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Am I really lovin’ it? Investigating love and hate of job in the fast food industry.

By
Tyra M. McFadden

Abstract: In recent literature Kelloway and his colleagues introduced the construct of loving one’s job. Although investigation of loving one's work is growing, there has yet to be examination of hating one’s job (Kelloway et al., 2010). Drawing from Sternberg's triangular theory of hate and triangular theory of love (2005; 1986) this study aims to develop the construct of hate of job and provide evidence of the construct of love of job. A total of 135 blog posts written by fast food workers were collected from aboutmyjob.com and coded. This study proposes that hate of job consists of negative work relationships, intense anger and a lack of commitment. Constructs associated with hate and love of job are also examined using qualitative comparative analysis.

Understanding the components of loving and hating one's job may help organizations better understand how to decrease withdrawal, organizational conflict and increase well-being in the workplace.
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“Find a job that you love” is frequently offered as career advice. Kelloway, Inness. Barling, Francis and Turner (2010) recently defined what it means to love one’s job. Drawing on the triangular theory of love (Sternberg, 1986) they suggested that individuals who love their job are affectively committed to the organization, are passionate about the work that they do and have strong and close relationships with coworkers. If one can “love one’s job” it is also plausible to suggest that one can “hate one’s job”, yet to date there has been little examination of hate in the context of work. Current measures, such as job satisfaction, which focus on work have been criticized for their poor utility and low correlations (Iaddaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Scott & Taylor, 1985; Watson, 1981) perhaps because they are not capturing the emotional depth or intensity that a construct such as hate of love of job would (Kelloway et al., 2010). The popular media has recognized the relevance of hating one’s job for individual well-being. Recent articles from Forbes (Kaufman, 2014, March 21st) and the Huffington Post (Kjerulf, 2014, March 26th) discuss the effects of hating one’s job for the individual. However, researchers do not have a good understanding of negative job attitudes as shown by the lack of predictability of current measures (Iaddaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Scott & Taylor, 1985; Watson, 1981). The notion of hating one’s job has not been empirically examined and this is the primary goal of the proposed study.

Hate has been defined as a “deep, enduring, intense emotion expressing animosity, anger and hostility towards a person, group or object” (Reber & Reber, 2002, p. 315). Utilizing Reber and Reber’s (2002) definition of hate, I define hate of job as a deep, enduring, intense emotion, expressing animosity, anger and hostility towards a job.
The proposed research adapts Sternberg’s (2005) triangular theory of hate which involves negation of intimacy, passion and commitment to a workplace context. These components, along with constructs associated with hate and love of job are discussed and examined in 135 blog posts written by individuals in the fast food industry. The proposed research combines qualitative and quantitative methods to compare the notions of loving and hating one’s job.

**Hate**

Examining the classic definitions of hate, Descartes (1989) believed that hate causes an individual to recognize something as bad and in turn urges oneself to withdraw from this object. Darwin (1998) believed that hate was a special feeling which manifests itself as rage. While Descartes (1989) believed that hate makes an individual withdraw, both Darwin (1998) and Artistotle (1954) believed the behavioural tendency associated with hate was attack.

Although the definitions and behavioural tendencies described have differed both have received support in the literature. McKellar (1950) conducted one hour semi structured interviews to examine hostile attitudes (e.g. hate). Participants were asked to think of an incident involving someone they hated or disliked, their ideal resolution of the incident, and how they currently feel towards that individual. One study participant described physical pain they felt due to the actions of the individual they hated. Furthermore, the participant wanted the person to experience the same amount of pain they felt. Other participants stated they wanted their object of hatred to cry like they have
or wanting to torment the source of their hatred. McKellar (1950) concluded that the main desire of hate is to give individuals a dose of their own medicine.

In another study of hate in marital relationships, participants described acting coldly and leaving the situation as typical behaviours of hate (Fitness & Fletcher, 1993). Optow (2005) examined hate among middle school children; participants described wanting to hurt others, exclude others (including excluding others due to personal discomfort), and conflict as the consequences of hate. Additionally, 29% of participants described hating something (e.g. fighting, being ignored, gym class) rather than a particular person. The differences in these studies may be attributed to the different types of relationships and participants recalling real scenarios compared to being asked about hypothetical situations (Fitness & Fletcher, 1993).

Fitness (2000) examined anger and hate in the workplace; she found that experiences that involved humiliation were more associated with hate than experiences that were not humiliating. Additionally, she found that respondents reported more intense hate against supervisors and coworkers compared to subordinates. Moreover, in situations where they had less perceived self-power and less perceived successful resolution respondents reported more intense hate. These ‘lower power’ workers reactions were to immediately withdraw and either maintain distance after the event or plan revenge (Fitness, 2000). Although Fitness (2000) examined interpersonal hate in the workplace, as mentioned, the concept of hating one’s job has not been examined (Kelloway et al., 2000).
Hate of Job

In current literature psychologists have found that the construct of hate is difficult
to define and there are disagreements over what comprises hate (Fitness, 2000; Optow, &
McClelland, 2007). This paper uses Sternberg’s (2005) model of hate and the existing
definition of love of job (Kelloway et al., 2000) to define hate of job. Sternberg’s
triangular theory of hate was chosen as it provides a clear definition of the components of
hate which are relatable to a job context. Other definitions of hate focus on mental
abnormality (see Gaylin, 2003), seeing objects of hate as a future threat (see McCauley,
2002), have a focus on stereotypes or ingroup/outgroup dynamics (see Optow and
McClelland, 2007) or provide an ostensive definition (i.e. solely providing examples of
hate; see Kressel, 2002). In Sternberg’s (2005) triangular theory of hate, he discusses
three components of hate: negation of intimacy, passion, and commitment:

Negation of intimacy. The first component of hate in Sternberg’s theory (2005),
negation of intimacy, involves seeking of distance from the target. Thus, interpersonal
negation of intimacy involves the perception that the hated target is “different” or “not
like me”. Sternberg (2005) believed that the feelings of distancing develop slow and are
slow to fade. In the context of work this may involve distancing yourself from the job or
interpersonal relationships at work. Furthermore, conflicts may arise with co-workers,
supervisors, or customers as individuals perceive that these individuals are different than
themselves.

As negation of intimacy arises due to feelings of disgust or repulsion towards the
target, applying this to a work context, feelings of disgust or repulsion may result from
dealing with difficult individuals or completing tasks that are less than desirable (e.g., picking up garbage or cleaning grease off of a grill). Dirty work is a term that is often used in the literature to describe occupations that either have, or are associated with, these undesirable features (Ashforth & Kreiner, 2014). Dirty work consists of three specific areas: physical, social, and moral taint (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Physical taint involves being directly associated with dirt (e.g. garbage), death, or thought to be performed under dangerous conditions (e.g. miner; Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). Social taint occurs when an occupation has regular contact with stigmatized groups (e.g. police) or when the worker has a “servile relationship to others” (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999, p. 415). Finally, moral taint involves occupations that are thought to be deceptive, uncivil, or intrusive (e.g. car salesmen). Many occupations may fall under more than one category of taint (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). For example, as fast food workers often deal with cleaning (e.g. removing grease from the kitchen) and has a servile relationship with customers, this occupation falls under both physical and social taint. Focusing on dirty tasks Baran and his colleagues (Baran, Rogelberg, Lopina, Allen, Spitzmüller, & Bergman, 2012) found that dirty task involvement was negatively related to work satisfaction and positively related to higher levels of physical symptoms, somatic complaints, work-to-family conflict and burnout.

As society views these careers as tainted, it is important that workers develop a strong culture within their organization to buffer the negative perceptions regarding their careers (Ashforth & Kreiner 1999). Tactics to buffer these perceptions involve recalibrating (e.g. focusing on the positive aspects of the job), refocusing (e.g.}
overlooking the stigmatized tasks and focusing on the non-stigmatized or focusing on how the current occupation will assist them in long term goals), and reframing (e.g. changing the meaning attached to a stigmatized occupation such as a funeral director believing he is helping families with their grief; Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999). In another study Ashforth and his colleagues (Ashforth, Kreiner, Clark, & Fugate, 2007) found that managers use defensive tactics such as avoiding dirty tasks, accepting, comparing their job to jobs they perceive as worse, blaming and/or distancing themselves from the cause of the taint or distancing themselves from their role. However, employees may not always be able to employ these tactics such avoiding dirty tasks. Furthermore, employing these tactics and developing a strong culture is theorized to be more difficult with occupations that are physically isolated, have high turnover, and competition for rewards (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999) suggesting that the types of relationships ‘dirty workers’ have with their co-workers is extremely important. Therefore, I propose:

**Hypothesis 1.** Poor working conditions will be associated self-reported hate of job

In Sternberg’s (1986) triangular theory of love, intimacy is defined as wanting to help, feelings of respect, and cherishing an individual’s role in one’s life. In love of job this is viewed as intimacy with people at work, or positive relationships, whereby individuals share work related issues and develop trust (Kelloway et al., 2010). Positive relationships at work have briefly been defined as a “reoccurring connection between two people that takes place within the context of work and careers and is experienced as mutually beneficial, where beneficial is defined broadly to include any kind of positive state, process, or outcome in the relationship” (Ragins & Dutton, 2007, p. 9). Kahn
(2007) believed that positive relationships consist of communication, advice, friendship, influence and support. Research has provided evidence that social support increases well-being (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, & Murray, 2000; Park, Wilson, & Lee, 2004) and decreases intent to quit (Ducharme, Knudsen, & Roman, 2007). Conversely, uncivil acts from co-workers and supervisors have been shown to increase stress and even negatively impact relationships with romantic partners (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001; Ferguson, 2012).

**Passion.** The second component of hate involves passion which results in intense anger or fear in response to a threat (Sternberg, 2005). Conversely, in Sternberg’s (1986) triangular theory of love, passion is an attraction for and an intense unity with a person. In the context of love of job this would be felt for work (Kelloway et al., 2010). Kelloway and his colleagues (Kelloway et al., 2010) defined passion in love of job as “a strong inclination toward an activity that people like, that they find important, and in which they invest time and energy” (Vallerand et al., 2003, p. 757). Furthermore, they state that passion for the job consists of engagement, involvement, and excitement derived from the work itself (Kelloway, et al., 2010). In literature, engagement has been associated with many aspects of a psychosocial work environment such as job demands and amount of control (Demerouti, Bakker, Jone, Janssen, & Schaufeli, 2001). Additionally, perceived control has been associated with employee involvement (Spector, 1986). Defining the aspects of psychosocial work environment, Rugulies and colleagues noted that psychosocial work environment consists of psychological demands, work characteristics (e.g. degree of influence the workers have and opportunities for development), and
adverse and protective aspects of work (e.g. role conflict and meaningful work; Rugulies, Christensen, Borritz, Villadsen, Bültmann, & Kristensen, 2007). From this component of hate and love of job I propose:

*Hypothesis 2a.* A negative psychosocial environment will be associated with self-reported hate of job

*Hypothesis 2b.* A positive psychosocial environment will be associated with self-reported hate of job

**Commitment.** Finally, the third component of hate is commitment whereby the individual attempts to devalue the target of the hatred. Relating this to behaviours at work, this may be associated with workplace deviance (e.g. spreading rumors or sabotaging equipment; Bennett & Robinson, 2000). However, in the context of love, Sternberg (1986) believed commitment was where one made the decision to continue a relationship long term. Examining love of job, Kelloway and his colleagues believed that affective commitment reflected this type of love in an organization (Kelloway et al., 2010). Affective commitment originated from Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three component model. The first component, affective commitment, is when employees develop an attachment and identification to an organization and stay because they choose to do so (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Normative commitment is when an employee feels an obligation to stay with an organization (e.g. the organization paid for the employee’s education; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Finally, continuance commitment is when an employee stays with an organization because of the costs associated with leaving (e.g. a decrease in pay; Meyer & Allen, 1991). A meta-analysis conducted by Meyer and his colleagues
found that the three components relate to outcomes in different manners (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytky, 2002) with continuance commitment often unfavourably related to outcomes such as job performance and stress. As love of job has been theorized to consist of affective commitment (Kelloway et al., 2010), an individual who felt hatred towards their job would not feel an obligation to stay (e.g. continuance commitment).

Based on the research discussed previously, I propose:

**Hypothesis 3.** Self-reported hate of job will be associated with workplace deviance

**Hypothesis 4.** Self-reported hate of job will be associated with stress

**Hypothesis 5.** Self-reported love of job will be associated with mental well-being

Based on Sternberg’s triangular theory of hate (2005) I believe that hate of job will consist of having negative workplace relationships, intense anger, and lack of commitment. Negative workplace relationships may consist of conflict with their managers, co-workers, or other individuals such customers. Participants who hate their job will exhibit intense anger towards aspects of their job or individuals in their workplace. Finally, hate of job will be characterized by continuance commitment, whereby individuals stay in the job due to a lack of alternatives, or withdrawal whereby individuals have already quit their positions, display absenteeism, or have turnover intentions. Conversely, examining Sternberg’s triangular theory of love (1986) and Kelloway and colleagues work (2010) love of job will consist of positive relationships at work, a passion for one’s job, and commitment in one’s organization.
The Fast Food Industry

In 2007 there were approximately 318,088 individuals employed in limited-service eating places in Canada (e.g. fast food restaurants, food stands, and take out restaurants; Statistics Canada, 2013). After 2007, Statistics Canada stopped providing information solely on limited-service eating places and amalgamated this section into a general accommodation and food services category. In 2013 there were 1,131,060 employees in the accommodation and food services category (Statistics Canada, 2013) and approximately 351,642 or 34% of these individuals were 15 to 24 years of age (Statistics Canada, 2014). As these statistics show, there appears to be a young work force in the food services industry. In the United States of America there were 3,474,600 workers in the occupation ‘fast food and counter workers’ in 2013 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013, May).

McJobs’ is a term popularized by Douglas Coupland (1991) to describe a low-pay, low-prestige, low-dignity, low-benefit, no future job in the service sector that is frequently considered a satisfying career choice by someone who has never held one. It is no surprise that in one study based in the United Kingdom, 41% of a sample of 245 unemployed individuals stated they would never consider working in the hospitality industry (Lindsay & McQuaid, 2004). The stigma of working in these types of jobs have been linked to intentions to quit and not recommending the job to family or friends (Wildes, 2005). As it has been estimated that replacing a worker in the fast food industry costs $500 to $3,600, it is important that employers retain their workers (White, 1995).
Although no one has examined the cost in recent literature this is projected to be between $725 and $5,221 in 2015 (Inflation Calculator, n.d.).

Gould (2010) examined Australian employee perceptions in the fast food industry and found that the majority of the 800 respondents felt that their jobs consisted of a limited range of non-complex tasks even though employees preferred completing complex tasks. Furthermore, more educated crew members were less likely to want to work at McDonald’s in five years’ time compared to less educated crew (Gould, 2010). In another Australian study, Allan and his colleagues found that employees in the fast food industry felt that they were not paid well. A total of 11% of a sample of 256 workers reported that their wages had been deducted by managers due to problems they were alleged to cause at work (e.g., breakages or damages to their uniform; Allan, Bamber, & Timo, 2006). Nearly one third of employees reported working extra hours without pay and 25% of employees reported being injured at work. However, the majority of the respondents believed they were well trained to complete their job, were given responsibility, and learnt valuable career skills. Furthermore, they enjoyed interacting with customers, liked working in teams, and believed the best part of the job was working with other employees.

As job satisfaction is linked to workplace deviance (Judge, Scott, & Ilies, 2006) it is important to note workplace deviance in the fast food industry. Hollinger and colleagues surveyed 341 employees and examined personal property deviance, altruistic deviance, and production deviance (Hollinger, Slora, & Terris, 1992). Personal property deviance, which was defined as taking company profit for personal benefit, was reported
by 59.5% with most respondents younger than 21 years with little tenure. However, when treated unfairly, both young and old longer tenured employees engaged in these acts of deviance. Altruistic property deviance, whereby employees gave company property and assets to others, were reported by 36.1% and almost exclusively younger employees. Finally, production deviance was reported by 81.2% of respondents. This category of deviance was characterized by behaviours such as coming to work late or performing poorly on purpose and was a result of perceived unfairness (Hollinger, Slora, & Terris, 1992).

Overall, there is mixed results on employee perceptions in the fast food industry with some studies perpetuating the perception of McJobs’ (Gould, 2010; Wildes, 2005). The less than ideal conditions of some aspects of these McJobs’ make this industry ideal to study the concept of hating one’s job.

**Method**

**Participants**

This study examined blog posts from http://www.aboutmyjob.com/ where individuals based in any country could post about their job. The website states that they are interested in how individuals feel about their job, whether they feel they hate their job or they feel they have the best job in the world, and that the authors of the website may publish a collection of stories in some point in time that discuss personal values. The blog posts are moderated and edited solely for readability and to remove personal details.

In total, 135 blog posts were collected with the only criteria being that the author was referencing work at a fast food restaurant.
Procedure

The blog posts were coded by two researchers with knowledge of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Blog posts were analyzed using content analysis, a method that is appropriate when existing literature on the construct being examined is limited (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). Content analysis is a “process for systematically analyzing messages on any type of communication” (Kondracki, Wellman, & Amundson, 2002, p. 224). For the purposes of this study an inductive and deductive method was used for coding in ATLAS.ti.

An inductive method is when a researcher examines the content without preconceived notions or specific categories to code and consequently, the researcher shifts directions and reanalyzes data due to emerging themes (Kondracki, Wellman, & Amundson, 2002). Conversely, deductive methods would begin with pre-established key words or categories (Kondracki, Wellman, & Amundson, 2002). For this study, the researchers began with a list of categories they thought would emerge (e.g. hate, love, stress, conflict) and coded the data according to this. During this process the researchers also coded emerging themes and reanalyzed the data accordingly. After the researchers coded approximately every 10 to 20 blog posts the codes would be compared for reliability purposes, new themes were discussed, and any disagreements were resolved. Percentage of inter-rater agreement for 71 randomly selected blogs (499 data points) was 74%. Disagreement was measured by disagreement between codes (e.g., each coder selected a different code for the same text) or when individuals missed a code. All codes from the 135 blog posts were discussed and any disagreements were resolved. After all
blogs were analyzed the remaining codes were discussed and grouped into common themes.

As the blog posts come from an online website where individuals post anonymously there was very little demographic information that could be collected. The majority of the participants worked at a McDonalds restaurant (N = 110) and there was a total of 28 managers identified (it should be noted that this includes managers and managers in lower positions such as shift managers and swing managers). Due to the nature of the data other demographic information is not available.

**Qualitative Comparative Analysis**

The codes were coded as present or absent and analyzed using qualitative comparative analysis. Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) requires categorical outcomes and uses Boolean algebra to compare the data and examine group membership (e.g., hate or love of job). In other words, QCA examines which themes were consistently associated with someone saying they loved or hated their job.

FsQCA was used to analyze the data as this type of analysis allows for “fuzzy sets” (Ragin, 2009). This analysis is chosen due to the smaller sample size and the use of fuzzy sets allows a group to have partial membership (Ragin, 2008). In the current case, I created an outcome variable reflecting hate of the job. Posts that clearly said that the poster hated their job received a value of 1 to indicate full membership, inferred hate (i.e., where the poster described hating their job but did not explicitly say they hated their job) received a .9 (indicating that these cases are not as strong as individuals who explicitly stated they hated their jobs) and love of job received a 0.
Results

Hate of job

**Negative work relationships.** Individuals who hated their jobs often talked about how their managers were poor leaders. Managers were seen as incompetent, lazy, unhelpful and consistently verbally abusing their employees. Participants felt as though the managers had different and unreasonable expectations for their employees yet the managers were not seen as doing the same level of work. Employees would be yelled at for unreasonable things such as taking sick days, not keeping up with workplace demands even though they were understaffed and/or overworked, or completing tasks incorrectly even though they were not trained. If employees asked for assistance when the store was busy they were met with resistance.

They don’t want you to call in sick, even when you’re throwing up, can’t get out of bed. And when you do, guess what, you get written up and they tell you that “you have one more time before you’re going to have to find a different job. You get sick of getting screamed at by the managers. Or at least, I do. If you don’t have a problem with being disrespected, looked down on, your higher ups yelling at you, being taken advantage of, and an all around crappy time. Go work at Mcdonalds. Other than that, I WOULD NOT go there.

Managers scream at you even when you’ve done nothing wrong, they blame you for their own wrong doings and try to cover it up. All of the managers are either ***holes or uneducated, lazy pr*cks.
Have you ever had a manager yell in your ears to make you work faster, even though you’re working the fastest you can? Well, come to McDonalds, where the managers believe that screaming in the employees’ ears will make them go faster.

As customers are often a large part of service jobs, participants also discussed being treated poorly by customers. Customers were said to immediately get angry if workers made a mistake or were not quick enough even when they were understaffed and clearly working hard. Furthermore, customers would even lie so that employees were looked at as the cause of the mistake.

....customer b**ches to me about how they didn’t want pickles on their sandwich its’ like listen here you f***ing b**ch(customer) when i was up here taking ur order you didn’t f***ing ask to take off pickles. But as soon as my manager comes you wanna lie and GET me in trouble.

I deal with a tremendous amount of bulls**t from customers every single day because of McDonalds’s flawed ‘customers are always right’ policy. I get verbally abused nearly everyday, I have to give out refunds and food to customers who I and everyone else i work with know are clearly lying.

**Intense anger.** As mentioned, passion involves intense anger or fear in response to a threat (Sternberg, 2005). Employees who mentioned hating their job often expressed these feelings combined with strong language.

I am sick and tired of dealing with this bulls**t. I hate my job, I hate my boss, I hate every god damned thing about it. I have never been treated as badly as my devil reincarnate, N*zi B*stard, money grubbing, heartless and cruel, son of a
wh**e, ***hole of a boss does. He can burn in hell, and take his ice cream with him!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Ever since the new campaign for McDonald’s came out my new saying is this: McDonald’s!! I’m Hating It ……One of the worst things that I hate is how McDonalds uses their stupid propaganda to make you work harder. If you are making the minimum pay, do you really care about smiles and fast service, and customers being happy so they come back? NO, you just want your pay, the crew doesn’t benefit for S**T, and all it does is try to make you feel better about working harder for the same amount of pay. They made me wear a big o’ sticker on my shirt that says that IM loving, which I wasn’t, to make it look like we were happy, but the truth was I couldn’t stand to be there.

Commitment. Commitment was scarce among individuals who stated they hated their job. Individuals stated they stayed in their positions because they had no alternatives and needed the money, they had already quit, or were intending to.

I hate the job but I have a family to support. That’s the only reason, I’m there I hate the customers. They treat you like garbage, little do they know that I make more than them.

The corporation is greedy. It makes its vast fortunes unethically and has standards that are all but impossible for its crew to achieve. We do not receive recognition or praise for those things that we do well in. We are doomed to suffer really. Which is why I plan to leave at the end of the year and start my life fresh.
I worked from McDonalds from March and only recently quit in the end of June. The way they treated me was horrible. I was blamed for things I didn’t do; I was verbally abused; I was expected to do things I wasn’t trained in; and then I was yelled at for making mistakes.

**Inferred Hate**

Individuals categorized as inferred hate exhibited the same three components as individuals who explicitly hated their job; they had negative workplace relationships, they expressed intense anger and they displayed lack of commitment.

*Every which way you turn, even if you’re stopping to take a breather, or even have a quick glass of water, managers are always yelling at you. …..They yell at you for the drive-thru times, or if they want you to take another order on window. yet, when a manager actually gets their lazy a** out of their office to go on drive-thru, they are the slowest damn thing I’ve ever seen. I could have served 23 orders out of the drive-thru order before they got one.*

*I was 16 when I got my first job at Mcdonalds. I thought it was going to be great, but it turned out that the managers are all dirty c*nts! They yell at you, discriminate, put you down, and treat you like s**t! There was one incident when one of my friends was working breakfast for the first time and the manager yelled at him for not making food fast enough. Right then my spark blew and the string releasing my fist on her face was hanging by a thread. I’ve always wanted to say to here, “why don’t you come help us instead of yelling at us for not working fast enough because that’s the fastest we can go.”*
If you have never worked at a McDonalds restaurant before then you have no idea what it's like and if you have and have gotten a better job consider yourself lucky because it's almost impossible to find a better job that is hiring close to where I live. Don’t work at McDonalds. You will get screwed over, back-stabbed, insulted, and enraged beyond what you thought possible.

Whatever you do, do not get a job at McDonalds. No matter what people say, it's not worth it. So many people around the world who work at McDonalds experience these problems. McDonalds is just a lowlife organisation, the managers don’t give a sh*t about their employee’s they use and abuse the employee’s because they are too lazy to do any of the jobs themselves and then blame you for jobs not being done and saying you are lazy when you are working flat out.

This is absolutely been one of the worst experiences of my life and I would rather die of starvation than work at another McDonalds!!!!

The only reason I am still there is because I haven’t found another job yet, and I would work almost anywhere than there.. even telemarketing.. and I hated it!

Love of job

Positive work relationships. Individuals who stated they love their job often had extremely positive relationships with their co-workers and managers. Some mentioned that customers can be troubling at times but focused on the positive interactions with others around them. Managers were seen as extremely helpful, willing to lend a hand and help their employees grow.
I worked with great people and everything seemed fun. The managers were nice and I got along with everyone and I made some really great friends.

everyone of my co workers will tell you that we are all like one big family. i enjoy going to work and seeing all these smiling happy faces. i dont see work as a chore i see it as a meeting place.

One of the best things is that they are always willing to lend a hand to a crew person in need.

Passion. Employees who loved their job displayed extreme passion towards their work. They strived to do the best in their jobs and put in their full effort.

I love my job and I focus on the cool people I like working with and I put full effort into being as clean, fast, and safe as possible and I work hard to make it an easier place for everyone else to work.

I have come to the realization that if you are going to have a job the rest of your life, it needs to be something you truly love. That is my thought about life in general. If you’re going to do something, and you’re going to do it the rest of your life, you MUST have a passion for it. I have that passion for McDonald’s. I know a lot of you are probably thinking, “geeze what a loser,” but then the ones who say that, quite possibly don’t have a career that they truly love.

Commitment. Individuals who loved their job stated their desire to continue working in the same place. Often these individuals would talk about their desire to move up to higher position such as a manager.
I love where I work at and hope to become a manager.

In the next five years, I plan on still working at my store in my position, and learning as much as I can. In thirty years, I hope to own a couple McDonald's stores myself actually. It could happen.

General themes derived from blog posts

Poor working conditions. Poor working conditions included dangerous working conditions, malfunctioning or poor equipment, dirty work and unsanitary working conditions. This may have included an overall working environment such as an unclean workplace or completing grotesque tasks such as cleaning grease off equipment.

One day, one of the rotisserie chicken cooker exploded its glass windows. It happened right in front of me, and I could of been seriously injured, but instead they tell me to swipe the thing. How were they to know one of the other glass windows wouldn’t explode right in my face while I was sweeping?

At that time I was making 7.25/hr. and believe me, that was not enough for us to have to crawl under the fry vats and scrub fry grease off the floor!!

I go to dining, and she hands me 3 bin bags, and tells me to go change the bins. No gloves. At this stage the bins were purging with half eaten burgers mixed with coke. When I asked her for gloves, she was just like, “You'll do.”

Lack of support. Lack of support emerged as a theme from the individuals who stated they hated their job. This category was characterized by being understaffed or not
receiving support from their managers and/or co-workers. Participants felt as though they received inadequate training and in some cases they did not receive any proper training.

*I began working in the kitchen. I didn’t get any training, but pretty much thrown into an ocean of confusion.*

*Both i and my crew receive abuse, threats and the occasional death stare when we fail to give a customer there order in less than 5 minutes. Even when these customers can clearly see that we are understaffed and that we are struggling severely.*

*I have never been trained, but I am often held responsible for my lack of training.*

*Manager didn’t train me and every time I asked her a question she rolled her eyes did it with no explanation and walked away. Nobody was helping me.*

**Negative and positive psychosocial working environment.** Psychosocial environment included how employees felt they were treated in terms of appreciation, respect and recognition. It also included aspects of the work environment such as levels of autonomy, receiving adequate or inadequate breaks, and feeling as though ones work was meaningful or meaningless. Individuals who stated they hated their job often referred to feeling underappreciated, feeling disrespected, and that their workplace did not recognize or praise their efforts in their job. Furthermore, employees stated that managers displayed favouritism to other employees, discriminated against others, and other individuals
mentioned not receiving their breaks. Finally, some individuals felt that their jobs were not meaningful.

*They treat people with such disrespect that it’s unreal, we’re not 3 and we don’t need to be talked to like we are. I’m a person of average i.q., so come on now.*

_We do not receive recognition or praise for those things that we do well in._

_You get shown NO respect for all the hard work you do. I’m just shocked that I cant get a thank you for all the hard work i’m doing and also for no call ins!_

*People would talk crap about me for being a minority race, for being a legitimate worker who would do things right and making co-workers work extra, and boss will just tell me to ignore it.*

.....*Instead, a half dozen employees who don’t deserve to get promoted, get promoted. All of them get promoted just because they all kissed a** and sucked up or asked a ‘personal favor’ from the manager. Yeah, I actually saw it happen.*

Conversely, individuals who loved their job talked about opportunity for growth within the organization and were recognized formally and informally for their efforts.

*I’ve gotten employee of the month twice in this time and I’m in the process of being promoted to a crew trainer.*

_Yeah maccas rock and get a job there cos its fun and a great way to make friends and its the best job to have cos it opens many doors!!!!!!!!!!_
It’s a great place to work, and even if you could go to Target or something and get paid more, this is the place where you’ll have an exciting job filled with variety that will never get old, and with unlimited possibilities for the future.

Since being hired I have been named Employee of the month once, and been given numerous citations and congratulations for my work. I am even due to be promoted to Crew Trainer before this month is over.

I enjoy helping people, and each smile I see makes the job well worth it. As if I am actually making a difference.

Stress. Employees who stated they hated their job discussed how the characteristics of the job caused them stress and even physical symptoms that occurred due to stress.

I have had to take care of drive-thru (running/presenting) and front counter at the same time during a breakfast rush (which in the end gave me a stress induced twitch in my left eye)

The beginning of me working there I felt like a little slave laborer it’s sad how I let my managers take so much control of me that I became emotionally unstable the situation worsen when I started to have nightmares about cruel customers and hostile altercations

But what I hate most about my job? The stress I receive every single day. The stress of dealing with a customer complaint. The stress when the crew and I
struggle to keep up with the vast flow of orders and then are abused by the other managers because we are ‘too slow’. It’s no wonder every other manager in the store smokes.

**Qualitative Comparative Analysis**

Out of the 135 blog posts there were 22 individuals who stated they hated their job, 22 individuals who stated they loved their job, and 15 individuals who implied hate of job.

As previously noted, QCA uses Boolean logic to establish the relationships between categories. The strength of these relationships are assessed by two measures; consistency and coverage. Consistency refers to the “degree to which the cases sharing a given combination of conditions agree in displaying the outcome in question” (Ragin, 2008, p. 44). In other words, consistency represents how well your data follows your hypothesized pattern. Coverage “assesses the degree to which a cause or causal combination accounts for instances of an outcome” (Ragin, 2008, p.44). Whereas consistency examines the pattern, coverage assesses the strength of the relationship. For both coverage and consistency 1 represents the strongest relationship. Ragin (2008) states that when consistency scores are below 0.75 it is very difficult to argue that a set relation exists and although there are no numerical recommendations for coverage this should not be assessed when a consistency score is below 0.75.

Table 1 represents the results for hate of job whereas Table 2 represent the results for love of job. As represented in the tables hypothesis 1 was supported; poor working conditions was associated with hate of job. Hypothesis 2a and 2b were also supported; negative psychosocial environment was associated with hate of job whereas positive
psychosocial job was associated with love of job. Examining psychosocial environment in depth we can see that factors that contributed to individuals hating their job included lack of respect from their co-workers and managers, feeling as though their jobs were meaningless, and feeling underappreciated in their job.

Table 1

*Qualitative Comparative Analysis Results for Hate of Job*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Sample Size</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Working Conditions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Support</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Psychosocial Environment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Respect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Meaningful Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Underappreciated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Psychosocial Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coverage was not assessed unless consistency was 0.75 or higher.

Table 2

*Qualitative Comparative Analysis Results for Love of Job*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Sample Size</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor Working Conditions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Support</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Psychosocial Environment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Respect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Meaningful Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Underappreciated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Psychosocial Environment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Deviance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coverage was not assessed unless consistency was 0.75 or higher.
Hypothesis 3 was not supported; although individuals discussed workplace deviance committed by their co-workers they did not discuss their own workplace deviance. Stress was associated with hate of job, supporting hypothesis 4, however, hypothesis 5 was not supported as participants did not mention mental well-being.

Discussion

As suggested by Kelloway and his colleagues (2010), this study showed that the absence of passion, commitment, and intimacy was not sufficient to result in hating one’s job. Rather, hate of job is characterized by negative work relationships, intense anger and a lack of commitment. This study found support that poor working conditions, lack of support and a negative psychosocial environment was associated with hate of job. Conversely, this study showed that love of job is characterized by positive work relationships, a passion for one’s job, and commitment. Additionally, positive psychosocial environment was associated with love of job.

Although employers in the fast food industry can never fully remove the stigmatization of jobs characterized by ‘dirty work’ (e.g., occupations that have or are associated with undesirable features; Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999) employers can improve conditions by providing employees with proper working equipment and providing a safe working environment. Organizations with a higher safety climate influence workers safety knowledge and safety motivation thus increasing their safety performance and reducing accidents and in the workplace (Christian, Bradley, Wallace & Burke, 2009). Organizations can influence safety climate by providing their managers with safety-specific transformational leadership training. When managers call attention to the
importance of safety and demonstrate a commitment to safety while providing employee safety training occupational injuries subsequently decrease (Barling, Loughlin & Kelloway, 2002). Further highlighting the importance of leadership, transformation leadership has also been shown to increase follower job satisfaction, satisfaction with their leader, motivation, and group or organizational performance (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Conversely, another style of leadership, laissez-faire, has been related to a lack of presence whereby an individual physically occupies the leadership position but fails to fulfill any duties or responsibilities (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Bass and Avolio (1994) described laissez-faire leadership as absence and also the avoidance of intervention. Furthermore, leader’s decisions can be delayed and recognition and awards are not present. Leaders who exhibit this laissez-faire style do not attempt to motivate or satisfy the needs of their followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994). This style has been positively correlated to stressors such as role conflict, role ambiguity and conflicts with co-workers. Moreover, these stressors mediated the effects of laissez-faire leadership on bullying at work and psychological distress (Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, & Hetland, 2007). As negative work relationships is a component of hate of job and managers abusing employees and complaints about incompetent and/or lazy managers was consistently discussed in these blog posts it shows the importance of leadership and provides evidence for the need of leadership training. As mentioned, leaders impact employee recognition and influence role stressors such as role conflict or role ambiguity which relate to an organizations psychosocial environment (Rugulies et al., 2007).
Implications for Practice

To reduce the factors that contribute to employees hating their jobs, or increase the positive factors that contribute to employees loving their jobs, organizations should focus on leadership training. As mentioned in the blogs, employees often felt verbally abused and that managers were not supportive or helpful when required. As workplaces such as McDonalds have many levels of managers (e.g., shift managers, swing managers, assistant managers, store managers, etc.) they should provide employees with training when promoted to a leadership position. Additionally, organizations should implement and express value towards systems that recognize their employees (e.g., employee of the month) and that decrease employee contact with dirty work (e.g., ensuring employees have proper equipment or items such as gloves and that they utilize these items at all times when needed).

Focusing on training, a positive psychosocial environment and implementing and valuing systems may reduce the impact of hate of job on an employee’s mental health and reduce withdrawal. Reducing withdrawal, or more specifically turnover, is extremely important in the fast food industry as it has been estimated that it costs $500 to $3,600 to replace a worker (White, 1995) or between $725 and $5,221 in 2015 (Inflation Calculator, n.d.). Organizations can reduce these costs to replace workers by retaining them and increasing employee tenure.

Strengths and Limitations

Overall, the method of collecting the data had strengths and limitations. As the data was collected from online blog posts the participants were not prompted or asked
any questions. Since these blog posts were completely anonymous the authors of the posts likely spoke freely without fear of judgement or repercussions. On the other hand, it may be possible that they made themselves out in a better light. For example, this study proposed that workplace deviance would be a result of hating one’s job and found no results due to a lack of individuals mentioning themselves committing wrongdoings. Furthermore, it may be possible that individuals could have made up stories or how they felt about their job; managers may have posted that they loved their job in order to positively promote their organizations.

At the end of each blog post the authors were able to tag certain words such as hate my job or bad management which were included by the coders. Unfortunately, since the blog posts were anonymous we could not ask individuals follow up questions or to elaborate on these tags. For example, why were their managers bad? Were they incompetent or lazy or were they verbally abusive? As the results of these tags were unclear both bad management and bad co-workers were removed from the final analysis in fear of including the same code twice (e.g., if the participants tagged bad management due to their managers being incompetent and their blog posts also mentioned how their managers were incompetent). Therefore, this decreased the risk of type I error. In addition to these limitations, this data collection method may have resulted in a lack of results for the proposed hypotheses. For example, this study proposed that mental well-being would be associated with love of job. Participants who are writing blog posts would be more likely to discuss the negative aspects of their job such as stress associated with their position compared to making a statement about their mental well-being.
Another limitation of this study is the small sample size. Out of the 135 blog posts that were coded only 22 individuals stated they hated their job and 22 individuals stated they loved their job and an additional 15 individuals were included who inferred hate of job. Furthermore, using this method, the dichotomization of the variables do not lead to causal inferences. The software that was used only examines a group (e.g., hate) and examines if the variables (e.g., stress) is mentioned by the same individual who mentioned hate. If an individual mentioned love of job and stress this would result in lower consistency and coverage.

Finally, the inter-rater agreement for 71 randomly selected blogs was 74%. Although 80% or greater is acceptable in most situations, 70% may be appropriate in some exploratory studies (Neuendorf, 2002). As this study was exploratory and involved coding new themes as hate of job has yet to be examined in literature, 74% is considered acceptable.

**Implications for Future Research**

Future research should examine hate and love of job in a different context that allows researchers to question participants in each hypothesized area of the concept. For example, future researchers should conduct a qualitative interview whereby they can ask participants about any acts of workplace deviance, their affective commitment to the organization and their mental well-being, three areas that did not arise in the blog posts. Furthermore, researchers should examine if a specific subset of variables contribute to hate of job or if a negative experience in one area (e.g., negative work relationships) is sufficient to hate one’s job.
After examining the constructs mentioned above researchers should derive a scale of hate of job and love of job. By collecting data quantitatively researchers can examine the predictors of hate and love in a work context. Furthermore, by collecting data on a larger scale in different areas researchers can examine the generalizability of the constructs.

**Conclusion**

In this research I examined the nature of hate and love of the job among employees of the fast food industry. Using data collected from an online blog, I found that those who hated their job felt negation of intimacy in their workplace, expressed their opinions with intense anger and demonstrated continuance commitment or no commitment at all. In contrast, individuals who loved their job had intimate workplace relationships, expressed their opinions with passion and demonstrated commitment and a desire to grow within the organization.

These results suggest that the constructs of loving and hating one’s job have naturalistic validity in that they reflect individual perceptions of the job. Further research into both positive (love of the job) and negative (hate of the job) reactions to employment is both warranted and encouraged.
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