CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter reports the results of the research study. This section will be divided into three sections, namely respondents' demographic profiles, analysis of statistical results and summary of research results.

4.1 RESPONDENTS' DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

A summary of the respondents' statistics is presented in this section as frequency tables. The author analyzed the demographic profile of the respondents i.e. gender, age group, education level, working department and position level in their hotels by using analysis of frequency.

4.1.1 Respondents Gender

There are 102 respondents responded out of the 300 questionnaires distributed, representing a response rate of 34%. The respondents' gender profile is well distributed. As shown in Table 2, female respondents are slightly higher than the male respondents with composition of 52.9% and 47.1 % respectively.

TABLE 2: Respondents Gender

Description	Frequency	%
Male	48	47.1
Female	54	52.9
Total	102	100.0

4.1.2 Respondents Age Group

Majority of the respondents are in the 21-25 age group level (39.2%). 13.7% of the respondents fall under the 26-30 age group while 25.5 % is within the 31-35 age group. The percentage for the 36-40, 41-45 and 46-50 age group levels is 9.8%, 9.8% and 2.0 % respectively.

TABLE 3: Respondents Age Group

Age Group	Frequency	%
21-25	40	39.2
26-30	14	13.7
31-35	26	25.5
36-40	10	9.8
41-45	10	9.8
46-50	2	2.0
Total	102	100.0

4.1.3 Respondents Education Level

Majority of the respondents are secondary school educated (49.0%). This is quite representative of hotel employee's population as Malaysian hotel industry employ low level education staff for most of its departments such as food & beverage, housekeeping and security. 15.7% of the respondents are primary school educated and 33.3% with a Diploma . Only 2 respondents (2.0%) have University education.

TABLE 4: Respondents Education Level

Education Level	Frequency	%
Primary	16	15.7
Secondary	50	49.0
Diploma	34	33.3
University	2	2.0
Total	102	100.0

4.1.4 Respondents Working Department

Since the author decided to focus the study into four working departments where direct service encounters between guests and employees occur, the majority of the respondents were from the housekeeping, front office, food & beverage and engineering departments. 15.7% of the respondents were from the housekeeping department while another 15.7 % of the respondents were from the front office department. The number of respondents from the food & beverage and engineering departments were 19.6% and 17.6% respectively. These four departments accounted for 69% of the respondents. As we recall from the survey, questionnaires were also distributed to other departments i.e. Human Resource, Kitchen, Finance, Security and Sales departments for comparison purposes of results with the four main departments. Percentage of respondents from the other departments were 3.9% from Human Resource, Kitchen (5.9%), Finance (7.8%), Security (7.8%) and Sales & marketing (5.9%). The details of the results are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5: Respondents Working Department

Working Dept	Frequency	%
Housekeeping	16	15.7
Front Office	16	15.7
Human Resource	4	3.9
Food and Beverage	20	19.6
Kitchen	6	5.9
Finance	8	7.8
Security	8	7.8
Engineering	18	17.6
Sales and Marketing	6	5.9
Total	102	100.0

4.1.5 Respondents Position Level

Majority of the respondents were general workers such as Food & Beverage assistants and house keeping attendants. Based on the survey, 43.1 % of the respondents were in general worker grade. This phenomenon is desirable for the study as these workers have direct dealings with hotel guests. Only 15.7% of the respondents were in the managerial level such as the departmental head. 9.8% of the respondents are in the middle management level and the balance of 31.4% is in the supervisory grade.

TABLE 6: Respondents Position Level

Level	Frequency	%
Managerial	16	15.7
Middle level	10	9.8
Supervisory	32	31.4
General worker	44	43.1
Total	102	100.0

4.2 ANALYSIS OF STATISTICAL RESULTS

4.2.1 Mean Score Analysis

Most employees responded quite strongly that they believed that all ethical situations listed were "wrong" with an overall mean value of 1.62. The results show an "ethical" atmosphere among the four –star hotel employees in Kuala Lumpur. This result may due to the fact that employees may have been afraid that their answers would be viewed by hotel management. Anticipating this situation beforehand, the author had already given clear instruction to the hotels on the "way" to conduct this survey. However, after analysis of the variance and the trend of degree of agreement in each statement, the author concluded that the sample collected could be used for the purpose of statistical analysis.

4.2.2 Factor Analysis

A principal component analysis with a varimax rotation test was conducted .The decision to include a variable in a factor was based on factor loading of 0.5 or higher, and an eigenvalue equal to or greater than 1. Further, an alpha test was performed to test the internal reliability of the results. Based on the reliability analysis, the author concluded that the statements used in questionnaire could be used for the purpose of statistical analysis. Statement 5: ' Accepting tips to arrange room change for a guest' was excluded after the alpha test revealed that the respondents ratings for this statement is not consistent and thus, not reliable.

A "priori criterion" was applied to replicate the previous work done by Wong et al. (1996) followed by Simon Chak (1998). Finally, the author re-grouped those factors with one statement into only four factors and decided to apply the four factors extracted to compare the results with this study. These factors were similar to factors identified in researches done by Wong et al (1996) and Simon Chak (1998).

They were:

1) Factor 1: No harm.
2) Factor 2: Unethical behaviours.
3) Factor 3: Actively benefiting.
4) Factor 4: Passively benefiting.

Table 7 below summarizes the results of the Factor analysis.

TABLE 7: Results of Factor Analysis

Factors	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Statements	1,3,6,7,9,10,11	12,14,15	2,8,13,18,19,20	4,16,17
Eigenvalue	8.4663	2.9370	2.0890	1.7782

In this research, the author believes that the employees do not rely on the sources of benefits developed by Wong et al.(1996). The results showed that hotel employees do not concern themselves about the sources of benefits (from the guests or hotel). Rather, whether the benefits are active or passive determines the underlying motive of their ethical beliefs.

In ranking the four in ascending order ranging from 1, "Strongly believe that it is wrong," to 5, "Strongly believe that it is not wrong," it was discovered that hotel employees were less tolerant of the two factors "No harm" (e.g. mean value = 1.35) and "Passively benefiting" (e.g. mean value = 1.53). On the other hand, employees reacted with more tolerance to "Unethical behaviours" (e.g. mean value = 1.74), and "Actively benefiting"behaviours (e.g. mean value = 1.93). The overall mean value is 1.62. These results are inconsistent and contradicting the results obtained in the study done by Simon Chak (1998) in Hong Kong whereby the hotel employees were more tolerant of the two factors "(No Harm)" (e.g. mean value=1.25) and "Passively benefiting "(e.g. mean value = 1.23) as compared to "Unethical behaviours" (e.g mean value = 1.16) and "Actively benefiting" behaviours (e.g. mean value = 1.19). In the Survey conducted by

Simon Chak (1998) in Hong Kong, the overall mean value obtained was only 1.19, giving a general perception that Hong Kong hotel employees have lower tolerance level towards unethical behaviours as compared to employees in Kuala Lumpur. The differences in ranking of mean value by factors may due to differences in basis of grouping of statements into the four factors.
Table 8 below compares the results of both studies: -

TABLE 8: Factors Mean Score (N=102)

Factors	This Study (2001)	Ranking	Simon Chak (1998)	Ranking
No harm	1.35	1	1.25	4
Unethical behaviours	1.74	3	1.16	1
Actively benefiting	1.93	4	1.19	2
Passively benefiting	1.53	2	1.23	3
Overall	1.62		1.19	

In analyzing the six general attitudinal in the questionnaire, it was found that employees reacted positively towards the benefit of the guest rather than the hotel (Statement 22: "Satisfying a guest's need is necessary even if it is contradictory to company policy"). Employees tended to agree with sacrificing the company for the sake of customer satisfaction (mean value 3.86). This is not consistent with the findings by Simon Chak (1998) whereby he found that Hong Kong hotel employees disagree with sacrificing the company policy for the sake of the hotel guests.

Respondents also agreed, "If something is illegal, then it must be ethically wrong to do it". With a mean value of 3.53, it indicated a slight inclination to believe that

it is not wrong. Employees scored a mean value of 4.54 in Statement 23: "If a guest treats me well, I should serve him/her better", which showed that in the Malaysian culture there is no grey area in terms of whether guests should reciprocate a favour. Again, this is not in accordance to findings by Simon Chak in Hong Kong whereby the mean value was 3.34, which showed that in Chinese culture there is a grey area in terms of whether guests should reciprocate a favour. For Statement 27: "Flexibility is more important than honesty", respondents tended to agree with the statement with a mean score of 4.43. Generally speaking, hotel employees agreed that "Man is basically good" (Statement 25) with a mean score of 3.92. Finally, hotel employees chose "Honesty" rather than "Guest satisfaction" when they were confronted with a choice between the two values (mean score 4.21). Table 9 below summarizes the mean score obtained for the six attitudinal statements and the comparison with results obtained by Simon Chak (1998) in Hong Kong.

TABLE 9: Mean Score and Ranking of Attitudinal Statements

	This Study (2001)		Simon Chak (1998)	
Statements	**Mean Score**	**Ranking**	**Mean Score**	**Ranking**
Statement 22	3.86	5	1.34	6
Statement 23	4.54	1	3.34	3
Statement 24	4.21	3	4.56	1
Statement 25	3.92	4	3.02	5
Statement 26	3.53	6	3.29	4
Statement 27	4.43	2	4.02	2

4.2.3 Correlation analysis

The four factors: No harm, Unethical behaviour, Actively benefiting and Passively benefiting were analyzed with the six general attitudinal statements by correlation

analysis using the Pearson coefficient. Statement 22: "Satisfying a guest's needs is necessary even if it is contradictory to company policy" positively correlated with all four factors. This suggests that employees may tend to behave unethically towards the company for the sake of better customer service. This is consistent with findings by Simon Chak (1998) in Hong Kong.

Statement 23: "If a guest treats me well, I should serve him/her better" correlated positively with Factor 3: "Actively benefiting" and Factor 2:"Unethical behaviours ". This showed that employees might tolerate unethical behaviour in response to a guest's kind treatment. In other words, employees will take the initiative (actively benefiting) to satisfy the guests even though there may be unethical behaviours involved.

Statements 24 and 25 correlated negatively with all four factors. This suggests that employees who agreed honesty was more important than guest satisfaction were less tolerant of unethical behaviours. Similarly, employees who agreed, "Man is basically good" produced the same result.

Statement 26: "If something is illegal, then it must be ethically wrong to do it" correlated negatively to Factor 2: "Unethical behaviours" and Factor 3: "Actively benefiting". This further illustrated that employees who agreed this statement tended to have lower tolerance of unethical behaviours. Finally, Statement 27: "Flexibility is more important than honesty" was found to have no particular correlation with the four factors identified, except for factor 3: "Actively benefiting". This suggests that employees who agreed that flexibility is more important than honesty were more tolerant of unethical behaviours.

Table 10 below summarizes the results of Correlation analysis between the four factors and the six general attitudinal statements.

TABLE 10: Result of Correlation Analysis: Pearson Coefficient

Factors	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Statement 22	0.55	0.58	0.73	0.48
Statement 23	- 0.22	0.52	0.59	0.18
Statement 24	-0.53	-0.34	-0.20	-0.61
Statement 25	-0.62	-0.24	-0.38	-0.72
Statement 26	0.23	-0.65	-0.89	0.34
Statement 27	-0.21	0.23	0.52	-0.03

4.2.4 ANOVA analysis by Working Department

ANOVA analysis was performed to understand further the differences between department and the four factors. It was clear that security came top of the list with lowest tolerance for unethical behaviours. After security department, in ascending order of calculated means, Human Resource and Finance departments rated the lowest tolerance of unethical behaviours. This results is anticipated as these departments should 'ensure and control' ethical behaviours in the hotel industry.

ANOVA analysis produced a result with significant differences in Factor 2: "Unethical behaviours" and 3: "Actively benefitting". Front Office, Food & Beverage, Housekeeping and Engineering departments were comparatively shown to have higher tolerance to unethical aspects than 'back office' departments i.e. Human Resource, Finance, Security, Sales & Marketing and Kitchen. The Security department rated significantly lower than all the other departments. Kitchen, Finance and Security staff showed comparatively lower tolerance in unethical behaviours than front office, food and beverage, house keeping and engineering. The Food and beverage department rated the highest

towards unethical behaviours and statistically higher than front office, engineering and house keeping. Significant differences were also noted between Food Beverage department and Human Resource, Finance and Sale & Marketing departments. This result confirms that the working departments that have direct contact with hotel guests have higher tolerance for unethical behaviours. This result contradicts the findings by Simon Chak (1998), whereby Hong Kong hotel employees working in human resource and security departments showed higher tolerance towards unethical behaviours as compared to other working departments.

No significant difference was found between departments for Factor 1: "No harm" and Factor 4: "Passively benefiting". In general, the results show that there is a significance difference between the tolerance level of employees towards unethical behaviours and their working departments.
Table 11 below summarizes the result of ANOVA analysis of departmental mean with the four identified factors.

TABLE 11: ANOVA Analysis: Departmental Mean by Factors

Department	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Overall
Housekeeping	1.6	2.3	2.5	1.9	2.2
Front Office	1.5	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.1
H. Resource	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.3
F&B	1.8	2.5	2.9	2.0	2.4
Kitchen	1.5	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.8
Finance	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2
Security	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.1
Engineering	1.5	2.1	2.2	1.7	1.9
Sales &Mktg	1.2	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.4
Significance At 0.05 level	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

4.2.5 Independent T-test - by Gender

An independent t-test was performed to test the differences between the two genders. There were significant differences observed between genders for all the four factors at significant value (alpha) of 0.05. Comparing the calculated means, the female employees show lower tolerance towards unethical behaviours as compared to the male employees for all the factors. Male employees show significantly higher tolerance level for factor 2: Unethical behaviours and factor 3: Actively benefiting. The result is contradicting the findings by Simon Chak (1998) whereby Hong Kong hotel employees do not show any significant differences between genders for the four factors identified. Table 12 below summarizes the result of the Independent t-test analysis of gender mean with the four identified factors.

TABLE 12: Independent T-test analysis between genders

Mean Value	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Overall
Male	1.63	1.81	1.76	1.65	1.74
Female	1.48	1.54	1.46	1.51	1.54
Significance Level	0.052	0.011	0.034	0.071	0.048

4.2.6 ANOVA Analysis of Demographic Variables

ANOVA analysis was performed to test the mean differences between ages; education and position level with the four factors.

In analyzing the age range with the four factors, there was no significant difference found for all the factors. For the factors, (No harm, Unethical behaviour, Actively benefiting and Passively benefiting) respondents in younger age groups, i.e. 21-25 and 26-30, scored a higher mean value, meaning a higher tolerance level for unethical activities. Younger employees, i.e. those aged 21-25

and 26-30 showed a higher tolerance of unethical behaviours. Older employees scored lower which indicated lower tolerance to unethical behaviours in the all four factors: No harm, Unethical behaviours , Actively benefiting and passively benefiting. No any two groups that show significant difference at 0.05 significant level. Table 13 below summarizes the findings for the overall ANOVA analysis by age group of respondents:

TABLE 13: ANOVA analysis by age group

Age Group	Mean Score
21-25	1.81
26-30	1.63
31-35	1.51
36-40	1.78
41-45	1.45
46-50	1.23
F Prob = 0.3243	

There was significant difference found between education levels when correlated with all the four factors. This is in contradiction with the findings by Simon Chak (1998), whereby Hong Kong hotel employees showed no significant differences for factors 3 and 4. Nevertheless, significant differences were found for factor 1 and 2. Based on the overall analysis, it seems that the lower the education level, the more likely that hotel employees tolerate unethical behaviours. Respondents with Primary and Diploma education levels showed the greatest differences in term of their value towards unethical behaviours. Table 14 below summarizes the findings for the overall ANOVA analysis by education level of respondents:

PERPUSTAKAAN UNIVERSITI MALAYA

A5109505I9

TABLE 14: ANOVA analysis by Education Level

Education Level	Mean Score
Primary	1.96
Secondary	1.66
Diploma	1.48
University	1.38
F Prob = 0.0089	

As for ANOVA analysis of position level with the four factors, there were no significant differences observed in all four factors. This is in line with findings by Simon Chak (1996) in his study in Hong Kong. No two groups indicate significant differences at 0.05 significant level. Based on this finding, we can conclude that Kuala Lumpur hotel employees, despite differences in their job levels, reacted in similar ways towards unethical behaviours.

TABLE 15: ANOVA analysis by Position Level

Education Level	Mean Score
Managerial	1.65
Middle Mgmt	1.56
Supervisory	1.68
General worker	1.61
F Prob = 0.0789	

4.3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

This study reveals that there are four major dimensions, which govern the hotel employees' ethical beliefs. There are :-

1) Factor 1: No harm.
2) Factor 2: Unethical behaviours.
3) Factor 3: Actively benefiting.
4) Factor 4: Passively benefiting

In this study, hotel employees reacted positively in their ethical judgments since all the statistical mean scores of the four factors were less than 2.0. Most respondents reported that many statements were believed as wrong. This was a healthy phenomenon, for Malaysian hotel industry though rather higher than expected.

This study showed that staff employed in back-of-house departments such as human resource, finance and security, had a lower tolerance of unethical behaviours as compared to front-line employees who work in departments such as front office and housekeeping. This study also showed that younger employees are more tolerant of unethical behaviours, in general. Female employees are found to be more 'ethical' than male employees.

In analyzing the correlation among the four factors and the general attitudinal statements, people with positive beliefs about mankind tended to be less tolerant of unethical behaviours. It was also found from this study that employees tend to be tolerant of unethical behaviours when hotel guests treat them well.