

Job – Related Ethics of Four -Star Hotel Employees In Kuala Lumpur

SYED SABEER ALI BIN AHMED KHAN

Bachelor of Accountancy
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia
Serdang, Selangor
1993

Submitted to the Faculty of Business and Accountancy
University of Malaya, in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Business Administration

May 2001



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, most Gracious, Most Merciful.

This paper is written in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree Of Master of Business Administration, University of Malaya.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my Supervisor, Encik Mohd Khidzir Bin Yusof, for his valuable guidance, constructive comments and assistance throughout the preparation of this project paper. His patience and enthusiasm has left a feeling of indebt ness, which cannot be fully expressed in words.

I also wish to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have so generously contributed towards the completion of this paper.

I dedicate this paper to my dearest family especially my wife, Jamilah Abdul Alim for their constant encouragement and full support given to me throughout my study in this University.

Nevertheless, I would like to express my apology for any shortcomings of this paper.

SYED SABEER ALI B. AHMED KHAN

FACULTY OF BUSINESS AND ACCOUNTANCY
UNIVERSITY MALAYA
KUALA LUMPUR
May 2001

ABSTRACT

This research aims to investigate the job-related ethical beliefs of four – star hotel employees in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The results show that the four-dimensional factors model as suggested by Vitell and Muncy (1992) can explain hotel employees' job-related ethics.

The result revealed that employees working in departments, which have direct contact with hotel guests such as Food & Beverage, have higher tolerance for unethical behaviours. Significant differences were observed when analyzing the demographic variables (i.e. sex and education level) with the four factors identified including: no harm; unethical behaviours; actively benefiting; and passively benefiting. There were no significant differences observed for other demographic variables (i.e. age and position level). Correlation analysis revealed that there was a significant relationship among the four factors identified and the general attitudinal statements used in the survey.

Even though the results show that there is an overall "ethical" atmosphere among Kuala Lumpur hotel employees, there is a need for a proper ethical education, training and clearer ethical policy for hotel employees. Hotel management will benefit by being able to identify those areas where employees need guidance and education such as the identification of the behaviours that are viewed as "no harm" in the work environment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | | V |
|------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| ABSTRACT | | | |
| TABI | | | |
| LIST | | | |
| | | | |
| СНА | PTER 1 | INTRODUCTION | |
| | | | |
| 1.1 | Introdu | uction | 1 |
| 1.2 | Resea | rch Objective and Significance of Study | 1 |
| 1.3 | Scope | of the study | 4 |
| 1.4 | Limita | tions of the study | 4 |
| 1.5 | Organ | ization of the study | 5 |
| | | | |
| СНА | PTER 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | 7 |
| | | | |
| CHA | PTER 3 | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | |
| | | | |
| 3.1 | Resea | arch Hypotheses | 12 |
| 3.2 | Select | 13 | |
| | 3.2.1 | Respondents Demographic Profile | 14 |
| | 3.2.2 | Development of Test Measures | 14 |
| | 3.2.3 | Sampling Design | 15 |
| 3.3 | Data Analysis Techniques | | 16 |
| | 3.3.1 | Respondents Demographic Profile | 16 |
| | 3.3.2 | Factor Analysis | 17 |
| | 3.3.3 | Correlation Analysis | 17 |
| | 3.3.4 | Independent T-test by Gender | 18 |

| | 3.3.5 | ANOVA Analysis | 18 | |
|-----------------|--------|---|----|--|
| | 3.3.6 | ANOVA Analysis of Demographic variables | 18 | |
| | | | | |
| CHAP | TER 4 | RESEARCH FINDINGS | | |
| | | | | |
| 4.1 | Respo | ondents Demographic Profile | 19 | |
| | 4.1.1 | Respondents Gender | 19 | |
| | 4.1.2 | Respondents Age Group | 20 | |
| | 4.1.3 | Respondents Education Level | 20 | |
| | 4.1.4 | Respondents Working Department | 21 | |
| | 4,1,5. | Respondents Position Level | 22 | |
| 4.2 | Analy | sis of Statistical Results | 23 | |
| | 4.2.1 | Mean Score Analysis | 23 | |
| | 4.2.2 | Factor Analysis | 23 | |
| | 4.2.3 | Correlation Analysis | 26 | |
| | 4.2.4 | ANOVA Analysis by Working Department | 28 | |
| | 4.2.5 | Independent T-test by Gender | 30 | |
| | 4.2.6 | ANOVA Analysis of Demographic Variables | 30 | |
| 4.3 | Sumn | nary of Results | 33 | |
| CHAI | PTER 5 | CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | | |
| | | | | |
| 5.1 | Conc | lusions | 34 | |
| 5.2 | Reco | mmendations | 34 | |
| 5.3 | Reco | mmendation for Future Research | 36 | |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY 38 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| APP | ENDIC | ES | | |

Appendix 1: Sample of Research Questionnaire

LIST OF TABLES

| Table No | Title of Table | Page |
|----------|--|------|
| Table 1 | Research Population | 15 |
| Table 2 | Respondents Gender | 19 |
| Table 3 | Respondents Age Group | 20 |
| Table 4 | Respondents Education Level | 21 |
| Table 5 | Respondents Working Department | 22 |
| Table 6 | Respondents Position Level | 22 |
| Table 7 | Results of Factor Analysis | 24 |
| Table 8 | Factors Mean Score (N=102) | 25 |
| Table 9 | Mean Score and Ranking of Attitudinal Statements | 26 |
| Table 10 | Result of Correlation Analysis : Pearson Coefficient | 28 |
| Table 11 | ANOVA Analysis : Departmental Mean by Factors | 29 |
| Table 12 | Independent T-test Analysis between Gender | 30 |
| Table 13 | ANOVA Analysis by Age Group | 31 |
| Table 14 | ANOVA Analysis by Education Level | 32 |
| Table 15 | ANOVA Analysis by Position Level | 32 |