list should be of prime consideration for any administrator facing this management format decision (Rose, 1984). The factors compiled were described as follows:

1. the level of operating costs with or without use of a contracted company,
2. the level of customer satisfaction derived from the use of contracted services versus self-operation,
3. the realistic need of staff expertise offered from either management format,
4. the real amount of administrative time saved or spent on food services via either managerial format,
5. the general attitudes of the involved administrators toward food services whether self-operated or contracted,
6. the degree of standards to be obtained or retained

- through either format,
7. the accountability of food service management to campus administration as dictated by the management type,
 8. the concern about becoming dependent on a contractor once the switch is made, and
 9. the best ability to manage unskilled labor efficiently through either management type.

The existence of research concerning the factors administrators consider when deciding whether or not to pursue contract food service management or to stay self-operated was very limited. The information that did exist was not research based. The purpose of this research was to clarify the factors and set forth a systematic list for administrators' to consider to help evaluate their situation when pondering this decision.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Sample

In order to acquire sufficient data concerning administrators attitudes toward contract management food service, a sample of 400 college and university administrators were used. The sample consisted of a random sample taken from the member schools in the 1991 National Association of College Auxiliary Services (NACUS, 1991). There were over 1480 member schools and the sample taken was representative of 27% of the membership.

Instrument Development

The research instrument was developed utilizing the following steps and consisted of 3 parts. A list of potential factors which influenced administrator's management format was developed by means of phone interviews. Ten administrators from universities were contacted. Based upon the phone conversations, a three part questionnaire was developed to determine administrator's perceived importance of the identified factors and their attitudes toward contract management companies and their services (Appendix A).

The factors that were assessed consisted of

service-related factors, such as standards of quality, skilled expertise, and operation availability. Also included were financial-related factors that involved freeing inventory money, funding renovation, purchasing power, and employee pay scales. In addition managerial-related factors such as personnel management actions, employee loyalty, relief of administrative burden and freeing administrative time were included.

The initial section of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain administrators' perceived importance of the relevant decisional factors. The second portion of the questionnaire was designed to determine how much administrators agreed with the performance of the relevant decisional aspects by contract management companies. The third portion of the questionnaire asked for specific demographic data from the administrators to be utilized in the statistical analysis.

A five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree was utilized for expressing attitudes towards each statement. Careful instruction was given at the beginning of each section of the questionnaire (Appendix A). Demographic data concerning the size and type of institution were assessed.

The questionnaire was pilot tested to a group of 8 administrators of auxiliary services. Revisions to the

questionnaire were based upon the group's feedback. In addition, suggestions were taken from this group to ensure that the instrument was understandable and able to be filled out in a reasonable time frame.

Data Collection

To initiate data collection, the survey instrument, a cover letter communicating the research's appeal (Appendix B), and a postage paid reply envelope were sent to the research sample. Three weeks following the initial mailing, another cover letter, questionnaire, and self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to accomplish the desired response rate (Dillman, 1978).

Data Analysis

The Statistical analysis system was used for all analyses (SAS, 1978). Frequencies, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each of the items in the attitude scale. Frequencies of responses were determined for descriptive purposes. Each item in the attitude portion of the questionnaire also was analyzed with analysis of variance to determine if significant differences existed for administrators' attitudes based on the specific demographic characteristics. Tukey's test was utilized in determining where significant differences existed. A

probability level of 0.05 was used for the tests of significance.

The attitude questions were grouped according to financial factors, management factors, and service / quality factors. Analysis of variance was performed to determine if significant differences existed for administrators' attitudes based on management format preference, institution type (land-grant, public, private), enrollment size, current managerial format, and consumer meal purchasing format. Tukey's test was utilized to determine when significant differences existed. A probability level of 0.05 was used for the tests of significance.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographics

The initial mailing of questionnaires was sent to 400 administrators. There were 237 responses returned which yielded a response rate of 59.25%. This response rate compared favorably to other studies that also utilized a perception-based questionnaire (Gamio, 1990, Duke, 1989).

There are several demographic categories of interest that are descriptive of the sample group. These categories are depicted in Table 1. The types of institutions included land grant, public (non-land grant), private, and other. Land grant institutions included schools that initially were funded by the government where they exist. The public classification included all public colleges that were neither funded as a land grant institution nor privately funded. Public institutions comprised 51.1% of the survey while private and land grant institutions represented 36.7% and 11.4%, respectively.

Institution enrollment was divided into two categories. Institutions with enrollment at a level below 10,000 students represented the smaller-sized institutions and accounted for 66.6 % of the sample (Table 1). Institutions

TABLE 1. Demographic characteristics of the institutions in the sample (n= 228).

Characteristic	Percentage	Frequency
TYPE OF INSTITUTION		
Land Grant	11.4	27
Public (non-land grant)	51.1	121
Private	36.7	87
Other	0.8	2
INSTITUTION ENROLLMENT		
Below 10,000	66.6	158
10,000 And Above	33.4	79
CURRENT FOOD SERVICE OPERATION FORMAT		
Contractually Managed	58.2	138
Self-operated	37.6	89
Other (some of each)	4.2	10
PREFERRED FOOD SERVICE OPERATION FORMAT		
Contractually Managed	53.6	127
Self-operated	40.9	97
Other (some of each)	5.5	13

Characteristic	Percentage	Frequency
Where Perceptions of Contract Food Service Are Derived From		
From Colleagues	19.4	46
Organizational Affiliation	3.0	7
First Hand Experience	72.2	171
Trade Journals	5.5	13
Meal Plan Participation Format		
Mandatory For All On Campus Students	32.2	76
Mandatory By Class Or Grade Level	4.7	11
Mandatory By Campus Residential Area	26.3	62
Optional To All Students	13.1	31
Other (a combination of above)	23.7	56
Percentage Of Enrollment That Participates In A Meal Plan		
0% To 10%	36.9	87
11% To 20%	12.3	29
21% To 30%	10.6	25
31% To 40%	9.7	23
41% To 50%	6.8	16
51% To 60%	4.2	10
61% To 70%	3.8	9
71% To 80%	4.7	11
81% To 90%	5.1	12
91% To 100%	5.9	14

with enrollment of 10,000 and above constituted the larger-sized institutions and represented 33.4% of the sample.

The type of food service operation currently in place also was determined. Institutions which currently utilized contractual management made up 58.2% of the sample (Table 1). Institutions that were currently self-operated made up 37.6% of the sample. Institutions which had other arrangements such as a combination or no on-campus food service made up 4.2% of the sample. This distribution further evidenced the growth of the contract-managed segment which has been documented (Knapp, 1990).

The category of preferred format of food service operation was assessed. This question assessed which managerial format the administrator preferred without regard to the format currently in place (Table 1). Institutions that preferred contractual management made up 53.6% of the sample. This is 4.6% less than those that currently had contractually managed food service. The institutions that preferred self-operation made up 40.9% of the sample. This amounts to 3.3% more than the institutions that currently had self-operation. Institutions which preferred another arrangement or a combination of both contracted and self-operated made up 5.5% of the sample. This figure represented an increase of 1.3% when compared to

the category that currently had this arrangement (Table 1). From the comparison of the information from current management type to preferred management type, it would appear that there were slightly more administrators who would prefer self-operation to contractual operation than the actual situations dictate.

There were four areas where administrators derived their attitudes about contract-managed food service. Administrators who derived their perceptions about contractual food service from colleagues amounted to 19.4% of the sample (Table 1). Administrators who derived their perceptions through organizational affiliations made up 3.0% of the survey sample. Administrators who derived their perceptions from trade journals amounted to 5.5% of the surveyed sample. It was interesting to note that the overwhelming majority of the sample, 72.2% based their perceptions on first hand experience thus indicating a strong degree of expertise in their judgements (Table 1).

The format of meal plan participation was categorized into five groups as illustrated in Table 1. Institutions where meal plan participation was mandatory for all on campus students made up 32.2% of the survey sample. Institutions where meal plan participation was mandatory by class or grade level accounted for only 4.7% of the survey sample. Institutions where meal plan participation was

mandatory by campus residential area comprised 26.3% of the sample. Campuses that allowed meal plans to be optional to all students amounted to 13.1% of the sample. Any combination of the aforementioned participation schemes whether mandatory or optional made up 23.7% of the survey sample (Table 1). From this information, it would appear that the majority of institutions (63.2%) utilize some type of a mandatory meal plan participation method.

The percentage of the institutions total enrollment that participated in a meal plan was summarized in Table 1. Sixty-nine percent of the schools surveyed had a participation rate of 40% or less of their respective enrollment. The combination of institutions whose meal plan participation was at a rate above 40% amounted to 30.5% of the sample. It is of interest to note that the institutions which had less than 10% participation made up the largest percentage (36.9%) and that the institutions that had participation above 40% had ranges that were fairly evenly distributed in the designated increments (Table 1).

The comparison of demographic characteristics of the sample institutions with reference to current food service operation style was found in Table 2. Land grant institutions that were self-operated represented 8.77% of the sample which was greater than land grant institutions with contracted food service who comprised only 2.19% of

TABLE 2. Demographic characteristics of the institutions in the sample by current food service operation style (n= 228).

Characteristic	Contracted	Self-operated	Other
TYPE OF INSTITUTION			
Land Grant	2.19% (n= 5)	8.77% (n= 20)	0% (n=0)
Public	31.58% (n= 72)	18.86% (n= 43)	1.32% (n=3)
Private	25.44% (n= 58)	11.40% (n= 26)	0.44% (n=1)
INSTITUTION ENROLLMENT			
Below 10,000	47.37% (n=108)	19.30% (n= 44)	1.32% (n=3)
10,000 And Above	11.84% (n= 27)	19.74% (n= 45)	0.44% (n=1)
PREFERENCE OF FOOD SERVICE TYPE			
Contract Managed	52.63% (n=120)	2.63% (n= 6)	1.75% (n=4)
Self-operated	6.58% (n= 15)	36.40% (n= 83)	0% (n=0)

the surveyed sample. Public institutions that were contractually operated made up 31.58% of the sample which was more than the 18.86% that were public institutions with a self-operated food service format. Private institutions that utilized a contracted food service format accounted for 25.44% of the survey sample as compared to self-operated private institutions that amounted to only 11.4% of the sample. It was apparent that self-operated food service was more prevalent in land grant institutions while contract-managed food service was more prevalent in private and public institutions.

Institutions with enrollment below 10,000 that utilized a contractual food service format made up 47.37% of the survey sample. This compared to 19.30% for smaller institutions with a self-operated food service. Institutions with enrollment at 10,000 and above with contracted food service made up 11.84% of the survey sample. Large schools with self-operated food service comprised 19.74%. From this information, it was noted that the participants were fairly evenly distributed for self-operated institutions regardless of their size. However, the distribution of participants at contracted institutions were considerably larger for the institutions with enrollment below 10,000 thus indicating that more of the contracted institutions are smaller schools (Table 2).

Administrators from the institutions that were currently contracted that preferred self-operated food service accounted for 2.63% of the sample. Administrators from currently self-operated institutions that preferred contract-management amounted to 6.58% of the sample. It would appear that in general, the administrators were content with the management arrangement they currently had (Table 2). This may be attributed to the fact that the institution's administrator was either instrumental in getting the particular format of management or it was the format in which the administrator was most experienced.

Effect of Current Managerial Format on Importance Ratings

Several statistical analyses were performed on the data inquired by the first part of the research instrument to determine if significant differences existed in administrator's perceptions of the importance of and agreement with relevant decisional factors. The effects of current managerial format on the mean scores for importance on the relevant decisional aspects were presented in Table 3. It was determined that administrators from contracted institutions rated factors that were generally perceived as strengths of contractors more important than did administrators from self-operated campuses (Table 3). Conversely, administrators from self-operated campuses rated factors that are generally perceived as strengths of self-operation as more important than did administrators from contracted campuses. These results coincided with Souhrada's observations (1990) about administrators having to own up to their managerial responsibilities concerning their food service operations.

Administrators from contracted campuses felt that contractors' ability to relieve administrative burden and improve the level or quality of service was more important than did administrators from self-operated campuses (Table 3). Administrators from currently contract

TABLE 3. Effect of current type of operation on the mean scores^a for importance of relevant decisional aspects

Decisional Aspects	Contracted (n=138)	Self- operated (n=89)
Contractors relieve administrators of the managerial burden of the food service operation	1.89 ^c	3.09 ^b
Self-operation could deliver more financial return than contract	2.73 ^b	2.44 ^c
Contract could free funds normally tied up in inventory cost	2.07 ^c	2.72 ^b
Contractors improve the level or quality of service for no additional expense to the institution	2.18 ^c	3.45 ^b
Contractors offer expertise in areas such as catering and dietetics	1.76 ^c	2.80 ^b
Contractors might provide funds for facility renovation in conjunction with a lengthy contract	2.00 ^c	2.51 ^b
Contractors free administrative time allowing them to focus on educational matters instead of food	2.27 ^c	3.26 ^b
Contracting is in line with current trends	2.39 ^c	3.62 ^b
Institutions could benefit from contractor purchasing power	2.02 ^c	3.15 ^b
Contractors provide their own wage scale	2.36 ^c	2.75 ^b
Contractors might eliminate services that would remain with self-operation	2.84 ^b	2.26 ^c
Contractors could benefit from employee loyalty	2.74 ^c	3.20 ^b
Institutions have a hard time finding qualified food service managers	2.60 ^c	3.44 ^b
Contractors offer the same managerial control as self-operation	3.01 ^c	3.90 ^b

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree.

^b^c Means followed by different superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$.

managed campuses felt that contractors' ability to offer expertise as well as free administrative time from the food service burden was more important than did administrators from self-operated campuses (Table 3).

Contract campus administrators rated the ability to free funds that are normally tied up in inventory as well as provide funds for renovation more important than did self-operated campus administrators (Table 3). Contract affiliated administrators rated the benefits of contractor purchasing power and their own corporate wage scale more important than did their counterparts from self-operated campuses (Table 3). Similarly, administrators from currently contracted campuses rated contracting as an updated managerial trend more than did the administrators from self-operated campuses (Table 3). These results were consistent with the opinions of Stumph (1982) and Storm (1983), concerning the factors that influence administrators to favor contract-management arrangements.

Contract affiliated administrators felt that benefitting from employee loyalty was more important than did administrators from self-operated campuses (Table 3). Administrators from contracted campuses also felt the difficulty in finding qualified food service managers more important than did their counterparts from self-operated institutions. Similarly, administrators from

contracted campuses felt that the amount of administrative control with a contract service was more important than did administrators from self-operated campuses (Table 3).

The results from this examination were very straightforward. Administrators affiliated with contracted campuses rated the decisional factors that are generally considered contractor strengths more important than did administrators from self-operated campuses. Administrators from self-operated campuses rated the factors that are generally considered self-operation strengths significantly more important than did administrators from contracted campuses. One reason for these results would be that the administrators rated these factors in a manner that self-assured past decisions. Another reason these results occurred would have been that the polled administrators were actually satisfied with the results they had gotten from their respective managerial format.

A similar analysis was performed utilizing the administrators' preferred managerial format as the independent variable. The results for this analysis were identical to those found for the effect of current managerial format on the scores for importance for the relevant decisional factors. The significant difference appeared in an identical fashion for each of the decisional factors. These results indicated that the relationship

between the type of managerial format that an administrator currently had and what they preferred was extremely close and that their respective views for importance of decisional factors were parallel.

Effect of Institution Type on Importance Ratings

After examining the effect of institution type on the mean scores for importance of relevant decisional aspects, it was found that administrators from land grant institutions had significantly different importance ratings from administrators from public and private institutions for several decisional aspects (Table 4). The ability of contractors to relieve administrators of administrative time and the burden of food service were aspects the land grant administrators rated significantly less important than did administrators from either public or private schools (Table 4). Another decisional aspect that land grant administrators rated lower than administrators from other institution types was contractor's ability to free funds that are normally tied up in inventory costs (Table 4). Administrators from land grant schools rated contractors' ability to offer expertise in areas like catering and dietetics less important than did administrators from either public or private schools (Table 4). These results were consistent when one considers that the administrators from

TABLE 4. Effect of institution type on the mean scores^a for importance of relevant decisional aspects.

Decisional Aspects	Land Grant (n=27)	Public (n=121)	Private (n=87)
Contractors relieve administrators of the managerial burden of the food service operation	3.08 ^b	2.30 ^c	2.25 ^c
Self-operation could deliver more financial return than contract	2.76 ^b	2.62 ^b	2.56 ^b
Contractors could free funds normally tied up in inventory costs	2.72 ^b	2.21 ^c	2.37 ^c
Contractors improve the level or quality of service for no additional expense to the institution	3.16 ^b	2.63 ^b	2.61 ^b
Contractors offer expertise in areas such as catering and dietetics	3.00 ^b	2.11 ^c	2.00 ^c
Contractors might provide funds for facility renovation in conjunction with a lengthy contract	2.36 ^b	2.27 ^b	2.06 ^b
Contractors free administrative time allowing them to focus on educational matters instead of food	3.36 ^b	2.60 ^c	2.55 ^c
Contracting is in line with current trends	3.28 ^b	2.83 ^b	2.82 ^b
Institutions could benefit from contractor purchasing power	3.04 ^b	2.44 ^c	2.33 ^c
Contractors provide their own wage scale	2.28 ^b	2.43 ^b	2.69 ^b
Contractors might eliminate services that would remain with self-operation	2.16 ^b	2.57 ^c	2.80 ^c
Contractors could benefit from employee loyalty	3.32 ^b	2.87 ^b	2.88 ^b
Institutions have a hard time finding qualified food service managers	3.32 ^b	2.82 ^b	2.98 ^b
Contractors offer the same managerial control as self-operation	3.64 ^b	3.37 ^b	3.27 ^b

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree.

^{bc} Means followed by different superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$.

land grant institutions were largely the same as those who have self-operated campuses and therefore would have favored what they currently had. This could discount some of contract-management's perceived strengths or identify the land grant administrators as those who have recognized their responsibility to manage all campus areas including food service (Souhrada, 1990).

Land grant administrators rated the benefits of contractor purchasing power as significantly less important than did their peers from public or private colleges (Table 4). Administrators from land grant institutions rated the possibility that contractors might eliminate services that would remain with self-operation significantly more important than their counterparts at public or private institutions (Table 4). With respect to the rest of the decisional aspects, the administrators from the three different classifications of institution type did not rate any aspect more important than did any of their peers. It should be noted that no differences existed between administrators from public or private institutions.

It was apparent that administrators from land grant institutions viewed several of the aspects as less important than did their counterparts from public and private institutions. There were several possible reasons for these results. Administrators from land grant institutions

were more likely to have self-operated food service (Table 2) and would have favored what they currently had. Another reason that land grant administrators might have discounted certain decisional aspects is that by definition, they are more integrated with their respective governments and would have considerably more resources available to them than many public or private schools would have. The advantage of multiple resources available from a land grant institution could have influenced their perceptions to be less important concerning the respective decisional aspects.

The Effect of Institution Enrollment on Importance Ratings

The effect institution enrollment had on the mean scores for importance of decisional aspects were presented in Table 5. Administrators from smaller institutions with enrollment of 10,000 or less rated several aspects significantly more important than did administrators from larger schools. Administrators from smaller schools rated contractors' ability to relieve administrators of the managerial burden and administrative time in food service more important than did administrators from larger institutions (Table 5). This result was consistent with that reported by Storm (1983).

Administrators from smaller schools rated contractors' ability to improve quality of service and offer expertise

TABLE 5. Effect of institution enrollment on the mean scores^a for importance of relevant decisional aspects.

Decisional Aspects	10,000 Or below (n=158)	Over 10,000 (n=79)
Contractors relieve administrators of the managerial burden of the food service operation	2.15 ^c	2.82 ^b
Self-operation could deliver more financial return than contract	2.59 ^b	2.67 ^b
Contractors could free funds normally tied up in inventory costs	2.27 ^b	2.44 ^b
Contractors improve the level or quality of service for no additional expense to the institution	2.53 ^c	3.01 ^b
Contractors offer expertise in areas such as catering and dietetics	1.98 ^c	2.57 ^b
Contractors might provide funds for facility renovation in conjunction with a lengthy contract	2.23 ^b	2.14 ^b
Contractors free administrative time allowing them to focus on educational matters instead of food	2.44 ^c	3.14 ^b
Contracting is in line with current trends	2.72 ^c	3.22 ^b
Institutions could benefit from contractor purchasing power	2.32 ^c	2.79 ^b
Contractors provide their own wage scale	2.53 ^b	2.47 ^b
Contractors might eliminate services that would remain with self-operation	2.81 ^b	2.18 ^c
Contractors could benefit from employee loyalty	2.78 ^c	3.24 ^b
Institutions have a hard time finding qualified food service managers	2.78 ^c	3.26 ^b
Contractors offer the same managerial control as self-operation	3.29 ^b	3.54 ^b

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree.

^{bc} Means followed by different superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$.

in catering and dietetics more important than did administrators from larger institutions (Table 5). This result was understandable as larger institutions obviously would have more assets in this area than would smaller institutions. Small school administrators rated contracting as a current managerial trend more important than did administrators from larger schools (Table 5). These results indicate that administrators from smaller institutions felt that the decisional aspects that are perceived as strengths of contractors were more important than did their counterparts from larger institutions. This was not surprising because the majority of smaller institutions in the sample currently had contract management (Table 2).

Administrators from smaller institutions rated benefits from contractor purchasing power more important than did administrators from larger institutions (Table 5). Administrators from smaller schools rated contractor's ability to benefit from employee loyalty and difficulty in finding qualified managers significantly more important than did large school administrators (Table 5). With respect to the other decisional aspects, neither classification of enrollment size scored any factor significantly more important than did their counterparts. The size of the institution would often coincide with its available resources and would make the decisional aspects more

significant to the institutions who had the least. In this case, the smaller institutions had the least and therefore felt these decisional aspects were more important than did their administrative counterparts from larger institutions. From these results, it appeared that smaller institutions enjoyed the benefits illustrated by Stumph (1982), Storm (1983), and Allen (1992) more so than did larger institutions.

Effects of Meal Plan Participation on Importance Ratings

The effects on the importance ratings that could be attributed to the type of meal plan participation indicated there was only one factor where significant differences existed. Administrators from campuses where it was mandatory for all on campus dwellers to participate in a meal plan or administrators from campuses where participation was totally optional rated contractor's ability to relieve managerial burden significantly more important than did administrators from campuses where participation was mandatory by class. No other significant differences existed for the other decisional factors from campuses with these categories of meal plan participation. It was noted that administrators from campuses where meal plan participation was mandatory or optional also were the ones typically from smaller institutions which would further explain these results.

Institutions that are small enough to demand that all on campus dwellers participate in a meal plan would not have comparable personnel assets as a larger institution and therefore would place a greater emphasis on relieving managerial burden than would their counterparts from larger institutions.

Effect of Demographic Characteristics on Combined Relevant Decisional Factors

The effects of institution type on the scores for importance of combined relevant decisional factors were presented in Table 6. Administrators from both public and private schools scored the combined managerial, service related, and financial related factors more important than did administrators from land grant institutions (Table 6). These results were consistent with those found from assessing the individual factors found in Table 4. The reasons why these differences in importance ratings existed were the fact more land grant schools were self-operated and would not view the aspects considered to be contractor strengths as important as would the other classification of colleges.

The effect of institution enrollment on the scores for importance of combined decisional factors were presented in Table 6. Administrators from smaller-sized schools rated all the combined factors more important than did administrators

TABLE 6. Effect of demographic characteristics on the mean scores^a for importance of combined relevant decisional factors.

Demographic Characteristic		Importance of Managerial Related Factors ^b	Importance of Service Related Factors ^c	Importance of Financial Related Factors ^d
Institution Type				
Land-grant	(n=27)	3.40 ^f	2.85 ^f	2.90 ^f
Public	(n=121)	2.91 ^e	2.40 ^e	2.41 ^e
Private	(n=87)	2.90 ^e	2.41 ^e	2.40 ^e
Institution Enrollment				
10,000 or Below	(n=152)	2.80 ^e	2.37 ^e	2.39 ^e
Over 10,000	(n=72)	3.29 ^f	2.64 ^f	2.50 ^f
Current Managerial Format				
Contract	(n=127)	2.57 ^e	2.16 ^e	2.23 ^e
Self-Operated	(n=97)	3.55 ^f	2.90 ^f	2.71 ^e

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree.

^b Mean is for the importance of the combined managerial factors.

^c Mean is for the importance of the combined service related factors.

^d Mean is for the importance of the combined financial related factors.

^{ef} Means followed by differing superscripts within columns differ at $p < 0.05$. No intent for comparison among different demographic characteristics.

from larger institutions. These results were consistent with those found from the analysis of the individual decisional factors (Table 5). The reason for these results was that the smaller schools were mostly contract-managed. Therefore the administrators from the smaller institutions placed a higher value of importance on the aspects that were perceived as contractor strengths.

The effect of current type of operation on the scores for importance of combined relevant decisional factors were presented in Table 6. Administrators from campuses with contracted food service rated the combined managerial factors and the combined service related factors more important than did the administrators from campuses where the food service was self-operated. These results are consistent with those found for the individual decisional factors (Table 3). The reason for these results was obvious. The administrators who had contract management were content enough with it to feel strongly about the decisional aspects that were thought to be contractor strengths and subsequently rated them more important than did administrators who currently had self-operated food service.

The effect of type of consumer participation also was examined within this analysis. There were no significant differences in how the combined factors rated in importance based upon the method of consumer participation in meal

plans. This finding was consistent with that found in the analyses of the individual decisional aspects.

Effect of Current Managerial Format on Agreement Ratings

Several statistical analyses were performed on the data to determine if significant differences existed in administrators' perceived agreement with the performance of contract operators. The effect of current managerial type of food service operation on administrator's perceived agreement with decisional aspects was presented in Table 7. When evaluating the financial benefits of contract-managed food service, administrators from contracted schools agreed with these factors more so than did administrators from self-operated campuses. This relationship was true for contractors improving the quality of service and providing funds for facility renovation as well as utilizing economies of scale to offer cost efficiencies to the institution. This relationship also was true for contractors freeing campus funds normally tied up in inventory and contractors paying employees on their own rate scale. The reason for these results was clear. Those administrators from contracted food service were relatively satisfied with their food service operation and agreed more strongly that contractors achieved these results. These results were consistent with Stumph's (1982) observations concerning the benefits of contracted

TABLE 7. Effect of current type of operation on mean scores^a for agreement with performance of relevant aspects.

Decisional Aspects	Contracted (n=138)	Self-operated (n=89)
Contractors improve the quality of service at no extra expense to the institution	2.60 ^c	3.85 ^b
Contractors free campus funds that would normally be tied up in inventory	2.11 ^c	2.90 ^b
Contractors solve management and personnel problems quickly and efficiently	2.57 ^c	3.44 ^b
Contractors provide funds for facility renovations in conjunction with a long term contract	2.32 ^c	2.81 ^b
Contractors offer expertise such as dietetics and catering skills	1.92 ^c	2.79 ^b
Contractors evoke similar loyalty from campus as that found with selfoperated food service departments	2.88 ^c	4.04 ^b
Contractors utilize economies of scale to offer cost efficiencies to the institution	2.22 ^c	3.08 ^b
Contractors free administrative time that allows administrators to concentrate on academic matters rather than food service duties	2.35 ^c	3.30 ^b
Contractors remove the food service managerial burden from the campus administration	2.36 ^c	3.37 ^b
Use of contract management is a trend in college and university administration	2.22 ^c	3.29 ^b
Contractors eliminate services that would remain open with self-operation	3.12 ^b	2.53 ^c
Contractors pay employees on their own scale rather than the insitution's	2.22 ^c	2.51 ^b
Contract operations require as much or more administrative attention as self-operation	3.28 ^b	2.55 ^c

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree.

^{bc} Means followed by differing superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$.

food service. The administrators from self-operated campuses likely had poor experiences with contractors in order to have rated these aspects lower than their counterparts.

With respect to managerial decisional aspects, the administrators from contracted campuses had more positive perceptions towards contract-management than did administrators from self-operated campuses. This relationship was true for contractors solving management and personnel problems quickly, as well as relieving the food service managerial burden and freeing administrative time. This relationship also was true for contractors offering expertise and contract management being a current trend.

With respect to contract operations requiring as much or more administrative attention as self-operation, the administrators from self-operated campuses agreed to a greater extent than did administrators from campuses with contract-managed food service. These results indicated that administrators from campuses with contract-managed food services were content with their management arrangement as were administrators from campuses with self-operated food services.

Administrators from campuses with contracted food service felt stronger than did administrators with self-operated food service departments that contractors

evoke similar loyalty from campus employees as that found with self-operated campuses (Table 8). Administrators from self-operated campuses felt that contractors eliminate services that would remain open with self-operation more than did administrators from currently contracted campuses. These results also indicated that the respective administrators were pleased with the performance of the specific managerial format they currently had, thus resulting in these results. It made sense that an administrator would support the type of managerial format they had a hand in getting or keeping on their campus.

A similar analysis was performed utilizing the administrators' preferred managerial format as the independent variable. The results for this analysis were identical to those found for the effect of current managerial format on the scores for performance of the decisional factors.

Effect of Institution Type on Agreement Ratings

The effect of institution type on the scores for agreement with relevant aspects were presented in Table 8. The administrators from private institutions agreed to a greater extent than did administrators from land grant schools that contractors improve the quality of service at no additional expense to the school. This result probably

TABLE 8. Effect of institution type on mean scores^a for agreement with performance of relevant aspects.

Decisional Aspects	Land-grant (n=27)	Public (n=121)	Private (n=87)
Contractors improve the quality of service at no extra expense to the institution	3.64 ^b	3.12 ^{bc}	2.90 ^c
Contractors free campus funds that would normally be tied up in inventory	2.92 ^b	2.28 ^c	2.48 ^{bc}
Contractors solve management and personnel problems quickly and efficiently	3.08 ^b	2.93 ^b	2.86 ^b
Contractors provide funds for facility renovations in conjunction with a long term contract	2.44 ^b	2.63 ^b	2.39 ^b
Contractors offer expertise such as dietetics and catering skills	3.16 ^b	2.17 ^c	2.13 ^c
Contractors evoke similar loyalty from campus employees as that found with self-operated food service departments	3.72 ^b	3.33 ^b	3.25 ^b
Contractors utilize economies of scale to offer cost efficiencies to the institution	3.08 ^b	2.54 ^c	2.43 ^c
Contractors free administrative time that allows administrators to concentrate on academic matters rather than food service duties	3.40 ^b	2.67 ^c	2.61 ^c
Contractors remove the food service managerial burden from the campus administration	3.48 ^b	2.72 ^c	2.60 ^c
Use of contract management is a trend in college and university administration	3.04 ^b	2.56 ^b	2.65 ^b
Contractors eliminate services that would remain open with self-operation	2.60 ^b	2.79 ^b	3.09 ^b
Contractors pay employees on their own scale rather than the institution's	2.40 ^b	2.31 ^b	2.33 ^b
Contract operations require as much or more administrative attention as self-operation	2.16 ^c	3.10 ^b	3.07 ^b

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree

^{bc} Means followed by differing superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$.

was due to the fact that more self-operated food services were present in land grant institutions than in private institutions (Table 2). Therefore, the results may have been indicative of the administrator having stronger perceptions about the style of management they have experienced.

Public school administrators rated their level of agreement with contractors freeing campus funds that would be normally tied up in inventory significantly higher than administrators from land grant schools (Table 8). Because public schools also have more contracted food services than did land grant institutions (Table 2), these results were typical of the administrators favoring the management format they were comfortable with.

Administrators from both public and private schools agreed with contractors utilizing economies of scale to offer cost efficiencies more than did their counterparts from land grant schools (Table 8). Since both public and private institutions were primarily contract-managed, this result supported that the administrators favored the type management format they were most familiar with.

Administrators from both public and private institutions agreed more with contractors freeing administrative time and removing the food service burden than did administrators from land grant schools. Administrators from both public and private schools agreed

with contractors offering expertise more than did administrators from land grant institutions (Table 8). Land grant administrators agreed more than did administrators from public or private institutions that contractors require as much or more administrative attention as self-operation. These results indicated that agreement with aspects in favor of contracted management were more prevalent in public and private schools which coincided with their current food service management format. These results also indicated that land grant administrators, in which self-operation food service was more prevalent, had less favorable perceptions of contract-management. Again, it appeared that administrators felt a higher degree of agreement with the type of managerial format they were familiar with. This information confirmed Souhrada's (1990) observations that certain administrators must own up to their responsibility to manage all aspects of their campus.

Effect of Institution Enrollment on Agreement Ratings

The effects of institution enrollment on scores for agreement with relevant factors were presented in Table 9. Administrators from smaller schools tended to agree with the attributes that were considered contractor strengths more than the administrators from larger schools. Administrators from smaller schools with enrollment at 10,000 and below

TABLE 9. Effect of institution enrollment on mean scores^a for agreement with performance of relevant aspects.

Decisional Aspects	10,000 OR BELOW (n=158)	OVER 10,000 (n=79)
Contractors improve the quality of service at no extra expense to the institution	2.91 ^c	3.50 ^b
Contractors free campus funds that would normally be tied up in inventory	2.34 ^b	2.60 ^b
Contractors solve management and personnel problems quickly and efficiently	2.85 ^b	3.06 ^b
Contractors provide funds for facility renovation in conjunction with a long contract	2.56 ^b	2.43 ^b
Contractors offer expertise such as dietetics and catering skills	2.12 ^c	2.57 ^b
Contractors evoke similar loyalty from campus employess as that found with self-operated food service departments	3.16 ^c	3.74 ^b
Contractors utilize economies of scale to offer costefficiencies to the institution	2.46 ^c	2.78 ^b
Contractors free administrative time that allows administrators to concentrate on academic matters rather than food service duties	2.56 ^c	3.10 ^b
Contractors remove the food service managerial burden from the campus administration	2.54 ^c	3.24 ^b
Use of contract management is a trend in college and university administration	2.52 ^c	2.90 ^b
Contractors eliminate services that would remain open with self-operation	3.03 ^b	2.58 ^c
Contractors pay employees on their own scale rather than the insitution's	2.32 ^b	2.36 ^b
Contract operations require as much or more administrative attention as self-operation	3.11 ^b	2.74 ^c

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree.

^{bc} Means followed by differing superscripts differ at $p < 0.05$.

agreed that contractors improve quality and service and offer cost efficiencies more than did administrators from large schools with enrollment over 10,000. Smaller school administrators agreed to a greater extent that contractors free administrative time and relieve the food service burden than did large school administrators.

Small school administrators agreed with contracting being a current managerial trend more than did administrators from larger schools. Large school administrators agreed more than did small school administrators that contractors require as much or more administrative attention as self-operated food service and would eliminate services that might stay under self-operation (Table 9). Administrators from small schools agreed more than large school administrators that contractors offer expertise and evoke similar loyalty as self-operation (Table 9). The results from the effect of enrollment size on the decisional factors were similar to those from the results of current managerial format in that the scores of agreement tended to coincide with the type of managerial format the administrator was comfortable with. In this case, the smaller school administrators were more likely to have contract-managed food service than the large school administrators (Table 2) and therefore tended to agree with the decisional aspects that were deemed as

positive for contractors.

Effect of Meal Plan Participation on Agreement Ratings

Administrators who were from campuses where on campus dwellers were on a mandatory meal plan agreed more than did administrators from campuses where the meal plan was optional that contractors improve the quality of service at no extra expense. When considering that contractors free administrative time, only administrators whose campuses had mandatory meal plans by class (freshman, sophomore, etc.) agreed with this less than did administrators from campuses with any other meal plan arrangement. There were no other decisional aspects where the type of meal plan participation affected administrators' scores for agreement. These results would indicate that the administrators' perceptions about contractor's attributes are normally not related to the types of meal plan participation.

Effect of Demographic Characteristics on Agreement Ratings of Combined Factors

The effects of institution type on the scores for agreement with combined relevant factors were presented in Table 10. Administrators from public schools agreed with the combined service-related factors contractors offer more than did administrators from land grant institutions (Table 10).

TABLE 10. Effect of demographic characteristics on the mean scores^a for agreement with performance of combined relevant performance factors.

Demographic Characteristic		Agreement with Performance of Managerial Factors ^b	Agreement with Performance of Service Related Factors ^c	Agreement with Performance of Financial Related Factors ^d
Institution Type				
Land-grant	(n=27)	3.03 ^e	2.88 ^e	2.90 ^e
Public	(n=121)	2.80 ^e	2.48 ^f	2.58 ^f
Private	(n=87)	2.75 ^e	2.61 ^e	2.50 ^f
Institution Size				
10,000 or Below	(n=152)	2.72 ^f	2.57 ^e	2.52 ^f
Over 10,000	(n=72)	3.00 ^e	2.58 ^e	2.73 ^e
Current Managerial Format				
Contract	(n=138)	2.56 ^f	2.52 ^e	2.29 ^f
Self-Operated	(n=89)	3.19 ^e	2.67 ^e	3.03 ^e

^a Scale utilized 1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree.

^b Rating is for agreement with performance of combined managerial factors.

^c Rating is for agreement with performance of combined service related factors.

^d Rating is for agreement with performance of combined financial related factors.

^{ef} Means followed by differing superscripts differ within columns at $p < 0.05$. No intent for comparison among different demographic characteristics.

Also, administrators from both public and private schools agreed with the combined financial-related factors contractors offer more than did their counterparts from land grant schools. These results were consistent with those found concerning agreement with the same factors on an individual basis. This was expected because land grant schools tend to be mostly self-operated, therefore the administrators rated agreement commensurately with the managerial format they currently had.

The effects of institution enrollment on the scores for agreement with combined relevant factors were presented in Table 10. Administrators from smaller-sized schools agreed significantly more than did administrators from institutions with enrollment above 10,000 that contractors attain the promised results of the combined managerial and financial-related factors. These results were consistent with those found for these aspects as scored on an individual basis. These results were anticipated because the majority of the contracted operations were in smaller institutions. Therefore, these administrators rated their agreement in accordance to their current or preferred format.

The effects of current type of operation on the scores for agreement with combined decisional factors were presented in Table 10. Administrators from contracted

campuses agreed with the combined managerial and the financial-related factors more than did their counterparts from schools with self-operated food services. These results are consistent with those found for the individual decisional factors. It was obvious that the administrators rated their agreement with the decisional factors commensurately with the type of management style they were most familiar with.

The effect of the type of consumer participation also was examined in this analysis. There was no significant difference in how administrators rated their agreement with factors based on the method of consumer participation in meal plans. This result was consistent with that found in the analysis of the respective individual decisional aspect.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this research was to ascertain factors which influence college and university administrators' decisions on the managerial format of their food service operation. This included 1) developing a list of potential factors which could influence an administrator's decision to switch management types, 2) determining administrators' perceived importance of the factors, 3) determining the attitudes of administrators toward contract companies and the services they provide, and 4) if significant differences existed between attitudes toward contract companies as they related to size and type of institution (public or private).

From this evaluation, there were several areas where significant differences were found; however, there was a simplistic trend that accompanied these differences. In general, administrators who had experience with contract-managed food services felt that the factors that favored contractors were significantly more important than did administrators who had stronger ties with self-operated food service. Similarly, administrators who were more versed with contract-managed food service felt that contractors attained the results of the decisional aspects more than did administrators who were more familiar with self-operated

food service.

This relationship held true for the effects of the different demographic characteristics on the administrators' responses. For instance, the land-grant school administrators felt the factors that favored contract management companies were less important than did the other administrators. The land-grant administrators were the same group that primarily had self-operated food services.

In the case of the effect of enrollment size, the administrators from smaller institutions rated that contractors performed the aspects of the decisional factors more than did their counterparts from larger institutions. The administrators from smaller schools were more often recognized as currently having contract-managed food services. From this analysis it appeared that administrators either favored or were content with the arrangement they currently had or were most familiar with.

LIMITATIONS AND APPLICATIONS

There are two potential limitations that are noteworthy concerning this research. First, the fact that the test method was cross-sectional in design which will hinder the long term reliability of the results. Although we can comfortably rely on the results when identified with this particular time frame, it would be erroneous to think these

results would be true for other time frames. Further studies will be needed to offer time-tested results that lend themselves to trend analysis. Secondly, it was important to note that the results of this study were based on the integrity of the participating administrators. Until sufficient time elapses to determine if trends in college food service managerial format changes, it remains uncertain whether or not this was indeed a limitation or rather a strength.

The applications of this study were as follows. As was initially desired, a questionnaire was developed for administrators to utilize in determining the significant factors that apply to their food service situation. This questionnaire also may be an important tool to evaluate the criteria that operators should find important in their own operations.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

1. Allen, R. L. (1992) Budget cuts prompt schools to recruit contractors. Nations Restaurant News 21: 26, 81.
2. Bakos, J. B. & Karrick, G. E. (1989) Self operating food service versus contract management. In: Handbook of Noncommercial Food Service Management. (Bloom, R., ed.) vol. 1, 3-8, Aspen Publications, Rockville.
3. Becker, W. A. (1989) Contractual food service: Pros and cons. Camping Magazine 61: 25-27.
4. Dillman, D. A. (1978) Implementing mail surveys. In: Mail and Telephone Survey The Total Decision Method. Vol 1. Wiley-Interscience Publications, New York.
5. Duke, K. M. (1989) Administering an employee attitude survey in a university food service department. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
6. Gordon, R. T. & Lefever, M. M. (1990) Food service contracts that win: Essentials in the development of a food service agreement. FIU Hospitality Review 8, (2): 1-14.
7. Gamio, M. O. (1990) Cross-cultural training practices and needs in the lodging industry. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
8. Eyster, J. J. (1988) Sharing risks and decision making: Recent trends in the negotiation of management contracts. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Quarterly 29, (1): 42-55.
9. Kennedy, C. (1988) How Marriott corporation grew five-fold in ten years. Long Range Planning 21: 10-14.
10. Knapp, M. M. (1990) 1991 National restaurant association - food service industry forecast. Restaurants USA 10, (11): 13-32.
11. Lutz, S. (1988) Contract management survey: Services for hire. Modern Healthcare 18, (33): 31-48.
12. Martin, R. (1991) 'Self-op' college feeders buoyed by colleague's contract victory. Nation's Restaurant News 25: 27.

13. National Association of College Auxiliary Services Membership Directory (1991). Staunton, Virginia. NACUS.
14. Pontius, J. (1991) The 64,000 dollar question. Journal of The National Association of College Auxiliary Services 14, (2): 38-42.
15. Rose, J. C. (1984) Cost effective contract food service management. In: Handbook for Healthcare Food Service Management. Aspen Publications, Rockville.
16. SAS System for Elementary Statistical Analysis. (1987) Cary, NC: SAS Institute.
17. Schuster, K. (1988) Independents: An endangered species. Food Management 23: 104-115.
18. Soat, J. (1986) The ins and outs of contract services. Administrative Management 47: 57-61.
19. Souhrada, L., Hard, R. & Moran, E. J. (1990) Contract management. Hospitals 64, (8): 66-78.
20. Stephenson, S. (1990) 1990 Annual forecast - colleges and universities. Restaurants and Institutions 100: 82-96.
21. Storm, L. R. (1983) Management companies: A tool for school administrators. School Business Affairs 49, (11): 30-40.
22. Stumph, W. J. (1982) In-house vs. franchise college food services and bookstores. Paper Presented at Conference of the Association of School Business Officials. (Atlanta, Ga. November 2): 2-7.abs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I

Numerous factors may influence an administrators' decision to change from a self-operated food service department to a contract managed operation. Please rate the importance of the following factors to you. Circle the number that best agrees with your opinion.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Contractors could relieve administrators of the managerial burden of the food service operation.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Self-operation could deliver more financial return for the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Contractors could free funds that are normally tied up in inventory costs.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Contractors might improve the level or quality of service at no additional expense to the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Contractors might offer expertise in areas such as catering and dietetics.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Contractors might provide funds for facility renovation in conjunction with a long term contract.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Contractors could free administrators' time thus allowing them to focus on educational matters instead of food service.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Changing to a contractor would be in line with current management trends.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Institutions could benefit from the economies of scale that are enjoyed by contractors.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Contractors could provide their own wage scale for food service employees that would be more economical than campus wages.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Contractors might eliminate services that would remain open in a self operation.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Contractors could benefit from employee loyalty to the college or university.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Institutions have extreme difficulty finding qualified Food Service Managers.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Contractors offer the same managerial control you have with self-operation.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Please list any other factors that might be influential if you have made, are currently making, or not even considering the decision to convert to contract management.					

Please continue on the back cover.

PART II

Based on your perceptions of contract food service companies, indicate your level of agreement to the following statements using the scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree. Circle the rating that best describes your attitude.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Contractors improve the level or quality of service at no additional expense to the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Contractors free campus funds that would normally be tied up in food inventory.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Contractors solve management and personnel problems quickly and efficiently.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Contractors provide funds for facility renovations, in conjunction with a long term contract.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Contractors offer expertise such as dietetic and catering skills.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Contractors evoke similar loyalty from campus employees as that found with self operated food service departments.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Contractors utilize economies of scale to offer cost efficiencies to the institution.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Contractors free up time that allows administrators to concentrate on educational matters rather than food service duties.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Contractors remove the food service managerial burden from the campus administration.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Use of contract management is a trend in college and university administration.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Contractors eliminate services that would remain open with self-operation.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Contractors pay employees on their corporate scale rather than the college or university scale.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Contract operations require as much or more administrative attention as self operations.	1	2	3	4	5

PART III - DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

To determine which demographic characteristics are related to the decision between self-operation and contract-management, please answer the following questions to describe your institution.

Q1. Which of the following best describes you institution?

- ☐ 1. A Land-grant public institution
- ☐ 2. Public institution (not land grant)
- ☐ 3. A private institution
- ☐ 4. Other (please specify) _____

Q2. What is the total enrollment at you institution?

- ☐ 1. Less than or equal to 5,000
- ☐ 2. 5,001 to 10,000
- ☐ 3. 10,001 to 15,000
- ☐ 4. 15,001 to 20,000
- ☐ 5. 20,001 to 25,000
- ☐ 6. over 25,000

Q3. How long has your institution been in operation?

- ☐ 1. Less than 20 years
- ☐ 2. 21 to 40 years
- ☐ 3. 41 to 60 years
- ☐ 4. 61 to 80 years
- ☐ 5. 81 to 100 years
- ☐ 6. 101 to 120 years
- ☐ 7. 121 to 140 years
- ☐ 8. over 140 years

Q4. The food service at my institution is currently:

- ☐ 1. A contracted operation
- ☐ 2. A Self-operated entity
- ☐ 3. Other (please describe) _____

Q5. I would prefer the food service operation at my institution to be:

- ☐ 1. Contractually managed
- ☐ 2. Self-operated
- ☐ 3. Other (please specify) _____

Q6. My perceptions of contract food service are derived from:

- ☐ 1. Conversation with my colleagues
- ☐ 2. A national organization
- ☐ 3. Personal experience
- ☐ 4. Journal articles

Q7. My institution's food service department derives its percentage of sales from the following division:

- ☐ % Prepaid board plan
- ☐ % Declining balance / debit plan
- ☐ % Cash restaurant facilities
- ☐ % Summer conference feeding
- ☐ % Convenience store facilities
- ☐ % Charge or credit plan
- ☐ % Other (please specify) _____
- 100 %

Q8. Meal plan participation at my institution is:

- ☐ Mandatory for all on campus students
- ☐ Mandatory by class or grade level
- ☐ Mandatory by campus residential area
- ☐ Optional to all students
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Q9. What percentage of students enrolled at you institution participate in the meal plan?

- ☐ 1. 0% to 10%
- ☐ 2. 11% to 20%
- ☐ 3. 21% to 30%
- ☐ 4. 31% to 40%
- ☐ 5. 41% to 50%
- ☐ 6. 51% to 60%
- ☐ 7. 61% to 70%
- ☐ 8. 71% to 80%
- ☐ 9. 81% to 90%
- ☐ 10. 91% to 100%

Q10. Have you ever had contract services at your institution?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q11. How much input do you have in this decision?

- ☐ None
- ☐ Some
- ☐ Much
- ☐ All

Thank You for Your Participation.

Your Effort is Appreciated.

APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENT COVER LETTER

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE



September 10, 1991

Hotel
Restaurant
Administration

College of
Human Ecology

Dear Campus Administrator:

The nature of food service management is dynamic. The pros and cons of contract management versus self operation have had much recent publicity. In view of these facts, we are determining the reasons why a college or university would change from self-operation to contract management. We believe the findings of this study will be helpful to college administrators and food service directors as they make decisions that affect future performance of their food service department.

The initial list of factors which may influence decisions to change management, have been compiled from a review of literature and examined by a group of college administrators. We need you to tell us your perceptions about the importance of these factors when or if you decide to change the management format of your campus food service department. If you would not be involved in this type of decision, or feel that another administrator could more easily respond to this questionnaire, please pass this letter and questionnaire on to the appropriate person.

Response to the questionnaire will only require about fifteen minutes of your time. The questionnaire is coded only for follow-up purposes. All responses will be held confidential. A self-addressed postage-paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your assistance in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. The results of this study will be available should you desire them. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Tom Gaddis
Graduate Student

Carol Costello, PhD.
Assistant Professor

enclosures: questionnaire
return envelope

1215 West Cumberland Avenue, Room 220/Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1900/(615) 974-5445

VITA

Thomas Fredrick Gaddis received his Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Administration at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee in March, 1983. Immediately following, he worked for the Burroughs Corporation. While in this position, he received honors for field sales results.

In August 1984, he went to work for Cracker Barrel Old Country Store Incorporated. Upon completion of their Management Training Program, he began his food service management career at Richmond, Kentucky. By July 1985, he was promoted to unit manager status in charge of stores and gift shops in Memphis, Tennessee.

In February 1986, he went to work for Bojangle's Incorporated. By August 1986, he was transferred to Knoxville, Tennessee and was soon promoted to the position of regional manager in charge of multi-unit operations of several fast food restaurants.

In November 1988, he went to work for the University of Tennessee Food Service Department at Knoxville, Tennessee. In July of 1989, he was promoted to the position of unit manager in charge of six operations. In January 1990, he returned to school on a part time basis and began work toward a Masters Degree in Human Ecology.

He plans to continue work at the University of Tennessee, and has been admitted into a Doctoral program in the college of Human Ecology