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ABSTRACT

Employees typically have expectations concerning the organisations that employ them. The degree to which these expectations are met determine whether they will feel a part of the organisation and whether they will want to remain employed there. Previous literature on diversity among employees in the workplace has shown that high levels of diversity greatly benefit the employees of an organisation by providing higher levels of satisfaction and commitment (Charmine, 2004). Recently there has been a significant number of studies examining diversity in Western hospitality industry contexts (see Baum, Dutton, Karimi, & Kokkranikal, 2007; Devine, Baum, Hearns, & Devine, 2007). However, the literature on organisational diversity in North-East Asian settings remains inadequate, especially in the context of the hospitality industry. Though social identity theory has been used extensively in relational research on diversity, before insights from social identity theory can make a greater contribution to contemporary organisations, a better understanding of the applicability of this construct across cultures is needed. Thus, an examination of the impact of organisational diversity on employees in the Taiwanese hospitality industry in the context of a collectivistic culture is an important contribution to the literature. The aim of this research project was to explore whether organisational diversity is associated with Taiwanese employee attitudes and behaviours and to illustrate if social identity theory is applicable in the North-East Asian context because Taiwan is a state in North-East Asia and the first constitutional republic in Asia (Directorate General of Budget Accounting and Statistics, 2013).

A mixed-method approach was utilised to identify and examine the effects of hotel diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours. Ethnic diversity was utilised to represent the organisational diversity levels in Phase 1 due to the ease of access to the target sample of hotels. Phase 1 involved semi-structured interviews of 24 hotel employees. This group comprised eight employees from each of three hotels, each representing a different level of ethnic diversity (high, medium and low, respectively) and selected using snowball and purposive sampling procedures. A number of important themes and findings emerged from the qualitative phase. The levels of ethnic diversity in the hotel as perceived by the majority of employees matched the actual levels of
ethnic diversity present in each hotel, respectively. Important company attributes that attract employees were salary and employment conditions, job suitability, job interest, job security, opportunities for rapid advancement, training opportunities, reputation and image of the company, level of work environment harmony, clarity of rewards and discipline systems, stability of company systems, location of the company, and desire for increasing numbers of ethnic minorities at workplace. The results suggested that the ethnic composition of a Taiwanese hotel is an important attribute for indigenous employees, which leads to a key research finding that diversity does matter to employees in the Taiwanese hotel sector. Moreover, many employees in the organisations with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity reported one of the qualities that they liked most about the company was diversity related (e.g. frequency of ethnic interaction and different levels of ethnic diversity in the workplace). Employee preferences for diversity in the workplaces also vary within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The findings demonstrated that most employees in the hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity reported that they were happy with high level of diversity within the workplace.

In Phase 2, a quantitative approach was utilised and Phase 2 consisted of a self-administered survey developed using relevant information from the existing literature and theory, coupled with the information gleaned from the responses of employees and managers during the semi-structured interviews in Phase 1. Quantitative data were collected using snowball, convenience, and purposive sampling procedures. A total of 305 completed surveys were received from the 22 participating hotels. The self-administered survey measured personal demographic data, employee attitudes (job satisfaction, organisational commitment and diversity-related attitudes), employee behaviour (job performance, organisational citizenship behaviours and turnover intentions, and diversity-related behaviour), importance and performance analysis of key company attributes. The findings demonstrated that ethnic diversity levels were more aligned with the variation in employee attitudes and behaviours than other forms of organisational diversity, and therefore hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity became a focus and were used to represent organisational diversity throughout the entire quantitative phase. Moreover, the results revealed that employees in hotels with a high
level of ethnic diversity were more likely to indicate significantly more positive employee attitudes and behaviours than those in the hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity. The findings also showed that demographic variables such as ethnicity, gender, education, and management status were associated with employee attitudes and behaviours within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity.

Finally, data integration and combining the two types of data from Phases 1 and 2 were involved. The results indicate that levels of ethnic diversity in the workplace are important determinants of employee attitudes and behaviours among Taiwanese hotel staff. The overall findings indicated that:

- The levels of ethnic diversity perceived by employees is consistent with the actual level of ethnic diversity according to the demographic data provided by the hotels.
- The ethnic composition of the hotel workforce is an important attribute of the Taiwanese hospitality industry and diversity is an important organisational feature that attracts Taiwanese indigenous employees.
- Indigenous employees were more likely to report significantly lower levels of turnover intention and more positive diversity-related attitude than non-indigenous workers.
- Employee attitudes and behaviours are positively associated with higher levels of ethnic diversity in the organisations.

This study contributes to the body of knowledge by elucidating the importance of diversity impacts on employee attitudes and behaviours in some North-East Asian hospitality organisations. The results have theoretical and practical implications for researchers, organisations and government. For instance, there is ambiguity in the literature about the impacts of diversity on organisations (see McMillan-Capehart, 2005; C. M. Riordan, 2000; Schaubroeck & Lam, 2002). However, this study supports the view that high levels of diversity are associated with more positive employee work outcomes, and its findings that diversity matters to Taiwanese hotel staff could assist in the development of policies to educate managers and CEOs in the hospitality industry.
about the value of employing ethnic minority staff or a more ethnically diverse workforce. Additionally, this study has provided evidence that could encourage the government to incorporate equal opportunity requirements into policy and strategy initiatives in order to integrate Taiwanese indigenous and non-indigenous employees within the workplace.

Finally, future research could examine additional non-observable diversity categories (e.g. organisational goals or missions) and employee attitudes and behaviours toward work and diversity in the domestic and international hotel contexts. Furthermore, as Gefen, et al. (2003) link profits and employee satisfaction to customer satisfaction measures, customer satisfaction could be considered as additional outcome and variable.

**Key words:** diversity, job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, organisational citizenship behaviours, turnover intentions.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Background to the Research

In Taiwan, since 2000 the right to engage in leisure activities has been regarded as a human rights issue. The right to engage in leisure is a fundamental social need, and conditions for people to participate in leisure should be offered (Marimon & Zilibotti, 2000). In 2000 the Taiwanese government implemented laws providing for two days off per week and in 2001 labourers’ working hours were reduced (Fan, 2004). Over the past decade the government has pushed ahead with cultural and leisure developments. Leisure activities have become popular in Taiwan both in institutions and in people's everyday lives. Consequently, as shown in Figure 1-1, there are increasing opportunities for employment in the leisure and tourism industry in Taiwan, which is one of the biggest industries in the world in terms of employment and income generation (Directorate General of Budget Accounting and Statistics, 2013). In 2009, the leisure and tourism industry contributed 4.3% to Taiwan’s overall Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (Ministry of Transportation and Communications, 2010). Moreover, the hospitality sector is one of the largest contributors to the Taiwanese leisure and tourism industry’s GDP contribution, accounting for 47.2 % of total gross value during the financial year from 2008 to 2009 (Ministry of Transportation and Communications, 2010). Thus, the hospitality sector in Taiwan has emerged as a significant area of study.

Research on the Western hospitality context is prolific and a focus on organisational diversity has also become commonplace (Baum, et al., 2007; Devine, et al., 2007). Several studies suggest that with increasing globalisation, diversity has become a positive element in organisational life (Strachan, French, & Burgess, 2009; Tsui, 2004). According to Joppe (2012), the entrenched problems of shortages of skilled staff, high levels of staff turnover and high levels of tourism and hospitality business failure can potentially be alleviated by encouraging diversity. However, the literature available in regards to organisational diversity in East Asian settings is sparse, especially in the
context of the hospitality industry. This may be due to the fact that in the past, organisations in Asia have attempted to employ homogeneous groups of employees and have wanted them to conform to the ideal employee image (Von Glinow & Teagarden, 1988). Thus, the lack of research in this area was one rationale for conducting this study.

**Figure 1.1 Work opportunities for employment of the leisure & tourism industry in Taiwan**

![Graph showing work opportunities for employment in the leisure & tourism industry in Taiwan](image)


### 1.1.1. Diversity, employees and organisations

The efficiency of employees in the performance of their work is a key component of the success of any organisation. In the hospitality industry context, it has been demonstrated that employees are the most important resource and also the primary marketers who deliver excellent service to the customer (I. S. Hwang & Chi, 2005). Bowen and Ford (2002) also suggested that better organisational outcomes in the hospitality industry are associated with higher levels of customer-perceived service quality, which directly links to employee work attitudes and behaviours. According to Charmine (2004), a workplace that emphasises diversity will be of great benefit to its employers and employees.

Diversity will increase employee satisfaction, motivation, morale, and commitment and, in turn, increase company productivity and, subsequently, the bottom line. ‘Diversity’
refers to all the ways in which people differ. In a workplace context, individuals differ from others both in terms of personal characteristics such as ethnicity, gender or sexuality and organisation-related characteristics such as tenure or hierarchical position (Waigt & Madera, 2011).

Moreover, a diverse customer base means that managing diversity can be embraced in hotels to provide customers with a quality service experience where staff diversity meets their increasing expectations (Ekiz & Arasli, 2007; Lockwood, 2005). Therefore, adopting a managing diversity approach may also have the potential to enhance insight into various populations of customers and improve employees’ work outcomes and thus improve service from this perspective in leisure organisations (Devine, et al., 2007). Improved service quality can help the providers of services retain customers, and satisfied customers are more likely to recommend the service to other potential customers (Haran, 2005; Howat et al., 2002; Venetis & Ghauri, 2004). Customer satisfaction and loyalty directly relate to organisational profits, and therefore research has recommended that efforts to increase customer satisfaction should encompass employees’ work-related attitudes and behaviours because employees must deliver quality service as a prerequisite to customer satisfaction (Babin, Lee, Kim, & Griffin, 2005). Employees, on the other hand, are often thought of as the most valuable resource of any service organisation, and as such, their attitudes and behaviours determine the organisation’s success and ultimate existence (Barsky & Nash, 2003; Solnet, 2006).

Furthermore, employees must have reasons, such as tangible or intangible rewards, or a friendly workplace, in order to feel part of an organisation and to maintain a desire to remain employed in it (De Cieri et al., 2008). Managing diversity in the workplace is regarded as a strategy that can help increase employee satisfaction and commitment toward the organisation (Strachan, et al., 2009).

Research on the organisational effectiveness of diverse workforces has been extensive. Organisational effectiveness can be described as the concept of how successful an organisation is in achieving the outcomes it intends to produce (Barkema, Baum, & Mannix, 2002; McKay & McDaniel, 2003; McKay & McDaniel, 2006; Roth, Huffcutt, & Bobko, 2003; Waigt & Madera, 2011). Prior studies argued that the effective
management of diversity remains a challenge for many hospitality managers and their organisations (Devine, et al., 2007; Hardesty, 2005). Thus, organisational diversity and its relationship to employee work attitudes and behaviours is the focus of this study.

1.1.2. **Demographic characteristics**

Diversity in demographic attributes such as gender, race and age has been studied broadly. Strachan et al. (2009) argued that increasing diversity in the labour market is inevitable and therefore managing demographic diversity in organisations is one of the major management challenges for the coming decades. Although most studies indicate that similarities in these attributes enhance mutual liking and team functioning, and that demographic diversity decreases both social interaction and social integration (Dreachslin, Hunt, & Sprainer., 2000; D. Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002; Tsui, Porter, & Egan, 2002), the overall results of demographic research have been mixed (Kochan et al., 2003). Lau and Murnighan (1998) and Tsui et al. (2002) argued that in practice, multiple demographic characteristics are salient and they therefore suggested analysing several variables simultaneously. They reasoned that subgroups become more visible as demographic attributes overlap, setting the stage for social categorisation processes, instigating the formation of subgroups and the eruption of disputes between them. Social identity research adds that demographic attributes that co-vary increase the likelihood of both subgroup formation and inter-group conflict (M. A. Hogg & Terry., 2000), and that the effects will be particularly strong under conditions requiring intense collaboration. In general, a characteristic of organisational demographics (e.g. employment duration and management status) may affect team performance in ways that are different to the effects of demographic characteristics, such as gender or ethnicity, because seniority levels may also be associated with compensation, authority in the organisation and a sense of job security (Aksu & Aktas, 2005; Tu, Forret, & Sullivan, 2006; Wegge, Roth, Neubach, Schmidt, & Kanfer, 2008). However, in the context of the present study these characteristics have in common attributes that manifest in the initial stages of working together. Thus, it is necessary to include both personal and organisational characteristics in this study.
1.1.3. Taiwanese indigenous people and the hospitality industry

Between seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, indigenous communities in Taiwan were oppressed by the government, which attempted to assimilate them into the Han Chinese culture in order to eliminate ethnic diversity, as their lifestyle, language and culture are quite different from that of the majority (Y. Y. Hwang, 2006). However, the Taiwanese government recently formally recognised that ethnic pluralism has not produced conflict between different groups (Tao, 2006). The Taiwanese government also recognised that global and national tourism developed through the promotion of diverse indigenous culture would result in substantial economic benefits to tourism and hospitality businesses (E. Lin, 2003; Lu, 2006). Chen (2008) noted that tourism and hospitality have a kind of symbiotic relationship; hospitality has a significant relationship with tourism and is a service component of other industries (Alonso, 2010).

According to the Taiwanese government’s earlier census data in 2006, the number of employees in the hospitality industry increased by 1.05% from 2000 to 2005. However, the percentage of indigenous people working in the hospitality industry only increased by 0.6% between 2000 and 2005, although the total employment rate of indigenous people increased by 4.9% from 2003 to 2005 (Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2006). In 2005 the percentage of the general population working in the hospitality industry was 6.3%, whereas the percentage of indigenous peoples working in hospitality was only 4.8%. Even though the chairman of the Council of Indigenous Peoples said that the Taiwanese government emphasised attracting more local and international tourists by promoting Taiwanese indigenous tourism (Mo, 2005), prior to 2005 there was no equal opportunity in employment for indigenous people in the hospitality industry. However, between 2006 and 2010 the percentage of indigenous people working in the hospitality industry increased from 6.6% to 8.5%. That is to say, the percentage of the indigenous population in the hospitality industry is now higher than the 6.8% figure for the general population, although the unemployment rate of indigenous people is still 0.40% higher than that of the general population (Council of Indigenous People, 2010). As there are increasing numbers of indigenous employees in the hospitality industry, a focus on ethnic characteristics in this study is essential.
1.1.4. Culture of Taiwan

Taiwan is a state in North-East Asia and the first constitutional republic in Asia (Directorate General of Budget Accounting and Statistics, 2013). Classification of nations into groupings like North-East Asia is fraught with danger because each nation within the grouping is unique. However, a classification like North-East Asia which would include, North Korea, South Korea, China and Taiwan (Statistics, 2011) would have some similarities because they are collectivistic cultures influenced by Confucianism. While a classification allowed for a convenient grouping it is augued that each nation within is unique. Throughout the thesis majority references is made solely to Taiwan, however in some cases a broader classification like North-East Asia was used. Taiwan’s culture and cultural legacy have been shaped largely by the processes of imperialism and colonisation. The structural and psychological effects of successive colonial projects have been integral to developing Taiwan’s self-image and the evolution of both official and unofficial Taiwanese culture (Yip, 2004, pp. 2-5). Briefly, Taiwan was under the colonized authority of the Netherlands and Spain. Spaniards were conquered by the Netherlanders who seized the sovereignty of Eastern Taiwan. Two hundred years later, due to a Sino-Japanese War and ‘Treaty of Shimonoseki’ in 1895, Taiwan was ceded to Japan for 50 years. At the end of the World War II, when Japan was defeated, Taiwan was taken over by the government of the Republic of China (Hsiau, 2004). In recent years, the concept of Taiwanese multiculturalism has been proposed as a relatively apolitical alternative view, which has allowed for the inclusion of mainlanders and other minority groups into the continuing re-definition of Taiwanese culture as collectively held systems of meaning and customary patterns of thought and behaviour shared by the people of Taiwan (R. Ma, Huang, & Shenkar, 2011).

Taiwanese culture has been strongly influenced by Confucianism (L. H. Lin & Ho, 2009) which also has a great impact on the management of business organisations and human resources (see Warner, 2010). Confucian ethics in an organisation often seem to overlap with characteristics of collectivism which is also one of the cultural traits of North-East Asian society. Englehart (2000, p. 549) posited that, “North-East Asian cultures are characterized by a set of values that includes obedience to authority, intense allegiance to groups, and a submergence of individual identity in collective identity.”
For many years, the traits of individualism and collectivism have dominated research efforts aimed at explaining the development and expression of personal behaviour and motives in a culture. In collectivism, an organisation is more important than an employee, who is required to make his or her personal needs and desires accord with organisational goals, in contrast to people in more individualism cultures who are more likely to have characteristics like detachment, distance, and self-reliance (Hofstede, 2001). In this respect, the peoples’ attitudes and behaviours in collectivist cultures are considerably different from those of people in individualism cultures, in which conflicts between employees are regarded as acceptable. At the extremes of the two cultures between collectivism and individualism, no one has yet determined how far social identity theory can be applied to the collectivistic behaviours of North-East Asians. That is, this study aims to answer the research questions followed by the approaches of social identity theory with perspectives of collectivism and individualism cultures.

1.2 Research Problem

The research presented here is an exploration of the associations between levels of organisational diversity in Taiwanese hotels and employees’ work-related attitudes and behaviours. The effects of organisational diversity have been examined widely in the study of business (Spataro, 2005; Svyantek & Bott, 2004; Thomas, 2005; Waight & Madera, 2011; Wickham & Parker, 2007). However, much of this research has been conducted in Western countries, with little attention given to the North-East Asian context. More importantly, very few studies have been conducted on diversity in the Taiwanese business sector specifically (e.g., Wu & Chiang, 2007).

Moreover, in an attempt to find a comprehensive theoretical framework that can address the question of whether and how Taiwanese employee attitudes and behaviours could be impacted by organisational diversity, researchers are increasingly adopting a process-based approach derived from social identity theory. For example, Bell and Menguc (2002) applied a social identity perspective to develop a model that examines extra role behaviours, such as organisational citizenship behaviours. Haslam, Powell, and Turner (2000) argued that group-based social identity provides employees with work attitudes that advance the interests of that particular group. Similarly, van Knippenberg (2003)
provided further support for this argument by analyzing employee work performance using social identity theory. Given these analyses, it seems that social identity theory is well suited to assess employee attitudes toward their job, organisations and diversity and, consequently, the performance of employees. Consistent with previous research, the researcher argued that an individual’s work performance is “contingent on social identity processes to the extent that the individual possesses the necessary skills and knowledge” (Daan Van Knippenberg, 2000, p. 367). Specifically, within this study the focus is on whether social identity theory can be used to explain the impacts of diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours in different cultural settings (e.g., Westerners compared with North-East Asians and individualism compared with collectivism).

Furthermore, employees are seen as one of the key resources delivering service quality in the hospitality sector. Employers and managers in hotels must have a sound understanding of the employees’ needs for feeling a part of and a desire to stay employed in that organisation, which in turn improve their work-related attitudes and behaviours. While there was ambivalence in the literature about the impacts of diversity on employee work performance (Ali, Kulik, & Metz, 2011; Barkema, Baum, & Mannix, 2002; Cunningham & Sagas, 2004; Raatikainen, 2002; Reagans, 2005; Strachan, et al., 2009), through identifying the effect of organisational diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours, insights can be gained into how to increase and improve organisational outcomes. Nevertheless, it seems there have been no studies investigating the influences of diversity levels on employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese organisations. Additionally, ethnicity has become one of the major foci of business research (Chow & Crawford, 2004; J. G. Montalvo & Reynal-Querol, 2002; Waight & Madera, 2011) following the significant increase in the number of minority employees working in the hospitality industry due to the growth of the global economy and immigration activities. However, there are few studies investigating the relationship between ethnic backgrounds and employees’ attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels.

To date there has been a lack of research on how the levels of diversity in organisations affect employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwan. A comparison of the hotels with different levels of diversity can illustrate the influence of diversity on employee
attitudes and behaviours. Therefore, this study attempts to answer the main research problem:

“What is the effect of organisational diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels?”

1.3 Research Justification

This study aims to examine the associations between levels of organisational diversity and employee attitudes and behaviours in the Taiwanese hospitality industry. According to social identity theory, individuals define themselves through a process of self-categorization; defining oneself as a member of a particular social category (e.g. based on ethnicity, gender, age and so on). It is likely that some co-workers will be viewed as being members of an in-group or out-group. Interacting with those identified as being in one’s social category acts to reinforce self-identity, increasing group integration and communication (Inkelas, 2003). As such, organisational diversity influences employee attitudes and behaviours.

1.3.1. Theoretical rationale

Social identity suggested that individuals define themselves in relation to their social environment and identify with others based on perceived similarity or dissimilarity (Tajfel, 1982). When employees do not share the predominant traits of the group, they may face negative consequences, including exclusion from formal and informal interactions, bias, and discrimination (Fiske, 2000; Foley, Hangyue, & Wong, 2005). The other relevant theory, such as a role theory, concerns one of the most important characteristics of social behaviour, which is that human beings behave in ways that are different or predictable depending on their respective social identities and the situation (Biddle, 1986). There are several strengths within the social identity theory which was commended by Rubin and Hewstone (2004); the first is that this theory has a surplus of empirical evidence to support it both in the lab and organisations. Second, it comprises societal and personal feature along with explaining the motivational reasoning for the
behaviour. When a person categorises his or herself as part of the group, feels committed to the group, and gains some esteem from the group, that group has become the person’s in-group. Finally, due to the fact that an individual’s identity is not just limited to their personal identity, this theory incorporates the motivational reasoning for both the personal and social characteristic of an individual. That is, social identity theory can be a useful concept in understanding organisational behaviour as a study suggests that individual employees may exert increased effort and experience greater motivation if working on tasks for their collective group rather than in working for his or herself (Haslam, 2003). Polzer et al. (2002) also found that demographic dissimilarity is associated with negative attitudes of employees towards the organisation. However, McMillan-Capehart (2005) argued that high levels of diversity in the workplace could also weaken these negative outcomes. As the literature on the impact of diversity on organisations is inconsistent, there is a need to explore the role of diversity as an influence in organisations. Organisations comprise employees from diverse backgrounds with different characteristics, attitudes and behaviours. Diversity may therefore be a factor influencing employees’ work outcomes but these theoretical propositions have not been empirically tested in relation to the Taiwanese hospitality industry.

Moreover, the influence of varying organisational diversity levels on employees’ work attitudes and behaviours has not been considered in the Asian context. Although social identity theory has been used extensively in relational research on diversity, it has assumed that it is equally applicable to all people. The researcher argues that a better understanding of how this construct is viewed across cultures is needed. As a result, this study represents a critical pathway to assess whether existing theories and concepts could be derived from the setting of Westerners to North-East Asians, and from the culture of individualism to collectivism. The findings of this research project indicate that there is heterogeneity within in groups. Much social identity theory is based on the assumption that in groups are homogeneous. This study questions this assumption and therefore adds to the body of theoretical knowledge. This is a significant contribution to social identity theory which has been criticised for its assumption that in-groups are homogeneous. In the case of indigenous employees in this study, for example, those
with higher levels of education were different from those with lower levels, in terms of intentions to leave their present employment.

1.3.2. Practical rationale

The government in Taiwan has made progress with cultural and leisure developments; leisure is now considered to be a human right in Taiwan both in terms of legislation and in people's practical lives. The number of employees in the leisure industry is also increasing. Through understanding the effect of diversity on the leisure industry, this research may generate rich information for the Taiwanese government to address the increasing social, political and economic issues related to staff diversity in Taiwan. For example, the results of this research may assist governments in establishing integrated work programs and reduce indirect discrimination as well as enhancing personal wellbeing. Moreover, this research may also be an indicator of the need to evaluate minority employment opportunities.

Furthermore, this research may help organisations become more open to exploring diversity matters as a means to reduce staffing and training costs, increase marketing opportunities, and create a workplace conducive to higher productivity and teamwork. In addition, this research will help to establish employees’ needs for interacting positively with diverse others in work settings and this may facilitate employees’ delivery of better service and enhance businesses’ service reputation among customers.

1.4 Structure of Thesis

This thesis consists of 6 chapters; following is an overview of the structure of the thesis.

Chapter 1 presents the background, objectives, and justification of the research, detailing the research problem and briefly reviewing prior research.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature, including a definition of diversity; a discussion of the importance of diversity in the Taiwanese hospitality industry; a review of social identity theory and macrostructural inquiry; a discussion of the measurement of diversity; a discussion of the relationship between employees and customers; and a
discussion of diversity and employee attitudes and behaviour. This review provides the foundations for building a research model for the study.

Chapter 3 presents an overview of the qualitative and quantitative research methods used in this study, including data collection, interviews and survey instruments, and sampling procedure.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the qualitative research. A description of the sample is provided. The perceived key company attributes are identified. The concepts of diversity and concepts related to employee attitudes and behaviours are then outlined.

Chapter 5 illustrates the results of quantitative research. The sampling criteria and the processes used to test the reliability and validity of the measurements, and the descriptive statistics and the correlation analyses are discussed. Various statistical analyses are used to answer the quantitative research questions.

Chapter 6 summarises the outcomes of the research and discusses the implications, contributions, and limitations of the research. Conclusions and topics for future research are also discussed.

1.5 Summary

This chapter sets out the basis of this study, provides a preview of the research, outlines the research questions, and sets out the structure of the thesis. The next chapter presents a literature review, and emphasises the crucial points of this study, including diversity and employee attitudes and behaviours. An introduction to the Taiwanese ethnic minority (Taiwanese indigenous people) is also provided.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This literature review introduces the notion of diversity and focuses in particular on diversity in Taiwanese hotel industry. This chapter also provides the theoretical foundation such as social identity theory and macrostructural inquiry used to interpret diversity impacts on employee attitudes and behaviours. The comparison between social identity theory and similarity-attraction paradigm, as well as the comparison between macrostructural inquiry and contact theory are also discussed to demonstrate the reason social identity theory and macrostructural inquiry are well suited to the current research. Measurements of organisational diversity are then introduced. Relationships between employees and customers are discussed in order to unfold any variables that may initially influence employee attitudes and therefore affect organisational performance. Literature related to diversity and employee attitudes is also reviewed. Literature about diversity and its relation with employee behaviours is assessed. In the final section, the relationships between diversity and employees attitudes and behaviours within the context with different levels of diversity are proposed as research questions.

2.2 Diversity

2.2.1 Definitions of diversity

Diversity has been defined in a number of ways. Maxwell (2004) stated that it is difficult to pinpoint a single, common definitional framework, although there are many useful definitions of diversity. Diversity could be seen as the quality of diverse or different cultures, as opposed to monoculture (Yakura, 1996). Culture could be further distinguished differences between surface and deep cultures (Shaules, 2010). She explains that surface culture is basically the cultural norms that can be easily identified and sometimes involve cultural stereotypes. Deep culture is the cultural norms not easily detected unless the individuals spend an extended amount of time in that particular culture. Similarly, definitions of diversity can be separated into two
dimensions: the observable and non-observable (Kochan et al., 2003; Singh, Vinnicombe, Schiuma, Kennerly, & Neely, 2002). Singh et al. (2002) demonstrated two dimensions of diversity in the management and diversity literature, pointing out that in relation to organisations, diversity is a multidimensional concept. The meaning of diversity is associated with the specific strategy, needs and characteristics of an organisation. Definitions consist of both visible/observable and invisible/non-observable diversity. Observable dimensions include such characteristics as gender, race, ethnicity and age. Discrimination on the basis of these characteristics is legally prohibited in many developed countries (Goldman, Gutek, Stein, & Lewis, 2006) and the concepts of race and ethnicity are discussed in the section of ethnic diversity. Kochan et al. (2003) mentioned that non-observable dimensions include such characteristics as cognitive and technical differences among employees. For example, research has shown that non-observable characteristics such as educational level, organisational tenure, work experience, socio-economic background, and personality affect interactions between group members (Kephart & Schumacher, 2005). Diversity in the organisational context can refer to race, ethnicity, gender and age, as well as socio-economic factors such as income and education, and organisational characteristics such as job position and employment duration. Similarly, Griggs (1995) made the distinction between primary and secondary dimensions of diversity. The primary dimensions are inborn human traits, which differentiate individuals and are important in the process of early socialisation as well as during life in general. These include nationality, age, race, ethnicity, gender, physical abilities, and sexuality. These qualities form a person’s self-image and world views.

It has been established that there are also discrepancies between the heterogeneity that actually exists in a group and the heterogeneity that group members perceive (de Chermont & Quiñones, 2003; Riordan, 2000). In a study of performance evaluation literature, Kacmar et al. (2009) examined actual and perceived similarities between supervisors and employees. de Chermont and Quiñones (2003) suggested, based on direct comparison, that actual and perceived group diversity are independent, albeit related, conceptualisations. In other words, direct comparison of the two diversity dimensions was possible by obtaining parallel measures of objective and subjective diversity across a variety of dimensions (i.e. gender, race and age). Hence, the
differentiation of actual and perceived diversity is the difference between the heterogeneity that actually exists in a group and the heterogeneity that group members perceive (de Chermont and Quifiones, 2003). However, Harrison et al. (2002) found that there are connections between actual and perceived diversity, and that actual differences in diversity variables are positively reflected in perceptions of diversity. Thus, one research question in this study is partly concerned with identifying whether there is a link between actual and perceived diversity, and if actual diversity is linked to organisational outcomes.

2.2.2 Importance of diversity

According to Guzman (2000, p.77):

the workforce of the twenty-first century will be diverse, with more women and minorities; therefore organisations should be prepared to establish diversity-friendly environments as long-term commitments. Organisations should seek relationships with professional minority associations and develop programs that focus on awareness and understanding of diversity, including its cultural implications, effect on productivity, and value. Diversity-friendly means valuing people for their contributions and knowing that contributions can come from people of (for example) all races or ethnic backgrounds, ages, and genders and that a person's sense of identity should be acknowledged.

The dimensions of demographic diversity that have been linked to improved team performance include gender (Sagas & Cunningham, 2005), ethnicity (Pitts, 2005), age (Kilduff, Angelmar, & Mehra, 2000), occupational background (Barsade, Ward, Turner, & Sonnenfeld, 2000; Carpenter, 2002; Scott, 2006), and educational level (Tate, 2011). Several scholars also support the view that diversity is associated with higher productivity (Chavan, 2005; Salomon & Schork, 2003). Govendo (2005) indicated that diversity could improve a group’s ability to implement creative solutions. That is to say, diversity improves the quality of decisions and provides superior solutions and innovative ideas (Dunphy, 2004).
A workplace that emphasises the need to consider diversity will benefit the employees of an organisation, because diversity can increase their satisfaction and commitment and raise a company’s productivity (Charmine, 2004). Smerd (2006) investigated employees at Marriott hotels throughout the US and found hotels where employees are satisfied at work are 10% more profitable than similarly staffed hotels where satisfaction is not as high (Smerd, 2006). Since the most common initiators of programs or policies addressing workforce diversity comprise human resource professionals, a substantial number of studies provide valuable evidence that organisational diversity does offer competitive advantage (McBain, 2000; Salomon & Schork, 2003; Chavan, 2005). Several researchers have examined the relationship between team diversity and productivity, and most results support the assertion that diversity is associated with higher productivity (Lockwood, 2005; Mannix & Neale, 2005). Hamilton, Nickerson and Owan (2004) also suggested that organisational diversity could reduce the company’s communication costs with particular segments of customers or yield greater team problem-solving abilities. They also reported that teams with more heterogeneous employees are more productive. Therefore, businesses need to include strategies to support the achievement of equity outcomes through managing diversity for effectiveness and productivity, and developing a long-term and integrated approach to equity and diversity, integrating these concepts and principles into the key plans of the organisations (Ospina & Wagner, 2001).

The well-known international hospitality chain Hilton Hospitality Inc. (2002) reported that it is maintaining a workforce representation of approximately 60% ethnic minority employees and 50% female employees. In management positions Hilton reported a representation of 30% ethnic minority employees and over 40% female employees. The results of maintaining high levels of diversity in the workforce lead to competitiveness through a workforce that reflects the diversity of hotel customers, that appreciates the uniqueness of each customer, and that values contributions all fellow team members make toward the continuing success of the organisation. Hilton Hospitality Inc. (2002) further mentioned the benefits of promoting brand relevance within minority markets and supporting objectives of continuing to increase market share for all their brands, as the customers want to conduct business with a company that values and respects diversity.
Moreover, in the dynamic work environment where the HR configuration is constantly changing, the challenges of ensuring employee well-being and ethical treatment is also important. Managing employee pressures requires positive action both by the individual and by the organisation (Greenwood, 2002). Turner, Huemann and Keegan (2008) suggested that diversity management could be seen as the strategy to look after the well-being of employees in order to create the sense of fairness and decrease level of job stress. It seems clear that diversity not only could benefit the business but also play a valid role to facilitate employee well-being. Findler, Wind and Barak (2007) suggested that organisations should support implementation of fair policies, promotion procedures, training programs, and mentorship that promote inclusion of diverse employees such as women, members of minority ethnic and racial groups, immigrants, less educated and nonprofessional employees. Whereas an exclusionary workplace is based on the perception that all workers need to conform to pre-established organisational values and norms (defined by its “mainstream”), the inclusive workplace is based on a pluralistic value frame (Cox, 2004) that respects all cultural perspectives represented among its employees and supports employee’ sense of empowerment (Waigt & Madera, 2011). Inclusive workplace will strive to constantly modify its values and norms to accommodate its employees. The notion of productive diversity has been criticised because of its frequent over emphasis on productivity and profitability through the use (exploration) of diversity in employment. The benefits of diversity include engagement of organisational culture and the broader cultural context. Diversity not only could benefit the business but is also important to employee well-being. The literature also indicates that the concept of diversity management offers a useful construct that can contribute to the development of organisational interventions to improve employee well-being, job satisfaction, and retention among employees (R. Turner, et al., 2008).

2.2.3 The paradox of diversity management

Roosevelt (2006, p.451) defined managing diversity as “a comprehensive managerial process for developing an environment that works for all employees”. The best policy for employers is to make diversity a benefit within the organisation. Moreover, managing diversity is a concept that contains both affirmative action and equal employment opportunity regulations and rules (Bajawa & Woodall, 2006). Thomas
(2005) stated that the aim of managing diversity is to build an environment that works for all individuals within the organisation. Similarly, Cox (2004) argued that planning and implementing organisational systems and practices to manage employees in order to take full advantage of diversity and minimise the disadvantage of diversity is core to managing diversity. The widespread concern over standards of service quality in the tourism and hotel sector has encouraged more employer interest in managing diversity (Gefen, et al., 2003; Getty, 2001; Maxwell, et al., 2000). Managing diversity could have the potential to increase insight into diverse customers and consequently improve service in leisure organisations (Gardenswartz, 2003). Diversity management has been described as “planning and implementing organisational systems and practices to manage people so that the potential advantages of diversity are maximized while its potential disadvantages are minimized” (Cox, 2004, p.11). For example, Cox (2004) demonstrated that workplace inequality is directly related to discrimination, absenteeism and high employee turnover with costly outcomes for the corporate bottom line. However, this is contradictory to Leonard and Levine (2006) who have found that staff turnover rates decreases in more diverse workforces. It seems there is ambivalent result with the association between diversity and turnover rate, therefore the primary need for the management process is to identify and address those barriers and limitations that impact on the effective functioning of diverse employees within a workplace. The secondary need is to understand, value and capitalise on the skills and talents of a diverse workforce. Similarly, Kellough and Naff (2004) identified seven core components in diversity-management programs: ensuring management accountability; examining organisational structure, culture, and management systems; paying attention to representation; providing training; developing mentoring programs; promoting internal advocacy groups; and emphasising shared values among stakeholders. Kirton and Greene (2005, p.23) also suggested four critical strategies for managing diversity:

1) an emphasis on the centrality of the individual who should be positively recognised, nurtured and rewarded;

2) a move away from standardised procedures in order to respond to the individual basis of difference;

3) an organisational policy agenda that is business-driven rather than resting on moral claims to social justice;
4) and policy action that goes beyond redressing the imbalance, towards changing the culture and equality policies.

However, attempts to manage diversity have had mixed results. For example, studies showed that diverse workgroups compared with homogeneous groups suffer more from group conflict (Jehn & Chatman, 2000), negative competition (Reagans, 2005), communication difficulties (Abdel-Monem, Bingham, Marincic, & Tomkins, 2010) and higher levels of turnover intentions (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004). On the other hand, there is a link between effective management of diversity and positive organisational outcomes such as “large competitive gains, boosts to performance and enhanced long-term survival (Barkema, et al., 2002, p.924”). Shaw (2004) demonstrated that the benefits of effective diversity management can include a positive effect on the organisation through recruitment, increased business market growth, increased creativity and innovation, higher-quality problem solving, enhanced leadership effectiveness, and more effective global relationships. Some researchers contend that in order to gain the most talented applicants an organisation must attract, retain, and promote exceptional employees from all backgrounds (D.R Avery, 2003; McKay, Avery, & Morris, 2008). Jayne and Dipboye (2004) argued that different perceptions and unique ideas within the organisations should be treated as creativity and innovation; thus, engaging in diversity management can be regarded as initiatives progressing company performance. There is some evidence of a positive correlation between effective management of diversity and improved organisational performance. For instance, Barkema, Baum and Mannix (2002) stated that there is a clear link between positive organisational outcomes and effective management of diversity. They also mentioned studies that examine the negative outcomes of diversity, arguing that the effective management of diversity promises both positive outcomes and also a way to eliminate the possible negative consequences of diversity such as conflict in teams. Similarly, Raatikainen (2002) reviewed case study evidence in support of the interplay between diversity management and business performance, revealing a number of advantages such as improved creativity and customer focus through competitive practice of multiculturalism in the workplace. Many studies have demonstrated that the effectiveness with which an organisation manages diversity is associated with
competitive advantage in terms of recruitment and retention (Guzman, 2000; Hart, 2006; Roosevelt, 2006; Witkowski, Ma, & Zheng, 2003).

Apart from providing mixed results, the quality of research on diversity effects is often questionable. Wise and Tschirhart (2000) reviewed 106 empirical, theory testing studies on workplace outcomes of diversity and found reliability, validity, and generalizability to be weak. Originally intending to conduct a meta-analysis of statistical findings, Wise and Tschirhardt found that there were not enough cumulative and consistent findings to do so. Searching for studies that analysed the effects of specific types of diversity upon specific outcomes, there were often less than three studies that addressed the same combination of diversity dimension and outcome. For the rare combinations that offered 10 or more findings, the authors found mixed results, incomparable measures, and a differing use of control variables (L. R. Wise & M. Tschirhart, 2000, p. 391). Moreover, the design of many studies on diversity does not allow any immediate conclusions about effects in and upon actual organisations. While effects on the organisational level are of major importance regarding the business case for diversity management (as it suggests that organisational performance will be increased), effects of diversity have predominantly been studied for individual and group levels. “The lack of empirical research on organisation-level outcomes is troubling, given the emphasis in the literature on the organisational-level benefits of the managing for-diversity approach (L. R. Wise & M. Tschirhart, 2000, p. 389).”

It has also been criticized that a considerable number of studies on diversity effects have measured performance in laboratory settings (e.g. using students as research subjects) which lack so many of the context factors of actual organisations that the applicability of such research is highly questionable (e.g., K. Y. Williams & O'Reilly, 1998; L. Wise & M. Tschirhart, 2000). In contrast, research in real organisations is comparably underdeveloped, especially when it comes to applying reasonably objective performance measures (see Kochan, et al., 2003). With may be just a little overstatement, the researcher argued that while opinions from diversity management practitioners reflect experiences in real organisations, but are rarely based on systematic measurement of effect, a considerable part of the academic research measures effects that might bear little relation to the mechanisms found in actual organisations.
On the other hand, whether the effect of diversity might be rather negative or just not automatically positive, based on empirical research, it is safe to say that diversity does not consistently and under all conditions lead to improvements in team performance. Most research agrees that diversity has the potential for positive effects (like increased creativity, innovation, and flexibility) as well as for negative effects (like worse communication and increased conflicts), and that the actual effects strongly depend upon context factors (see Rushton, 2007; Spataro, 2005) or personal factors (see Derks, van Laar, & Ellemers, 2009; M. A. Hogg & Terry, 2001; Lozano & Etxebarria, 2007; Sotelo, 2000; Van eckert, Gaidys, & Martin, 2012). The question of whether or not diversity increases organisational performance is not so simple. Upon closer examination, it involves a plethora of complex and interdependent variables. Taking into account varying types and degrees of diversity, the multitude of meanings that they might have for social actors (and that only constitutes a ‘type’ of diversity in a proper sense of the term), the multitude of organisational and social context factors that will probably intervene (among them, and not least of all, the effects of management policies), and the multitude of possible outcomes on individual, group, and organisational levels, it may not come as a surprise that research does not provide a simple answer (Dickie & Soldan, 2008).

Although it seems that while the literature has an overview of the context factors that do play a role, in the end the impact of diversity upon performance will be either positive, negative, or none at all, and literature do not have a coherent and tested theory able to exactly explain and predict the outcomes in real world situations. It seems that managing diversity is a strategy to fully utilise the differences between all employees to create the most effective organisation and diversity management may change diversity effects. That is, the purpose of this research is to understand whether organisational diversity levels could be an effective strategy to facilitate employee attitudes and behaviours, and the findings on the relationship between diversity and employee attitudes and behaviours and highlight practical implications for applying these findings in Taiwanese hotels are also the key. Since diversity involves more than simply race and gender, the focus of this research is not to examine all facets of diversity, but to better understand the influence of diversity levels as a whole. Specifically, organisational diversity levels in this study are measured singly (i.e. compositions of ethnicity in the
hotel, gender in the hotel, age in the hotel, education in the hotel), and the diversity found to be associated most with employee attitudes and behaviours are then utilised to represent organisational diversity in the research as a whole.

2.3 Diversity in Taiwan

2.3.1 Ethnicity

The concepts of ethnicity, ethnic backgrounds and race are usually ill-defined constructs and highly contested terms. According to Spencer (2005), ethnicity is a term used for a population of human beings whose members identify with each other, usually on the basis of a presumed common genealogy or ancestry. Ethnicity can also be based on the recognition by others that a set of people comprise a distinct group or by the possession of common cultural, linguistic, religious, behavioural or biological traits (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2007). Banks (1996) stated that an ethnic group is a group whose members identify with each other, usually on the basis of a presumed common genealogy or ancestry. Ethnicity is a concept that refers to groups distinguished by colour, language, and religion; it covers “tribe,” “race,” “nationality,” and “caste” as indexes of contrast to other groups (Eriksen, 2001).

The concept of ethnic background is an attempt to classify people, not according to their current nationality, but according to commonalities in their social background. The term race refers to the concept of dividing people into populations or groups on the basis of various sets of characteristics and beliefs about common ancestry (Rowe, 2004). Genetic studies have determined that race is connected to genes, which are viewed as predominantly biological factors (Guzman, 2000). However, Abizadeh (2001) argued that neither ethnicity nor ethnic background and race are genealogically or biologically determined; they are social constructs. Similarly, a study by Isaksen and Ekvall suggested that race is more of a social rather than biological construct as there is more genetic variation within races than between races. Thus, the concept of race is more socially meaningful than of biological significance (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2007). However, Bamshad and Steve (2003) suggested that the most commonly used human racial categories are based on visible traits (especially skin colour, facial features and hair
texture such as Asian and Caucasians), and self-identification. For example, Asian was defined earlier as yellow or olive skin, broad face, Mongolian eye form, abundance of head hair, scant beard, small stature, coarse straight hair, a round face, small black eyes and a medium-size, flat nose, whereas Caucasian was recognised as thin nasal aperture ("nose narrow"), a small mouth, facial angle of 100°–90°, with skin colour ranges greatly from pale, reddish-white, olive, through to dark brown tones (S. M. Williams, Templeton, Swallen, Cooper, & Kaufman, 2003). Today, many social scientists used the concept of ethnicity rather than ethnic background and race, to refer to self-identifying groups based on beliefs concerning shared culture, ancestry and history (Bindon, 2005). The researcher adopts the concept “ethnicity” instead of “ethnic backgrounds” or “race’ in this study.

According to the Information Office of the State Council of the People's Republic of China (2005), a list of the 56 ethnic groups in China is officially recognised by the government of the People's Republic of China. The Han Chinese is the largest ethnic group, and some 91.5% of the population is classified as Han Chinese (1.2 billion). China recognises 55 other ethnic groups, numbering approximately 105 million people. They include the Gaoshan (Gāoshān Zú: a collective name for all Taiwanese indigenous groups). The 23 million people in Taiwan can be categorised by ethnic or biological differences into two ethnic groups: Han Chinese and indigenous people (Shih, 1999). That is, ethnic diversity in this study involves two groups: non-indigenous Taiwanese and indigenous Taiwanese. The general data on the Taiwanese indigenous people are shown below.

**Population and the tribes**

There are 439,000 indigenous people in Taiwan, which has a total population of more than 23 million. Nearly 2 per cent of Taiwan’s population is indigenous, which is a similar proportion of the national population to that of Canada (3 per cent) and Australia (1.8 per cent) (Munsterhjelm, 2002). Academic research has found that there were once more than 20 aboriginal tribes living in Taiwan and all belonged to the Austronesian racial group. Blundell concluded that Taiwan might be one of the original homelands of the Austronesians (Blundell, 2001). Bird, Hope and Taylor (2004) further confirmed that Taiwanese indigenous are Austronesian peoples, with linguistic and genetic ties to
other Austronesian ethnic groups, such as peoples of the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia, Madagascar and Oceania. Thus this has made indigenous cultures unique, from native dress to language, as well as darker complexions and different facial features (e.g., round eyes and a more sharp/hooked nose) than other Austronesians.

According to a Taiwanese government report, twelve tribes are identified by the government. They are Atayal, Saisiyat, Bunun, Tsou, Rukai, Paiwan, Puyuma, Amis, Yami, Thao, Kavalan and Truku. Currently, 38% of Taiwanese indigenous peoples are from the Amis tribe; 18% are from the Atayal; another 18% are the Paiwan; and the proportions belonging to other tribes are lower (Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2010). Figure 2.1 indicates their geographical distribution.

![Figure 2.1 Traditional geographical distribution of indigenous tribes](image)


**Resident location**

There are 16 counties in Taiwan. According to a 2010 Taiwanese government report (Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2010), Taiwanese indigenous peoples living in Hualien County, Taitung County and Pingtung County, account for almost half of the total
Taiwanese indigenous population. Taiwanese indigenous peoples living in Taitung County account for 33.1% of the total population in Taitung; 25.5% of the total population in Hualien County; and 6.1% of the total population in Pingtung County. Figure 2.2 indicates administrative divisions of Taiwan.

![Figure 2.2 Map of administrate divisions in Taiwan](image)


**Unemployment rate**

In 2010, 229,211 indigenous people were employed, and the participation rate in the labour force was 60.3%. The participation rate in the labour force is the ratio between the labour force and the overall size of their cohort. Table 2.1 shows that the unemployment rate for indigenous peoples was 10.3% in May 2003; the rate decreased to 4.3% in December 2005 and increased to 8.9% in September 2009; and the rate as of December 2010 was 5.1%.
Looking into the reasons for the decrease in the unemployment rate in December, 2005, the Taiwanese government reported that the proportion of indigenous persons employed in paid jobs in December 2005 was 1.5% higher than in May 2004, which is an increase of 13,129 jobs. However, the indigenous unemployed rate (4.3%) was still higher than the national average (3.9%) in 2005. The greatest increase in indigenous employment occurred in the construction sector, followed by the manufacturing, wholesale and retail sectors. It appears that increases in the numbers of indigenous peoples employed in these industries at the end of 2005 were the major reason for the decline in their unemployment rate. In 2010, 11,618 people were unemployed, indicating an unemployment rate of 5.1%. Compared to 8.9% in December 2009, the rate has decreased significantly, although it is still higher than that of the general population, which is 4.7% (see Table 2.1).

It seems clear that the indigenous employment rate is not only higher but also more volatile than that of the general population. This might be because Taiwanese indigenous are distinct ethnically from non-indigenous Taiwanese both culturally and linguistically. This increases the potential for Taiwanese indigenous to be labelled as an “other” and different which could lead to stereotyping them as lazy, unproductive, consumers of alcohol, and lawless, or good at singing and dancing and natural born athletes (Munsterhjelm, 2002). Such stereotypes could influence the behaviour of prospective employers. This is very similar to what happens in Australian for First Nation people.

Table 2.1 The unemployment rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous people</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average monthly income per person

In December 2010, the average monthly income in Taiwan was approximately 36,128 NT dollars (1,205 AUD). The average monthly income for indigenous people was 25,368 NT dollars (846 AUD), which is 70.2% of the national average.
**Employed persons by industry**

Most indigenous people were employed in manufacturing (15.6%), followed by the construction industry (13.2%) and agriculture, forestry, fishing and animal husbandry (8.9%) in 2010. Most are employed in unskilled or semi-skilled labouring jobs. The proportions of indigenous people working in the “agriculture, forestry, fishing and animal husbandry”, “construction”, “other services” and “public administration” sectors were higher than those of the Taiwanese population generally. It can be noted that only 4.8% of indigenous people worked in the “hospitality industries”, which was lower than the overall 6.3% national average in 2005. However, by 2010 the percentage of indigenous people working in hospitality industries had climbed to 8.5%, compared to 6.8% for the population as a whole. One possible explanation is that since 2004 the Taiwanese government has emphasised promoting Taiwanese indigenous tourism (Mo, 2005), therefore promoting opportunities for employment of indigenous people and increasing the percentage of indigenous people working in the tourism and hospitality industry, finally extending beyond the national average in 2010.

**Educational level**

Figure 2.3 indicates that in 2010 36% of indigenous people had a senior high school education, 29% had attained only a primary school education or under, and 22% had finished junior high school. Only 13% of indigenous people had a tertiary education compared to 31% of the general population. The percentage of indigenous people with junior high school education and below was 51%, compared with 36% of the general population. Therefore, it is evident that indigenous people had much lower educational levels than the general population.
2.3.2 Gender

Generally, many people do not distinguish between “sex” and “gender” and consider those two words as interchangeable (Kimball, 2007). Unger and Crawford (1992, p.18) provided two significant reasons for distinguishing sex from gender. First, equating sex and gender can lead to the belief that differences in the traits or behaviours of men and women are due directly to their biological differences, when the traits or behaviours actually may be shaped by culture. Second, keeping the concepts of sex and gender distinct can help people analyse the complex ways they interact in people’s lives.

A number of studies indicate that sex and gender are only two ways of looking at the same division, where sex is a biological difference between males and females, while gender is concerned with psychological, social and cultural differences between men and women (Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008; Wegge, et al., 2008). Specifically, sex refers to the anatomical or chromosomal categories of male and female, whereas gender refers to socially constructed roles that are related to sex distinctions. However, some studies argued that sex is socially constructed. For example, Giddens and Birdsall (2001, p.109) stated that:

we should view both sex and gender as socially constructed products. Not only is gender a purely social creation that lacks a fixed ‘essence’, but the human body itself is subject to social forces which shape and alter it in various ways.

Figure 2.3 The educational level
Meyerowitz (2002, p.3) further argued that:

sex signified not only female and male, but also traits, attitudes, and behaviours associated with women and men. The desires and practices known as masculine and feminine seemed to spring from the same biological process that divided female and male. All came bundled together within the broad-ranging concept of sex.

Therefore, in this study the word “gender” is used to indicate a category of a person’s self-identity as either male or female.

Yuxiu (2002) revealed that Taiwan was rated at the top of “Women’s Power in Asia”, which indicated women in Taiwan were more advanced in terms of political participation and economic empowerment than most Asian countries. This was due to the report of Taiwan’s GEM (Score of Gender Empowerment Measure) as 0.668, which ranked 19th in the world and first in Asia. The GEM is created to measure women’s agency (what women are actually able to do) within a country (Batalova & Cohen, 2002). The Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) captures gender inequality in three main areas: (1) women’s representation in parliament (2) the proportion of women employed as professionals (3) the wage ratio between women and men (Batalova & Cohen, 2002). The GEM was 0.928 (the highest) in Norway and 0.826 in Australia. However, Taiwanese women have not achieved equality in all aspects of life (Rao, Lai, Cai, & Wang, 2003).

According to a Taiwanese government report (Directorate General of Budget Accounting and Statistics, 2011), the percentage of women in the Taiwanese population working in the hospitality industry grew from 2.9% in 2005 to 3.6% in 2010. The percentage of men working in the hospitality industry only grew slightly from 2.3% in 2005 to 2.6% in 2010. In 2010, 64.6% of employees in the Taiwanese hospitality industry were female and 35.4% were male. That is, there is a lack of gender balance in the hospitality industry, as there are more female employees than there are male employees. This seems to be a global phenomenon. In 2006, 56.7% of employees in the Australian hospitality industry were female and 43.3% were male (Deery, Jago, Fredline, & Dwyer, 2006). According to the reported information, Taiwanese hotels have a
majority of women and are primarily non-indigenous, so they are demographically homogenous in terms of ethnicity and gender. In other words, they are more likely to employ a homogeneous workforce of Han Chinese women rather than indigenous people and men. However, organisations that want to remain competitive in today’s business environment must accept the diversity that is present in their employees and in the market place (Guzman, 2000). The hospitality industry, in which increasing globalisation and diversity have become major concerns, now faces the need to develop future managers who can effectively cope with organisational diversity and interact with co-workers and customers of varied cultures (American Hospitality Academy, 2005). Therefore this study attempts to include ethnicity and gender as major components of diversity characteristics in order to explore diversity impacts on employee attitudes and behaviours.

In order to study the topic of diversity in-depth, the relevant theories in similar fields must be examined. The well-established concepts in diversity-related research are that of social identity theory and macrostructural inquiry. Both well-grounded theories have been used to explain what individuals do or how they react in a group based on how different/similar they have perceived themselves to be from others. Therefore social identity theory and macrostructural inquiry are discussed in the following section.

2.4 Social identity theory and macrostructural inquiry

2.4.1 Social identity theory

Several studies have used social identity theory in research on organisational diversity (Chow & Crawford, 2004; Lynch, 2001; Tsai, 2006). In social identity theory, social identity is taken to mean people’s awareness that they belong to a social category or group (Abrams & Hogg, 2012). Tajfel (2010) defined social identity as “that part of the individual’s self-concept which derives from their knowledge of their membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Abrams & Hogg, 2012, p.2). Social identity theory was originally developed to understand the psychological basis of inter-group discrimination. Edwards and Foley (1997) stated that social identity operates as a social construct, rather than at
an individual level. Based on symbolic interactionism, it recognises that people collectively create the reality in which they live by identifying symbolically with certain categories. According to the social identity theory, individuals tend to classify themselves and others into various social categories (Tajfel, 2010). Individuals define, describe, and evaluate themselves in terms of social categories and apply the norms of conduct of the ingroup onto themselves (M. A. Hogg & Terry., 2000). Therefore, they attach meanings to objects arising from social interaction, and perceive the fate of the group as their own (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Based on observation and inference they are subject to change and modification, and assist individuals to determine what behaviours and responses are appropriate during exchanges.

Abrams and Hogg (2012) mentioned that there are two important processes involved in social identity formation, self-categorisation and social comparison, and these produce different consequences. Self-categorisation is a way of thinking about the self and others that emphasise memberships in groups, rather than personal qualities. However, McGarty (2001) suggested that social identity should also include social categorisation, as it is a separate issue to self-categorisation, which is the individual's level of identification with a group. Although a person may perceive themselves to be a member of a particular group, that group may or may not be an important part of the individual's self-concept. When the group is important, individuals tend to be merged in the group and perceive themselves as fairly typical of the group (Chattopadhyay, Tluchowska, & George, 2004). Social categorisations are used to order the social environment in groupings of people, which are assigned to the individual (Tajfel, 2010). It provides order by assigning prototypical features of the category (e.g., stereotyping), however, stereotypes are not necessarily reliable for predetermining behaviour (John C Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994). Social categorisations not only provide the individual with a systematic way of defining others but also allow the individual to define him or herself within the social environment as opposed to being separate from the social context (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Social comparison is the process of comparing oneself to others in both the in-group (e.g. looking for similarities) and the out-group (e.g. looking for differences) (Tajfel, 2010). Social comparison draws on social cognition in the context of individual
differences (Buunk & Gibbons, 2007). This process recognises that individuals are driven to compare themselves to similar others or to those slightly better on relevant dimensions (Abrams & Hogg, 1990). They often choose to compare themselves with those perceived to be better, in the desire and belief they belong to the same category. The association between self evaluation affiliation choices has implications for problem solving and emotional regulation (Exline & Lobel, 1999). For example, Tajfel (2010) attempted to identify the least conditions that would lead members of one group to discriminate in favour of the in-group to which they belonged and against an out-group. During the social comparison process, a person assesses whether the other person is similar to them. If they judge that they are similar, the other person is considered to be part of the in-group, while if they are judged to be dissimilar, they are considered to belong to the out-group. This is particularly relevant because social identity becomes important where the category includes the individual since it holds a degree of emotional and value significance. These processes of social identity are self contained units with different emphases. However, they are not mutually exclusive. When combined they complement each other to the extent that they are proximally intertwined (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). According to social identity theory, when diversity increases, social categorisation, social identity, and social comparison processes occur. In-groups/out-groups and personal biases may emerge, creating barriers to social intercourse. Thus, as perceived dissimilarity in the groups reaches certain levels, the psychological processes associated with social identity theory may be more likely to occur. These processes generate individual behaviours such as solidarity with others in an ethnic or gender-based group, conformity to the norms of one’s group, and discrimination against out-groups (Tsai, 2006). For instance, Williams and O’Reilly (1998) found that cultural homogeneity in management groups may increase satisfaction and cooperation and decrease emotional conflict. On the other hand, Schaubroeck and Lam (2002) argued that demographic heterogeneity indicates negative attitudes towards supervisors and peers. However, social identity theory may not hold true among similar groups. Social identity theory predicts that groups that are similar should be especially motivated to show intergroup differentiation. A study by Brown (2000) noted, “groups perceiving themselves to hold similar norms of attitudes, or to enjoy equivalent status, have been found to show more intergroup attraction and less
bias than dissimilar groups”. Specifically, Brown (2000) found that the schoolchildren actually moderated their levels of in-group bias in performance evaluations when the children believed they were engaging in a cooperative task with a school of equivalent status. Based on this example it seems that social identity theory has a shortcoming. However, all is not lost, instead of rejecting this theory completely, the researcher chose to embrace the elements of it that help this study better understand diversity impacts and provide a basic framework for understanding complex social situations in the work place.

In the Western context, social identity theory primarily reflects an intergroup orientation, rather than emphasising intragroup relations. Social identity theory identifies intergroup comparison as a key source of in-group identification. In contrast, the North-East Asia context is often considered as having a collectivistic focus, which is based largely on the promotion of cooperative behaviours and maintenance of relational harmony within groups (Hofstede, 2001). As a result, the Asian perception of self is personally connected with other members of the in-group. Asians’ in-group representations involve a network of such interpersonal connections rather than a differentiation between in-groups and out-groups. On the basis of traditional social identity theory and the characteristic of North-East Asia collectivism, the researcher argues that contrary to group identification as understood by social identity theory, North-East Asia collectivism is an intragroup rather than an intergroup phenomenon. In keeping with this point of view, it can be suggested that Westerners (culture of individualism) tend to demonstrate stronger in/out-group membership than do people in the North-East Asia culture of collectivism. Social identity theory predicts that groups that are similar should be especially motivated to show intergroup differentiation. However, social identity theory may not hold true among similar groups. Social identity theory has shortcomings. Instead of rejecting this theory completely, the researcher chose to embrace the elements of the social identity (e.g, categorisation, identification and comparison) that help this study better understand diversity impacts and provide a basic framework for understanding complex social situations in the work place.
Similar to social identity theory, Byrne’s (1971) similarity-attraction paradigm suggested that similarity of race could elicit the positive outcomes associated with homophily. Homophily is a principle that helps explain social interactions between individuals who share similar characteristics. Byrne’s (1971) original conceptualization of the similarity-attraction paradigm was that individuals are attracted to one another on the basis of perceived similarities in attitudes and values. Upon initial contact, individuals use observable demographic characteristics to infer similarity on such attributes as socioeconomic status and competence. These cognitive cues effect an individual’s expectations about task and interpersonal interactions prior to having any other interaction with the target individual. This process can subsequently affect group performance through reduced psychological commitment and group cohesiveness, more frequent absences and lowered intentions to stay in the group. Similarity-attraction and its effects on dyadic and group interactions have been addressed in terms of people’s tendency to form homophilous relationships. These tendencies suggest that the interpersonal attraction initiated by racial similarity within a group would affect group performance by enhancing communication, and trust within the group. Thus, both similarity-attraction paradigm and social identity theory indicated that that individuals use race as a means of classifying themselves and others into groups which they perceive as having differing levels of social attractiveness. This identification process facilitates favourable behaviour toward those perceived as being similar to the individual, but leads to discriminatory behaviour toward out-group members. These existing theories suggest group member perceptions of racial diversity within their group would tend to have negative effects on group performance by reducing interpersonal attractiveness and, consequently, reducing interaction between group members.

Similarity-attraction paradigm is closely related to social identity theory; however, the former elaborates the intervening processes that occur between recognition of a referent other as similar and the ensuing favourable assessments of the referent other. In particular, the similarity-attraction paradigm posits that individuals who are similar will be interpersonally attracted. Because of this attraction (liking), they will experience
positive outcomes. Although similarity-attraction occupies a central position in the social identity theory, it differs in its focus on the interpersonal level, compared to the social identity theory which focuses on the group level. The premise of the similarity-attraction paradigm is that high order attraction is based on the individual’s need to evaluate themselves for similarity of features, such as abilities, attitudes, values, opinions, and experiences (e.g., Baskett, 1973). The possession of similar characteristics encourages attraction where they are observable and/or valued by those within the interaction, since behaviour becomes more predictable validating an individual’s beliefs and attitudes. By contrast, divergent attributes will lower attraction and therefore individuals would be more likely to direct their networking strategies to those sharing similar attributes. It seems clear that the similarity-attraction paradigm was developed to understand interpersonal relationships. Yet, individuals can express preferences for membership in particular groups even when they have had no prior social interaction with members of that group. This suggests that the dyadic-level similarity-attraction paradigm may not account for all the reported demographic effects, especially when actual interaction between participants is unlikely or limited. Social identity theory provides both a cognitive and motivational perspective on the origins and consequences of group identification. Ultimately, social identity arises when individuals put themselves and others into salient social categories that allow comparison among the resulting groups. Therefore social identity theory is more applicable than the similarity-attraction paradigm as the theoretical framework in the current research.

**Social identity in collectivistic and individualistic cultures**

Social identity theory suggests that belonging to certain groups occurs through categorization and affective components that are associated with group memberships (Tajfel, 2010). Social identification with a group provides individuals with a certain level of comfort that can lead to positive outcomes when interacting with fellow group members, for instance agreement and information sharing (M. A. Hogg & Terry, 2001). Additionally, social identity is a relevant construct that can help group members understand and avoid detrimental real-world consequences. These include phenomena, such as peer pressure, faulty decision-making, and intergroup hatred (Gonzalez, 2001). These are some of the reasons researchers, such as Chattopadhyay (2004), and Brewer
and Yuki (2007) have investigated identity models as a strategy to mitigate negative consequences, such as intergroup bias. As a result, this construct is becoming more commonplace in the understanding of multicultural team processes and outcomes.

However, before insights from social identity theory can be of a greater contribution to modern-day organisations, a better understanding of how this construct is viewed across cultures is needed. For instance, Yuki (2003) pointed out that how social identities can signal which behaviours are appropriate. The researcher argued that these behaviours can be shaped differently across social contexts. Similarly, individuals across the globe hold different cultural orientations in regards to views of power and group memberships (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 1991), which in turn leads to the assumption that identity emerges differently across cultures. Specifically, differences in cultural styles can be accounted for by five dimensions of culture and these dimensions consist of (1) individualism/collectivism, (2) power distance, (3) uncertainty avoidance, (4) masculinity/femininity and (5) long- versus short-term orientation (Hofstede, 2001). Hofstede’s cultural dimensions have created patterns of values and thoughts, but there could be a misunderstanding caused by the stereotyping of each culture and society. It is a good approach to the reality but not everyone in a society fits the cultural pattern. There is enough statistical regularity however, to identify trends and tendencies (Marcus, 2002). The dimensions could also help researchers understand the way people select the sources of and the way people access information, Hofstede’s approach excludes differences between people within a nation. The national characteristics that Hofstede claimed to uncover are actually national stereotypes. While the statement may be true for many people within a culture, there are many others within the culture for which it is not true. In response to the weakness of the cultural dimensions, Hofstede (2002) said “I never claim that culture is the only thing we should pay attention to. In many practical cases, it is redundant, and economic, political or institutional factors provide better explanations. But sometimes they do not, and then we need the construct of culture.”

Despite mixed critics regarding the cultural dimensions, the dimension of individualism describes the relationship between the individual and the collectivity that can be found in a given society (Hofstede, 2001). While this relationship is reflected in the way people live together, it is also linked to societal norms and associated value systems.
Therefore, it affects the individuals’ mental programming and guides their behaviours. Behaviours of those individuals that belong to a society with a more individualistic value system would then be focussed on the individual. Whereas individuals that are part of a culture with a more collectivistic value system direct their behaviours towards goals that are oriented towards the collective. Both internal and external social capitals are linked to the interactions within a collective or between collectives. The researcher argues that the extent of interaction within and between collectives is weaker in those societies that are more individualistic, while it is stronger in those that are more collectivistic.

On the basis of the notion between social identity theory and collectivism/individualism, the researcher argues that contrary to group identification as understood by social identity theory, collectivism is an intragroup rather than an intergroup phenomenon. In keeping with this point of view, it can be suggested that people in a culture of individualism tend to demonstrate stronger in/out-group membership than do people in culture of collectivism. Consequently, the importance of this construct calls for a better understanding of its cross-cultural role and its operationalization. Therefore, one of the purposes of this study is to find out whether concepts of social identity theory are applicable in a North-East Asian context (collectivism).

2.4.2 Macrostructural inquiry

“Macrostructural inquiry is concerned with the patterns of social relations among different social positions occupied by many persons, not with the networks of all relations between individuals” (Blau, 1977a, p.29).

Erez and Gati (2004) suggested that organisations with different levels of diversity experience dissimilar dynamics and organisational outcomes via the concept of macrostructural inquiry. Specifically, within homogeneous groups, group members tend to communicate with one another more often and in a greater variety of ways, perhaps because they share worldviews and a unified culture resulting from in-group attachments and shared perceptions. Kim (2002) mentioned that Blau’s macrostructural inquiry is useful for explaining diversity impact within workplaces. The foundation of the macrostructural inquiry is a quantitative conception of social structure in terms of
the distributions of people among social positions that affect their relations (Blau, 1977b). As the definition of social structure starts with the idea of differences among people, this could be applied to employees in the organisational context. In Blau’s theory, in-groups with high levels of cultural heterogeneity, casual social contacts and communication are more likely to involve members of different racial/gender groups. Further, the in-group pressures that inhibit social interaction with out-group members should be weakened (Blau, 1977b). One possible explanation is that heterogeneity on nominal parameters (observable diversity such as ethnicity and gender) promotes more opportunities for inter-group communication and interaction. For instance, in extreme cases, if all members of a given population are white, there is no opportunity for interracial communication. In a population that is racially heterogeneous, on the other hand, interracial communication and interaction are difficult to avoid and therefore group conflict might be reduced (Blau, 1977a, 1977b). Blu’s analysis of race and ethnic relations provides a useful illustration of this theorem. The logical implication of this formulation is that majority group members are less likely to have relations with minority group members than are minority group members with actors belonging to the majority group. This makes it more likely that stereotypes and prejudicial beliefs held by the majority group will remain unchallenged and persist due to their lower rates of interaction with minority group members.

Research guided by macrostructural inquiry suggests that since group members will be more evenly diffused over the categories of cultural diversity, in-group/out-group identities will be reduced while the chances of interracial communication and interaction increase (Ben-Ner, McCall, Stephane, & Wang, 2009). Likewise, Earley and Mosakowski (2000) demonstrated that in management groups with high heterogeneity, out-group discrimination is less likely to happen. Additionally, few common bases for subgroup formation and social identity formation are likely to exist in management groups with relatively high levels of diversity. That is, whereas heterogeneity creates barriers to social interaction, high levels of heterogeneity could actually break down these barriers, because intergroup associations and interactions depend on opportunities for social contact (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; McMillan-Capehart, 2005).

*Macrostructural inquiry compared with contact theory*
Accordingly, macrostructural theory predicts a positive association between peoples’ contact with specific racial–ethnic out-groups and having friends who belong to those out-groups (Blau, 1977a). However, this general prediction is consistent with a somewhat different sociopsychological theory that has been developed in connection with the so called contact theory (Allport, 1954), which predicts that exposure to members of other racial–ethnic groups will reduce prejudice, foster more favourable perceptions of intergroup relations, and increase openness to intimate social ties that cross racial–ethnic lines. Some literature emphasized that contact should only have this beneficial effect on attitudes when the resulting interaction occurs under several facilitating conditions (Bossert, 1988; D. W. Johnson & Johnson, 1992). Allport’s (1954) influential early formulation of what might be called the weak form of the contact theory emphasized the importance of equal status, shared goals, intergroup cooperation, and support from authority figures, and suggested that, if these facilitating conditions are absent, contact is unlikely to lead to more favourable attitudes. A study further added the importance of contact that is relatively frequent and intimate (J. C. Dixon, 2006).

It seems clear that Blau (1977) based his theory on a random-mixing context: the greater the opportunity for people to meet, the greater the likelihood that relationships form. On the other hand, Allport ‘s contact theory in 1954 situated interracial mixing within a setting’s status hierarchy, identifying three characteristics that explain why contact leads to friendship in some settings and conflict in others. The first characteristic is the status equality of the participants. If the setting is structured such that positional hierarchy is correlated with race, then interracial friendships are unlikely and stereotypes about inherent group differences will be magnified (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). Second, cooperative interdependence is expected to foster intergroup relations (D. W. Johnson & Johnson, 1992). Third, the most effective groups are those organized around a common goal that cannot be achieved independently (Schofield, 1995).

Such considerations suggested that the weakness of the contact theory implies that the environment without under certain conditions (e.g., equal status or common goal), the interactions between members of different social groups are less likely to happen. However, the researcher argued that contact does not result in positive generalizations
being made to the whole group but rather people recognise that not all individuals’ status, values, goals are representative of their group. Contact theory has also been criticized for assuming a causal relationship between contact under ideal conditions and a reduction in prejudice when there are alternate conclusions that can be drawn from the research findings. One study argued that the optimal conditions (e.g., the group members with equal status or common goal), required for prejudice reduction make the contact theory inapplicable to the real world (J. Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005). The conditions for optimal contact are not characteristic of most casual encounters between groups and because of this it has been suggested that casual contact is not sufficient in reducing prejudice (Ellison & Powers, 1994; Robinson & Preston, 1976). Other studies also argued that even contact under ideal conditions might not result in the in-group making positive generalizations towards the out-group. In-group members might view those they come into contact with as atypical and subcategorize those individuals as exceptions to their particular social group (Baumeister & Bushman, 2010; Chrisler & Erchull, 2011).

That is, the researcher summarised that Blau's (1977) theory is more flexible and sets less limits than contact theory concerning the specific spatial context within which opportunities for or actual contacts take place. Drawing on Blau's macrostructural inquiry, the researcher argued that by working with diverse workforce as a phenomenon can be subsumed under the broader conceptual framework of intergroup relations. Macrostructural inquiry is therefore more applicable than contact theory in this study, because organisational diversity promises differentiation and the researcher agreed that diverse workforce and intergroup relations influence each other and their possibilities depend on opportunities for intergroup contacts rather than contacts with ideal conditions (e.g., homogeneity of status and goals). Macrostructural inquiry which has been demonstrated to be useful in explanations of intergroup relations can be readily borrowed to study of organisational diversity as well (Christerson & Emerson, 2003; DiTomaso, Post, & Parks-Yancy, 2007).

In summary, social identity theory suggests that increasing diversity may be associated with a negative relationship in intergroup relationships as social categorisation, social identity, and social comparison processes occur, and in-groups/out-groups and
individual biases would appear and obstruct social interaction. However, macrostructural inquiry argues that different levels of diversity will impact intergroup relationships differently, as in-groups with high levels of diversity, general contacts and communication will be more likely to involve group members of different racial or gender groups, and therefore the in-group pressures that restrain social interaction with out-group members will actually be reduced (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000; McMillan-Capehart, 2005; Richard, Barnett, Dwyer, & Chadwick, 2004). Based on these two theories, the researcher provides an integrated theoretical framework which focuses on the effects of different levels of organisational diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours.

2.5 Relationship between Employees and Customers

In the hospitality industry, most organisations are service-oriented. Customer satisfaction and loyalty always come from the experience of customer-perceived services, which implies the relationship between employees and customers is important (see Barsky & Nash, 2003; Bowen & Ford, 2002). Brotherton (1999) identified some major characteristics of service, such as relative intangibility, simultaneous production and consumption, and customer participation in the production of service. That is, compared with manufactured goods, services are less tangible; are produced, delivered, purchased and consumed simultaneously; and customers often participate in the production of their own services. These features imply that customer experience directly affects customer satisfaction, purchase decision, and loyalty, and that front-line employees have a tremendous burden of responsibility because customer interactions with them form the central part of customer experience. The interaction and relationship between what service employees give and what customers demand become significant factors for the hospitality industry and the industry should not only focus on employees but also consider customer needs to achieve superior market performance in terms of sales, market share, and profitability. Similarly, central to service-dominant logic is the proposition that the customer becomes a co-creator of value and this emphasises the development of customer–supplier relationships through interaction and dialog (Humphreys & Grayson, 2008).
Co-creation is a form of marketing strategy focusing on customer experience and interactive relationships (Payne, Storbacka, & Frow, 2008). Co-creation allows and encourages a more active involvement from the customer to create a value-rich experience. In the traditional conception of process of value creation, consumers were “outside the firm.” Value creation occurred inside the firm (through its activities) and outside markets. The concept of the “value chain” epitomised the unilateral role of the firm in creating value (Payne, et al., 2008). It seems that service-dominant logic implies customer relation through the definition that value is co-created with the customer. It is a foundation of this new logic that benefits arise by the collaboration of multiple parties to fulfill the needs of the consumers. The service-centred view is a restatement of the customer orientation. Consumer orientation is just a modification of the goods-dominant logic that should solve the problems which arise by a strict focus only at the manufactured output, without taking the needs of the customers into consideration. But the focus of the goods-dominant approach still lies on the tangible output of production and it is only an “add-on” to also look at the desires of the customer needs. Service-dominant logic is built on the foundation of the co-creation of value, so that the consumer orientation becomes redundant and is already integrated.

The researcher also argues that it is not correct to identify service-dominant logic as an outcome of the excellent customer responsiveness to so-called “service” companies. The traditional goods-dominant view is strongly integrated, so that even organisations or companies which are mainly classified as service organisations like hospitals see themselves from a goods-dominant view and often miss consumer needs by denying the idea of co-creation of value. This is also an outcome of the idea of a strict distinction between goods and services, which is actually a part of hospitality businesses. In this view, services are seen as a special sort of goods, with the absence of some attributes like “tangibility, separability of production and consumption, standardisability, and inventoriability” (Vargo, Lusch, & Akaka, 2010). The researcher also argues that sometimes it is not the tangibility which is bought. Sometimes tangible goods are only bought because of the intangible services that they provide, like the visible of service skills. Both the tangible and the intangible are needed to enhance marketing possibilities. Co-creation has a customer focus which is not the aim of this study. This information can be used by the researcher in a future study.
Moreover, in Rucci et al. (1998) study that the Employee-Customer-Profit Chain model is a process that outlines the relationships among employees, customers and organisational profits (see Figure 2.4). In this model, variables include employee attitudes and behaviours and customer impressions (e.g. satisfaction and loyalty). Specifically, employee attitudes are represented by their attitudes toward the job and the company. These attitudes have a greater effect on employee behaviours such as job performance and turnover than all other dimensions. In turn, employee behaviours affect customer satisfaction (e.g. emotional satisfaction and the level of service as perceived by the customer) and loyalty, which were measured by retention and recommendations to new customers. Customer retention and recommendations to new customers would directly impact organisational revenue growth.

**Figure 2.4 Employee-Customer-Profit chain**


Hwang and Chi (2005) recommended that service persons (employees) are the most important resource in the hospitality industry and are the primary marketers who provide excellent service to the customer. The present study partly adopts the model of Employee-Customer-Profit Chain (Rucci, et al., 1998) to examine the relationship between service providers (employees) and customers. However, this model does not include any variables that may initially influence employee attitudes; therefore this
model needs to be situated in a socio-cultural context, which will include the broader and diverse inputs which are introduced into the Employee-Customer-Profit Chain by outside personal influences (e.g. ethnicity, gender, age and educational level). It seems that there is a strong relationship between employees and customers and it is important to investigate customer variables in this model. However, due to the large sample size and time constraints of the project, customer variables are omitted. This research explores the effects of the levels of organisational diversity in hotels on employee attitudes and behaviours. The levels of organisational diversity are measured by Blau's (1977b) index of heterogeneity.

2.6 Diversity and Employee Attitudes

In the Employee-Customer-Profit Chain model, employee attitudes are measured by job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Rucci, et al., 1998). Mattila (2006) demonstrated that job satisfaction is a predictor of organisational commitment. Similarly, Dirani and Kuchinke (2011) adopted a quantitative approach to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Dirani and Kuchinke (2011) research data were collected from a convenience sample in five Lebanese banks comprised of 922 participants. The study produced results indicating a strong correlation between job commitment and job satisfaction and indicated that satisfaction was a reliable predictor of commitment. Job satisfaction and organisational commitment are also critical components of employee attitudes that are likely to be influenced by work environment and organisational culture (see Arnett, Laverie, & McLane, 2002; Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, & Gremler, 2002; Lam & Zhang, 2003; R. M. Ma, Hechanova, & Alampay, 2006; Paulin, Ferguson, & Bergeron, 2006)

As this study is based in an organisational diversity context, the interactions between personal attitude and diversity are also considered. Therefore, in this study employees’ attitudes are defined as comprising the three dimensions of work and diversity-related attitudes: job satisfaction; organisational commitment; and attitude to diversity. Each dimension is discussed below.
2.6.1 Job satisfaction

In any industry, employee satisfaction is an important factor of which management should be aware. Satisfaction is defined as the level of pleased feeling of participants with the organisation and with their jobs (Schmidt, 2007). Employee job satisfaction is always a major concern for employers, as low job satisfaction is associated with low service quality and reduced customer satisfaction (Batt & Moynihan, 2002; Karatepe & Ekiz, 2004). Low job satisfaction can also cause health complaints (Waddell & Burton, 2004), but also results in higher employee turnover rates (Shields & Ward, 2001). In earlier studies, job satisfaction is explained as a pleasurable or positive feeling resulting from the evaluation of one’s job (Niemann & Dovidio, 2005) and refers to a positive affective reaction by individuals to their jobs. In other words, job satisfaction refers to employees recognising that they are contributing to the overall achievement of organisational goals (Waddell, 2004).

Job satisfaction is a multidimensional construct examining a person’s satisfaction with different elements of the job (e.g. pay, tasks, and relationships). Substantial numbers of research have indicated that job satisfaction is positively associated with levels of job position, management status and income (Aronson, Laurenceau, Sieveking, & Bellet, 2005; Clark, Kristensen, & Westergard-Nielsen, 2009; Fang, 2001; Klinefelter, 1993; Parker, 2007). The characteristics of the work-environment have also been found to be one of the variables having an impact on job satisfaction (Price & Wulff, 2005). Niemann and Dovidio (2005) found job-related feedback, affirmative action and the social environment to be significant determinants of job satisfaction. Personal characteristics such as ethnicity, age and gender have been found in many studies to be related to job satisfaction (Price & Wulff, 2005). Green et al. (2005) also indicated that employees are an organisationally important resource and managers commonly seek methods, techniques, and processes that could enhance employee satisfaction. Therefore, an investigation of the ethnicity, age and gender differences or other related characteristics of employees becomes crucial.

Job satisfaction has also been found to correlate with a number of antecedent variables involving organisational culture. Organisational culture can be seen as the recurring
patterns of attitudes, behaviour and perceptions of the way things are within the organisation (Isaksen & Ekvall, 2007). Some research has examined the relationship between perceived diversity culture (i.e. organisational and personal dimensions) and job satisfaction (Wheeler, Coleman, Brouer, & Sablenski, 2007). Specifically, Heilman and Chen (2005) revealed that women were more likely to report their workplace as being less inclusive and fair compared to men and they also suggest future research should examine the relationship between perceptions of diversity and job satisfaction as well as other outcome variables (e.g. organisational commitment).

Ethnicity and gender have been found by a number of studies to be related to job satisfaction (Castro, Douglas, Hochwarter, Ferris, & Frink, 2003; Mueller, Finley, & Porter, 2001; Price & Wulff, 2005). Several studies found that men and women do not differ on organisational job satisfaction (S. Corbin, 2001; Porter, 2001; Savicki, Cooley, & Gjesvold, 2003; Velde, Bossink, & Jansen, 2003) and that there were no significant differences in job satisfaction between different ethnicities (Eisa, Mutar, & Abduljalil, 2005).

Moreover, Seifert and Umbach (2008) found that female academics are less satisfied compared to their male peers. These findings are consistent with the findings of Halpin and Johnston (2004) as well as Okpara et al. (2005). For example, Halpin and Johnston (2004) found that in British universities, female academics are less satisfied with their salary as compared to male academics (e.g., $7912 USD a year less than male). Okpara et al. (2005) also indicated that in colleges and universities in the United States, male teachers recorded higher overall job satisfaction compared with female teachers. Okpara et al. (2005) further explained that this may be because male academic staff have better opportunities to be recognized by the administrators, achieve personal goals, promote their academic rank, get managerial posts and participate in the process of decision making. In addition, female academic staff are confronted with two different demands; family and institutional demands. This imposes bilateral pressure on female academic staff and therefore, they showed lower satisfaction compared to their male colleagues. However, this finding contradicts those of Santhapparaja and Alam (2005) who showed that female lecturers are more satisfied compared with their male colleagues due to the fairness of treatment in the workplace. Brown and Sargeant (2007), also observed that
there is no significant difference between male and female faculty members in terms of job satisfaction. Since there are mixed results with regard to gender impacts on job satisfaction, the researcher argued that the factors such as salary and fairness of work environment are more important antecedents of job satisfaction than just simply gender differences. Hence, considering female workers’ needs and requests, paying attention to their ideas and recommendations, recognizing their performance, providing the same level of salary and opportunities for promotion as male workers in order to create a fair work environment, could be seen as strategies to eliminate gender differences in levels of job satisfaction.

Theories such as social identity theory and self-categorisation theory suggest that individuals within organisations classify themselves and then identify with superiors and organisational members of similarly categorised demographics (Tsui, et al., 2002; Young & Buchholtz, 2002). These theories predict that demographic dissimilarity will lead to dissatisfaction and a lack of commitment to the organisation on the part of minority members (Chattopadhyay, Tluchowska, & George, 2004). For example, Schaaafsma (2008) found that workers from minority groups, particularly minority ethnic groups, express less positive attitudes to working in an organisation when they find themselves in a minority within workgroups. Earley and Mosakowski (2000, p.256) argued, however, that high levels of demographic dissimilarity in the organisation could also help decrease these negative attitudes, as group members will be more evenly diffused over the categories of demographic diversity, and in-group/out-group identities will be reduced. The organisational demography perspective points out that workgroup composition (e.g. ethnicity, gender, age, educational level, and duration of employment) affects individual employee attitudes. Co-workers can mediate this relationship.

Mixed results about the relationship between diversity and job satisfaction have been reported (Chattopadhyay, et al., 2004; Price & Wulff, 2005; Savicki, et al., 2003). Job satisfaction is included as one measure of work-related attitudes in this study to determine whether there are differences among employees from organisations with different levels of diversity.
2.6.2 Organisational commitment

Organisational commitment refers to an individual’s attitudes about the organisation as a whole (O'Driscoll, Pierce, & Coghlan, 2006). Organisational commitment has been an area of interest in organisational research for many years, both as an antecedent variable and as an outcome (Chuo, 2003). Organisational commitment is defined as “a psychological state that (a) characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organisation, and (b) has implications for the decision to continue or discontinue membership in the organisation” (Meyer, David, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Commitment can take different forms and can be directed at different constituencies within the organisation (Powell & Meyer, 2004). Similarly, Dee et al. (2006) argued that a strongly committed employee might be more willing to accept organisational changes that are recognised as beneficial to their work. Moreover, a strongly committed employee might be expected to refuse to accept judgements that are critical of the organisation. As Williams and O'Reilly (1998, p. 84) noted, the “process of self-categorisation has been shown to be both fundamental and powerful, such that people prefer to work in groups with other in-group members, and when they are in groups with out-group members, their work experiences are likely to be poor”. Thus, in drawing from the empirical research cited above (Fink, Pastore, & Riemer, 2001; K. Y. Williams & O'Reilly, 1998) and self-categorisation theory (J. C. Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), it seems that employees in groups with dissimilar others are likely to have less organisational commitment than persons in homogenous groups. According to Gaertner and Dovidio (2000), there are several factors that contribute to a common in-group identity, including interaction, a common fate, and common goals. Tsui (2004) offered similar propositions, and suggested that creating the organisational goals and missions could lead to a common identity among members of diverse groups.

Earlier studies have found that managing workplace diversity provides organisations with a competitive advantage through the benefits associated with a pluralistic workplace, in particular self-perceptions of competence and organisational commitment (Camp, Saylor, & Wright, 2001; Kirby & Richard, 2000). On the other hand, negative outcomes have been associated with the benefits. When a goal of properly managed diversity is to increase the overall commitment of the workforce in an effort to achieve
competitive advantage, the use of race- and gender-based hiring and promotion preferences has been shown to produce negative reactions in both majority members and the targeted groups alike (Tsui, Egan & O'Reilly, 2002; Dee, Henkin, & Singleton, 2006). For example, Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly (2002) examined white male employees' behavioural and psychological attachments to organisations with racial and gender diversity. Their findings indicated that white men in diverse work groups feel less attachment to the organisation as measured by absenteeism, intentions to remain with the firm, and less psychological commitment. Organisational psychology and sociological research indicated that persons who are different from others in the workgroup have less organisational commitment, perceive less social integration, and have greater intentions to leave the organisations than do persons who are demographically similar to their cohorts (Tsui, 2004). Moreover, Wickham and Parker (2007) demonstrated that employees who perceive their employment is attributable to their demographic status rather than to their qualifications often suffer negative self-perceptions of competence. Similarly, Moynihan and Landuyt (2008) found that women who hold lower positions report low satisfaction with work, less satisfaction with supervisors and co-workers, and less psychological commitment to their organisations. Velde (2003) further established that although organisational commitment increases with age, this type of work attitude decreases with employment duration. In terms of organisational commitment, the negative influence of employment duration was significantly stronger for women than for men. These findings of the potential negative impact of diversity and demographic characteristics on self-perceptions of competence, satisfaction, and organisational commitment do not bode well for pluralism and the achievement of competitive advantage through improved human resources capabilities (Matthewman & Matignon, 2004). Research also indicated that racial dissimilarity is significantly related to lower perceptions of one department's diversity-management strategy (Fink et al., 2001) and a more equitable gender balance of the department is accompanied by "a more rigid demarcation of gender boundaries" (Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing, & Forrest, 1993, p. 266). Cetin (Cetin, 2006) reported that there is a positive correlation between affective and normative commitments related to occupation and organisation. In short, demographic dissimilarity influences employees' work experiences and the associated outcomes such as organisational commitment.
2.7 Diversity and Employee Behaviour

Employee behaviour during service interactions has a clear relationship with customers’ perceptions of service quality (L. L. Berry & Bendapudi, 2003; Brady, Cronin, & Brand, 2002; Wall & Berry, 2007). Customers’ evaluation of employee behaviour has also been found to have a strong effect on customer-retention behaviour (Wall & Berry, 2007). Research has identified a number of factors that affect employees’ work-related behaviour (e.g. job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and turnover) such as individual experience and ability, job security, the immediate work environment, quality of the supervisor–subordinate relationship, discrimination and perceptions of fit (Duffy, Shaw, Scott, & Tepper, 2006; Goldman, Gutek, Stein, & Lewis, 2006; Heilman & Chen, 2005; Levy & Williams, 2004; Scullen, Mount, & Judge, 2003). Research on employees in the workplace has focused on their attitudes in general, but little research has mentioned the relationship between employee demographic differences and employee-related work behaviours (e.g. job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and turnover) (Branca, 2008; Lo, Ramayah, & Hui, 2006). Thus, this research attempts to investigate the relationship between employee demographic differences and employee behaviours.

2.7.1 Job performance

Job performance has been defined as “the duties, activities, and accomplishments considered part of the job” (Roth, Huffcutt, & Bobko, 2003, p. 28). For an organisation to be managed effectively, employees must perform their assigned duties and responsibilities; and the organisation must determine for each employee the behaviours that are necessary to achieve effective performance (Rotenberry & Moberg, 2007; Vancouver, 2000). Job performance evaluations have always been an important means of improving workplace effectiveness (Rotenberry & Moberg, 2007).

Research shows that diversity effects job performance. For example, Webber and Donahue (2001) stated that personal demographic characteristics (e.g. age, gender, and ethnicity), social demographic characteristics (e.g. educational background) and organisation-related characteristics (e.g. industry experience) have inconsistent and
indefinite effects on performance. Hambrick (2007) explained that many studies of
diversity used observable characteristics such as ethnicity, age and gender as substitutes
for cognitive or value-based differences between individuals. According to Hambrick
(2007, p. 337), value-based differences such as “executives’ experiences and
personalities serve to filter and distort information in a three-step process: (1) affect
their field of vision (the directions they look and listen), (2) selective perception (what
they actually see and hear), and (3) interpretation (how they attach meaning to what
they see and hear)”. These characteristics are more difficult to evaluate, and therefore
have not received as much research attention (M. D. Johnson & Morgeson, 2004; D.
suggested that two types of moderators, affective factors (e.g. conflict and cohesion)
and task-related factors (e.g. motivation and ability) should be addressed and they could
contribute to the contradictory results of the effects of diversity on performance.
However, as suggested by van Knippenberg and Schippers (2007) and Johnson and
Morgeson (2004), it is difficult to evaluate value-based diversity and in order to avoid
the complexity of this project, this study focuses on personal, social and organisational
factors which are more easily observed.

2.7.2 Organisational citizenship behaviour

Organisational citizenship behaviour has also been a useful concept for theoretical
discussion and has provided substantive support for the idea that job performance is a
defined organisational citizenship behaviour as “individual behaviour that is
discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal reward system, and that
in aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation” (p. 4). Lambert
(2006) defined organisational citizenship behaviour as behaviour that: 1) goes beyond
the basic requirements of the job; 2) is to a large extent discretionary; and 3) is of
benefit to the organisation. That is to say, these behaviours are rather a matter of
personal choice, such that their omissions are not generally viewed as punishable. Lee
and Allen (2002, p.132) also explained “organisational citizenship behaviour as
employee behaviour that is not critical to the task or job, but which serves to facilitate
organisational functioning”. Organisational citizenship behaviour is thought to have an
important impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of work teams and organisations, and therefore contributes to the overall productivity of the organisation. Studies demonstrated that employee attitudes significantly influence subsequent organisational citizenship behaviours, as citizenship appears to consist of discretionary behaviours (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006). How employees perceive the organisation (as evidenced by their attitudes toward it) would likely influence these employees to either perform or hold back such performance (Meyer, et al., 2002; O'Driscoll, et al., 2006; Rioux & Penner, 2001).

Moreover, organisational citizenship behaviour has also been compared to prosocial organisational behaviour (POB). POB is defined as behaviour within an organisation that is aimed at improving the welfare of another coworker (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986). The important distinction here is that this type of behaviour, unlike organisational citizenship behaviour, can be unrelated to the organisation. Thus, someone exhibiting prosocial behaviour could be helping a coworker with personal matter. However, Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006) argued that organisational citizenship behaviours are multi-dimensional and include behaviours that are aimed at other individuals in the workplace such as – organisational citizenship behaviour-individuals (OCBI) while organisational citizenship behaviour-organisational (OCBO) involves behaviours directed at the organisation as a whole.

Many studies showed there was a strong link between organisational citizenship behaviour and diversity. Hunt (2002) found that organisational citizenship behaviour is positive and contributes significantly to tenure. Ehigie and Otukoy (2005) also found organisational citizenship behaviour was associated with tenure while examining how perceived organisational support and perceived fair interpersonal treatment relates to organisational citizenship behaviour and tenure as a controllable factor. Choi (2009) found that variations in tenure increase the degree of group-level organisational citizenship behaviour. Organisational citizenship behaviour has also been seen as valuable for providing substantive support for the view that job performance is a multi-dimensional construct (Van Dick, et al., 2006). Thus, organisational citizenship behaviour represents one type of employee-related work behaviour in this study.
2.7.3 Turnover intention

Employee turnover refers to a “group of employee movements that create a vacancy within the organisational unit” (Beach, Brereton, & Cliff, 2003, p.49). Employee turnover always implies a high cost to companies, seriously hindering efficient, effective customer service, and undermining competitiveness so that employee retention is as important to business success as customer retention (Baldrige National Quality Program, 2005; Frank, Finnegan, & Taylor, 2004). Ahmad et al. (2010) reviewed various research studies and summarized that employees’ turnover into a variety of reasons, these can be classified into the following:

- Demographic factors: Various studies focus on the demographic factors to see turnover across the age, marital status, gender, number of children, education, experience, employment tenure.

- Personal factors: Personal factors such as health problem, family related issues, children education and social status contributes in turnover intentions. However, very little empirical research work is available on personal related factors.

Push factors contain organisational factors and attitude factors. According to Loquercio et al. (2006), it is relatively rare for people to leave jobs in which they are happy, even when offered higher pay elsewhere. Most staff have a preference for stability. However, some employees are 'pushed' due to dissatisfaction in their present jobs to seek alternative employment. Organisational factors consist of salary, benefits and facilities; size of organisation (the number of staff in the organisation); location of the organisation (small or big city); nature and kind of organisation; stability of organisation; communication system in organisation; management practice and polices; employees’ empowerment. On the other hand, attitudinal factors consist of job satisfaction. Extrinsic factors include variables such as job security, physical conditions/working environment, fringe benefits, and pay. Intrinsic factors comprise variables such as recognition, freedom, position advancement, learning opportunities, nature, and kind of job and social status (workers with a high status position who link their social position with their job and want to retain it) and job stress, ambiguity, role conflict, work-overload and work-family conflicts.
Pull factors: The reasons that attract the employee to a new place of work. In some papers pull factors are named as uncontrolled factors because it is out of the control of organisations. Various pull factors derived from literature are: high salary, career advancement, new challenge and interesting work, job security, good location of company, better culture, life-work balance, more freedom/autonomy, well reputation of organisation, vales, more benefits, good boss.

Tzeng (2002) also suggested more positive work attitudes (e.g. job satisfaction) and higher general job happiness correlate with lower intention to leave a job. Wise and Tschirhart (2000) summarised some research that suggests diversity and diversity programs could actually decrease employees’ turnover intention and the actual turnover rate. Moynihan and Landuyt (2008) and Walker, Field, Giles, Bernerth and Jones-Farmer (2007) also supported the view that encouraging a diverse workforce and practising diversity management could be linked to lower levels of turnover intention. Moreover, Wheeler et al. (2007) found that younger workers and those with higher levels of education are more likely to leave a company than older and less educated staff. This is because education is a form of human capital that can simply and quickly be used in other companies so that staff who are more highly educated are more likely to have greater opportunities to move to another company. Organisational productivity is also one of the challenges that arise as a consequence of turnover (Siong, Mellor, Moore, & Firth, 2006). In the hospitality industry, high staff turnover is a major factor affecting workplace efficiency, productivity and hotel cost structures (Lashley & Chaplain, 1999). The hotel labour market has a dual face; on the one hand, it is difficult to attract suitable labour; and on the other, it has relatively high levels of turnover representing a significant loss of investment in human capital, training and quality. Labour turnover represents a challenge for contemporary HRM strategies and practices as there is no standard reason people leave organisations (Ongori, 2007). Organisations' ability to attract and retain people from diverse cultural backgrounds, may lead to competitive advantages in cost structures and through maintaining the highest quality human resources. Therefore, there is a need to explore the associations between organisational diversity impacts and employee turnover.
2.8 Summary and Research Questions

Despite mixed results regarding the impact of diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours, research and theory clearly indicate that the outcomes of a diversity initiative depend heavily on how the diversity initiative is managed. It is suggested that attracting more diverse employees to organisations is a critical strategy, as a diverse workforce not only increases representation in the labour market but also can be a key strategy for effective diversity management. Managing diversity could help develop higher levels of service quality and image-enhancing opportunities for the hotel industry.

After carefully comparing social identity theory and similarity-attraction paradigm, it seems that social identity theory is well suited to assess the employee attitudes toward job, organisations and diversity and, consequently, the performance of employees. However, the researcher argued social identity theory does not differentiate between groups by cultural context and there is a need to better understand how social identity process across cultures. As a result, this study aims to examine the relationship between levels of organisational diversity and employee attitudes, behaviours and the value employees place on the key company attributes in the Taiwanese hospitality industry.

Based on social identity theory, individuals define themselves through a process of self-identification. In defining oneself as a member of a particular social and organisational category (e.g. based on ethnicity, gender, age, educational background, employment duration and management status), it is likely that some co-workers are viewed as also being members of that category. Specifically, social identity theory notes that individuals tend to support and positively evaluate the groups that embody salient aspects of their social identities because it builds their self-esteem and maintains a positive self-identity. A work unit in which the individual is similar in terms of demographic characteristics may, therefore, increase the individual’s identification with that work group. In turn, it is likely that identification with a work unit enhances support and commitment to it (Ashforth & Mael, 1996). Thus, it is proposed that levels of organisational diversity will be associated with different levels of positive or negative employee attitudes, behaviours and evaluations of the attributes of an organisation. Blau (1977a) recommended that higher levels of group diversity (group heterogeneity) are
associated with lower levels of negative attitudes in groups. In turn, it is proposed that
diversity level will be a significant factor affecting interactions between minority and
majority groups in the Taiwanese hospitality industry. This result in the selection of the
main variables such as employee attitudes, behaviours and key company attributes in
this study.

Finally, the researcher posits that employee attitudes, behaviours and key company
attributes of a hotel will be influenced by levels of organisational diversity.
Organisational diversity levels in this study are measured singly (i.e. compositions of
etnicity in the hotel, gender in the hotel, age in the hotel, education in the hotel), and
the diversity levels found to be most associated with employee attitudes and behaviours
are then utilised to represent organisational diversity in the research as a whole.

In addition to the above, it is posited that employee attitudes and behaviours are likely
to be differentiated by demographic characteristics of employees. Also, the more
satisfied an employee is with the key company attributes that have been provided in the
hotels, the more positive employee attitudes and behaviours they will have in the
workplace. Based on the findings of earlier research, the following major research
questions and sub-questions for this study were developed.

RQ1. To what extent is organisational diversity associated with employee attitudes and
behaviours?

RQ2. What differences do selected demographic characteristics make in regard to
employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels with different levels of
organisational diversity?

   a) Are there differences in employee attitudes and behaviours between hotels
      with different levels of organisational diversity?

   b) Are there differences in employee attitudes and behaviours based on selected
demographic characteristics of employees?

   c) Are there differences in employee attitudes and behaviours based on selected
demographic characteristics of employees within hotels with different levels
of organisational diversity?
RQ3. What is the nature and extent of associations between employee perceived importance and performance of key company attributes within hotels with different levels of organisational diversity?

a) Are there differences between importance and performance of key company attributes in hotels with different levels of organisational diversity?

b) Are there differences between indigenous and non-indigenous employee perceived importance and performance of key company attributes in hotels with different levels of organisational diversity?

c) Does satisfaction with performance of key company attributes predict employee attitudes and behaviours?
Chapter Three

Methodology

3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter discussed how the literature that underpins this research topic was subsequently developed. The purpose of Chapter 3 is to outline the methodological approach and how it addressed the research questions. Chapter 3 includes an overview of research design, instrument-development process, data collection and analysis procedures, and research limitations. The research design is introduced and discussed. The mixed method approach is then justified in relation to the aims of the study. The qualitative and quantitative data-collection approaches are explained, and in each case, sampling procedures, instrument development and analysis methods are discussed. Finally, details of how the data are analysed and interpreted, together with a rationale for the analysis, are presented.

3.2. Research Design

Research design is a framework or blueprint for conducting the research project that specifies the details of implementing the project and lays the foundation for conducting the research (Malhotra, Hall, Shaw, & Oppenheim, 2004). Hanson et al. (2005) stated that research is a multi-step process and can be described as a systematic and organised effort to investigate a specific problem that needs a solution. In this section, the mixed-method approach is explained, justified and described. Lastly, the overall structure of the research design is provided.

3.3. Mixed-Method Research

3.3.1. Research paradigms

Methodology is a research strategy that translates ontological and epistemological principles into guidelines that show how research is to be conducted (Sarantakos, 2005), and principles, procedures, and practices that govern research (Marczyk, DeMatteo, &
Ontology is concerned with assumptions about the variety of phenomena in the world. It is concerned with the nature of reality (Delanty & Strydom, 2003). Delanty and Strydom (2003, p.24) also define epistemology as the study which investigates the possibility, limits, origin, structure, methods and truthfulness of knowledge and how knowledge can be acquired, validated and applied. The positivist research paradigm underpins quantitative methodology. The objectivist ontology and empiricist epistemology contained in the positivist paradigm require a research methodology that is objective or detached, where the emphasis is on measuring variables and testing hypotheses that are linked to general causal explanations (Marczyk, et al., 2010). Positivist research uses experimental designs to measure effects, especially through group changes. The data collection techniques focus on gathering hard data in the form of numbers to enable evidence to be presented in quantitative form (Neuman, 2003).

In contrast, qualitative methodology is underpinned by interpretivist epistemology and constructionist ontology. This assumes that meaning is embedded in the participants’ experiences and that this meaning is mediated through the researcher’s own perceptions (Merriam, 1998). Researchers using qualitative methodology immerse themselves in a culture or group by observing its people and their interactions, often participating in activities, interviewing key people, taking life histories, constructing case studies, and analysing existing documents or other cultural artefacts. The qualitative researcher’s goal is to attain an insider’s view of the group under study. Due to the complex nature of the research study, there was no single paradigm that could satisfactorily deal with all of the required methodological aspects. Therefore, the researcher found it necessary to utilise the quantitative (positivist paradigm) with the qualitative (interpretive paradigm).

One of the limitations of interpretive paradigm is that it abandons the scientific procedures of verification and therefore results cannot be generalised to other situations (Ernest, 1997). Therefore, many positivists question the overall benefit of interpretivist research. Cohen et al. (2003, p. 18) criticised positivist paradigm by arguing that it ignores the moral choices and value judgments scientists make. Positivist ideology ignores the complexity of the world we live in and peoples’ multiple perspectives on events which make theories complex and chaotic. So many variables affect different events and people’s actions that it is impossible to determine an absolute truth. The use
of both paradigms provided the researcher with the ability to statistically analyse the scientific data whilst also recognising the complex psychosocial, sociological, and environmental factors that influence employee attitudes and behaviours. This study utilised data integration to explore and guide the development of diversity impacts on employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels. The process of combining two types of data is referred to as integration (G. R. Taylor, Trumbull, & Taylor, 2000). The fundamental principle of data integration is the application of several method-appropriate strategies for assessing the same phenomenon (Jack & Raturi, 2006), used with methods that are complementary – such as qualitative and quantitative approaches. Data from the qualitative and quantitative components can be integrated at the analysis stage of a mixed methods study and the mixed method provides researchers with several important advantages. It allows more confidence in the research conclusions, it stimulates inventive methods, helps uncover the deviant or off-quadrant dimension of a phenomenon, and different viewpoints are likely to produce some different elements that do not fit a theory or model (Neuman, 2003). Thus old theories are reworked and new empirical theories may be developed.

Quantitative research emphasises quantification in the collection and analysis of data, entailing a deductive approach, whereas qualitative research emphasises words in the collection and analysis of data, which entails an inductive approach (Bryman, 2004). It was an intention of this research that analyses of data go beyond description, and thus involve inductive and deductive methods. Inductive methods involve discovering patterns and themes, whilst deductive methods involve analysing data following an existing framework (Patton, 1990). This study uses both inductive and deductive approaches. In the qualitative phase, semi-structured (inductive), in-depth interviews were used to help explore the role of diversity as an influence in organisations and also help the researcher gain a deeper and richer understanding of participants’ personal attitudes and behaviours in their own words and according to their own perceptions. This approach aids in the construction and design of a conceptual framework to be tested. In the quantitative phase, a set of questions comprising a survey was designed to seek answers to the research questions. Finally, the researcher integrated the results of the quantitative and qualitative research to obtain a more in-depth understanding of the research problem. The semi-structured interviews consisted of seven core questions.
Some of these were open-ended facilitating the development of unique responses. Each interview was unique and depends on response of individual interviewers.

3.3.2. **Rationale for mixed method**

In the period of 1990 to the present, two significant events have occurred for mixed methods approaches. First, the pragmatist position was posited as a counterargument to the incompatibility thesis and second, several seminal works appeared aimed at establishing mixed methods as a separate study approach. Several authors have proposed pragmatism as the best paradigm for justifying the use of mixed method research (see Datta, 1997; Patton, 1990). The philosophy of pragmatism underpins the approach or mixture of approaches that are most effective in a given situation regardless of any philosophical assumptions, paradigmatic assumptions, or any other type of assumptions. Maxcy (2003) provided theoretical justification for the use of pragmatism as an epistemological underpinning for the use of mixed methods. There has been an increased interest in and a great deal of support for the combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches (Creswell, Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson., 2003; Morse, 2003). Creswell (2003) and Rocco et al. (2003) were among other researchers who recommended combining qualitative and quantitative research methods to better measure a psychological trait and to ensure that any observed difference can be attributed to the actual trait. Those who support this approach share the view that qualitative and quantitative approaches should be viewed as complementary, rather than rivals (Jick, 1979). Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003b) suggested that mixed methods designs would become the dominant methodological tools in the social and behavioural sciences during the 21st Century.

The mixed-method approach also receives attention and support in the leisure research context. For instance, Long (2007) suggested that applying mixed-method approaches in leisure, sport and tourism research assists in obtaining more complex information. Other researchers stated the mixed-method approach can actually maximise the strengths of qualitative and quantitative research methods and can minimise the weaknesses of each. That is, this approach could increase the validity and reliability of the research while gathering and evaluating data (Hanson, et al., 2005; Neuman, 2003).
Watts (2000) mentioned that a mixed-method approach is acceptable beyond the sole application of quantitative methods, and it is becoming the modern researcher's methodology of choice. Based on these arguments supporting the use of mixed research methods, this research uses a mixed method following the strategy detailed below.

3.3.3. **Sequential exploratory mixed method**

A mixed-methods approach has been applied in many business, social, educational and behavioural science disciplines (A. Green & Preston, 2005; R. B. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tarver, 2006; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Six major strategies of mixed methods were categorised (Creswell, 2003, 215-219):

- sequential explanatory
- sequential exploratory
- sequential transformative
- concurrent triangulation
- concurrent nested
- concurrent transformative.

The sequential exploratory strategy was adopted for this research. It is characterised by an initial phase of qualitative data collection and analysis, followed by a phase of quantitative data collection and analysis. The researcher identified this strategy as the most appropriate in this study, as the sequential exploratory strategy is used when testing elements of an emergent theory resulting from the qualitative phase and it is also often discussed as the model used when a researcher develops and tests an instrument. According to Creswell and Clark (2007), sequential exploratory strategy involves collecting and analysing first qualitative and then quantitative data in two consecutive phases within one study. The advantage of sequential exploratory strategy is that there are practical benefits to such research because the researcher conducts the two methods in separate phases and collects only one type of data at a time. This means a single researcher can use this design. Additionally, this design feature makes it easier to describe and to report. It is useful to a researcher who wants to explore a phenomenon
but needs to expand on the qualitative findings. A disadvantage of this strategy is the length of time involved in data collection due to having two separate phases.

In sum, the phase of qualitative data collection focused primarily on revealing the differences in employee attitudes and behaviours within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. However, the data collection was limited to one source, being in-depth interviews that involved “detailed exploration with a few cases” (Creswell, 2003, p.16). The goal of the quantitative phase is to expand upon and compare what the researcher found in the qualitative phase. A survey was utilised in the quantitative phase. The conceptual plan of the mixed method is divided into two phases

Phase 1, the qualitative phase, included semi-structured interviews of hotel employees and managers. Ethnic diversity was used to represent the organisational diversity levels in Phase 1 due to less complication of access to the target sample of hotels. The purpose of this qualitative phase was: to obtain information from different sources in order to investigate whether the employment of a diverse work force is a priority for the participating organisations; to explore whether the relationships between the ethnic diversity perceived by the employees and the managers matches the actual ethnic diversity reflected in the organisations’ employee data; to explore the key company attributes that employees consider to be attractive (e.g. harmony of work environment and increasing numbers of ethnic employees), to interpret the meanings of Taiwanese employee attitudes and behaviours in the hotels context, and to examine the association between levels of ethnic diversity in the organisations and employee attitudes and behaviours.

Phase 2, the quantitative phase, consisted of a self-administered survey developed using relevant information from existing literature and theory, coupled with the information gleaned from the semi-structured interviews in Phase 1. The initial purpose of this phase was to assess whether there are any types of organisational diversity levels (e.g. compositions of ethnicity, gender, age or education in the hotel) associated with employee attitudes and behaviours. One type of organisational diversity was found to be more closely related to most employee attitudes and behaviours. Furthermore, the differences in employee attitudes and behaviours within the hotels with different levels
of organisational diversity were assessed. Demographic characteristics were also investigated in order to determine the differences among the respondents’ employee attitudes and behaviours across the organisations. Finally, the importance and performance of key company attributes were examined to determine whether diversity attributes have Taiwanese employee expectations within the hotels with different levels of organisational diversity.

Finally, the researcher used data integration to facilitate the combination of the two types of methods in analysing the data and to show a means of comparing and concluding results.

The following sections of this chapter present a detailed explanation of the qualitative (Phase 1) and quantitative (Phases 2) methods adopted in this research.

3.4. Qualitative Approach (Phase 1)

3.4.1. Methods used in qualitative research

Qualitative researchers use a number of approaches to understand the phenomena they are studying, these include grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenology, life history and conversational analysis (Neuman, 2003). Each discipline seems to have adopted their own preferred type of qualitative methods. For example, an educator might use ethnography, a psychologist might use phenomenology. This is a reflection of a rejection of standardisation in qualitative research (Tesch, 1990). A grounded theory approach is frequently used in qualitative research. In 1967, Glaser and Strauss developed the idea of a grounded theory approach, which is a detailed grounding of knowledge by systematically and intensively analysing data using a process of constant comparison.

Glaser (2002) indicated that grounded theory is presented as a general method, which can use any type of data and is not attached to any one theoretical perspective; it is essentially ontologically and epistemologically neutral. Holton (2007, p. 269) also stated that “this is not to say that classic grounded theory is free of any theoretical lens
but rather that it should not be confined to any one lens; that as a general methodology, classic grounded theory can adopt any epistemological perspective appropriate to the data and the ontological stance of the researcher. Locke (2001) suggested that grounded theory lies closer to an interpretive paradigm than positivist paradigm. The interpretive paradigm supports the view that there are many truths and multiple realities. This type of paradigm focuses on the holistic perspective of the person and environment (K. Weaver & Olson, 2006). Grounded theory included doing qualitative analysis that involves a number of distinct features such as theoretical sampling, certain methodological guidelines such as constantly making comparisons between the pieces of information and the use of several coding phases to ensure consistent conceptual development and density. Grounded theory emphasises the need for developing many concepts and their linkages in order to capture a great deal of the variation that characterises the central phenomena being studied during a research project (Goede & Villiers, 2003). The use of grounded theory in this study could facilitate the emergence of the main themes inductively and ideas from the data which could stand-alone and be developed into propositions to be tested in a subsequent quantitative study. However, the disadvantage of using grounded theory include the fact that the analysis process considered a very subjective process, relying a great deal in the researcher’s abilities (Seaman, 1999) and it is not clear to what extent and for how long the theory can be applied to other situations. According to Strauss and Corbin (A. Strauss & Corbin, 1994), how good a theory is can be judged by closeness of fit between theory and data. The analysis of qualitative data is often tedious and extensively time-consuming According to Green and Preston (2005), many business publications increasingly note the importance and application of qualitative approaches, especially when the research is associated with understanding attitudes, human interactions and perceptions, product preferences and other areas of business. Neuman (2003) recommends that qualitative measurement is inductive, with the goal is to allow the researcher to note specific observations that lead to concepts and themes. During the qualitative phase of the current study, the researcher used the grounded theory approach which could facilitate item development through the identification of the main themes of the research and sorting through data to find examples of words that respondents used when describing the central themes and ideas. Specifically, this followed three
steps: making observations, studying the observations and searching for a pattern (making a statement of what is occurring), and finally making tentative conclusions or generalisations about how some aspect of the respondents’ experiences and behaviours link.

3.4.2. Sample

Target population

Employees in selected hotels comprised the target population. Roy (2003) stated that most of the research on Taiwanese cultural diversity focuses on Taitung county. Taitung was historically a multicultural county due to Hakka immigration in different periods of history and, later, Chinese mainlanders were sent by the governing Nationalist Party for military purposes in the initial years of the Republic of China. Taitung also has the highest percentage (31.6%) of indigenous inhabitants among all of the counties in Taiwan. Existing data indicate that Taitung is the most ethnically diverse county in Taiwan. The researcher therefore chose hotels in Taitung in order to obtain a more representative sample of the ethnic diversity in Taiwan.

The study uses Blau's (1977b) index of heterogeneity to examine the demographic profiles of employees in the organisations. A perfect ethnically homogeneous population has an ethnic diversity index score of 0 while a perfect ethnically heterogeneous population has an ethnic diversity index score of 0.5 (assuming indigenous and non-indigenous employees have equal representation in each category). This study applies this index to separate the participating hotels on the basis of their ethnic diversity index score arranged according to high, medium and low levels.

Sample size

The qualitative phase comprised interviews with a sample of 24 people consisting of eight employees from organisations representing each level of ethnic diversity. Demographic descriptors including criteria such as ethnicity, gender, and job positions are the basis of selection of the target samples.
Sampling procedure

Potential interviewees were located by the snowball sampling method and then purposive sampling was adopted. The definitions of sampling procedures are explained in the following.

- Snowball sampling: The researcher starts by identifying an individual perceived to be an appropriate respondent relevant to the research topic. This respondent is then asked to identify another potential respondent. The procedure is repeated until the researcher has gathered an adequate sample (Creswell & Clark, 2007). With this approach, the researcher uses recommendations to locate the target sample (Sagalnik & Heckathorn, 2004).

- Purposive sampling: Described also as judgmental sampling, which is another form of convenience sampling, purposive sampling is a procedure in which potential participants, who are easily accessible, are handpicked from the population. Purposive sampling attempts to obtain a sample that is representative of the population to ensure the inclusion of a range from one extreme to the other (Sagalnik & Heckathorn, 2004). Purposive sampling can be very useful for situations where the researcher needs to reach a targeted sample quickly and where sampling for proportionality is not the primary concern (Guarte & Barrios, 2006). Using a purposive sample, the researcher is highly likely to get sufficient data from the target sample (e.g. indigenous, female and managers’ groups).

The sampling processes are discussed in the following. The researcher in this study has a history of working in the Taiwanese hotel industry. Having work experience in the hotel made it is easier to get access to the Taiwanese hotel industry in the initial stage of the research. The researcher started contacting previous colleagues in the same hotel, who introduced the researcher face to face to a member of one of his networks - a manager in a hotel with a high level of ethnic diversity. Then the researcher asked the manager to participate in this research, as well as nominate other appropriate employees, and provide their contact details (e.g. email and phone numbers), who might fit the purposive selection criteria such as ethnicity, gender and job positions and who work in
the same hotels, or any other contacts in hotels with low and medium levels of ethnic diversity through snowball sampling procedures. The relevant selected demographic characteristics were listed to determine the distribution of these in the target population so that the researcher could ensure the population is representative of indigenous, non-indigenous, men, women, managers and non-managers in each hotel with different levels of ethnic diversity.

Furthermore, the researcher either visited face to face, phoned or emailed the nominated interviewees from the relevant hotels to ascertain their willingness to participate and to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for the interviews. Before the interviews, an information sheet and informed consent form (see Appendix A & D) were presented to each interviewee in order to ensure that the respondents voluntarily participated and knew their rights with regard to this research, as well as being aware of their right to withdraw their participation at any time.

_Semi-structured in-depth interview_

According to Given (2008), an interview seeks to discover the meaning of central themes in the life world of the subjects and the main task in interviewing is to understand the interviewees’ construction of meaning. Three main types of interviews (structured, semi-structured and non-standardised interviews) can be identified depending on their degree of standardisation (Shank, 2006). During a structured interview, the interviewer asks the same questions in the same order of all the respondents. In contrast, during a non-standardised type of interview, the interviewer asks open questions in whatever way they think is suitable and natural and in whatever order they feel is the most appropriate in the situation. The semi-structured interview combines the advantages of the other two interview types. Shank (2006) indicated that in semi-structured interviews, the interviewer creates the overall structure by setting the main questions. Prompts and probes can be used to fill in the structure and a mixture of closed and open questions can be used. The interviewee has a fair degree of freedom, (e.g. what to talk about, how much to say, how to express it), but the interviewer can assert control when necessary. Common questions are included in each semi-structured
interview to facilitate comparison across the interviews. Each interview flows uniquely according to the perceptions of the interviewer–interviewee relationship.

Semi-structured interviews are also a way of doing in-depth interviewing. In-depth interviewing is defined as

conversation with a purpose – a conversation between researcher and informant focusing on the informant’s perception of self, life and experience, and expressed in their own words. It is the means by which the researcher can gain access to and subsequently understand, the private interpretations of social reality that individuals hold (Minichiello, Aroni, E., & Alexander, 1995, p. 81).

It is a recommendation that the researcher develops an interview guide or schedule around a list of topics with more flexible and open questions than those included in a questionnaire so that the interview questions can be openly discussed while the focus can remain safely aligned with the research questions. Although this phase of study was exploratory in nature, one of the aims was to compare responses and allow new ideas and perspectives to emerge, and use predetermined prompts, which could facilitate meaningful comparisons of responses. The semi-structured schedule remained flexible enough to allow for the follow-up of important issues raised during the discussions and also allowed for the inclusion of the same set of questions in each interview though they may have been asked in a different order. Each interview, nevertheless, was different and unique because each respondent provided unique insights which needed to be followed up.

To meet the requirements of this study, the researcher developed a semi-structured in-depth interview schedule. Interviews were approximately 45 minutes to an hour in duration and audio-taped. Before each interview, the researcher ensured that interviewees had completed an information sheet and informed consent form. The interviews included questions about attitudes and behaviours toward their work and about organisational diversity. The qualitative data obtained were subsequently utilised in the development of a quantitative instrument to assist the researcher with the exploration of additional significant issues and with building new or rejecting old items.
3.4.3. Qualitative data analysis

Silverman (2000, p.32) suggested that “it is important to take a position on how interview responses, especially the ones related to perceptions, are to be treated”. There are two approaches, namely the realist approach and the narrative approach. The realist approach treats interview responses as information giving direct access to experience. In other words, the answers are treated as “describing some external reality (e.g. facts, events) or internal experience (e.g. feelings, meanings)” (Silverman, 2000, p.122). Alternatively, the narrative approach treats interview data as “accessing various stories or narratives through which people describe their world” (Silverman, 2000, p.122). This study takes the realist approach using constant comparison to analyse the interview data. The constant comparison method helps the researcher look for statements and signs of behaviour that occur over time during the study, and the process of constant comparison helps stimulate the researchers’ thoughts and ensure all statements are compared until no new ones can be classified (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2011).

One of the benefits of qualitative data analysis is that words are a mode of expression with greater open-endedness, more capacity for connecting various realms of argument and experience and more capacity for reaching people’s thoughts (Shank, 2006). Data from the coding is reflexively analysed to develop themes, dimensions or categories. While the researcher generates some ideas and thoughts during the transcribing and coding processes, they are stored as memos. These memos are subsequently used to record the researcher’s ideas and thoughts about the interview data. To check for understanding and accuracy, the researcher provides each participant with the raw data transcripts and analysis notes. NVivo 7 was used to manage and code the data. NVivo 7 is a qualitative data-analysis software package for managing data and is used to code and analyse qualitative data, such as that gathered using questionnaires, open-ended surveys, transcriptions of focus groups, or other text-based data. “The advantages NVivo 7 offers to the mixed methods researcher are enhanced flexibility and convenience” (Bazeley, 2002, p.241).
3.4.4. Procedure for qualitative data analysis

Qualitative measurement is inductive, with the goal being to allow the researcher to note specific observations that lead to conceptual definitions and concepts (Neuman, 2003). According to Corbin and Strauss (2008, p.103), a “concept is a labelled phenomenon”. In other words, a concept should be seen as an abstract idea that a researcher recognises as frequently occurring in the data. Concepts vary in abstraction from concrete to very abstract. Goulding (2005) called this process “data reduction”. Coding can be used to reduce qualitative interview data in transcripts and is “the process of analysing data”. There are various levels of coding, such as open, axial and selective (J. M. Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

The process of open coding reduces the information to separate pieces in order to compare similarities and differences. The application of open coding means data can be categorised. Once concepts start to amass, the researcher needs to commence grouping the concepts under more abstract explanatory terms, namely “categories” (J. M. Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The goal of the open coding phase is to identify categories as well as their properties and dimensions from the data. Goede and Villiers (2003) identify properties as characteristics that are common to all the concepts in the category; while dimensions demonstrate the position of a property along a range. The open codes (categories) such as “job satisfaction” is linked to characteristics of work. To further clarify, the properties of the category “job satisfaction” include training opportunities. Training opportunities encompass staff education programs and practical work experiences available to the employees. Training opportunities also support employees’ service capability through various processes such as staff-development programs.

According to the interviewees, the more training opportunities offered at work, the more satisfied they feel about the job. This property can be dimensionalised by numbers of training opportunities from sufficient to insufficient. An example of the process from open coding to axial coding can be illustrated using the phrase according to the interviewees: “The more training opportunities offered at work, the more satisfied I feel about the job” and the other phrase “I love this job because of challenging levels of work” were each open coded as “training opportunities” and “challenging levels of work” and then both axial coded as “job satisfaction”. Later, in the examination of
these codes in context and during the linking of findings to a broader theory, perception of “job job satisfaction” is seen to be linked to either positive or negative employee attitudes toward their job. Therefore, the selective code - core category of “attitude to job” - is formed (see Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1 Sample of initial coding phase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>Interaction with co-workers</td>
<td>Positive to negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication with co-workers</td>
<td>Frequent to infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>Sufficient to insufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task completion</td>
<td>Efficient to inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels of challenge</td>
<td>High to low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effort investment on the job</td>
<td>High to low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer</td>
<td>Reaction of customers</td>
<td>Satisfied to unsatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction with customers</td>
<td>Positive to negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of customers</td>
<td>Large to small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repurchase behaviour of customers</td>
<td>Frequent to infrequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the property of “task completions” is seen by employees to have a significant association with their work attitudes. Task completion refers to the time that it takes from when the worker begins a particular business process to when they exit or are seen to have completed the task. During the interview, interviewees were asked to describe their feelings in terms of satisfaction as a result of meeting their expectations of efficient task completion at work. The researcher dimensionalised task completions from efficient to inefficient.

The property of “levels of challenge at work” refers to how well an individual’s personal ability and knowledge within the organisation matches the work they are meant to support. During the interview, interviewees discussed their ideas of how their abilities and knowledge match or mismatch with work they are required to perform. One interviewee discussed his satisfaction as the perfect match between the talent he actually uses and the “relatively challenging task” of acquiring access to information associated with his work. That is, levels of challenge at work can be dimensionalised as high to low.
The other property for the category of job factors is “effort investment”. This property refers to the levels of commitment and energy that employees invest in their work. The levels of effort investment connect with employees’ work-related attitudes. The interviewees discussed the effort investment level as a key enabling element for satisfaction within their work. Higher levels of effort investment at work are associated with more positive attitudes toward the job. Hence, the researcher dimensionalised effort investment of work from high to low.

Axial coding systematises data around the axis of a category and relates categories to their subcategories with the assistance of properties and dimensions (J. M. Corbin & Strauss, 2008). During the axial coding procedure, the researcher groups open codes under more abstract codes, thus further reducing the data. Throughout this process the researcher continues to refer to the transcripts to ensure that axial codes and meanings are being interpreted in context so as not to misrepresent meaning.

The selective coding process aims to integrate and link the literature using data investigated in open and axial coding (J. M. Corbin & Strauss, 2008). After the axial coding process there are many categories that are identified and linked to each other but have no core category (sometimes called central category), which clarifies “what this research was about”. Specifically, the core category emerges inductively and stands for the main concept of the research, as suggested by Corbin and Strauss (2008, p.116), who argued it is "the central phenomenon around which all the other categories are related”. A core category unites all the strands in order to provide an explanation of the behaviour under study (Goulding, 2005). It symbolises the description of hypothetical relationships between categories and subcategories (Shank, 2006).

The final phase of coding in this study, selective coding, involved choosing the themes and issues that are related to the aims of this study. During this coding phase, consideration was given to the relationships between the codes and models and conceptual maps that are used to further explore the data and to link ideas (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2011). An example of the process from open coding to axial coding can be illustrated using the phrase: “I am not happy about this job because there is not enough salary”. When open coded this phrase became “not sufficient salary”. During
the axial coding stage it was coded as “rewards”. The other phrase “I love this job because of challenging levels of work” was open coded as “challenging levels of work” and then axial coded as “job characteristics”. Later, in the examination of these codes in context and during the linking of findings to a broader theory, perceptions of “rewards” and “job characteristics” are seen to be linked to either positive or negative employee attitudes toward their job. Therefore, the selective code - core category of “attitude to job” - is formed (see Table 3.2). During the qualitative phase, data are coded with the following: properties (results of open coding), categories (results of axial coding) and core categories (results of selective coding). Chapter 4 presents further details of categories. Category relationships in three organisations with different levels of ethnic diversity are also outlined in Chapter 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee attitudes</th>
<th>Core Categories</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes to job</td>
<td>Job characteristics</td>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>Sufficient to insufficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task completion</td>
<td>Efficient to inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels of challenge</td>
<td>High to low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>High to low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work effort</td>
<td>Effort of investment on the job</td>
<td>High to low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes to company</td>
<td>Harmony of workplaces</td>
<td>Friendly co-workers</td>
<td>Strong to weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>Positive to negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location of hotels</td>
<td>Close to home</td>
<td>Close to far</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Famous tourist destination</td>
<td>High to low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Number of staff</td>
<td>Sufficient to insufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes to diversity</td>
<td>Diversity preference</td>
<td>Frequency of ethnic interaction</td>
<td>Frequent to infrequent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels of ethnic diversity in workplace</td>
<td>High to low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management status</td>
<td>Williness of hire indigenous</td>
<td>Positive to negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</td>
<td>Levels of acceptance toward minority</td>
<td>High to low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5. Quantitative Approach (Phase 2)

Quantitative research empirically investigates general propositions about social life as illustrated in social theories (Straub, Gefen, & Marie-Claude, 2005). The researcher used questionnaires for collecting data on the existing diversity profile, perceived levels of diversity, and employee variables (e.g. attitudes and behaviours). Personal diversity-related attitudes and behaviours of employees in each hotel were also measured.

3.5.1. Sample

Target population

The target population was composed of hotel employees in small to medium hotels because of information from managers that these hotels are more likely to hire indigenous employees than are five-star hotels. In order to obtain sufficient numbers of ethnic minority representatives (indigenous participants) in the sample, five-star hotels are therefore excluded. Additionally, Blau (1977) argued the one of the conditions that constrain or create opportunities for an interracial interaction is group size. The size theorem proposes that the probability of intergroup associations is greater for smaller groups than larger ones. Therefore the group size is necessary to be controlled in the study. Thus the organisations researched in this study are Taiwanese locally owned small- to medium-sized hotels (i.e. hotels with a minimum of 60 rooms in one hotel and between 30 and 80 employees). According to a 2007 Taiwanese government report, there are 16 counties in Taiwan and indigenous peoples living in Hualien County, Taitung County and Pingtung County account for almost half of the total Taiwanese indigenous population. This study samples hotels in these three counties. The hotels are snowball sampled and then selected on the basis of low, medium and high levels of ethnic diversity, respectively, based on the demographic profile data that the companies provided. The levels of ethnic diversity are measured by using the existing general demographic profile of employees (i.e. ethnicity) held by the organisations.

Sample size

The researcher aimed to have a sample with a minimum of 300 participants from the selected organisations. Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999) suggested a sample size of at
least 150 to avoid issues of high multicollinearity. The surveys were conducted with employees with duration of employment of more than one year (a common employment probation period reported by the Taiwanese hotels) so that the participants would have worked in the hotels for sufficient time to experience the organisational culture and may have been influenced by organisational diversity in the workplace.

**Sampling procedure**

In the quantitative phase of the research, the questionnaires were distributed systematically and snowball, purposive and convenience sampling methods were used. Firstly, in the snowball sampling process, the researcher’s networks were used to access the potential participating organisations. The researcher initially phoned the employees and managers who had participated in the interviews. They were asked if they knew anyone in any hotels with varying proportions of indigenous employees and then to nominate these employees or hotels and provide contact details. The researcher decided to use snowball sampling because it reduced time costs to locate the target sample. Essentially, the researcher needs to expend a great deal of effort to contact nominated people and hotels in order to communicate the main goals of the study, and to gain access to potential participants. Since the researcher phoned every nominated individual and organisation to explain the purpose of the study and to ask for their participation, the purposive sampling was conducted after gaining their agreement to join the study.

The researcher developed a list of criteria for conducting purposive sampling to determine whether the potential participant hotels had similar sized workforces and sufficient numbers of indigenous employees, in order to represent the hotels with high, medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. The researcher therefore declined the participation of potential hotels if they could not meet the purposive criteria. After the organisations met the criteria, convenience sampling was conducted.

Convenience sampling attempts to obtain respondents who happen to be in the right place at the right time (Malhotra et al., 2004). Researchers commonly use convenience sampling techniques to conduct quantitative studies. Convenience sampling involves the use of “the most conveniently available people as study participants” (Polit & Beck, 2004). The researcher chose to use convenience sampling on the basis that many studies
exist where researchers use convenience sampling in the field of leisure and because, as its name suggests, it is expedient, economical, and time efficient (Chung & Law, 2003; Jennifer, 2000; Rayka, Fitzgerald, & Chapman, 2004). Following an initial contact with hotel managers selected through the snowball and purposive sampling process and an explanation of the purpose of this study, the researcher delivered the questionnaires. The managers then accompanied the researcher to each department to introduce the employees. The researcher delivered the surveys to employees face to face. Each respondent received a questionnaire and an accompanying letter detailing the purpose of the study and an information sheet which included a request for respondents to return the completed survey to reception in their respective organisations. Due to a number of natural disasters (e.g. typhoon and flood) through the data-collection period, the completed survey were received in a different timeframe. Some participant organisations were heavily affected and the participant hotels collected the completed surveys from the respondents and made contact with the researcher after one to eight months. In an attempt to gather as many responses as possible, both mailout with reply-paid envelope and online-survey methods were also made available for the other six organisations that preferred the survey to be conducted by these methods.

3.5.2. Research instrument development and translation

In the quantitative phase, surveys were administered to employees to determine whether there are differences in employee attitudes and behaviours within Taiwanese hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. Buckingham and Saunders (2004) stated that surveys collect information from a sample of people who have been selected to represent a larger population. Following analysis, data can be used to assist in answering the research questions. Surveys enable the researcher to reach conclusions by sampling from a broad population of participants with diverse backgrounds, rather than those representing a single, highly specialised and idiosyncratic group.

The researcher developed a survey to specifically address the purpose of the current study. The survey consisted of personal information (demographic data), key company attributes (importance and performance analysis), employee-related attitudes (e.g. job satisfaction and organisational commitment), employee behaviour (e.g. job performance
and organisational citizenship behaviours), and personal attitudes and behaviour toward organisational diversity (see Appendix C).

The survey was first developed in English. This original English version was translated by a valid and reliable procedure into a Chinese version based on forward-backward procedure (Degroot, Dannenburg, & Vanhell, 1994). Translation and back-translation were conducted independently by two bilingual translators. Back-translation is a common practice to verify that translation was properly performed steps. English is not the official language of Taiwan and most of respondents may not be familiar with the original survey language. The translation into the local language aimed at avoiding miscommunication and misinterpretation (Punch, 2003). This study carefully chose a translator based on two criteria. First, the person must be competent in both languages. Second, the person must be capable of writing high-standard, official Chinese, and especially, in language that is suitable for a survey. The researcher first translated the survey into Chinese for this study. A Taiwanese certified translation company checked and back translated this Chinese-version survey to ensure that the essence of the survey was retained and not distorted, or the meaning diluted during the process of translation.

Appendix C shows the English version of the questionnaire, which includes the following nine scales. The details of these scales are discussed in the section on instruments:

1. **Personal information in a demographic profile**: includes name of organisation, employee and manager ethnicity, gender, age, education, job title, duration of employment and job position.

2. **Importance of key company attributes**: a 15-item scale developed from the information collected from the interviews during the qualitative phase of the study.

3. **Job satisfaction**: a five-item scale developed using Brayfield and Rothe’s Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951).

4. **Organisational commitment**: a nine-item scale chosen from the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979).

5. **Job performance**: a seven-item scale built by the researcher with reference to Williams and Anderson’s Performance Scale (Williams & Anderson, 1991).


8. Diversity-related attitudes in the organisation: a five-item scale developed from subscales of Comfort with Differences. These subscales are partly from M-GUDS, namely Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (Miville et al., 1999).

9. Diversity-related behaviour in the organisation: a five-item scale including items developed from Diversity of Contact subscale of M-GUDS (Miville, et al., 1999).

10. Performance of key company attributes: a 15-item scale developed from the information collected from the interviews during the qualitative phase of the study.

Reverse coding

According to Malhotra et al. (2004), the reverse coding of items is used to keep a scale consistent. For example, the job satisfaction scale that is used in this study includes items such as, “Each day of work seems like it will never end”. This item describes that an employee is dissatisfied (the opposite of satisfied). The researcher needs to reverse how that item is scored so that it remains possible to measure satisfaction. Recoding allows items to be consistent. A discussion of reverse-coded items is found in the following instrument section.

Reliability

Neuman (2003) stated reliability means that the information provided by indicators (e.g. items in a questionnaire may be taken as an indicator of an attitude or behaviour) does not vary as a result of characteristics of the indicators, the instrument, or the measurement device itself. In other words, reliability refers to the accuracy, dependability, consistency or repeatability of score results. In more technical terms, reliability refers to the degree to which the scores are free of measurement errors. There are many ways to measure reliability. One of the most commonly used reliability coefficients is Cronbach’s alpha (Neuman, 2003). In this study, the researcher uses
Cronbach’s alpha to assess the internal consistency of the scales. Accordingly, analysing latent constructs such as job satisfaction or customer satisfaction requires instruments to accurately measure the constructs (González & Garazo, 2006). Interrelated items may be summed to obtain an overall score for each participant. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha estimates the reliability of the scale by determining the internal consistency of the test or the average correlation of items within the test.

**Validity**

According to Scullen et al. (2003), validity is the extent to which the measurements of the survey provide the information needed to meet the study’s purpose. There are different types of validity such as content validity and construct validity. Content validity and construct validity are explained in the following section. In this study, the researcher consulted the literature to check the validity of each scale for its suitability for adoption and use in the survey.

**Content validity**

Content validity or face validity checks how well the content of the research relates to the variables to be studied. Churchill and Lacobucci (2002) suggested that in the early stages of research experts should check the scale items used and the items for each scale should be edited through a pilot study. The majority of scales used in this research are adopted from established scales that have already been subjected to tests of content validity (Adcock & Collier, 2001). The translated version of the survey was sent to ten employees in a Taiwanese hotel in the pilot stage of the study to make sure that the questions asked were relevant to the Taiwanese hospitality business context. No negative comments were received. This suggested that future participants might only experience very minimum issues in understanding and completing the survey.

**Construct validity**

Construct validity checks what underlying construct is being measured. Neuman (2003) stated that there are two forms of construct validity: convergent validity (how well the item relates to other measures of the same construct), and discriminate validity (how poorly the item relates to measures of opposing constructs). According to Adcock and
Collier (2001), convergent validity is assessed using the correlation among items that build the scale or instrument measuring a construct. High correlations between the test scores are evidence of convergence. On the other hand, discriminant validity analysis is used to test whether two constructs differ. Straub et al. (2005) indicated that constructs are different if their respective indicators load most heavily on different factors in a principal-components factor analysis. Factor analysis is the test of internal consistency. For a valid scale indicator items need to load unambiguously on their own factor. Neuman (2003) suggested that the test of construct validity should be established using correlation coefficients and factor analysis. Therefore correlation and factor analysis are adopted in the quantitative phase and details of these two analyses are expanded upon below.

**Correlation analysis**

Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between two variables. The linear relationship (the coefficient of correlation from “+1” to “-1”) was applied to the significant difference between the two variables. This study expresses the coefficient of correlation between employees’ work-related attitudes (factors) and employees’ behaviour (factors) in the organisation according to Pearson’s “r”. There are two aims of conducting correlation analysis on all scales in this study. Firstly, Neuman (2003) stated that construct validity is assessed by measuring how well the item relates to other measures of the same construct. Thus, high correlations between the scales are verification of construct validity. Secondly, correlation tests the presence of multicollinearity to indicate whether the inter-correlation between explanatory variables exceeds 0.8 (W. D. Berry & Feldman, 1985). Cohen, Cohen and Aiken (2003) stated that in interpreting the strength or weakness of relationships between scales, classification of the correlation coefficient (r) is shown in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>−0.3 to −0.1</td>
<td>0.1 to 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>−0.5 to −0.3</td>
<td>0.3 to 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>−1.0 to −0.5</td>
<td>0.5 to 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor analysis**

The purpose of factor analysis is to determine the patterns of correlations among variables and to condense a large number of variables to a smaller number (Levine, Hullett, Turner, & Lapinski, 2006). Generally speaking, there are two types of factor analysis, exploratory and confirmatory. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is the most common type and is utilised to discover the core structure of a relatively large number of variables. In contrast, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is useful for the researcher who wants to determine the number of factors essential in the data and which measured variable is related to which latent variable. In summary, it is a tool used to confirm or reject the measurement (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). This study incorporated an EFA for the key company attributes scales that were developed through the qualitative phase, which was exploratory in nature. On the other hand, CFA was conducted for the employee attitudes and behaviours scales that were adopted from the literature. Levine et al. (2006) suggested that CFA should be used on existing and previously validated scales.

3.5.3. Measurement of Organisational Diversity

In order to demonstrate if there are either positive or negative effects/outcomes from employing a diverse workforce in Taiwan, it is necessary to investigate whether there are differences in employee attitudes and behaviours between Taiwanese hotels with different levels of organisational diversity.

Some literature uses the index of fractionalisation as the indicator of diversity levels. Taylor and Hudson (1972) defined an ethnic fractionalisation index (EFI) when considering diversity as

\[ EFI_i = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{J} n_{ij}^2, \]

where \( n_{ij} \) is the population share of group \( j \) in country \( i \). Basically, this indicator can be interpreted as measuring the probability that two randomly selected individuals in a
country will belong to different ethno-linguistic groups. Therefore, EFI increases when
the number of groups increases.

Another diversity index is the family of polarisation measure. Montalvo and Reynal-
Querol (2002) used an index that measures the normalised distance of a particular
distribution of ethnic and religious groups from a bimodal distribution. It is computed as

\[ PI_i = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left( \frac{0.5 - n_j}{0.5} \right)^2 n_j. \]

PI is an index that measures the distance of any distribution of ethnic and religious
groups from the situation. The closer the distribution of religious and ethnic groups in a
country, the higher the PI. In a country in which three ethnic or religious groups are
distributed with percentages of 45, 45 and 10, the index and hence the likelihood of
conflict is higher than in a country with percentages of 34, 33 and 33 or in a county with
percentages of 90, 10 and 0 (J. G. Montalvo & Reynal-Querol, 2002).

The most common index of diversity is Blau’s (1977b) index of heterogeneity, which
measures the probability of two individuals chosen at random from the population being
of different race or ethnicity. In Blau’s (1977b) diversity index,

\[ D = 1 - \sum_j p_j^2 \]

where D is diversity and \( p_j \) is the proportion of the total population from group j. If the
entire population were from a single group, D would equal 0. If the number of groups
increases, and if in the extreme case each individual belonged to their own unique group,
D would approach 1 in value. So a higher value of D means more diversity. In other
words, a perfectly homogeneous population would have a diversity index score of 0. A perfectly heterogeneous population would have a diversity index score of 1 (assuming unlimited categories with equal representation in each category). The current study explores the relationships between levels of organisational diversity and employee work outcomes (e.g., attitudes and behaviours). The researcher adopts Blau's (1977b) index of heterogeneity to measure the levels of ethnic diversity and the other demographic diversity levels in the study, as Blau's index of heterogeneity (index of diversity) is a well-established and frequently used index for demographic research (Chon, 2012; Naranjo-Gil, Hartmann, & Maas, 2008; Rushton, 2007). The statistical interpretation of the Blau index, ranging from 0 to 1, is the chance that two randomly selected individuals from a group belong to different categories. This approach is appropriate for measuring diversity of a group where the variable of interest is categorical (i.e. indigenous/non-indigenous) and no group member simultaneously belongs to multiple categories (D. A. Harrison & Klein, 2007). Using Blau’s index, the researcher was able to code the diversity variables (e.g., ethnic, gender and age diversity) as numerical data in order to perform statistical analysis. The researcher was also able to use this method to code our two other portfolio diversity variables. However, Blau’s index of diversity suggests that 80 percent white and 20 percent Asian is identical to a population that is 80 percent black and 20 percent Hispanic and will exhibit similar behaviour. This example indicates the caution that should be employed when using Blau’s index of heterogeneity. “The substantive content of people’s social attributes and positions is ignored, as attention focuses on their distribution. ... Not the significance of race but that of racial heterogeneity is a subject of structural inquiry (Blau, 1977, p. 11)” Therefore, Blau’s index is only an appropriate tool in empirical work when the theoretical model of the organisation or society under consideration suggests that the number and relative proportions of subgroups is a relevant consideration, but the relative size of any particular subgroup does not matter (Rushton, 2008).

3.5.4. Instruments

Key company attributes

A literature review and the qualitative data analysis of this study were used to generate a list of company attributes that employees reported as attractive aspects for them to
choose to work in their present organisation or another possible organisation. As in Thomas and Wise’s (1999) study, the attributes used in previous studies were partly adopted and summarised into a basic list of attributes, and then additional input to the list was obtained from the in-depth interviews with employees. This attributes list was used for the importance and performance analysis. In the importance analysis section, the employees had to indicate how important the listed aspects of the organisation were to their decision to work in the organisation. This is a 15 item five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Very unimportant to (5) Very important, with a possible resultant range of scores between 15 and 75. In the performance analysis section, the employees responded to how satisfied they were with each of the aspects they experienced in the organisation. The scales also used a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly dissatisfied to (5) Strongly satisfied, and the possible range of scores was between 15 and 75.

**Job satisfaction**

The Job Satisfaction scale used to test job satisfaction levels of employees was originally developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951). Six items were later developed by Arnett et al. (2002). The scale includes items such as, “Most days I am enthusiastic about my work”, “Each day of work seems like it will never end” (reverse coded), and “I consider my job rather unpleasant” (reverse coded). The scales used a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree, and the possible range of scores was between 6 and 30.

Many studies indicated a high Cronbach’s alpha for the Job Satisfaction scale ranging from .89 to .93 (see Ertürk, Yilmaz, & Ceylan, 2004; Makover, 2003; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). Moreover, the construct validity of the scale has been well established by a number of studies (Arnett, et al., 2002; Cetin, 2006; Ertürk, et al., 2004; Makover, 2003).

**Organisational commitment**

The Organisational Commitment scale is a measure initially developed by Porter and Smith in 1970. The measure was created with commitment being a generally affective
reaction to the organisation rather than specifically to the job. Nine items were later developed by Mowday et al. (1979). The entire scale is rated on a five-point scale with anchors ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. The range of possible total scores for these items is 9 to 45.

The original scale indicated a high level of Cronbach’s alpha of .87 (Mowday, et al., 1979). The Organisational Commitment scale was used to measure commitment in a study that involved a Taiwanese highly diversified manufacturing company with staff from a wide range of divisions and functional areas and across all position levels. Their sample identified a population of 726 with a Cronbach’s alpha of .82 (Mckinnon, Harrison, Chow, & Wu, 2003). Recently, the Organisational Commitment scale has also been used successfully with high reliability in studies of organisational behaviour with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .84 to .93 (Liu, 2004; Luttmann, Mittermaier, & Rebele, 2002; Tayyab, 2007). Studies have indicated that the scale has good construct validity in numerous validation procedures (Knights & Kennedy, 2005; Tayyab, 2007).

**Job performance**

The Job Performance scale was developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). The measurement of job performance captures what the management literature defines as “behaviours that are recognised by formal reward systems and are part of the requirements as described in job descriptions” (Williams & Anderson, 1991, p.606). There are seven items in the Job Performance scale. Two items, “At my work at the hotel: Fail to perform essential duties” and “Neglect aspects of the job I am obligated to perform”, were reverse coded. All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale with anchors ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. The range of possible total scores for these items was 7 to 35.

The Cronbach’s alpha of the Job Performance scale was .91 (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Recent studies further indicated a high Cronbach’s alpha between .81 and .92 (Makover, 2003; Spotts & Chelte, 2005; Vigoda, 2000). Construct validity of the scale has also been demonstrated (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2006; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002).
**Organisational citizenship behaviour**

The Organisational Citizenship Behaviour scale (13 items) was developed by Williams and Anderson (1991). In Lau et al.’s (2003) study, the Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) construct was separated into two dimensions. The first dimension relates to citizenship behaviour directed at achieving organisational goals (OCBO) and the second dimension concerns citizenship behaviour targeted at helping other individuals (OCBI). Thus, this study includes OCBO and OCBI to measure organisational citizenship behaviours directed at the organisation and other employees, respectively. The scale is rated on a five-point scale with anchors ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. The items “Take undeserved work breaks”, “Spend a great deal of time in personal phone conversations”, “Complain about insignificant things at work” were reverse coded. The range of possible total scores for these items was 13 to 65.

The OCBO subscale showed a Cronbach’s alpha from .71 to .83, and the OCBI subscale showed a Cronbach’s alpha from .70 to .86 (V. C. Lau, et al., 2003; Nasurdin & Ramayah, 2003; Paré & Tremblay, 2000) therefore the whole scale indicated an acceptable level of internal consistency. The entire scale has also been shown in recent studies to have strong construct validity (Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2006; LePine, Erez, & Johnson, 2002).

**Turnover intention**

Turnover intention was measured using a three-item scale which was developed by Nadler et al. (Nadler, et al., 1975). According to Cammann et al. (1983), this set of items focuses on employees’ behavioural intent rather than their affective attachment to indicate the degree of commitment to the organisation. The items, “I will probably look for a new job in the next year”, “I often think about quitting” and “I could easily find a job with another employer with about the same pay and benefits I now have”, are included. The three items were rated on a five-point Likert scale with anchors ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. The possible range of scores was between 3 and 15. Higher values for the turnover scale represented stronger levels of turnover intentions.
Several studies showed that Cronbach’s alpha for the scale of turnover intentions ranges from .70 to .95 (Bernhard & Sverke, 2003; Boxall, Macky, & Rasmussen, 2003; Hofhuis, Van Oudenhoven-van der Zee, & Otten, 2008; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001). The construct validity of the turnover intentions scale has been well established in recent studies (Bernhard & Sverke, 2003; King, Xia, Quick, & Sethi, 2005; Tayyab, 2007).

**Diversity-related attitude**

Diversity-related attitude in the organisation was measured using the Comfort with Differences scale (5 items), which is one subscale of the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale-Short Form (M-GUDS-S). There are 15 items in the M-GUDS-S (Miville, et al., 1999). The M-GUDS-S is the short form of the 45-item Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale (M-GUDS). M-GUDS was used to measure participants’ Universal Diverse Orientation (Miville, et al., 1999). UDO is a construct that encompasses appreciation of differences and similarities among people. The M-GUDS-S measures an overall attitudinal orientation toward diversity. The scale includes items such as, “I am only at ease with people of backgrounds similar to mine”, “Getting to know someone of diverse background is generally an uncomfortable experience for me,” and “I often feel irritated by persons with diverse backgrounds” have been reverse coded. The scales used a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. Five items were rated on a five-point scale and the possible range of scores was between 5 and 25.

The reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of this subscale score has been between .71 and .92 (Constantine et al., 2001; Fuertes, Miville, Mohr, Sedlacek, & Gretchen, 2000; J. P. Strauss & Connerley, 2003). The scale has been reported to have good content and construct validity in numerous validation procedures (Miville, et al., 1999). Evidence of the construct validity of this scale has been demonstrated by many researchers (Fuertes, et al., 2000; Maddux, 2002; Miville, Carlozzi, Gushue, Schara, & Ueda, 2006).

**Diversity-related behaviour**

Diversity-related behaviour in the organisation was developed from the Diversity of Contact scale, which is the other subscale of M-GUDS-S. The Diversity of Contact
subscale measures the potential for behaviour (as well as past behaviour) that is oriented towards others who are different from oneself (Fuertes, et al., 2000). The Diversity of Contact subscale assesses respondents' interest in and commitment to interacting with culturally diverse individuals and in participating in diverse cultural activities. It can be seen that the subscale of Diversity of Contact refers to measures of behaviour so the researcher placed these items in the section on diversity-related behaviour. There are five items based on the Miville-Guzman Universality-Diversity Scale-Short Form (M-GUDS-S). Items were rated on a five-point scale with anchors ranging from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree. The range of possible total scores for these items was 5 to 25.

The reliability of this subscale showed a range of Cronbach’s alpha from .77 to .82 (Constantine, et al., 2001; Fuertes, et al., 2000; Strauss & Connerley, 2003). Research reported that the subscale has good construct validity in numerous validation procedures (Fuertes, et al., 2000; Miville, et al., 2006).

**Matrix of the scales**

After all the instruments were discussed previously in detail, these scales with the original names, purposes, authors, item numbers in the survey, and reliability from the literature are then summarised in Table 3.3. This table shows seven employee attitudes and behaviours scales in the quantitative phase that are adopted in the literature to correspond to the qualitative results of employee attitude and behaviour in Chapter 4 (see Table 4.6). Additionally, the identified key company attributes in the qualitative phase were summarised and used to develop the items in the quantitative survey, which can be seen in Table 3.3.

### 3.6. Ethical Clearance

Research concerning human subjects is a significant aspect in this study. A cautious consideration of ethical standards, in terms of equality, truthfulness, privacy and disclosure, was essential. Griffith University sets out specific guidelines under the “Human Subject” category, therefore Ethical approval to conduct the study was applied for from the Griffith University Human Research Committee after the confirmation...
process. An information sheet (see Appendix A) regarding the research and an informed consent form were provided to the participants. The researcher provided a short briefing to respondents about the aim of the research and its processes and approval was granted in January 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name of Scale</strong></th>
<th><strong>Purpose</strong></th>
<th><strong>Author</strong></th>
<th><strong>Item number</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reliability from literature</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance of key company attributes Scale</td>
<td>Expectations of attributes</td>
<td>The researcher</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>New scale development from qualitative phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Brayfield and Rothe (1951)</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .88-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment Questionnaire</td>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>Mowday et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .84-.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Performance Scale</td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Williams and Anderson (1991)</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .81-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire</td>
<td>Retention behaviour</td>
<td>Nadler et al. (1975)</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .74-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Scale</td>
<td>Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>Williams and Anderson (1991)</td>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .71-.83 (OCBO) = .70-.86 (OCBI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort with Differences</td>
<td>Diversity related attitude</td>
<td>Miville et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Q9 (1-5)</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .71-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Contact</td>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>Miville et al. (1999)</td>
<td>Q9 (6-10)</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha = .77-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of key company attributes Scale</td>
<td>Satisfactions of attributes</td>
<td>The researcher</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>New scale development from qualitative phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7. Pilot Study

The researcher conducted a pilot study to identify and resolve potential problems with any elements of the research design and to determine the effectiveness of the sampling technique. A pilot study also served to test the validity and reliability of the measuring instrument. The Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS 17.0) was used to measure correlations between each scale. The pilot study consisted of respondents selected through employees in Taiwanese hotels. The participating organisations were reached via the researcher’s networks. The pilot study sourced a sample of 34 respondents who were employees from three organisations that also participated in the qualitative phase. Initially, the researcher distributed 10 questionnaires to the employees of Hotel A to see whether the questions in the survey were comprehensible to respondents. Any item respondents found to be problematic or difficult to understand was reviewed and revised. All comments were welcomed. Since no negative comments and suggestions were received, it appeared that future respondents might experience only minor problems in understanding and completing the survey. Another 45 surveys (15 surveys to each of the three participating organisations) were then delivered. Thirty-four surveys were returned and reliability tests were conducted on all the scales that measure employee attitudes and behaviours, and key company attributes. The range of Cronbach’s alpha scores for these constructs was from 0.71 to 0.95. They were therefore above the 0.7 score, which is the lowest acceptable score (Cronbach, 1951).

3.8. Data Analysis

SPSS

The researcher used SPSS 17.0 software to analyse the quantitative data collected from the questionnaires. Most social research data analysis involves three major steps: (1) cleaning and organising; (2) describing the data; and (3) testing hypotheses. The SPSS program is useful in doing data analysis (Buckingham & Saunders, 2004). This research used cross tabulations, independent samples t-tests, paired t-tests, one-way ANOVA, two-way ANOVA, multiple regression analyses, and cluster analysis to examine
research questions. Table 3.4 provides a review of the method of analysis for each research question.

### Table 3.4 Summary of data analysis methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Analysis Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To what extent is organisational diversity (ethnic, gender, age, and education diversity) associated with employee attitudes and behaviours?</td>
<td>Multiple regression analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What differences do selected demographic characteristics (ethnic, gender, age, education, employment duration, and management status) make in regard to employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-tests, ANOVA, cross tabulations and cluster analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Are there differences in employee attitudes and behaviours between hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Are there differences in employee attitudes and behaviours based on selected demographic characteristics of employees?</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Are there differences in employee attitudes and behaviours based on selected demographic characteristics of employees within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is the nature and extent of differences between employee perceived importance and performance of key company attributes within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-tests, ANOVA, and multiple regression analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Are there differences between importance and performance of key company attributes in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Are there differences between indigenous and non-indigenous employee perceived importance and performance of key company attributes in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Does satisfaction with performance of key company attributes predict employee attitudes and behaviours?</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Cross tabulations**

Cross tabulations were used to display the frequency distributions between respondent demographic characteristics within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. To communicate these data in a clear way, a table was constructed and each cell shows the number of respondents who gave a specific combination of responses.

**T-test**

The t-test is the commonly used method to measure the differences in means between two variables. According to Hair et al. (1995), in an independent sample t-test, the equality of variances assumption usually needs to be confirmed using Levene’s test. The t-tests were used to determine whether there is a significant difference (p-value ≤0.05) between means for the two sets of scores. The next step was to determine significance by looking at probability levels.

**ANOVA**

One of the purposes of this study is to examine whether there is a significant difference in employee attitudes and behaviour within the hotels with different levels of diversity. ANOVA therefore can be used to compare and establish the significant difference of the mean between more than two independent groups.

**Multiple regression analysis**

The common purpose of multiple regression analysis is a flexible method to analyse the relationship between a quantitative variable (e.g. dependent or criterion variable) and other factors (e.g. independent or predictor variables) (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003; Shavelson, 1996). In general, multiple regression analysis allows determination of the independent contributions of each predictor variable in a model by allowing for partitioning of variance. Wright (2009) indicated that there should not be normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals discovered through the examination of normal probability plots of residuals and scatter diagrams of residuals versus predicted residuals for suitability of data analysis before each multiple regression analysis. A check for outliers was carried out by inspecting the Mahalanobis distances and any
detected outliers were deleted. Multicollinearity was also checked using variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance values, which demonstrate the amount of variability of the selected independent variable (predictor) not explained by the other independent variables (Gujarati, 2003). That is to say, multicollinearity occurs when an independent variable is excessively correlated with one or more of the other independent variables. Generally speaking, high tolerance scores suggest there are no multicollinearity issues to distort beta coefficients of variables in the equation. According to Gujarati (2003), multicollinearity may not be a problem to be concerned about if VIF does not exceed 10 and tolerance values are greater than 0.1. The VIF values of all variables are considered to be acceptable at less than 1.8 and the tolerance values above 0.53. In addition to the variance inflation factor (VIF) and the tolerance values, multicollinearity was then checked by looking at the correlations between the dependent variables and the independent variables using the Pearson correlation coefficient. These correlations are presented with the results of each regression analysis.

**Importance performance analysis (IPA)**

Parasuraman et al. (1991) developed “SERVQUAL” to measure customers’ evaluation together with expectation of service quality. In SERVQUAL, perceived quality is represented by the difference in scores between perception (what they think actually happens) and expectation (what they would like to happen) ratings. Similarly, Levenburg and Magal (2004) stated that Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) is a useful method for simultaneously considering the importance and performance category when evaluating or defining a strategy. In order to address the gaps occurring between employee expectations and satisfactions of key company attributes in meeting employee employment needs, the ideas of SERVQUAL and IPA were applied in this study.

**Cluster analysis**

Cluster analysis is one of the methods that has previously been applied to human resource management research (Galia & Legros, 2004). It is used to distinguish different categories of demographic profiles (e.g. ethnic, gender, age, educational backgrounds) and work-related characteristics (e.g. employment duration and management status) and is subjected to Ward’s (1963) hierarchical clustering method. In general, cluster analysis
has two purposes: first, the measurement of similarity between employees’ demographic characteristics; and second, the use of that measure to form the groups or clusters (Finch, 2005). In order to divide respondents into groups with similar work attitudes and behaviours, a two-step cluster analysis is applied to gain the advantages of hierarchical and non-hierarchical methods. Before performing two-step cluster analysis, the outliers are checked using the Mahalanobis distances, due to the substantial impact of outliers on hierarchical methods. Hierarchical cluster analysis based on employee attitudes and behaviours was used to classify the proper number of clusters using Ward’s (1963) method. This method was used to decrease the Sum of Squares (SS) of any two (hypothetical) clusters that can be formed at each step (Ward, 1963).

3.9. Data Integration

Condelli and Wrigley (2004) suggested that by combining qualitative and quantitative methods, the researcher can obtain a much better understanding of a research problem. In other words, using a rigorous design, quantitative methods can tell us what works, while qualitative methods can tell us how it works. Data integration refers to the point in the process of research procedures at which the researcher mixes or integrates the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis (Creswell & Clark, 2007). As the sequential exploratory strategy is applied in this research, the collections of quantitative and qualitative types of data were done in different phases. Qualitative data collection and analysis were conducted first, followed by quantitative data collection and analysis.

It is possible the quantitative results will be inconsistent with the qualitative results. In general, quantitative and qualitative approaches to data analysis treat variations and exceptions differently. For example, a quantitative researcher will often simply dismiss “outliers” from the analysis and rely on probability estimates to deal with variation across the sample. In a qualitative approach, a researcher uses variation to illuminate developing theories and to modify theory to take account of exceptions (Tarver, 2006). Bennett and Braumoeller (2004, p.7-8) also mentioned that
the outliers in any particular piece of research could be . . . the product of stochastic processes, the result of measurement error, the consequence of a variable that affects the outcome of the outlier case and also those of other cases in the sample, or the consequence of a variable that is unique. Combining different methods provides more powerful means than any one method used alone for discerning which of these holds true.

Therefore, the inconsistent results are checked and analysed in detail, based on literature. In the study, the inconsistent results may be significant elements and are treated as alternative information in the quantitative phase. Thus, the quantitative study is complemented, transformed and enriched using the responses from qualitative interviews.

The researcher integrated the results of the qualitative and quantitative phases during the discussion of the outcomes of the entire study. As indicated at the beginning of the study, the researcher uses in-depth interviews to explore the effects of levels of organisational diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours. In the Discussion section, the researcher combines the results from both phases of the study to more fully answer the questions and develop a more robust and meaningful picture of the research problem. First, the researcher interprets the results that help answer the major research question: “What is the effect of levels of organisational diversity in Taiwanese hotels on employee attitudes and behaviours?” Then, the researcher discusses the findings from the survey that aim to be confirmed by the results of the qualitative study. This process allows for the findings from the first qualitative phase to further clarify the results from the quantitative phase.

The researcher further expands the discussion by integrating related literature, reflecting both qualitative and quantitative published studies on the topic. Combining the qualitative and quantitative findings helps in examining the findings of the in-depth interview and confirms the survey results, which underscore the elaborated purpose for a mixed-methods sequential exploratory design (Creswell, et al., 2003).
Chapter Four

Qualitative Data Analysis and Results

4.1. Introduction

This chapter reports on the qualitative phase, which collected and analysed the interview data to examine the impacts of level of organisational diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours. The information collected in this stage was subsequently used to inform the development of a survey used in the quantitative phase discussed in Chapter 5.

As detailed in the methodology, the aims of the qualitative phase were to determine the key company attributes that employees considered important to attract them to work for their organisations. As a result, the researcher aimed to explore whether diversity is important to employees in the workplace. There were four stages involved in the qualitative phase.

First, both primary and secondary data were used to expand the researcher’s understanding of management and diversity-related aspects in the hotels and gather background information on the hospitality sector in Taiwan.

The second stage involved the selection of appropriate sites and interviewees using snowball sampling to ensure the nominated employees and hotels were appropriate for the purposive selection criteria. The purposive selection criteria were developed to ensure that the nominated hotels had similar employee numbers. The researcher determined the distribution of employee demographic characteristics in the population of nominated employees to make sure the potential interviewees were representative of ethnicity, gender and job positions in each hotel. Overall, the selection of interviewees and hotels was followed by snowball and purposive sampling, as explained in Chapter 3. This stage involved individual interviews (see interview schedule in Appendix B) with 24 employees at three hotels in Taitung County.
The third stage in the process was the collection of the key company attributes that were considered significant in attracting employees to work for their organisation. More importantly, this process guided the researcher to discover whether diversity was an attribute that helped attract employees to work in the Taiwanese hospitality industry.

The fourth stage was data reduction using three levels of coding. This process led the researcher to locate themes and to assign initial codes or labels in a first attempt to condense the mass of data into core categories, and then identify any interrelationships that may exist between the major themes. As indicated in Chapter Three that qualitative data were analysed using NVivo 7. NVivo is one of the most available and potentially useful qualitative data analysis tools. This product enables the researcher to associate codes or labels with chunks of text, sounds, pictures, or video; to search these codes for patterns; and to construct classifications of codes that reflect testable models of the conceptual structure of the underlying data (Lewins & Silver, 2007). The main advantage of using Nvivo was that it simplified and sped up the mechanical aspects of data analysis without sacrificing flexibility. Thus, the researcher could concentrate to a greater extent on the more creative aspects of interpretation. By using NVivo software, the researcher maintained a record of the properties of each code, including a description of the code and its relationship to other codes. The researcher referred to these descriptions throughout the coding process to ensure consistency with the coding process.

The following sections describe the background and demographic information of the hotel employees who participated in this research. This is followed by a summary of the main attributes employees used in deciding to work for particular hotels. Throughout the interviews with staff, the manner in which diversity affected employee attitudes and behaviours was investigated. The meanings of work attitudes and behaviours for Taiwanese employees in hotels were also explored. Additionally, a number of factors that influenced employee attitudes and behaviours were identified by the researcher. These findings and discussions are included in this chapter and were subsequently used to inform the development of the survey instrument, as well as being integrated with quantitative results in the discussion and conclusions chapter.
4.2. Employees

The aim of interviewing employees was to reveal current perceptions about key company attributes that are associated with employees’ working with their chosen organisations in order to discover whether diversity was considered an important attribute by the employees. The inclusion of participants from hotels of similar size (measured by staff numbers) with three different levels of ethnic diversity allowed for a compilation of the most important attributes that employees initially focused on in choosing to work at particular hotels. The classifications of the hotels with three different levels of ethnic diversity are discussed in the next section. The investigation of participants’ perspectives on interview questions also had an important role in determining what factors within the hospitality sector would have either positive or negative effects on employee attitudes and behaviours in the organisations.

4.3. Demographic Information

According to Shih (1999), the Taiwanese population of 23 million can be differentiated by ethnicity into Han Chinese and indigenous people. Therefore, ethnic diversity in this study was limited to the proportions of indigenous and non-indigenous (Han Chinese) employees in the organisations studied. The demographic profiles of employees in the organisations are provided in Table 4.1.

The proportions of indigenous and non-indigenous employees in the three participating hotels are listed in Table 4.2. The researcher classified that a hotel with less than or equal to 20% of indigenous employees is an organisation with a low level of ethnic diversity. A hotel with more than 20% but less than 40% of indigenous employees is seen as an organisation with a medium level of ethnic diversity. A hotel with the equivalent or more than 40% of indigenous employees is identified as an organisation with a high level of ethnic diversity. The proportion of indigenous and non-indigenous employees in the three hotels was examined using Blau’s (1977b) diversity index (see Chapter 2 for details). Therefore, the ethnic diversity index for organisation A was calculated as 0.30 (18% indigenous employees and 82% non-indigenous employees).
For organisation B, the ethnic diversity index is 0.44 (32% indigenous employees compared to 68% non-indigenous employees). The ethnic diversity index for organisation C is 0.49 (48% indigenous employees and 52% non-indigenous employees).

Table 4.1 Organisational demographic profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Hotels</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Numbers of employees</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male employees</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indigenous employees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Numbers of managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under junior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni/college</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20—30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30—40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40—50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Duration of employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1—3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The profile of interviewees from organisation A is shown in Table 4.3. The eight interviewees from this hotel were selected through snowball sampling, and then purposive sampling was conducted, as the researcher wanted to access a particular subset of interviewees and ensure there was equal probability of a particular profile. These subjects were selected because of their demographic characteristics (e.g. ethnicity, gender and job positions). Sagalnik and Heckathorn (2004) suggested that it is possible to prevent sampling bias by having equal probability for a particular profile in the sample. Sampling bias is defined as a statistical sample of a population in which all participants are not equally balanced. It is a systematic error causing some samples of the population to be less likely to be included than others, resulting in a biased sample (Sagalnik & Heckathorn, 2004).

### Table 4.2 Hotels with high, medium and low level of ethnic diversity by diversity index scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of indigenous &amp; non-indigenous</th>
<th>Ethnic diversity index score</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Level of ethnic diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:90</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:82</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:80</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:70</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:68</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:62</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:60</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:52</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ D = 1 - \sum p_j^2 \]

D: diversity index score; \( p_j \): the proportion of the total population from group j.


### 4.4. Interviewee Group Information

#### 4.4.1. Hotel A (low level of ethnic diversity)

The profile of interviewees from organisation A is shown in Table 4.3. The eight interviewees from this hotel were selected through snowball sampling, and then purposive sampling was conducted, as the researcher wanted to access a particular subset of interviewees and ensure there was equal probability of a particular profile. These subjects were selected because of their demographic characteristics (e.g. ethnicity, gender and job positions). Sagalnik and Heckathorn (2004) suggested that it is possible to prevent sampling bias by having equal probability for a particular profile in the sample. Sampling bias is defined as a statistical sample of a population in which all participants are not equally balanced. It is a systematic error causing some samples of the population to be less likely to be included than others, resulting in a biased sample (Sagalnik & Heckathorn, 2004).
Eight interviewees in the hotel with low levels of ethnic diversity participated in this study. Four indigenous and four non-indigenous respondents were selected (see Table 4.3). There were three males and five females. Three participants were managers and the others were working as general staff. One interviewee was aged between 20 and 29 years, three were between 30 and 39 years, and four interviewees were aged between 40 and 49 years. The average duration of their employment in the organisation was four years. Average interview time was 1.5 hours. A common set of open-ended interview questions (individual demographic profiles, reasons for and attraction to working in the organisation, employee attitudes and behaviours) was used in all the interviews. Responses to the common questions provided summarised data across all interviewees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity (I/N)</th>
<th>Gender (M/F)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Job position (M/N-M)</th>
<th>Duration of employment (years)</th>
<th>Work experience in other hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean | 37.5 | 4 |

### 4.4.2. Hotel B (medium level of ethnic diversity)

For the hotel with a medium level of ethnic diversity, eight interviewees were chosen using the same procedure as previously detailed. Four indigenous and four non-indigenous interviewees were included. There were four females and four males (see Table 4.4). There was one participant aged between 25 and 29 years, four between 30 and 39 years, two between 40 and 49, and one participant aged 50 years. The average duration of their employment in the hotels was four years. Three were managers and the others were working as general staff. Average interview time was 1.5 hours.
Table 4.4 Interviewee profile of organisation B (medium level of ethnic diversity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity (I/N)</th>
<th>Gender (M/F)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Job position (M/N-M)</th>
<th>Duration of employment (years)</th>
<th>Work experience in other hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 37.125 4.25

4.4.3. Hotel C (high level of ethnic diversity)

The average duration of employment at Hotel C was seven years (see Table 4.5). Eight interviewees in the organisation with a high level of ethnic diversity were selected using the process discussed previously. There were four males and four females. Three participants were managers and the others were working as general staff. The average interview time was 1.5 hours. Two interviewees were aged between 20 and 29 years, two between 30 and 39 years, and four interviewees were aged between 40 and 49 years.

Table 4.5 Interviewee profile of organisation C (high level of ethnic diversity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity (I/N)</th>
<th>Gender (M/F)</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Job position (M/N-M)</th>
<th>Duration of employment (years)</th>
<th>Work experience in other hotel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Senior High</td>
<td>Non-M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 36 8
4.5. Identified Key Company Attributes

The focus of this study is to determine whether diversity matters to Taiwanese employees in hotels. This section concentrates on the relative importance of the company attributes that attracted employees to work in the organisation and this guides an exploration of the extent to which diversity-related attributes in particular are important to employees. During the interviews, the researcher asked the question: “What company attributes attracted you to work in this hotel?” Some interviewees indicated either they cannot remember or they just needed a job and were selected by the organisations. The researcher is aware that errors may enter into research studies when there is a dependence on memory (Padilla-Walker & Poole, 2002; Parks, 1999). For example, an experiment has shown that some people who attempt to recall childhood events encounter errors in memories that in turn affect their current reflections. Therefore, the author concluded that people’s recall abilities are poor (Parks, 1999). Padilla-Walker and Poole (2002) also noted that there are variations in the conditions under which memories are retrieved which may promote unreliability. Thus, in order to address the problem with trying to capture memories of key company attributes before employees entered the organisations, the researcher asked the additional question: “What company attributes would attract you to another organisation?”

These interviews identified a number of key company attributes that attracted employees to work in their present organisation and possibly other organisations in the future. These attributes were categorised broadly into five main areas: diversity, job, network, geographic, and reputation. Each of these categories is discussed below.

4.5.1. Diversity

Employees’ perspectives of company attributes were relatively similar across the participating hotels. Employees agreed that when they chose to work in the current hotels, the composition of indigenous employees in the hotel was significant. Thus, the attributes related to ethnic perspectives such as a desire for increasing ethnic minority
numbers in the workplace and recommendations by indigenous members are described here as diversity attributes. Respondents who mentioned diversity as an attraction were all from indigenous backgrounds. This is best depicted in the following statements that mirror many of the thoughts of indigenous employees:

“... it is more comfortable to work with someone who comes from similar backgrounds. It is easier for me to get along with the staff who are indigenous ... there used to be more indigenous employees in this company.”

“There were many indigenous employees in this organisation a few years ago and that’s why I chose to come here to work.”

“I would love to work somewhere with more people who come from a similar ethnic background as me.”

A similar opinion was reported by another indigenous employee, who mentioned that an indigenous friend suggested he work for the organisation as it was an indigenous-friendly work environment. He then stated that “more indigenous employees in that organisation will suit me better to work for; we usually can speak same language and have more in common”.

The ethnic composition of a Taiwanese hotel is an important attribute to indigenous employees, which leads to a key research finding that organisational diversity does matter to Taiwanese indigenous employees in the hotel sector. Additionally, the researcher noted that these respondents are all indigenous employees in non-managerial positions who also attained primary to senior high school education. Another study has demonstrated that people with lower levels of educational backgrounds are more likely to form ties with their own ethnic group (Fong & Isajiw, 2000). Thus, not only ethnicity and job position but also level of education may be associated with employees being attracted by high levels of organisational diversity.
4.5.2. Job

It became clear from the discussions with participants that the nature of the job is a factor of attraction to the employees. In all three organisations studied, opportunities for rapid advancement, job interest, job suitability, job security, potential for salary increases as well as training opportunities were the most common attributes that attracted the interviewees to join their current organisation or another organisation. Most employees agreed that potential for salary increases was the most important factor. A typical response was:

“Salary package is the most important factor to me. Will I have a bonus and how much salary will be increased in the future?”

The importance of job suitability, opportunities for rapid advancement, job interest, and training opportunities were of higher importance in the non-indigenous group than the indigenous group. Employees also said that they often discussed job suitability and interest, chances of promotion, and training opportunities, and made numerous comparisons with other hotels to see which hotel offered the better job opportunities. Therefore, they may be seeking any opportunity to move to another organisation they perceive to be better. On the other hand, the indigenous employees claimed that job characteristics were important but also added that “most hotels pretty much offer similar job positions with similar characteristics like others.”

In addition, the response “it’s just a job” could be interpreted as showing poor involvement in a job. There were staff in the hotels who responded that the reason they chose to work in their organisation was that they just needed a job and the organisation accepted their application. It can be noted that these respondents were all indigenous. As mentioned earlier, the average educational level of most indigenous employees was lower than for non-indigenous employees. These interviewees said that they had poor chances of obtaining the job that they really wanted and so they would accept any employment offers that were available.
4.5.3. Network

Another important attribute that was stressed by employees was network/system. According to respondents, work environment harmony, stability of working structure and management system, and clear company policies would encourage them to choose to work in the organisation. Above all, employees reported that they were conscious of management system stability, policy clarity and the work ambience, which made them feel comfortable. Chang (2006) stated that organisational management systems are the processes and procedures used to ensure that an organisation can meet all tasks required in order to achieve the organisational goals and mission.

In terms of system stability and policy clarity, employees reported that:

“...structured and comprehensible working system and understandable policy and rules of the organisation would be my first consideration to choose another company.”

“The system stability of the organisational management is very important as it shows that the company has been operated well and this indicates a secure future.”

Furthermore, the need for a harmonious work environment was indicated in these statements by the interviewees:

“I do not care how much I earn, but I really care about if this is the happy work environment. I do not like to work with whole group of grumpy people.”

“If this is the organisation that I have to work for eight to twelve hours a day and I have to make sure it is a peaceful and harmony workplace.”

A structured harmonious workplace with stable management systems and clear rules appeared to affect the future choices of job applicants. Pinpointing these three major attributes that are significant to employees could be one direction for managers and employers when considering an evaluation of policy clarity, management system stability and workplace harmony in the organisation. Therefore, the results of these
evaluations could be used in the development of a recruitment strategy in the Taiwanese hotel sector.

4.5.4. Geographic

Geographic position (famous tourist destination and close to home) was also a significant category reported across the participating organisations. Employees indicated that when they chose where to work, the location of the hotel was significant. They reported that they chose a hotel conveniently located close to their home as well as those near major attractions and popular sightseeing destinations. For example,

“I like to work in the hotels where near the famous tourist destination. Just like the hotel I am working in right now, it locates on the top of mountain and has a great view. It’s great to work somewhere surrounding the natural environment.”

Several employees made comments about the importance of their home being a short distance from work. However, the location of the company is not something that hotels can change or modify in order to meet employees’ needs. Because geographic position was perceived to be important by the employees, the researcher decided to keep it as a separate category rather than merge it into the network category, which could be modified and improved based on employees’ recommendations.

4.5.5. Reputation

The final important attribute identified from the interviews was hotel reputation, such as the image of the company and public relations as perceived by the community. Employees who had been working in the hospitality industry longer had become more experienced and better understood the competitive working environment of the Taiwanese hotel sector. They shared information with other hotels’ employees about each others’ organisations and make judgments about the reputations of particular hotels. These reputations may build the image of hotels and their public relations with local communities. Reputations were a key driver for employees in choosing which hotel to
work for and were seen to mitigate the risk of taking a new job. This is illustrated by the following comments:

“I am sure the image of the company is the most important reason to choose the organisation to work for. If they have good images in the industry, I shouldn’t worry too much.”

“Most of locals have heard this company before and have a good image about it. This company has a quite good relationship with the local communities; therefore I decide to work here.”

“I know this hotel have good public relations with the local community and that’s why I chose to work here. I do not want to work somewhere do not know how to negotiating and managing community interests and conflict. If the hotel care about the local community, I am sure the company will care for me too.”

Since the image of the company and public relations were demonstrated to be important attributes to the respondents, these can be seen as cost-effective methods for promoting the hotel business and getting the company name in front of the industry and in publications. As a result, employees are more likely to feel secure and honoured to work in hotels with these attributes.

4.5.6. Overview of key company attributes

Overall, the attributes that employees thought important in choosing a hotel to work for are summarised in Figure 4.1 and are broadly categorised into five main areas: job, network, geographic location, reputation and diversity. The interview results revealed that diversity was considered as important attribute by Taiwanese indigenous employees when choosing to work in the hotels. This finding suggests that organisational diversity does matter to Taiwanese indigenous hotel employees. Therefore, it is important to further investigate the impact of diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels. Additionally, the attributes such as it’s just a job and word of mouth from indigenous members cited during the interviews are aspects that can’t be
controlled by the organisations and are therefore not considered further. The rest of the identified key company attributes were summarised and incorporated into the development of the items in the quantitative survey detailed in the next chapter.

4.6. Employees’ Perceptions of Diversity

This section analyses two interview questions: 1) Could you please talk about your perception of diversity in this organisation? 2) Does organisational diversity matter to you and why? Respondents’ perceptions of diversity are grouped according to employees’ responses concerning levels of ethnic diversity, and the advantages and disadvantages of diversity.
4.6.1. Perceived levels of ethnic diversity

Respondents were asked what their perception of diversity was in their hotels. Most of the employees in the hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity indicated that they perceived equal or slightly higher numbers of indigenous employees in their organisations. Most employees in the hotel with a low level of diversity reported that they perceived fewer indigenous employees than non-indigenous employees. This finding suggests that the levels of ethnic diversity in the organisations as perceived by the majority of employees approximately matched the actual pattern of ethnic diversity. Therefore, the diversity levels were only measured by the actual diversity in the hotels to answer the remaining research questions.

4.6.2. Perceived advantages of diversity

Interviewees were asked whether organisational diversity mattered to them and why, and the responses were coded into two axial codes; perceived advantages and disadvantages of diversity. These advantages of organisational diversity may benefit both individuals and communities. Individual benefits discussed by interviewees in this study were cultural learning, emotional effectiveness, and improvement of indigenous work performance, whilst group benefits in this study consisted of developing a friendly/interesting work environment, building relationships within the indigenous village (e.g. development of job opportunities for indigenous village), and obtaining diverse work skills. Each of these factors is discussed and illustrated in Figure 4.2 below.
Interviewees indicated that organisational diversity does result in beneficial impacts on the employees who perceive themselves as minorities. Consider this comment made by an indigenous employee:

“... the higher level of ethnic diversity would make me feel better in an emotional and psychosocial way. I felt like I have been treated equally and fairly as I do not like to be seen as the minority in the workplace.”

Non-indigenous employees also indicated that there are many individual benefits of organisational diversity; one respondent illustrated an example of why he thought it was good to mix the two ethnic groups at the workplace.

“Mixed minority and non-minority employees in the workplace could enable indigenous people to experience non-indigenous work attitudes and behaviours and eventually this could help them to develop skills and obtain a competitive advantage.”

Furthermore, managers agreed that organisational diversity has positive effects on both indigenous and non-indigenous employees. A typical comment by respondents was:
“Like our hotel, we have mixed numbers of indigenous and non-indigenous staff. I found that they can actually learn the cultural uniqueness from each other through work. For example, non-indigenous employee could take indigenous staff as a model to be more open hearted and easy going. On the other hand, indigenous employee should emulate non-indigenous employees’ work attitudes and ethics. I also found that our employees were trying to learn each other’s local languages which were great to see.”

In fact, employees in all three organisations stated that the advantages of organisational diversity included developing a friendly/interesting work environment, obtaining diverse work skills, and offering equal job opportunities for minorities in the local community, which were classified as group benefits (benefits for organisations). Several managers mentioned the link between high levels of organisational diversity and a friendly work environment, as illustrated in this statement:

“When ethnic diversity is more balanced in the workplace, there would be less classification between a majority and a minority. It looks like each of us is equal and this balance would help to develop harmony in the workplace.

Employees emphasised this association between organisational diversity and group benefits such as obtaining diverse work skills, as illustrated by these comments:

“If you can’t work with people who come from diverse backgrounds then how can you serve people who come from different backgrounds. Working with people who come from diverse backgrounds could be seen as training for dealing with customers who come from different backgrounds.”

Building relationships within the local indigenous village by offering job opportunities for minorities in the local community also emerged as a group benefit and an advantage of organisational diversity. Indigenous and non-indigenous employees had similar ideas about the group benefit that could be achieved by having higher levels of organisational diversity at the hotels. Typical comments provided by managers were:
“When we need to increase the indigenous staff in our hotel, we start recruiting the indigenous people in the surrounding village. We are therefore offering more job opportunities to the indigenous community, in turn, we are building and maintain the closer relationship with the village by offering them more jobs. It is win win situations.”

The findings indicate that some managers in Taiwanese hotels are willing to utilise the full potential of the labour market from local indigenous villages in order to develop and sustain positive public relations with these communities. This view was supported by comments reported earlier, that Taiwanese employees believed hotels’ public relations activities with communities was an important attribute that could attract them to work for the organisation. The managers emphasised what public relations had achieved within the local community. For instance, the hotels participated in community recruitment fairs and events; increased the numbers of indigenous employees in the hotel; promoted the hotel and encouraged positive relationships with local indigenous communities via billboards, newsletters and publications; and played an active part as a corporate tourism partner to promote indigenous tourism, art and culture. Therefore these achievements could be adopted as strategies by other Taiwanese hotels to demonstrate their commitment to providing sustainable working opportunities for indigenous people, as well as active and positive engagement with indigenous communities.

4.6.3. Perceived disadvantages of diversity

Potential disadvantages of organisational diversity were also reported by Taiwanese hotel employees. Difficulties of communication, differences in alcohol drinking behaviour, negative leading examples, decreased competitiveness of the workforce and differences in work ethic/values were identified.

As mentioned earlier in chapter two, Shaules (2010) distinguished differences between surface and deep cultures. Difficulties of communication and differences of alcohol drinking behaviour are classified as surface elements. These elements usually involve stereotypes of indigenous and non-indigenous groups in Taiwanese society and can exist between indigenous and non-indigenous groups even though they may not be
working together. Competitiveness of the workforce and differences in work ethic/values were considered deep elements. These elements are not easily discovered unless the indigenous and non-indigenous employees spend time working together and work values clash. Each of these factors, illustrated in Figure 4.3 below, will now be discussed.

**Figure 4.3 Perceived disadvantages of diversity**

The interviews contained examples of deep elements such as differences in work ethic/values, negative leading examples, and decreased competitiveness in the workforce. These were perceived mainly by managers. A manager with more than 10 years’ experience in the hotel sector observed that the disadvantage of organisational diversity is as follows:

“There are still cultural differences between the two ethnic groups. These two groups have very distinct work ethics and attitudes. It is difficult applying the rule on indigenous staff as they do not often follow which may leads an example for non-indigenous employee not following the rules. Eventually, non-indigenous staff becomes less competitive and efficient at work.”
These findings correspond to the following view of another manager, for example:

“I often have indigenous staff didn’t show up at the work without informing me or with the reason for not attending work with trivial reasons. They turn out to be the bad leading example for the non-indigenous employee.”

Both respondents are managers with non-indigenous backgrounds. Notably, both managers are employed in the hotel with a low level of ethnic diversity. They both had experienced difficulties in managing indigenous employees. They added that they had quite good relationships with their indigenous employees, but that it was just too hard to manage their work attitudes/behaviours. In other words, they believed that indigenous employees were good to socialise with but not so good to work with because of poor attendance record and low work efficiency.

Furthermore, an interview with the employees emphasised that the disadvantages of organisational diversity include such things as difficulties in communication and differences in alcohol drinking behaviour.

“Sometimes the indigenous staff may speak their mother language at work or we speak Taiwanese instead of Mandarin which make us hard to communicate with each other.”

Another respondent observed:

“Indigenous people can really drink a lot and they were sometimes too drunk to come to work. We all know that they love alcohol!”

Both elements could be used to explain why in hotels with high levels of ethnic heterogeneity, both the majority and the minority are more likely to perceive surface elements (e.g. difficulties of communication, differences in alcohol drinking behaviour) than the deep elements (e.g. competitiveness of workforce and differences of work ethic/values). In other words, employees in organisations with medium and high levels of diversity seem be less aware of cultural differences in terms of employee work ethic/values (deep element). Communication and interaction with ethnically different workers are difficult to avoid if the work environment is ethnically heterogeneous. In
these cases, employees are exposed to more opportunities to communicate with others of different ethnicity. Due to more frequent communication and interaction, employees may share opinions and ideas more. From these frequent communications, workers’ otherness becomes normalised and less foreign. In this way different cultures, regardless of minority status, become integrated or, at least, mix more easily with one another. Employees form attachments and share their perceptions across cultural divides more easily and comfortably without an awareness of this taking place. Finally, the negative behaviours linked to the awareness of differences in work ethic and values are likely to be reduced.

Surface elements such as communication difficulties and alcohol drinking issues involve the stereotypical images about ethnic minorities. Thus, in the hotel with a high level of ethnic diversity, deep elements could be erased by assimilation between the majority and the minority, but surface elements might not be erased as easily due to the long-term impact of stereotypical images within society. Additionally, most respondents who perceived disadvantages in diversity were non-indigenous. Very few indigenous employees in the three hotels thought there were any disadvantages and all agreed that surface elements such as alcohol drinking issues and communication difficulties were the main disadvantages.

4.7. Employee Perceptions of Their Work within the Hotel

Due to the depth and richness of responses and opinions gained from the interviews, the majority of the analysis and discussion focuses on the data derived from the semi-structured interviews. Interview data have been integrated with the findings from the literature, which were used to support or reject findings emerging from the interview data. In the interviews, participants were asked about their perceptions of their work within the hotels. Employees are usually in a good position to assess the organisation’s actions, issues, and proposed solutions to the company (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). Thus, employee perceptions and the inclusion of their opinions and suggestions should be seen as important in today’s global and competitive work environment, as the more that management knows about employee sentiment, the easier it is to manage their
behaviour, to help them grow and the business to prosper. Two core categories emerged from the analysis of interview data and are illustrated in Figure 4.4 below.

Employee perceptions of their work within the hotel are summarised as two core categories; employee attitudes and employee behaviours. Not all participants discussed all the factors associated with a theme, further illustrating the variety of individual experiences and opinions whilst working in the hotels. Each of the constructs will now be discussed.

4.8. Employee Attitudes

In analysing the interview data, the researcher observed that the participants have attitudes or viewpoints about many aspects of their jobs, their organisation, and diversity in the workplace. That is, several reasons underpinning the development and construction of distinctive employee attitudes were identified. These reasons fell into
three broad areas: attitude to job; attitude to company; and attitude to diversity. Employee attitudes are shown in greater detail in Table 4.5 below.

![Figure 4.5 Hotel employee attitudes](image)

**4.8.1. Attitude toward the job**

In general, most employees across the hotels reported that they were happy with their present job. From the perspective of research and practice, one of the central employee attitudes is job satisfaction (Cetin, 2006). Job characteristics such as task completion, effort investment in work, challenging levels of work and training opportunities were reported by the interviewees as the reasons for their attitude toward the job. In terms of these job-related characteristics, employees responded that:

“My job is really interesting! I can meet so many different people and there are a variety of tasks waiting for me each day. I especially like the feeling when I complete the tasks I have been asked for.”

“I quite enjoy my work, I like my job full of the challenges every day. To meet different customers’ needs means that I need to overcome different types of challenges.”
“To be honest, I have learned a lot since I start working here. I have been trained in the front desk, restaurants and room services. I am happy that I can handle many types of work tasks and do them well now.”

On the other hand, some employees indicated that they looked forward to finishing work so that they could go home for their personal activities. This was interpreted as a negative attitude toward levels of work effort.

“The happiest time of my job is when I finally finished the day so that I can do whatever I want.”

Low levels of work effort may be suggestive of negative job attitudes, but it could also be interpreted that those respondents are more likely to put work–life balance into practice. It is noted that these respondents are all in non-manager positions and mostly have indigenous backgrounds.

Quite frequently, respondents indicated that they were not happy about their job because of low pay. A typical comment was, “I am not happy about this job because there is not enough salary.”

The common phrase “money can buy you happiness” has been demonstrated to be valid based on the above finding. It seems that Taiwanese hotel employers underestimate the percentage of their employees who are not satisfied with the salary linked to their job. This study found that low pay may be the one important cause of Taiwanese employees’ unhappiness toward their job.

4.8.2. Attitude toward the organisation

Another dominant response that emerged from the interviews was employees’ attitudes toward their organisation. According to respondents, the harmony of the work environment and location of the hotel were reported as the reasons they liked their organisation. A couple of representative comments were:
“I like to work in this hotel because this is the company that promotes a good and harmonious working environment and atmosphere.”

“I am glad that I can work in this company as it is close to my home.”

Moreover, the more dissatisfied with their company employees are, the more likely they are to quit and to seek other work (Mattila, 2006). This is especially important in industries with high turnover, such as hospitality. In this study, recruitment issues are the most common reason that the employees disliked their company. For example,

“I am not happy about our company as we do not have enough staff here. Lack of staff in this organisation indicates that we have to share more duties that we suppose to.”

This comment raises the question, are the effects of staff shortages felt acutely by Taiwanese hotels? In the hotel industry, staff shortages are particularly problematic in seasonal areas with small workforces and peak tourist periods (Tracey, Way, & Tews, 2008). The respondents believed that the shortage of staff is the critical reason related to decreases in service quality. It can be seen that insufficient employees would also cause heavier workload so that the interviewees stated that they were too exhausted to perform their duties to a reasonable standard.

### 4.8.3. Attitude toward diversity

The participants’ attitudes toward diversity differed with respect to the extent to which they worked in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. Employees in organisations with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity indicated that they were happy to embrace higher levels of diversity in the hotels. These respondents were both indigenous and non-indigenous. For instance, a non-indigenous manager noted that there are many indigenous employees in the company and they are easy going.

“I like that there are many indigenous employees in this hotel. In particular they like to drink alcohol and usually express themselves easily after a drink. Indigenous people are much more relaxed and less complex than non-indigenous people.”
“We have many indigenous employees in this hotel and they are one of our icons to attract customers who interests in Taiwanese indigenous culture. I like our indigenous employees, they are fun and naive sometimes.”

Comments by employees in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity indicated that the hotel they worked for had formally recognised workforce diversity as an advantage by increasing numbers of indigenous staff. This finding may indicate that hotel managers and employees were more tolerant and positive toward diversity.

Moreover, employees in the hotel with a low level of diversity reported they wanted to see more ethnic diversity in the organisation. Interestingly, they all had indigenous backgrounds and none of them were managers. For instance,

“I hope we can have more indigenous people work here. I think it’s good to hire more indigenous employees as they are good at dancing and singing as the performers to attract guests.”

Managers in the organisation with a low level of diversity noted that they would like to see less ethnic diversity in the organisation and preferred not to hire indigenous people. Surprisingly, one of them came from an indigenous background.

“As I am a manager and I have to admit it is harder to manage indigenous employees. Although I am an indigenous but I would prefer to hire less indigenous people.”

It seems that employees’ diversity-related attitudes vary within the hotels and are least positive or supportive in the hotel with a low level of diversity. In particular, managers and general employees’ indications were extremely different and suggested that job positions impact diversity-related attitudes. The managers in the hotel with a low level of diversity contrast with the managers in the other two hotels, who noted that they were happy to have higher levels of ethnic diversity within the workplace.
4.9. Employee Behaviours

Many characteristics make up an individual’s behaviour in the workplace. Managers and employees have been shaped by their personal backgrounds and culture, as well as by the organisation’s culture. These influences affect the way employees behave at work, communicate, and interact with one another. In analysing the interview data, several aspects of interviewees’ perceptions about their performance and behaviours at work were observed. These aspects are summarised into five common behaviours, being job related; customer related; co-workers related; diversity related; and retention. The constructs of these employee behaviours are shown in Table 4.6 below.
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4.9.1. Job-related behaviours

In all three organisations, job-related behaviours were commonly reported by employees. These include those behaviours that an individual undertakes as part of a job. Respondents said they usually completed their tasks successfully and on time, performed problem-solving skills well and met the job requirements, which were summarised as task-specific behaviours. Task-specific behaviours are the core substantive tasks that differentiate one job from another. Several typical comments were:

“…..always finish my job efficiently and successfully! I think I do a good job.”

“…..completed the task that the manager asked me to do.”

“……finish the task smoothly and do it well.”

“… this is the hospitality business and we receive customer complaints and many other problems every day. I can deal with the problems in an efficient way and solve them properly.”

On the other hand, personal factors were the main reasons given by employees for not achieving their best performance in the three organisations. The respondents noted that the reasons they often could not perform well at work were related to their personal emotional effectiveness and self-commitment levels. Respondents reported that,

“I do not think I perform well at work as I always easily get stressed or upset about my job.”

“I am usually quite laid back about my work [laughs]! It is our natural personality [indigenous background] as we are more laid back toward the life, not to mention about the work.”

“Sometimes I may work a few hours and fool around the rest of day.”

“I always have a trouble with time management so that I can’t finish the job on time.”
However, some employees stated that they always keep themselves motivated in order to maintain active and positive performance at work. They also believed positive work behaviour was a worthwhile ideal. Motivation can be seen as a significant factor that drives employees’ positive behaviour.

“I like to keep myself motivated and active while I am working.”

“Always remind myself being active toward work without the managers’ request and show a positive attitude in the workplace. This motivation helps me to performance my job well”.

It appears that most employees identified their behaviours that were significantly associated with their job. These job-related behaviours were also apparently linked to employees’ self-commitment and motivational levels.

4.9.2. Customer-related behaviours

Another interesting observation from the interviews was employee behaviours associated with customers. The hospitality industry – a service industry – is characterised by the crucial importance of interactions between employees and customers. How hotel staff offer customers exceptional quality service is an essential part of a hotel’s success. For all employees, whether or not they are on the frontline dealing with customers, their behaviours will directly affect the quality of customer service. Typical comments made by employees were:

“I always do my best to satisfy customers’ needs in order to make them happy. Satisfying customers as much as I can is what I believe in and what I have achieved at work.

“I would really like to if we could meet all of our customers’ needs and satisfied all of our customers… happiness of customer is what I am looking for….even though sometimes customers’ requests may not related our job requirement.”
“Service is what we sell in the hotel; therefore offering good service to our customer is what I believe in. I actually like to interact with our customers wherever I saw them or even just have a chat with them and make them feel welcomed.”

The other employee behaviour related to customers identified from the interviews was associated with customer complaints. As customers become more experienced and sophisticated, and better understand the competitive nature of the hotel sector, their desires and expectations increase (Rayka, et al., 2004). Further, customers can expect more for less and therefore there may be a gap between customers’ expectations and employees’ perception in meeting the increased expectations of customers. The respondents described how dealing with customer complaints was part of their work behaviours:

“I have to provide more and better service to minimise variety of customer complaints in order to enhance level of customer happiness all the time. It’s really tiring.”

“I wish we didn’t have so much customer complaints everyday as I am a manager and I have to deal with most of the customer complaints, sometimes it’s really too much for me. I felt stress and helpless constantly.”

Pinpointing the number and variety of complaints and quality of customer service appears to be significantly associated with employees’ behaviours, which is one of the many challenges for managers and employees. Accordingly, this finding also implies that employees’ customer-related behaviour could link to employee burnout due to Taiwanese customers’ demanding attitudes.

4.9.3. Co-worker related behaviours

Many respondents in the three organisations stated their work behaviour was significantly associated with their co-workers. Communication and cooperation are often the behaviours related to co-workers. For example,

“I usually have good communication with co-workers and this leads us to have a good work relationship and good interactions in the workplace.”
“Highest levels of cooperation with other workers and even to other departments are definitely what I do for my best at work.”

Successful companies and organisations know that effective communication and cooperation is essential to their success (Davis, 2005). Improved communication and cooperation can promote creativity and increase productivity. On the other hand, miscommunication and lack of cooperation can cause severe problems and create difficult situations. These problems in turn create a poor and ineffective work environment. Through the interviews, the respondents indicated that their work behaviours were strongly associated with the levels of communication and cooperation between departments in the workplace.

“The employees in different departments may not familiar with other department’s jobs because of the differences of job characteristic. But I usually have high levels of cooperation relationship with different departments as I am happy to help others out.”

“Honestly, I do not know much about the employees in other departments but I usually go home late because I stay to help my co-workers.”

“I always tried to interact and communicate with each other more, no matter at work or after work….no matter manager or non-manager has to respect that everyone has their own way of doing things so that we can work well together.”

Many employees mentioned that they performed well at work mainly because they had good communication and cooperative relationships with their co-workers. However, a different view was put forward by employees regarding the co-worker related behaviour that they disliked. Here, differences between manager and employee behaviours were apparent. For example,

A manager stated, “Sometimes it really frustrating to work here. I am a manager and responsible for managing the staff, however sometimes the staff can’t follow my orders or instructions and they even talk behind my back.”
By contrast, an employee declared, “I do not really like some manager’s management style in this organisation. I feel like they do not provide enough freedom for us to work here and sometimes their orders make no sense or are not necessary. Criticism is what we often received than praised”.

The typical frustration reported by these employees was: “Some managers often do not understand what general staff felt and thought, and interfere our work too much. It shows that there are always poor communication situations between managers and general staff.”

As the above statement indicates, miscommunication between managers and non-managers is a critical issue across the Taiwanese hotel samples.

Managers should be a positive role model to promote open communication in a harmonious workplace, which is often used as a positive aspect in an organisation. It is crucial that managers maintain an air of professionalism. The challenge for managers is to balance the expectations of the organisation’s goal with the tasks that general staff accomplish. The interview findings provide the basis of an understanding of the aspects of co-worker related behaviour.

The interviewees indicated that managers should not discuss or criticise fellow general staff in front of others, and they should not overly interfere with employees’ work. Bergen, et al. (2005) suggested that with the right support, training, and modelling behaviour, general staff will be on the way to developing successful work relationships and open communication.

4.9.4. Diversity-related behaviour

It became obvious from the discussions with participants that diversity-related behaviour is an important form of cultural interaction for employees. Diversity-related behaviour is the work performance and behaviour associated with employees’ cultural background. The interviewees indicated that their diversity-related behaviour reflects the influence of employees’ ethnic backgrounds. Frequency of ethnic interaction was
mentioned regularly by employees in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity.

“I was in another organisation before and every employee went home straight away after work, however I always have activities with the indigenous employees after work, sometimes they invited me to their place for a drink or I invite them to my place.”

“I have been working here for more than 10 years. I have seen and used to the work climate that indigenous and non-indigenous employees interact actively with each other in our hotel. We are not only working together, but also hangout all the time after work.”

The researcher observed that non-indigenous employees and managers in the hotel with a low level of ethnic diversity tended to describe indigenous employee work behaviour as demonstrating a “poor work ethic”. They suggested that indigenous employees are more likely to have less commitment to the job. A manager mentioned that she doesn’t like to manage indigenous employees as sometimes they just did not have similar perspectives to those of non-indigenous employees regarding the job, but she also added that she got along with and was happy to socialise with indigenous people. However, as a manager, she said it was difficult to work with someone who was not committed to their job. Additionally, she pointed out that this was the reason the hotel tried not to hire many indigenous employees.

Another non-indigenous employee explained that he liked to socialise and interact with indigenous co-workers but still had trouble working with them due to their poor work ethic. He stated that

“... the departments usually would help each other out, but some indigenous employees are more likely not to help other departments; sometimes they also take home organisational resources (e.g. stationery, food ingredients and bedding)... Do not give me wrong, I am friends with them very well, but it is not easy to work with them.”
The researcher noted that differences in work ethic were more frequently mentioned by employees in the hotel with a low level of ethnic diversity. This suggests that managers in the organisation with a low level of ethnic diversity expressed less positive behaviour regarding employing indigenous employees. On the other hand, the interview responses indicated that employees in hotels with higher levels of ethnic diversity actually appreciated interaction between non-indigenous and indigenous employees more than those in the hotel with a low level of ethnic diversity. This may suggest high levels of diversity in the workplace could actually reduce negative consequences of cultural differences and, in turn, facilitate managers’ more positive behaviour of hiring indigenous employees.

4.9.5. Retention behaviour

The interviews revealed another key response, being employees’ behaviours relating to their intention to leave the hotel. Most respondents reported that they had thoughts about changing their job.

The researcher noted that every employee in one particular hotel said they had thought about changing jobs. One possible explanation is that the average employment duration was 8 years in this particular hotel compared to the other two hotels, which had average employment durations of approximately 4 years. Additionally, the majority of the respondents had been employed in this particular hotel for more than 7 years. When employees work in an organisation for a longer period, they may be exposed to more opportunities to have thoughts about changing their job.

Although most employees indicated they had thoughts about changing their job, they added that it would not be easy for them to find another job with a similar salary and benefits. These respondents were generally indigenous employees, and they were more likely to remain in the organisation.

“Honestly, we are indigenous and we are already fine with having a job so that we shouldn’t complain too much; I should be happy where I am.”
“It’s hard to find another job that I have right now, especially I only have a junior high school education background so that it’s not easy for me to find another job.”

“To difficult for me to find another job in my age. Most of hotels prefer to recruit younger and prettier staff.”

These responses demonstrated that not only ethnic background but also educational background and age were the main factors influencing employees to seek another job. In addition, according to the organisational demographic information and the interview profile provided earlier, most indigenous employees had only attained primary to senior high school education. As their average educational level was lower than that of non-indigenous employees, they reported that they had less chance of getting a job, and therefore these indigenous employees indicated that they didn’t have many choices, and took whatever they were offered.

Unlike indigenous employees, many non-indigenous employees commented that they were usually looking for better job opportunities and it would not be difficult for them to find another job.

“As I mentioned earlier, the turnover rate of this organisation is too high, it’s hard to keep consistent service quality if our staff keep changing, however … I believe I can find another job easily and I think that’s’ what other employees in this organisation think as well.”

“I consider myself as a hard worker with high work ethics. But my current company doesn’t offer me enough rewards to stay...low pay, poor work conditions and etc. I always know that there will be some better opportunities waiting for me, I just have to be patient until it comes along.”

In a business setting, the goal of employers is usually to decrease employee turnover, thereby decreasing training costs, recruitment costs and loss of talent and organisational knowledge. This study found that employees with demographic characteristics such as indigenous backgrounds, insufficient educational background and older age are more
likely to remain in their present job. On the other hand, employees’ intention to leave a job is related to the rewards, such as pay, benefit packages, and employment conditions. Prior research has established that the most frequently stated reason for employees wanting to leave a job is employment conditions, being salary and benefits (Ghiselli, La Lopa, & Bai, 2003). Lee and Eyraud (2008) stated that employment conditions include hours of work, overtime, holidays, personal leave, superannuation and other penalty provisions. Taiwanese hotel retention strategies should consider the benefits of recruiting newcomers with indigenous backgrounds, inadequate educational backgrounds and older age, since the respondents with these characteristics are more likely to express lower turnover intentions. Furthermore, hotels can reassess pay, benefit packages, and employment conditions to retain only those employees they consider to be high performers.

4.10. Factors Affecting Employee Attitudes and Behaviours

In the interviews, participants were asked to consider factors that would affect their work attitudes and behaviours. As explained in Chapter 3, interviews with managers and employees were semi-structured, and although an interview protocol was used to outline a set of questions about employee perceptions of working in the hotels, opportunities were provided to also address new areas. In analysing the interview data, several factors affecting employee attitudes and behaviours were identified. The interviewees demonstrated a variety of personal experiences and perceptions about working in the hotels. This suggests that a range of strategies could be adopted to meet and influence individual expectations in order to enhance positive employees’ attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese workplaces. These findings were used to integrate with the quantitative findings and provided the recommendations made in the discussion and conclusions chapter. These factors fell into four broad areas: job; network and system; customer; and diversity. Four core categories emerged from the analysis of interview data, as illustrated in Figure 4.7 below. Each of the core categories will now be discussed.
4.10.1. Job

The training opportunities and challenging levels of work all contributed to more positive employee attitudes and behaviours. For example, employees reported that they are confident that the effort they make has a high likelihood of resulting in success by receiving a great number of training opportunities. Respondents believed that mastery achieved through training and practices is more likely to develop their positive attitudes toward the job and better work performance. They also indicated that the level of challenge at work could stimulate work motivation and satisfaction. The staff interviews are summed up in the following comments:
“There are so many things that I need to learn from this job and I have learned a lot from the training opportunities that our hotel provided. These training programs are very useful, and help me become more confident and positive at work.”

“The job itself is very challenging and it has required me to motivate myself in the best way and have a positive attitude toward my work so that I always do my best at work.”

Moreover, through incentive compensation structures, employees can be led to focus their attention and efforts on crucial job tasks and the organisational mission. The respondents indicated that rewards from the job have a significant impact on employees’ attitudes and behaviours. These rewards can take various forms, such as salary and bonuses or praise and recognition. This study found that the rewards were a crucial factor affecting Taiwanese employees’ job satisfaction and retention behaviours. Rewards help to increase employees’ satisfaction with their job and the organisation. Employees usually want to be praised and rewarded; once their participation is recognised and acknowledged, their motivation increases, and they become happier (Ozgan, 2011).

However, comments about salary and remuneration were only provided by respondents in non-managerial positions. A couple of typical statements were:

“Absolutely salary, salary would motivate and facilitate me to be in a good mood and be satisfied with the job.”

“How about suggesting to the boss that they increase the level of salary and employment conditions and I will be very happy with this organisation. I would stay in this job longer if the pay is better.”

It appeared that employees with non-managerial positions were more likely to be concerned about salary than were managers. Other forms of reward, including praise and recognition, are revealed by some managers to have more of an impact on managers’ work attitudes and behaviours, as summed up by the hotel managers in the following comments:
“Sometimes I just feel like my company didn’t see how much effort I have put in for this hotel. I would work even harder if I know my company recognise and honour how much I have done for this company.”

“When the boss of the hotel recognises my work performance and praise that I have done a good job, which makes me happy where I am working for. In turn, it’s worthy to me to stay in this hotel and of course I will offer what I can do to lead this hotel successful.”

Rewards such as praise and recognition do not involve any material gain. Such rewards have the greatest impact when the managers respond following the desired behaviour and are closely tied to work performance. This suggests that hotels need to use praise or recognition rewards more effectively. This particular reward may need to be offered for a high level of performance and for things that the manager has control over, which may also help improve staff retention.

4.10.2. Networks and systems

The results of this study indicated that networks and systems have a significant impact on employee attitudes and behaviours. For example, consider the key company attributes theme discussed above, where employees indicated that they value “...comprehensible working systems and understandable policy and rules of the organisation” and a “harmonious work environment” as a first priority in choosing another company. This example demonstrates that employees prefer a stable and harmonious workplace with clear policies, as this helps to increase their satisfaction with their job and the organisation.

Harmonious network dynamics discussed by interviewees in this study indicated communication and interaction between managers and non-managers, interaction and communication between different departments, and co-worker relationships were important. Communication and interaction between managers and non-managers were reported as significant factors that could affect staff performance at work. As two managers explain:
“Good communication between managers and non-managers is definitely a crucial factor with my positive performance ... both managers and non-managers have to respect that everyone has their own way of doing things, and they need to try to interact and communicate with each other more. If they do then the misunderstandings or miscommunications may be reduced.”

“I am speaking as a manager; I like to show the employees that I like to interact with them to let them feel like that I am not only their team leader but also their team member; therefore, when I work hard, other employees will follow my lead to work hard. When I see they work hard, that pushes me work even harder.”

And another makes the following observation:

“......sometimes the basic staff may be afraid to speak out to the managers, and managers should be more active to interact with the employees in order to understand their needs and then create closer relationship between manager and employees.”

In contrast, an employee declared that “I do not really like some manager’s management style in this organisation. We do not usually communicate and I feel like they do not provide enough freedom for us to work here and sometimes their orders make no sense or are not necessary.”

This supports the view projected by employees that the communication and interaction between managers and employees is extremely important. Another comment by a staff member echoed this:

“I felt that there are two groups of power in this organisation, one is manager power and the other is employee power. I can’t say these two groups against each other, however there seems always have miscommunication and misunderstanding between these two groups. I do not feel that we work as a team, it is more likely to have two teams at the work, although these two groups of people are not up tide and easy going.”

According to Hofstede (2001), the power distance index (PDI) is the extent to which a culture accepts differences between the lowest and highest in the organisational
hierarchy. In other words, those in the lowest power distance organisations expect and accept power relations that are more consultative or democratic. Employees in these cases are more comfortable with and demand the right to question the manager/employer. On the other hand, in the highest power distance cases members of the lowest hierarchical level of institutions and organisations expect and accept that power is distributed unequally.

Based on Hofstede’s (2004) power distance index measures, on the cultural scale of Hofstede’s analysis: in Arab countries the power distance is very high (80); the United States (40), Canada (39) and Australia (36) are in the middle; while Taiwan is 58. That is, Taiwan is a culture with a moderately high power distance; the employees acknowledge the power of others simply based on where they are situated in hierarchical positions, thus the gaps or differences between managers and employees are generally more dramatic than in the countries with the lowest power distance culture.

Lucas and Deery (2004) indicated that attention has been drawn to the diffusion of new approaches to human resource management in the hospitality industry which has historically been dominated by images of poor working conditions and underdeveloped HR practices. The hierarchical structure of the hospitality industry and the difficulties involved in switching to a different department are the current issues for HR practices (Ladhari, 2009). In this respect, employees in the hierarchical structure of the hospitality industry perceive a large power distance between managers and employees and that was why they were eager to have good communication and interaction between managers and employees.

Moreover, many employees across all three organisations expressed that there is minimal interaction and communication between different departments, as follows:

“Honestly, I do not know much about the employees in other departments as we usually go home when we finish work and there’s not much chance to interact with other departments. It would be good to know about what other departments are doing and have more association with them, as this would make it easier for us to work with each
other and in turn make our job performance more efficient, such as finishing work on time.”

“If the managers of other departments have seen one of my employees make a mistake then they should come and discuss it with me. They should not just report it to the boss and try to make me look bad. On the other hand, if they discuss the issues with me directly, I will be very happy to take it on board and I believe that could also help to improve my work performance.”

In addition, the researcher observed a lack of cooperation and interaction between departments. Such interaction is vital in the hospitality industry, particularly if hotels wish to deliver service quality throughout the customers’ entire stay. For example, when dining in a restaurant, the researcher made several requests of the young waitress to use the free wifi. The waitress replied only with short answers that she didn’t know how to operate the wifi, as this was not part of her job task, although there was a sign on the restaurant wall stating, “This is a free wifi zone and please contact our friendly staff member for assistance”. She suggested that I should go to the front desk and ask for assistance. This example shows a failure to deliver service quality to the customer due to lack of cooperation among different department levels. A possible explanation for this seemingly poor service quality reported by the employees was:

“There were much less cooperation relationship between different departments, maybe it is because of the differences of job characteristics and the employees in different departments may not familiar with other departments’ jobs.”

“Every department may come out some decision after their meetings of the department, but there were no integration to these decisions with each department, and sometimes it is quite confusing that different department has different decision toward the same issue.”

The employees in these hotels hoped to enhance interaction with staff in other departments and other job positions. As indicated by Hofstede (2001), Taiwan has a moderately high power distance compared to other countries. As such, the power
distance between managers and employees is high in the participating hotels, as is the relational distance between different departments. These hotels are more likely to be hierarchically structured. The interviewees appeared to believe that no matter what job positions and departments they worked for, co-worker relationships had a significant impact on their work performance. A typical comment was:

“I do not like to stay in the workplace with the tensions between co-workers, unfriendly work relationship affect my work performance negatively.”

“when the co-workers keep criticising my work or doubting my ability, that really frustrated me and damage our work relationship, and then I do not have energy to perform well at work”

Moreover, the interview with the managers revealed another view of the co-worker relationship. Some managers noted that inexperienced staff members’ lack of experience and poor performance at work meant the managers had to be harsh and tough toward these workers.

“Some inexperienced employees do not maintain their quality of work performance and sometimes I have to keep repeating to reminding them to do their work right and correct them and that cause negative relationship between me and the employees. This problem not only wastes my time but also reduces my quality of work performance.”

A similar opinion was voiced by another manager, who stated:

“some employees brought their personal issues and emotions to work and that is definitely not professional; therefore it is my responsibility to advise them to be proficient at work but they usually disregard my advice and think that I do not understand and care about them which affect our working relationship as colleagues. It also affects my passion for this job and makes me feel like I do not really want to interact with them anymore.”

The co-worker relationship also appeared to be an important factor influencing employee attitudes and behaviours. The respondents mentioned that if employees could
consistently deliver good quality work performance, and managers were happier and treated employees equitably, there would be better co-worker relationships between managers and employees. That is, a positive co-worker relationship was believed to be more likely to develop more positive employee attitudes and behaviours.

4.10.3. Customer

The interviews revealed how customer factors affect employee attitudes and behaviours significantly in the Taiwanese hotel sector, with four characteristics indicated: customer happiness, customer loyalty, number of guests and customer complaints. According to Solnet (2006), it seems logical that a business that pays attention to employees’ job satisfaction is able to facilitate customer satisfaction and increase the number of customers who intend to do repeat business with the company. A happy customer can usually be seen as one who is loyal and willing to refer the business to others (Babin, et al., 2005). Satisfied customers had their problems solved and their needs met. This study found that employee job satisfaction is also affected by customer factors such as customer happiness and loyalty. This is conveyed in several comments:

“If customers are happy with my service and that would make my day and make me happier with my job.”

“Sometimes some customers come back again to stay in our hotel and that really make me feeling good.”

“I will be so happy to see our numbers of loyal customers increase. More customers with repurchase behaviour indicate that we are doing well with our job, which makes me feel significant in the organisation, and makes me happy to stay in the organisation as long as I can.”

In interviews with staff members, it was emphasised that insufficient customers and large numbers of customer complaints had negative impacts on employee motivation and performance. Respondents noted:
“When there were not many customers in the hotels that made me disappointed and I worked without any motivation.”

“I do not like to have no customers to use our business, I am motivated by having many customers, if customer numbers are low it demotivates my performance.”

“When customers complained about the service of the hotels that made me depressed and it would take time for me to get back to work on the right track.”

“There are always some customers who are unbelievably rude and that’s really annoying … how can you go back to work properly after being treated like a shit by the customers?”

Bell and Luddington (2006) illustrated that customer complaints are significantly and negatively linked to service providers’ attitudes and commitments to customers and the job. During the interviews, respondents specifically reported that customer complaints affected employee retention behaviour in the hotels. A couple of comments summed this up:

“Sometimes some customers just came to complaint to me in a bad manner, I really wish that the quality of customers could be improved, or I should say we really need to educate our people to have better civilisation. Service quality is important but this is not the case as there are still so many customer complaints every day… and that is my problem with this job. Often I doubts if I choose the right job.”

“This job is quite difficult dealing with the customers sometimes. I wish our customers could see how customers of other countries behave and learn manners from those customers, the quality of our people really needs to be improved. I really hope we didn’t have so much customer complaints everyday as I am a manager and I have to deal with most of the customer complaints, sometimes it’s really too much for me. That makes me want to leave this job sometimes.”

As the above statements revealed, hotels in Taiwan must take into consideration the great frustration reported by staff; the high turnover rate in the hotel industry was
associated with high levels of customer demands and complaints. As mentioned in the literature review chapter, one reason for turnover is attitude factors which include job stress (e.g., ambiguity, role conflict, work-overload and work-family conflicts). (Ahmad, et al., 2010). Customer demands could be classified as an attitude factor with work-overload and this finding opens the opportunity for research and shifts emphasis away from employer-related conditions to customer related effects. Bell, Menguç and Stefani (2004, p. 121) argued that service providers can become “sandwiched” between the expectations of customers and the expectations of management, as customers’ expectations are related to their previous experiences and organisational management. A manager observed that:

“Most of Taiwanese customers expect greater value for money, and a lot of free services, meals and facilities… In a competitive market of Taiwanese hotel industry, customer take high service quality with low price for granted which caused our employees emotional and physical draining.”

In contrast to the situation in the Western hotel industry, where customers often expect to pay for services, meals and facilities, Taiwanese hotels often utilise low prices and free service strategies to attract customers. As such, employees stated that they often feel overworked, which may partly explain why there is such high turnover in the Taiwanese hotel industry.

This research indicates there is a delicate relationship between customer demands and employee retention behaviours, and the changes hotels may need to make to reduce staff workload. For instance, hotels may need to reassess price and free service strategies to attract customers, which would result in customers having to pay for the extras they expect and demand. Thus, employees’ wellbeing could be ensured and this could add value to the longer-term strategic goals for retaining employees.

4.10.4. Diversity

Another important factor affecting employee attitudes and behaviours was diversity related; for example, ethnic compositions of the work place, cultural conflicts, and
communications and coordination between ethnic groups. The common responses from many indigenous employees were that they would love to see more indigenous employees, which they believed would facilitate higher levels of both job satisfaction and work performance. For example,

“As I have mentioned earlier, I like to see more indigenous employees in this organisation. This kind of gesture would make me feel like the hotel actually values our indigenous employees’ contribution to this organisation and would make me happier while I am working.”

“I like to work with more indigenous employees at the workplace. We understand each other and work well together. Without miscommunication and misunderstanding, I believe that I could perform more positively at this hotel.”

Although the perceived impacts of diversity were readily identified, most participants did not immediately observe the effects of the presence of different cultures. Following the interviews, however, the employees were able to provide examples of difficulties they were having with one another that they had not necessarily initially identified as being the result of cultural conflicts. The common perceptions of cultural conflicts among the respondents were that there were disagreements, influenced by work ethic and cultural values between indigenous and non-indigenous employees that often led to problems for Taiwanese hotels. Hogg and Terry (2000) indicated that demographic differences increase the likelihood of both subgroup formation and inter-group conflict based on the concept of social identity theory.

The respondents reported they did not perform well at work because of indigenous employees’ work ethic. Respondents could not understand indigenous employees’ ways of working, as some would not attend work when they knew there would be many customers coming to visit their hotels, despite this resulting in more customer complaints due to insufficient service providers. When there were so many complaints from the customers, the respondents were not happy that their job performance was negatively impacted by their indigenous co-workers’ ethics. A typical example was:
“Sometimes what I want to do is totally against the way that indigenous employee works ... their conservative way of thinking is hard to accept in the workplace so that it is always frustrating me when I try my best to do a good job; the differences between indigenous and non-indigenous in work ethnic is definitely an issue that makes it difficult for me to manage the employees and that’s why I often feel like I can’t perform very well in my work.”

In terms of cultural values, employees reported,

“There are many indigenous employees in this organisation, their personalities are more natural and do not know how to adjust their way of speaking; sometimes I have to be careful about what I say to them as well. I would say that it is more likely to be different cultural values, between the two ethnic groups. Developing employees' interactions and communication would be a key to understanding the different cultural values from both sides and respect each other’s cultural values more. If we understand each other more, we will misunderstand and miscommunication less and we will have our work done more efficiently.”

Communication and coordination between ethnic groups were also emphasised by respondents. They indicated that when individuals from a given ethnic group are concentrated in one department, they tend to use their native language for communication, rather than Mandarin. Consequently, communication with other departments and hotel management can suffer. In turn, difficulties can arise between departments and individuals, encroaching on interdepartmental coordination and cooperation.

“We have many indigenous staff in the housekeeping department and they often speak their native language when they work together. On the other hand, we have more non-indigenous staff in some other departments and most of them also like to speak Taiwanese rather than Mandarin. This affects our work productivity negatively as it’s harder to communicate between departments and with each other.”
“If we all try to speak the languages that the other group can’t understand, how can we cooperate and coordinate together among the department.”

This study found that diversity in the workplace can have both positive and negative impacts on employees in Taiwanese hotels, depending on how effective management is at handling this diversity. Hotels that desire the full benefits of a diverse workforce must establish a corporate culture that values diversity. This finding demonstrated that increased numbers of indigenous employees in Taiwanese hotels could facilitate indigenous employees’ happiness, and in turn affect their work performance. As a result, Taiwanese hotels could adopt high levels of ethnic diversity as one effective management strategy in implementing diversity policy. Moreover, the concentration of ethnic groups in particular departments should also be avoided in order to have more effective communication and cooperation among the departments. Employees should be placed in jobs based on their skills and interest, rather than on stereotypical assumptions of their demographic backgrounds. Additionally, the company should provide professional development (e.g. cultural training) for all employees in order to improve understanding of differences in cultural behaviours. Diversity has been identified as having a crucial role in affecting employees’ attitudes and behaviours in these Taiwanese hotels.

4.11. Summary

In this chapter the researcher reported a number of major findings, as outlined below.

First, the identified company attributes that attract employees to work in their present organisation and potentially other organisations in the future were identified. These attributes were salary and employment conditions, job suitability, job interest, job security, opportunities for rapid advancement, training opportunities, reputation and image of the company, level of work environment harmony, clarity of reward and discipline systems, stability of company systems, location of the company, and the desire for increasing the numbers of ethnic minority employees. These key company attributes were identified, summarised and used to develop the items in the quantitative
survey in the next chapter. These identified key company attributes were then broadly categorised into five main areas: job, network, geographic location, reputation and diversity. The diversity attributes significantly affected indigenous employees’ decision in selecting a job. This indicates that diversity does matter to Taiwanese indigenous employees in the hospitality industry.

Second, the qualitative phase of the study found that the levels of ethnic diversity in the organisations perceived by the majority of employees were similar to the actual levels of ethnic diversity in the organisations. Most employees, however, perceived slightly higher numbers of indigenous employees than the actual numbers of indigenous employees in each organisation, but this has also shown that the pattern of the actual levels of ethnic diversity matched the patterns of the perceived levels of ethnic diversity in the organisations.

Third, eight core categories of employee attitudes and behaviours were found. Employee attitudes fell into three broad areas: attitude toward the job; attitude toward the company; and attitude toward diversity. Moreover, employee behaviours were summarised into five common aspects, such as job related; customer related; co-worker related; diversity related; and retention behaviours. These core categories were used to represent the meaning of the employee attitudes and behaviours in the study as a whole, and were further extrapolated from the literature in order to build the survey instruments in the quantitative phase. As a result, Table 4.6 shows seven employee attitudes and behaviours scales in the quantitative phase that are adopted in the literature to correspond to the qualitative results of employee attitudes and behaviours. Additionally, although customer-related behaviours were mentioned during the interviews, this particular behaviour can not be controlled by the hotels and it was therefore not considered in the analysis.

Fourth, a number of factors affecting employee attitudes and behaviours were identified. These factors fell into four core categories: job; networks and systems; customers; and diversity. In the Taiwanese hotel sector, employee attitudes and behaviours tend to be influenced by characteristics of the job considered important by employees; networks
and systems within the hotel distinguished by managers and non-managers; the extent of customer happiness, loyalty, numbers and complaints; and levels of ethnic composition, cultural conflict, and communication and coordination between indigenous and non-indigenous employees.

Table 4. 6 Correspondence between quantitative scales and qualitative items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee attitudes</th>
<th>Qualitative (categories)</th>
<th>Quantitative (scales)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude to job</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude to company</td>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude to diversity</td>
<td>Diversity related attitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee behaviours</th>
<th>Qualitative (categories)</th>
<th>Quantitative (scales)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job related behaviour</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers related behaviour</td>
<td>Organisational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention behaviour</td>
<td>Turnover Intention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the results indicated that employees in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to report that they would like to see higher levels of diversity in the organisation. Those employees also frequently and regularly participated in ethnic interactions within the workplace. However, the researcher further noted that few employees in the hotel with a low level of ethnic diversity reported that they wanted to see more ethnic diversity in the organisation. Interestingly, those respondents all had an indigenous background and none of them were managers. Additionally, more disagreements concerning work ethics and cultural values were reported between indigenous and non-indigenous employees within the hotel with a low level of ethnic diversity.

This section summarised the major results of the qualitative analysis. Core categories of employee attitudes and behaviours, and key company attributes were identified. Diversity impacts on constructs of employee attitudes and behaviours have also emerged through this analysis. The relationships among these constructs and categories were also established. The results of the qualitative study then informed the
development of a quantitative survey and were also used to check the consistency of results emerging from the quantitative phase. Finally, the findings of the qualitative phase combined with the literature were used to integrate the results of the quantitative phases during the discussion of the outcomes of the entire study.

4.12. Findings from the Qualitative Phase and the Development of the Quantitative Phase

In the qualitative phase a range of categories and core categories that were important in the formation of employee attitudes, behaviours and key company attributes emerged. The findings from the qualitative phase were linked with the literature and existing theory and this is presented in the discussion and conclusion chapter.

Furthermore, employee attitudes and behaviours were the main concepts the researcher focused on in this study. However, measurement of employee attitudes is usually perception oriented (Comm & Mathaisel, 2000). In other words, often the question has been asked, “how satisfied are you with factor A within your job?” without asking “how important is factor A to your satisfaction within the job?” The researcher argues that unless employees indicate very low satisfaction levels, it is difficult to provide specific managerial direction from the results. In other words, do the higher levels of satisfaction indicate a low level of employee expectations? Staff in a study of British hotels reported high levels of job satisfaction, yet turnover rates were high (Lee-Ross, 1996). The researcher suggests there is a need to investigate whether there is a gap between how employees perceive work characteristics and what they expect of their work. More importantly, the researcher aimed to discover the importance of diversity attributes in attracting Taiwanese employees to choose to work in an organisation; how satisfied they were with diversity attributes within the organisations; and whether there were any significant differences between ratings of importance and satisfaction on diversity attributes among employees. These findings could help bridge that gap by highlighting which attributes are being met and which are not by the employees. Consequently, in the discussion and conclusions chapter, the researcher focuses on whether diversity
attributes should be improved and then use the results for developing a strategy to enhance employee attitudes and behaviours, and potentially retain employees.

This study focused on the effects of organisational diversity (e.g. ethnic composition within the workplace) on employee attitudes, behaviours, and key company attributes in hotels. Antecedent variables (e.g. influences of previous work experience, family employment history, previous unemployment experience) were not considered in either phase. Even though the researcher is aware that employees’ expectations (importance and performance of key company attributes) may be influenced by many factors prior to entering their present experience of employment, antecedent variables were not considered because of their complexity and the difficulties respondents would have in remembering the actual variables from the past that influenced their present expectations, attitudes or behaviours. For these reasons there are weaknesses associated with trying to capture, measure, or compare prior expectations with current ones. Thus, the researcher investigated only the current expectations of employees in this study.

Additionally, the researcher was aware that diversity perceptions could be influenced by antecedent variables such as occupations. It was posited, however, that employee diversity perceptions tend to be influenced by levels of organisational diversity and demographic characteristics of employees. In order to emphasise the central idea of the study and avoid the overly complicated data analysis, therefore other variables (i.e., occupations) were excluded.

Organisational diversity has been discovered in the qualitative phase to be associated with variations in employee attitudes and behaviours, and with key company attributes. Blau (1977b) suggested that organisations with different levels of diversity experience dissimilar dynamics and organisational outcomes. Within homogeneous groups, group members are more likely to communicate with one another more often and in a greater variety of ways, perhaps because they share worldviews and a unified culture resulting from in-group attachments and shared perceptions. Therefore, minority group members would tend to be seen as out-group members and experience negative attitudes.
Therefore, high levels of heterogeneity (larger numbers of indigenous employees in a hotel) are more likely to increase positive work attitudes among minority employees.

Further, as ethnic background and job position were found to be associated with employee attitudes and behaviours in the qualitative phase. It is important to investigate whether there are differences in employee attitudes and behaviours according to demographic variables of employees (e.g. ethnic background, gender, age, educational level, duration of employment and job position) in the organisations, based on the larger sample size in the quantitative phase. The goal of the quantitative phase is to expand upon and compare outcomes of the qualitative phase. The qualitative phase is intended to assist in the interpretation and confirmation of quantitative findings. The quantitative phase is detailed in the next chapter.
Chapter Five

Quantitative Data Analysis and Results

5.1. Introduction

This chapter is divided into five sections. First, the quantitative preliminary data analysis is detailed. For example, the data treatment, and the processes used to test the reliability and validity of the measurements, as well as the descriptive statistics and correlation analyses of the scales used in this study, are presented. Factor analysis is also performed to validate the employee attitudes and behaviours scales, as well as for the purposes of data reduction on the key company attributes measurements.

Second, the results of the factor analysis conducted on the key attributes are summarised and indicate that these attributes could be used with confidence for further analysis. Therefore, a useful characteristic of the Importance Performance Analysis technique is utilised to understand how respondents perceive the strengths and weaknesses of items by comparing two criteria: the relative importance of attributes and the respondents’ evaluation of those attributes (Eskildsen & Kristensen, 2006).

The third section examines whether there is a particular type of organisational diversity levels (e.g. ethnic, gender, age, and educational diversity) predicting employee attitudes and behaviours. In order to investigate these relationships, multiple regression analyses are utilised. Prior to examining these relationships, four types of diversity level are calculated using Blau's (1977b) index of heterogeneity, as discussed in the chapter two. One particular type of diversity (levels of ethnic diversity) predicts greater variation in employee attitudes and behaviours than any other form of diversity, and as such the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity are used to represent `organisational diversity throughout the entire quantitative phase.

In the fourth section, differences in employee attitudes and behaviours within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity are assessed using one-way between-group ANOVA. Demographic characteristics are also investigated using t-test and one-way ANOVA.
ANOVA, in order to determine differences in employee attitudes and behaviours across the organisations.

Finally, the researcher seeks to further classify the two ethnic groups of employees based on their responses to work attitude and behaviour measures, and to examine the characteristics of the classifications. Cluster analysis is used. In this procedure, the employees are grouped into specific clusters or groups that exhibit common characteristics.

5.2. Quantitative Preliminary Data Analysis

5.2.1. Treatment of data

All returned valid questionnaires were numbered. A code book was created and missing values were coded as 9 for every item. The responses were then coded and entered into the computer using the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS 17.0) program. Initial frequency analysis was done in order to detect possible errors in data entry. When inappropriate values were detected, the questionnaire number was noted and then the particular questionnaire was checked.

Survey response rate

Of the 758 surveys that were distributed to 22 participating organisations, a total of 329 completed surveys were returned (includes 14 online surveys). There were 24 participants who did not indicate their demographic information (e.g. ethnic backgrounds, job positions and organisational name), leaving 305 valid surveys and resulting in a response rate of 40.2%, which met acceptable levels of response rates (Punch, 2003). According to Punch (2003), response rates of 30% and lower usually require further data collection over an extended period.

Participants

Six employees’ demographic characteristics are displayed in Table 5.1. In total there were 172 (56.4%) indigenous employees and 133 (43.6%) non-indigenous Taiwanese.
There were more than twice as many women (69.2%) than men (30.8%) in the sample (N = 305). Most respondents were aged 25-34 years (51.8%), followed by those aged 35-44 years (28.7%). The remainder were aged 18-24 years (12.5%) or 45-55 (7.0%). The educational levels achieved for more than half (52.3%) of respondents was senior high school, followed by those with junior high school education or less (27.2%) and those with college education or above (20.5%). Most respondents had been employed for less than 3 years (58.6%), followed by those employed for 3 to 5 years (27.4%). The remainder had been employed from 6 to 10 years (7.7%) or for more than 10 years (6.3%). In terms of management status, more than two-thirds of respondents were employees with non-management status (68.2%) and about a third had managerial positions (31.8%).

### Table 5.1 Demographic characteristics of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Indigenous</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24yr</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34yr</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44yr</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-55yr</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education levels</td>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior high school</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University/College</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment duration</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management status</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managers</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organisational profile

A total of 22 Taiwanese hotels participated in the quantitative phase of the study. The name of each organisation was coded from A to V. The demographic information, especially for indigenous and non-indigenous Taiwanese employees for each organisation, was examined using Blau’s (1977b) index of heterogeneity in order to divide participating organisations into low, medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. Table 5.2 indicates that hotels with less than or equal to 30% of indigenous employees are classified as having a low level of ethnic diversity (e.g. ethnic diversity index from 0.26 to 0.39). The hotels with more than 30% but less than 40% of indigenous employees are classified as having a medium level of ethnic diversity (e.g. ethnic diversity index from 0.42 to 0.46). The hotels with 40% or more indigenous employees are then assigned as organisations with a high level of ethnic diversity (e.g. ethnic diversity index from 0.48 to 0.50).

Table 5.2 Participating organisations by levels of ethnic diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Code</th>
<th>Total staff no.</th>
<th>Indigenous no.</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>N (305)</th>
<th>Ethnic diversity index</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22:78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19:81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18:82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25:75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23:77</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16:84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15:85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27:73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21:79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30:70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35:65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35:65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52:48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49:51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41:59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47:53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53:47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58:42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50:50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46:54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents in the organisation.

Diversity index score was calculated by \[ D = 1 - \sum_j p_j^2 \] where \( p_j \) is the proportion of the total population from group \( j \).
5.2.2. Reliability analysis, descriptive statistics and normality assumption testing

Reliability refers to the accuracy, dependability and consistency of score results. The internal reliability measures used in the study were assessed through the Cronbach’s alpha statistic (Cronbach, 1951). An alpha value of .70 was established as the lowest level of acceptable internal reliability (Cronbach, 1951). Scale reliabilities were as follows (see Table 5.3): job satisfaction (alpha = .72); organisational commitment (alpha = .86); job performance (alpha = .71); organisational citizenship behaviour (alpha = .72); turnover intention (alpha = .80); diversity related attitude (alpha = .83) and diversity-related behaviour (alpha = .84). Internal reliability scores of all scales in this study were above .70. Thus, the items in this study have acceptable internal consistency. Additionally, the scales used in this study for measuring employee attitudes and behaviours have been tested and are well established in the literature (Ertürk, Yilmaz, & Ceylan, 2004; Knights & Kennedy, 2005; Hoffman, Blair, Meriac, & Woehr, 2006; Hoffman et al., 2006; Ragins & Cornwell, 2001; Miville, Carlozzi, Gushue, Schara, & Ueda, 2006).

All scales were also examined to determine whether normality assumptions were met. Means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis measures for all scales are presented in Table 5.3. Neuman (1997) stated that a value of zero for skewness indicates a symmetric distribution; a value of zero for the kurtosis indicates a close to normal shape (flatness or peakedness) and the normal distribution has a kurtosis of zero. In the present study, the scales’ skewness values ranged from .39 to -.48, and kurtosis values ranged from .35 to -.43. Malhotra et al. (2004) stated that skewness and kurtosis values in the range +2.00 to -2.00 are near enough to normal distribution for most purposes. Thus, data in the present study are within acceptable parameters.
The correlation matrix displayed in this section was created using the Pearson correlation, which focuses on two-tailed tests of statistical significance. Statistical significance was accepted at the 0.05 level to examine the relationship between employees’ attitudes and behaviour scales. The three scales measuring employee attitudes are positively and significantly correlated with one another (see Table 5.4). The relationships between job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and attitudes to diversity are highly significant at the p<0.01 level. Job satisfaction and organisational commitment have a moderately positive relationship (r ranges=0.417) but weak to moderate relationships with attitudes to diversity when the latter is based on measurement of the general attitude of respondents to diversity (r ranges from 0.164 to 0.265).

Likewise, the other four scales consist of employee behaviours that are positively and significantly correlated with one another, except for turnover intention (see Table 5.5). Specifically, job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and diversity-related behaviour have weak to moderate positive relationships with one another (r ranges from 0.149 to 0.463). On the other hand, turnover intention only shows a negative and weak significant relationship with organisational citizenship behaviour (r = -.198).

A noteworthy feature of Tables 5.4 and 5.5 is that the Pearson correlations (r) of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance and organisational citizenship

### Table 5.3 Descriptive statistics, reliability and normality assumption testing for all scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Citizenship</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related attitude</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents; α: Cronbach’s alpha

### 5.2.3. Correlation analysis

The correlation matrix displayed in this section was created using the Pearson correlation, which focuses on two-tailed tests of statistical significance. Statistical significance was accepted at the 0.05 level to examine the relationship between employees’ attitudes and behaviour scales. The three scales measuring employee attitudes are positively and significantly correlated with one another (see Table 5.4). The relationships between job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and attitudes to diversity are highly significant at the p<0.01 level. Job satisfaction and organisational commitment have a moderately positive relationship (r ranges=0.417) but weak to moderate relationships with attitudes to diversity when the latter is based on measurement of the general attitude of respondents to diversity (r ranges from 0.164 to 0.265).

Likewise, the other four scales consist of employee behaviours that are positively and significantly correlated with one another, except for turnover intention (see Table 5.5). Specifically, job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and diversity-related behaviour have weak to moderate positive relationships with one another (r ranges from 0.149 to 0.463). On the other hand, turnover intention only shows a negative and weak significant relationship with organisational citizenship behaviour (r = -.198).

A noteworthy feature of Tables 5.4 and 5.5 is that the Pearson correlations (r) of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance and organisational citizenship
behaviour are higher than those of scales with diversity components (attitude to diversity and diversity-related behaviour). In other words, the scales measuring employee attitude/behaviour toward work show strong positive correlations between one another but not employee attitude/diversity-related behaviour. The factor analysis was then conducted.

Table 5. 4 Correlation analysis of employee attitudes variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Attitudes to Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 5. 5 Correlation analysis of employee behaviours variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Job Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Organisational Citizenship Behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Turnover</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

5.2.4. Factor analysis

Prior to conducting the factor analysis, tests of the assumptions required for appropriate factor analysis were performed. The sample size of 305 respondents in this study was suitable; Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999) recommended having 150 to 300 cases. There may be issues with highly multi-collinear variables if the size is toward the lower end of the 150 range when there are a few highly correlated variables. Tests for normal distribution, linearity, and outliers revealed no serious violations. Factor analysis is robust to assumptions of normality. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling
Adequacy was utilised to test the sufficiency of the data obtained from a sample (Marshall et al., 2007). All KMOs (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) were found to be above 0.65. The minimum level recommended by Levine et al. (2006) is 0.60. Therefore it was appropriate to proceed with factor analysis, as it was demonstrated that some underlying structure did exist in the set of selected variables.

In order to assess discriminant validity, factor loadings were obtained for each item. The loadings reflect the strength of the relationship between an item and a particular construct or factor. The higher the loading, the better the representation that a particular item has on the factor. Kline (Kline, 1993) recommended that factor loadings greater than 0.30 are the minimum requirement; loadings of 0.40 are regarded as more important; and loadings of 0.50 or greater are seen as significant. Using the above rules, items that have low factor loadings (less than 0.30) should be removed. Thus, items with loadings lower than this target were not included in further analysis.

Overall, 62 statements were used initially to represent eight existing scales, which contained three measurements to represent the employee attitudes constructs, such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and diversity-related attitudes. The other four measurements were used for representing employee behaviours such as job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, turnover intention and diversity-related behaviour, as well as one other measurement for identifying the diversity problems that employees perceived in the workplace. Additionally, these measures underwent confirmatory factor analytical processes.

Furthermore, there were 30 statements used initially to represent the two new measures being developed from the qualitative study: (1) importance of key company attributes (expectation of company attributes), and (2) performance of key company attributes (satisfaction of the company attributes). The exploratory factor analysis process was then used to extract the greatest number of items that were included in the instrument (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). Factor analysis assisted the determination of convergent validity for all new scales. Further, a principal component extraction method, with an oblique rotation, was used on all scales with a total of 107 items, as shown
above. The results of the factor analysis for the seven existing scales and three new measures are reported.

**Job satisfaction**

First, job satisfaction was analysed and two factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1. The total variance explained by a two-factor solution was 67.3%. Two items loaded on the second component were associated with reverse coding. Oblique rotation was conducted and the factor correlation demonstrates the relationship between the two factors. Both factors appeared moderately related \((r=0.408)\) so all six statements were retained in the final measure of job satisfaction. Factor analysis showed convergent validity for all statements with factor loadings of 0.59 or higher. Factor 1 was termed “positive attitude” and Factor 2 was named “negative attitude”. Factor scores appear below in Table 5.6.

**Organisational commitment**

The organisational commitment scale was the second of the relational factors to be investigated. Nine statements were included in the questionnaire to measure this construct. The lowest factor loading of the retained statements was 0.604. The percentage of variance in the statements explained by the factor solution was 61.6% and two factors were extracted. Factor 1 was named “affective commitment”, as the items show employees’ positive emotional attachment to the organisation and that the employee commits to the organisation because they want to (Mowday, 1999). Factor 2

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
\hline
\textbf{Items} & \textbf{Factor} & \\
& & 1-positive attitude & 2-negative attitude \\
\hline
1. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work. & & .880 & \\
2. I feel fairly satisfied with my present job. & & .825 & \\
4. I find real enjoyment in my work. & & .792 & \\
6. Overall, I am satisfied about my job. & & .596 & \\
5. I consider my job rather unpleasant. & & & .855 \\
3. Each day at work seems like it will never end. & & & .840 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Factor analysis of job satisfaction scale}
\end{table}

KMO: .66
Cumulative variance explained by the two factors: 67.3%
was named “cognitive commitment” as the items measure the outcome of employees working in an organisation or their decision to stay in the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Additionally, oblique rotation showed that factor correlation exhibited high relationships between the two factors \( r = 0.503 \) so that all nine items were retained in the final measure of organisational commitment. Results of the factor analysis are shown in Table 5.7.

### Table 5.7 Factor analysis of organisational commitment scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1 - affective commitment</th>
<th>Factor 2 - cognitive commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I praise this organisation to my friends as a great organisation to work for</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organisation be successful</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I find that my values and the organisation’s values are very similar</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organisation</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. For me this is the best of all possible organisations for which to work</td>
<td></td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am extremely glad that I chose this organisation to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined</td>
<td></td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I really care about the fate of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This organisation really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO: .80  
Cumulative variance explained by the two factors: 61.6%

### Diversity-related attitudes

Diversity-related attitudes were measured by the diversity of comfort subscale of M-GUDS, which contains five items (Miville, et al., 1999). Factor analysis produced factor loadings of 0.562 or higher and all loading on the one factor. The percentage of variance in the statements explained by the factor solution was 51.6%. Thus, all original five statements were retained in the scale for further analysis.
Job performance

Seven statements were included in the scale to investigate employees’ self-assessment of their job performance. The factor analysis showed a three-factor solution, with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explained a total of 80.5% of the variance. The lowest factor loading of the statements was 0.624. It is not surprising that this structure has been gathered from varimax/orthogonal rotation, as the job performance scale contains both negative and positive responses. Factor 1 is termed “task-specific behaviour”, as the items include those behaviours that an individual undertakes as part of a job. Factor 2 is named “negative behaviour”, as the items were all regarding negative behaviours toward the job. Factor 3 is termed “evaluation-related behaviour”, as the items were all about employee work behaviours related to performance evaluation. All items were used to measure a single construct – job performance – and thus it was expected that factors extracted would be correlated. As a result three factors showed moderate to high correlation relationships (r ranges from 0.265 to 0.737) and no item was removed (see Table 5.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1 (task-specific behaviour)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (negative behaviour)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (evaluation-related behaviour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Fulfil responsibilities specified in job description.</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Adequately complete assigned duties.</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Complete tasks that are expected of me.</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Neglect aspects of the job I am obligated to perform.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fail to perform essential duties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Engage in activities that will directly affect my performance evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meet formal performance requirements for evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO: .711
Cumulative variance explained by the three factors: 80.5%

Organisational citizenship behaviour

Three factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1 for the organisational citizenship behaviour scale. The total variance explained by a three-factor solution was 61.4%. Factor 1 was labelled “organisational citizenship behaviour - organisational”, as
the items include behaviours related to the organisation as a whole (L. J. Williams & Anderson, 1991). Factor 3 was named “organisational citizenship behaviour-individual”, as the items are related to other individuals in the workplace (L. J. Williams & Anderson, 1991). Additionally, items 6, 8, and 10 with negative responses were located in Factor 2, which was named “negative citizenship behaviour”, as the items were all regarding the negative measurement of citizenship behaviours. All statements had factor loadings of .548 or higher. The researcher conducted oblique rotation and confirmed that the three factors were highly correlated (r ranges from -.503 to 0.618) so that all 13 original items were retained in the scale. Factor scores are presented below in Table 5.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1: organisational citizenship behaviour-individual</th>
<th>Factor 2: negative citizenship behaviour</th>
<th>Factor 3: organisational citizenship behaviour-individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Attend at work above the norm</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Help others who have been absent.</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Help others who have heavy workloads</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assist supervisor with his/her work (when not asked)</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Give advance notice when unable to come to work</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Spend a great deal of time with personal phone conversations</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Take undeserved work breaks</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Complain about insignificant things at work</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Take a personal interest in other employees</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pass along information to co-workers</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Go out of way to help new employees</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Take time to listen to co-workers' problems and worries</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO: .816  
Cumulative variance explained by the three factors: 68.5%

**Diversity-related behaviour**

Scales for personal diversity-related behaviour were based on the Diversity of Contact subscale of M-GUDS (Miville, et al., 1999). Nevertheless, five items were tested in a factor-analysis process for convergent validity. Factor analysis produced factor loadings
of 0.704 or higher and all loaded on the one factor. The percentage of variance in the statements explained by the factor solution was 61.7%. Factor analysis showed high convergent validity for the five statements.

**Turnover intention**

Turnover intention was operationalised using the items developed by Nadler et al. (1975). A factor analysis confirmed the unidimensionality of this scale. Factor loadings for the three statements were 0.735 or higher, indicating a high degree of convergent validity. The percentage of variance in the statements explained by the final factor solution was 72.2%.

In summary, all seven measures were tested satisfactorily using factor analysis. Factor loadings were moderate to high for statements in each scale. No statement was removed. The other consideration for minimising the redundant items was that the researcher wished to ensure that the level of comparability with earlier studies was not diminished. Furthermore, the exploratory factor analysis was then used to extract the greatest number of factors from the following two newly developed measurements through the study.

**Importance of key company attributes**

Importance of key company attributes was the first of the new scales to be developed and included 15 items. The KMO (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin), which provides a measure to quantify the degree of intercorrelations among variables, was used. The factor analysis was 0.834, exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Coakes & Steed, 1999; Levine, et al., 2006). Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance (p = 0.000), supporting the suitability of the correlation matrix for factor analysis. Three factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1 and the total variance explained by a three-factor solution was 66.8%. Fifteen statements had factor loadings of .618 or higher, so all original items were retained in the scale. Factor scores are presented in Table 5.10.
Reliability analyses were then utilised to test the internal consistency of each factor gained from the factor analysis. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is one of the most commonly used indicators of internal consistency (Coakes & Steed, 1999; Pallant, 2001) and is normally recommended to be above 0.6 for exploratory research (Levine, et al., 2006). All three factors showed a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84 or above. Each of the factors consisted of at least four items or more. The items for each of the factors were summed and averaged to form a new composite variable score. The three factors were then named. Factor 1 was labelled “importance of job attributes”, Factor 2 as “importance of organisation attributes” and Factor 3 was named “importance of diversity attributes”. It appears that these 15 items were grouped into the three individual factors appropriately and therefore a single new scale of these three summed factors was used in further analyses such as t-tests, ANOVA, multiple regression and cluster analysis.

Table 5. 10 Factor analysis of importance of key company attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1-importance of Job attributes</th>
<th>2-importance of Diversity attributes</th>
<th>3-importance of Organisation attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha coefficient</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Challenging and interesting work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunities for rapid advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Majority of employees are of my ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ethnic composition of organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gender composition of organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Majority of gender are same as my gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-workers relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Friendly work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Corporate image and reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Policies are clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Location of company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO: .834; Cumulative variance explained by the three factors: 66.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance of key company attributes

Performance of key company attributes (employee satisfaction with company attributes) was the other relational construct that was analysed. The same 15 statements used for
the importance analysis were included, with measurement of how satisfied the employee was with each of the attributes in the organisation. Table 5.11 displays the results of the factor analysis for performance of the key company attributes.

The factor analysis showed that the three-factor solution, with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explained a total of 68.2% of the variance. The lowest factor loading of the statements was 0.612 and no item showed cross-loading under .3 (Preacher & MacCallum, 2003). All three factors had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.85 or above, which showed strong internal consistency for each factor. All original 15 statements were retained in the scale. The three factors aligned closely with proposed groupings and were labelled. Factor 1 was labelled “performance of job attributes”. Factor 2 was labelled “performance of organisation attributes” and Factor 3 was labelled “performance of diversity attributes”. It can be seen that these 15 items were appropriately grouped into three separate factors and therefore a single new scale with these three factors representing employee satisfaction with company attributes was used in further analyses such as t-tests, analysis of variance (ANOVA), multiple regression and cluster analysis.

Table 5.11 Factor analysis of performance of key company attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1-performance of job attributes</th>
<th>Factor 2-performance of organisation attributes</th>
<th>Factor 3-performance of diversity attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha coefficient</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunities for rapid advance</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Training opportunities</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Challenging and interesting work</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Salary</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job security</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job suitability</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Corporate image and reputation</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Co-workers relationship</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Location of company</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Policies are clearly stated</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Friendly work environment</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gender composition of organisation</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Majority of employees are of my ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Majority of gender are same as my gender</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ethnic composition of organisation</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO: .873; Cumulative variance explained by the three factors: 68.2%
In addition to reliability analyses of the two new scales mentioned above, using Pearson correlation coefficients a correlation analysis was used to test the interrelationships among the six company attribute factors. All the factors were significantly correlated at the 0.01 level. In other words, there were significantly positive correlations between the factors ranging from 0.197 to 0.573 (Cohen, et al., 2003). Table 5.12 presents a correlation matrix showing the relationships between the importance and performance of key company attributes.

### Table 5.12 Correlation between the importance and performance of key company attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance-Job attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.216**</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.244**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Importance-Organisation attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.328**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Importance-Diversity attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.245**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performance-Job attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.573**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance-Organisation attributes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Performance-Diversity attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

### 5.3. Associations of organisational diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours

The aim of this section is to examine whether there are associations between organisational diversity levels and employees work outcomes. In order to investigate these relationships, multiple regression analyses were utilised to test whether any types of organisational diversity level predicted employee attitudes and behaviours. Prior to examining these relationships, four types of diversity level were calculated using Blau's (1977b) index of heterogeneity, as discussed earlier. In analyses where the relationships among employee attitudes and behaviours and levels of ethnic composition in the organisations are used, the proportions of indigenous and non-indigenous groups in the given hotels were used as dependent variables to indicate ethnic diversity levels.

The same approach as above was applied to the other demographic characteristics such as gender, age and educational levels. The index varied from 0 to 0.5 asymptotically
with two categories of demographic characteristics (e.g. ethnicity - indigenous and non-indigenous and gender - male and female); and the index differs from 0 to 0.75 with three categories of demographic characteristics such as age and education levels. Age is divided into three categories - 18 to 29, 30 to 39 and more than 40 years old, respectively. Education level is split into three groups - junior high/or lower, senior high and college or above.

Each hotel contains its own code with different types of diversity index as shown in Table 5.13. The review of the literature indicated that organisational diversity may influence employees’ attitudes and employees’ attitudes influence their behaviours. Therefore, using regression analysis the researcher relied on the diversity index to determine whether any of the four types of organisational diversity impacts employee attitudes and behaviours.

Table 5. 13 Hotels by types of organisational diversity index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotels Code</th>
<th>Total staff no.</th>
<th>N (305)</th>
<th>Ethnic diversity index</th>
<th>Gender diversity index</th>
<th>Age diversity index</th>
<th>Educational diversity index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1. Organisational diversity predicts employee attitudes and behaviours

The seven attitudes and behaviours scales (dependent variables) and the four types of organisational diversity levels (independent variables) were utilised to explore whether any forms of diversity levels impacted employee attitudes and behaviours, using standard multiple regression analysis. The researcher chose forward stepwise regression as an appropriate analytical technique because the purpose of the analysis was to explore which variables were the most crucial. Prior to regression analysis, the correlations between the variables were examined (see Table 5.14). The correlations among four types of organisational diversity index and employee attitudes and behaviours were partially significant ($r = -0.120$ to $0.367$). These results partially support the correlations between the organisational diversity index and employee attitudes and behaviours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnic diversity index</th>
<th>Gender diversity index</th>
<th>Age diversity index</th>
<th>Education diversity index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.146*</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.123*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>0.157***</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>0.267****</td>
<td>0.248***</td>
<td>-0.197**</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>0.205****</td>
<td>0.176**</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward diversity</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviours toward diversity</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.115*</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To expand upon the correlation findings, employee attitudes and behaviours were used as dependent variables separately in a series of multiple regression analyses. Each of the independent variables, ethnicity, gender, age, and education diversity, were used as predictor variables. Hierarchical regressions were conducted for each of the dependent variables. Regression analyses showed that four types of organisational diversity levels significantly predicted all seven employee attitude and behaviour variables (see Table 5.15).
Job satisfaction was the first dependent variable in the series of regression equations. The objective of the regression analysis was to determine which of the four predictor variables would have the most influence on job satisfaction. Accordingly, the four types of diversity index scores were entered as potential predictor variables of job satisfaction using the forward stepwise technique. Only one variable (ethnic diversity level) was found to be significant ($t = 2.56, p < .05$). Ethnic diversity level was also found to predict organisational commitment ($t = 2.77, p < .01$), and job performance ($t = 6.86, p < .001$). Specifically, the analysis showed that the respondents who worked in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to report more job satisfaction, higher levels of organisational commitment, and more positive work performance than employees of hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity.

Ethnic diversity levels ($t = 3.79, p < .001$) and educational diversity levels ($t = -2.35, p < .05$) were found to significantly predict organisational citizenship behaviour. Respondents who worked in the hotel with high ethnic diversity levels were more likely to report more positive organisational citizenship behaviours. Moreover, employees in the organisation with high educational diversity levels were more likely to report positive organisational citizenship behaviours. Ethnic diversity levels ($t = 2.59, p < .01$) were also found to be significant variables predicting employee diversity-related behaviour. The independent variable of age diversity levels was found to be the only variable significantly predicting turnover intention ($t = 2.47, p < .05$). Respondents who worked in hotels with high levels of age diversity were more likely to report stronger turnover intention than those who worked in hotels with lower levels of age diversity.

In summary, different types of organisational diversity predicted different forms of employee attitudes and behaviours. Specifically, ethnic diversity levels appeared to predict greater variation in employee attitudes and behaviours than did the remaining types of organisational diversity. As such, hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity are used to represent organisational diversity to answer the remaining research questions in the quantitative study.
Differences in Attitudes and Behaviours for Selected Demographic Characteristics in Taiwanese Hotels with Levels of Ethnic Diversity

The focus of this section is to examine whether there are differences in attitudes and behaviours for selected demographic characteristics of employees in hotels with varying levels of ethnic diversity. Prior to examining these differences, employee attitudes and behaviours were examined to identify the differences between hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The differences in employee attitudes and behaviours based on selected demographic characteristics of employees were also tested. The section is divided into three sub-sections. First, a one-way between-groups ANOVA was

### Table 5. 15 Multiple regression analyses of diversity levels on employee attitudes and behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicting “Job Satisfaction”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .038, Adjusted R² = .032, F (df) = 5.256 (301), P = .011*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in the equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity index</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting “Organisational commitment”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .025, Adjusted R² = .021, F (df) = 7.653 (303), P = .006**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in the equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity index</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.006**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting “Diversity related attitude”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .042, Adjusted R² = .036, F (df) = 5.027 (302), P = .005**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in the equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education diversity index</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting “Job performance”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .134, Adjusted R² = .132, F (df) = 47.033 (303), P = .000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in the equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity index</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting “Organisational citizenship behaviour”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .059, Adjusted R² = .053, F (df) = 5.513 (301), P = .02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in the equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity index</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.003***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Diversity index</td>
<td>-7.32</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting “Turnover”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .020, Adjusted R² = .016, F (df) = 6.078 (303), P = .014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in the equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age diversity index</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting “Diversity related behaviour”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = .041, Adjusted R² = .035, F (df) = 6.699 (303), P = .010**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables in the equation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic diversity index score</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.010**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant level at p < .05; **Significant level at p < .01; ***Significant level at p < .001

---

5.4. Differences in Attitudes and Behaviours for Selected Demographic Characteristics in Taiwanese Hotels with Levels of Ethnic Diversity

The focus of this section is to examine whether there are differences in attitudes and behaviours for selected demographic characteristics of employees in hotels with varying levels of ethnic diversity. Prior to examining these differences, employee attitudes and behaviours were examined to identify the differences between hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The differences in employee attitudes and behaviours based on selected demographic characteristics of employees were also tested. The section is divided into three sub-sections. First, a one-way between-groups ANOVA was
performed to assess the differences in employee attitudes and behaviours between hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. Second, an independent samples t-test and one-way between-groups ANOVA test were conducted to test differences in employee attitudes and behaviours between their demographic characteristics. Finally, a two-way between-groups ANOVA test was performed to examined differences in employee attitudes and behaviours with demographic characteristics of employees within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The details of each sub-section are discussed below.

5.4.1. Employee attitudes and behaviours within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity

To assess differences in employee attitudes and behaviours between employees in organisations with different ethnic diversity levels, a one-way between-groups ANOVA was performed. Employee attitudes and behaviours were compared across hotels with three levels of ethnic diversity (see Table 5.16). In the study, employee attitude measures included job satisfaction, organisational commitment and diversity-related attitudes. Employee behaviours included job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, turnover intention and diversity-related behaviour.

The analysis revealed that there were significant differences in employees’ responses regarding job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and diversity-related behaviour, between the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. In addition, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test were used to assess the level of differences among the groups. The results indicated that job performance mean scores for hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity (M = 3.68) were significantly higher than hotels with medium (M = 3.30) and low levels of ethnic diversity (M = 3.09). Employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to report higher job performance. For hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity, organisational citizenship mean scores (M = 3.60) were significantly higher than in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity (M = 3.38). The mean scores of diversity-related behaviour for organisations with the highest level of ethnic diversity (M = 3.38) were significantly higher than for hotels
with medium levels of ethnic diversity ($M = 3.27$) and hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity ($M = 3.04$). That is, the respondents in organisations with high level of ethnic diversity were more likely to indicate higher levels of diversity-related behaviour than respondents in the organisations with low levels of ethnic diversity. It appears that respondents in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to indicate more positive employee behaviours (e.g. job performance, organisational citizenship and diversity-related behaviour) than respondents in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. There were no significant differences on “job satisfaction”, “organisational commitment”, “turnover intentions” and “diversity-related attitude” between respondents in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity.

### 5.4.2. Employee attitudes and behaviours with selected demographic characteristics

In order to test the differences in the respondents’ attitudes and behaviours based on demographic characteristics, an independent samples t-test and one-way between-groups ANOVA test were conducted. The seven measures of employee attitudes and behaviours were utilised as the dependent variables and demographic characteristics as independent variables.

#### Table 5.16: Employee attitudes and behaviours X Levels of ethnic diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Low levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Medium levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>High levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>F(df)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.09b</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.38c</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related attitude</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.04d</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.27d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates variable that is significantly different from variables at $p < .001$ level

*Indicates variable that is significantly different from variables at $p < .01$ level

*Indicates variable that is significantly different from variables at $p < .05$ level

Mean scores was computed on the score of 5 scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree)
**Ethnicity**

The results of the t-test analysis for each of the work attitudes and behaviours are shown in Table 5.17. Two measures, “turnover intentions” and “diversity-related attitude”, were identified as being statistically significantly different ($p < .05$). Specifically, non-indigenous workers were more likely to report significantly higher levels of turnover intention than indigenous employees. In contrast, indigenous employees were more likely to report significantly more positive diversity-related attitudes than their non-indigenous co-workers. However, no statistically significant differences between indigenous and non-indigenous employees were found for job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, organisational citizenship, and diversity-related behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th>Non-indigenous</th>
<th>t (df)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related attitude</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents; *Significant level at $p < .05$
Mean scores was computed on the score of 5 scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree)

**Gender**

The results show that there were no significant differences in mean scores between males and females on any of the measures.

**Age**

A one-way ANOVA indicated significant differences on the measures “job satisfaction”, “organisational commitment”, “job performance”, “organisational citizenship”, and “turnover”, between the age groups. Table 5.18 summarises the ANOVA results. In
addition, post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test was used to assess the differences amongst the groups. In terms of employee job satisfaction, the mean scores for employees aged 40 to 59 years (M = 3.62) were significantly higher for employees aged 18 to 29 years (M = 3.35) and those 30 to 39 years (M = 3.52). This suggests that older employees were more likely to have higher levels of job satisfaction than other age groups. Similarly, it can be seen that older employees were more likely to have higher levels of organisational commitment, job performance and organisational citizenship than younger employees. For turnover intention, the mean scores for employees aged 30 to 39 years (M = 2.61) were significantly lower than for those aged 18 to 29 years (M = 2.97). That is, younger employees were more likely to have higher levels of turnover intention than older age groups. However, there was no significant difference between younger and older employees on measures such as diversity-related attitude and behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>18-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>F (df)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related attitude</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents
a Indicates variable that is significantly different from b variables at p < .001 level
b Indicates variable that is significantly different from c variables at p < .01 level
c Indicates variable that is significantly different from d variables at p < .05 level
Mean scores was computed on the score of 5 scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strong agree)

**Education**

The results of the ANOVA analysis indicated no statistically significant differences between employees with different educational levels in “job satisfaction”, “organisational commitment”, “job performance”, “organisational citizenship”, “diversity-related attitude” and “diversity-related behaviour” (see Table 5.19).
“Turnover intentions” was the only variable that was significantly different. Post-hoc tests using Tukey HSD indicated that turnover mean scores for those with college education or above (M = 3.12) were significantly higher than for those with only senior high school (M = 2.67) and those with junior high school education or lower (M = 2.69). These results suggest that employees with higher levels of education were more likely to have stronger intentions to leave the job than those with lower education levels.

### Employment duration

A one-way ANOVA analysis revealed statistically significant differences between employees with different employment duration in “job satisfaction”, “organisational commitment”, “diversity-related attitude”, employee behaviours of “job performance”, “organisational citizenship” and “turnover” (see Table 5.20). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that job satisfaction mean scores for those employed for more than 10 years (M = 3.61) were significantly higher than those employed for 3 to 5 years (M = 3.42) and for less than 3 years (M = 3.35). In general, the result indicates that those with longer employment durations were more likely to express higher job satisfaction, organisational commitment, diversity-related attitude, job performance and organisational citizenship than those with shorter employment durations.

### Table 5.19 Employee attitudes and behaviours X Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Junior High/or less</th>
<th>Senior high</th>
<th>College/University or above</th>
<th>F (df)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-related attitude</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity-related behaviour</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents
a Indicates variable that is significantly different from b variables at p < .001 level
b Indicates variable that is significantly different from c variables at p < .01 level
c Indicates variable that is significantly different from d variables at p < .05 level
Mean scores was computed on the score of 5 scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree)
duration. However, the turnover intention mean scores for those employed for 6 to 10 years (M = 2.55) were significantly lower than those employed between 3 and 5 years (M = 2.76), and less than 3 years (M = 2.91). That is, employees employed for less time were more likely to have a higher level of turnover intention than employees with longer employment durations. However, no significant differences were found in employee diversity-related behaviour.

### Table 5.20 Employee attitudes and behaviours X Employment duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Less than 3yrs</th>
<th>3 to 5yrs</th>
<th>6 to 10yrs</th>
<th>10 years above</th>
<th>F(df)</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.35 b</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.42 c</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.42 b</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.45 b</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.26 c</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.29 c</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Citizenship</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.38 c</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.42 d</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.91 d</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related attitude</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.65 d</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.66 d</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management status

T-test analysis indicated that the four measures of “job satisfaction”, “organisational commitment”, “job performance” and “turnover” were statistically significantly different (p < 0.05). However, no statistically significant differences were identified for management status in relation to “organisational citizenship behaviours”, “diversity-related attitude”, and “diversity-related behaviour”. The results of the independent samples t-test for the employee attitude and behaviour measures are shown in Table 5.21. Managers were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and job performance than non-managerial employees. In other words, managers were more likely to express higher levels of employee-related attitudes and behaviours than non-managers. However, there were no differences between managers and employees in relation to work attitudes and behaviours associated with diversity. In contrast, employees with non-management status were more likely to state higher turnover intentions than managers.
To examine the differences in employee attitudes and behaviours with demographic characteristics within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity, a two-way between-groups ANOVA test was performed.

Statistically significant differences were found ($p < .05$) between organisations with different levels of ethnic diversity and the effect of selected demographic characteristics listed in the study. Ethnic backgrounds of employees had a significant association with variations in the effects of ethnic diversity levels on job satisfaction ($F=5.92$, $P=.003$) and job performance ($F=3.02$, $P=.05$). Gender had a significant association with variations in the effects of ethnic diversity levels on organisational commitment ($F=6.21$, $P=.002$) and organisational citizenship ($F=6.28$, $P=.002$). Education had a significant association with variations in the effects of ethnic diversity levels on job performance ($F=2.98$, $P=.019$) and organisational citizenship ($F=3.49$, $P=.008$). Management status had a significant association with variations in the effects of ethnic diversity levels on diversity-related attitudes ($F=11.43$, $P=.000$) and diversity-related behaviours ($F=5.94$, $P=.003$). No statistically significant differences were found in the characteristics of age and employment duration within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The results of ANOVA tests are presented below in Table 5.22. Moreover, following a
significant interaction, follow-up tests are generally needed to investigate the exact nature of the interaction known as simple main effects. Specifically, simple main effects look at the effect of one factor separately for each level of the other factor. That is, ANOVA was used to obtain more detailed information by performing simple main effects.

Table 5.22
Employee attitudes and behaviours with demographic characteristics in hotels with ethnic diversity levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Ethnic Diversity</th>
<th>Gender Diversity</th>
<th>Age Diversity</th>
<th>Education Diversity</th>
<th>Employment Diversity</th>
<th>Management Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F(df)</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>F(df)</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>F(df)</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.92 (2)</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>7.27 (2)</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>6.44 (4)</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Commitment</td>
<td>1.12 (2)</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>6.21 (2)</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>1.42 (4)</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>3.02 (2)</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>4.93 (2)</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>9.54 (4)</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Citizenship</td>
<td>0.45 (2)</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>6.28 (2)</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td>2.21 (4)</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>2.67 (2)</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>1.80 (2)</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>8.54 (4)</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related attitudes</td>
<td>1.04 (2)</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>3.55 (2)</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>8.34 (4)</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
<td>0.90 (2)</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.18 (2)</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>1.21 (4)</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents*Significant level at $p < .05$

**Ethnicity in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity**

This section reports any differences in the views of indigenous and non-indigenous employees on job satisfaction and job performance in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The results are displayed in Table 5.23. The comparison of the mean scores from indigenous and non-indigenous employees on job satisfaction showed that in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity, indigenous employees reported significantly higher levels of job satisfaction mean scores than did non-indigenous employees. On the other hand, indigenous employees ranked significantly lower levels of job satisfaction and job performance mean scores than did non-indigenous employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. However, there were no significant differences between indigenous and non-indigenous employees on job performance in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity.
Moreover, the ANOVA findings suggest that indigenous employees in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity report significantly higher levels of job satisfaction and job performance than those in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. No significant differences can be found in non-indigenous employees’ mean scores of job satisfaction and job performance across all three types of hotel with differing levels of ethnic diversity.

**Table 5.23 Employee attitudes and behaviours X Ethnicity in the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th>Non-indigenous</th>
<th>T-test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ANOVA Sig.</strong></td>
<td><strong>.00</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>.13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ANOVA Sig.</strong></td>
<td><strong>.05</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>.09</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Gender in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity**

In this section differences in the perceptions of male and female employees on organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour are examined. The results are presented in Table 5.24. Female employees ranked organisational commitment significantly higher than male employees in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. However, no significant differences were found between female and male employees in organisational citizenship behaviour across all three types of hotel.

Furthermore, the ANOVA data illustrate that female employees in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity reported significantly higher mean scores for
organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour than those in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. No significant differences can be found in male employees’ ratings of organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour across all three types of hotel.

Table 5.24 Employee attitudes and behaviours X Gender in the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>T-test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation commitment</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>T-test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation commitment</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Education in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity

This section reports differences in education level in job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The results are displayed in Table 5.25. Employees with junior high school or lower education in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity rated significantly higher levels of job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour than those with senior high school level and college or above. However, there were no significant differences found between employees with junior high school or lower education, senior high school level and college or above in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity.

Moreover, the ANOVA findings show that employees with junior high school or lower education in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity reported significantly higher levels of job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour than those in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity.
Employees with senior high school level in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity indicated significantly higher levels of job performance than those in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. Employees with college or above in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity also indicated significantly higher levels of job performance than those in hotels with low and medium levels of ethnic diversity.

No significant differences can be found in employees with senior high school level and college or above on the rating of job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour across all three types of hotel with differing levels of ethnic diversity.

### Table 5.25 Employee attitudes and behaviours X Educations in the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Junior high or less</th>
<th>Senior high</th>
<th>College/ University above</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>ANOVA Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Management status in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity**

In this section differences in the rating of manager and non-manager on diversity-related attitude and behaviour are examined. The results are presented in Table 5.26. Managers reported significantly higher levels of diversity-related attitude than non-managers in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity. No significant differences were found between manager and non-manager employees on the ranking of diversity-related behaviour across all three types of hotel.
Furthermore, the ANOVA data illustrate that managers in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity reported significantly higher diversity-related attitudes and behaviours than those in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. Non-managers in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity also reported significantly higher diversity-related behaviour than those in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. No significant differences were found in non-managers’ rating of diversity-related attitudes across all three types of hotel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>T-test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related attitudes</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Non-manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOVA Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity related behaviours</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Non-manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANOVA Sig.</strong></td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

5.5. Importance Performance Analysis (IPA)

As discussed in Chapter 4, IPA is a procedure for asking a participant first to rate the importance of a key company attribute and then to rate performance on that attribute, since this provides a practical process for evaluating key company attributes and identifying the strength and weakness of key company attributes. In the importance analysis, the survey asked, “How important are the following aspects to your choice to work in your present organisation or other possible organisation?” For the performance analysis, the survey asked, “Based on your actual experiences at your present organisation, how satisfied were you with the following aspects of the organisation?” In the current study, 15 attributes were identified. The value of “1” indicated the lowest level of importance/performance and “5” the highest. Analysis using paired t-tests was conducted for each of the key company attributes in order to determine whether there
was a gap between employee expectations and satisfaction. To compare indigenous employees’ perceptions with non-indigenous employees’ perceptions of expectations and satisfaction, independent sample t-tests and ANOVA were conducted. These analyses compared the means of the indigenous and non-indigenous employees’ importance and performance measures within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. The results of this analysis are described below.

5.5.1. IPA from the perspective of employees

To determine which category of company attribute is the most important in attracting employees to choose to work in an organisation, IPA was first used to rate the importance of the attributes and then to rate satisfaction (performance) from the employee perspective. The results are displayed in Table 5.27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Hotels ethnic diversity levels</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Mean-difference</th>
<th>T-test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The findings indicated overall high importance results for all Job attributes across all three types of hotel with differing levels of ethnic diversity (see Table 5.27). Means ranged from 3.98 to 4.15. The Job attributes included: level of salary and wealth, job suitability, job security, challenging and interesting work, training opportunities,
opportunities for rapid advancement. These findings can be linked to the qualitative results, with level of salary and wealth the common reason for attracting employees to work for organisations. The t-test results show that overall employees rated the Job attributes with significantly higher importance mean scores than performance. Employees in all three types of organisation indicated that the performance of the Job attributes did not meet their expectations. Moreover, the ANOVA findings suggest that employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity report significantly lower importance mean scores than those in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. No significant differences can be found in the Job attributes performance mean scores across all three types of hotels with differing levels of ethnic diversity.

The following Organisation attributes covered aspects such as: location of company; clear policies; friendly work environment; co-worker relationships; and company image and reputation. The t-test results indicated that hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity were not meeting employee expectations. In all three types of hotel, the employees’ satisfaction mean scores were significantly lower than the importance mean scores. According to the ANOVA results, employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity indicated significantly lower importance and performance mean scores than those in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity.

Analysis of the Diversity attributes in Table 5.27 shows that diversity relations in the workplace were an important aspect of attributes reported by employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. These employees rated the Diversity attributes importance significantly higher than performance. Diversity attributes included: ethnic composition of organisation; gender composition of organisation; majority of employees are of my ethnic background; and majority of gender are the same as my gender. This suggests that hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity are not meeting employee expectations. However, there is no significant difference between importance and performance mean scores in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. ANOVA results show that employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity report significantly lower performance mean scores for Diversity attributes than those in hotels.
with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. No significant differences can be found in importance mean scores across all three types of hotels with differing levels of ethnic diversity. The findings suggest that employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity report lower performance mean scores than those in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. Employees in hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity also indicated significant differences between their ratings of highest importance and lowest performance on the Diversity attributes.

Finally, Table 5.28 illustrates that the Job attribute was the most important attribute to employees. The importance mean scores of the Job attributes are significantly higher than both the Organisational category and the Diversity attributes. On the other hand, the Diversity attribute was the least well performing attribute among the employees. The performance mean scores of the Diversity attributes are significantly lower than the Organisation attributes and significantly lower than the Job attributes. Therefore, these attributes should be taken into account for strategy building when hotel owners and managers are trying to attract newcomers or encourage employees’ intentions to stay.

Table 5. 28 Importance performance significant differences among attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes comparison</th>
<th>Employee importance mean</th>
<th>Employee performance mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean-difference</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Organisation .23 .00*</td>
<td>.08 .03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity .42 .00*</td>
<td>.14 .00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Job -.23 .00*</td>
<td>.08 .03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity .19 .00*</td>
<td>.23 .00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Job -.42 .00*</td>
<td>-.14 .00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation -.19 .00*</td>
<td>-.23 .00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
5.5.2. Difference between indigenous and non-indigenous employees’ importance of key company attributes in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity

As noted by Thomas and Wise (Thomas & Wise, 1999), people who come from different demographic backgrounds may have their own views on what company attributes will be important to them and these differences may contribute to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the employees. It is useful to examine differences between indigenous employees’ and non-indigenous employees’ evaluations. In the previous section IPA was used to rate the importance and performance of three variables of key company attributes; this section reports any differences in the views of indigenous and non-indigenous employees regarding the importance of key company attributes (see Table 5.29).

The comparison of the mean scores from indigenous and non-indigenous employees on the importance of key company attributes showed that in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity, indigenous employees rated diversity attributes significantly higher than did non-indigenous employees. However, there were no significant differences found between indigenous and non-indigenous employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity. The results also demonstrate that there were no significant differences in job and organisation attributes between indigenous and non-indigenous employees in all three types of hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity.

Moreover, the ANOVA findings suggest that non-indigenous employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity report significantly lower importance mean scores for job attributes than those in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. No significant differences can be found in the importance mean scores of job attributes across all three types of hotels with differing levels of ethnic diversity. On the other hand, indigenous employees in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity recorded significantly higher importance mean scores on organisation attributes than those in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. Indigenous employees in hotels with
medium and low levels of ethnic diversity also had stronger expectations with regard to diversity than those in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity.

### Table 5.29 Employee importance mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Indigenous employee importance evaluations</th>
<th>Non-indigenous employee importance evaluations</th>
<th>Mean-difference</th>
<th>T-test Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ANOVA Sig.</strong></td>
<td><strong>.12</strong></td>
<td><strong>.00</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ANOVA Sig.</strong></td>
<td><strong>.05</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>.09</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td><strong>.00</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td><strong>.00</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td><strong>.41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ANOVA Sig.</strong></td>
<td><strong>.00</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

#### 5.5.3. Difference between indigenous and non-indigenous employees’ satisfaction with key company attributes

In this section differences in the perceptions of indigenous and non-indigenous employees regarding satisfaction with key company attributes are examined (see Table 5.30). Indigenous employees rated the satisfaction mean scores on diversity attributes significantly lower than non-indigenous employees in hotels with medium and low ethnic diversity. However, as indicated in Table 5.16, in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity, indigenous employees rated the performance of job attributes significantly higher than non-indigenous employees. No significant differences were found between indigenous and non-indigenous employees on performance mean scores for the organisation attributes across all three types of hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity.
Furthermore, the ANOVA analysis illustrates that non-indigenous employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity report significantly higher satisfaction mean scores for job attributes than those in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. In contrast, non-indigenous employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity report significantly lower satisfaction mean scores on diversity attributes than those in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity.

No significant differences were found in the performance mean scores for organisation attributes across all three types of hotels. On the other hand, indigenous employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity recorded significantly lower performance mean scores in both organisation and diversity attributes than those in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Hotels with levels of ethnic diversity</th>
<th>Indigenous employee performance evaluations</th>
<th>Non-indigenous employee performance evaluations</th>
<th>Mean-difference</th>
<th>T-test Sig.</th>
<th>ANOVA Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANOVA Sig.</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

5.5.4. Summary

The study results showed that the respondents perceive job attributes as the most important criteria to attract employees to work in an organisation. However, employees in all three types of organisations indicated that job attributes performance did not meet
their expectations. This suggests that hotels need to improve attributes such as job suitability, salary, job security, training opportunities and opportunities for rapid advancement. Employees in the hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity rated the importance of diversity attributes significantly higher than performance. This suggests that hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity are not meeting employees’ expectations. It appears that Taiwanese hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity should address a range of issues concerning diversity attributes in order to improve the perceived performance of relevant aspects.

Furthermore, the results indicated that indigenous employees rated the importance of diversity attributes higher than did the non-indigenous employees in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. The finding suggests that the work environment in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity might actually affect minority employees’ awareness of diversity attributes and therefore, in turn, raise indigenous employees’ rating on importance. The results also illustrate that in hotels with low and medium levels of ethnic diversity, indigenous employees recorded significantly lower performance mean scores in diversity attributes than those in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity. Additionally, both indigenous and non-indigenous employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity recorded significantly lower performance mean scores on the diversity attributes than those in hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. That is, both indigenous and non-indigenous employees in the work environment with low levels of ethnic diversity perceived less satisfaction with the performance of diversity attributes than those in work environments with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity.
5.6. Associations of key Company Attributes with Employee Attitudes and Behaviours

5.6.1. Predicting employee attitudes by key company attributes

In this section, Pearson correlations were utilised to determine whether there are correlations between employees’ attitudes and key company attributes (see Table 5.31). The correlations among job attributes, organisation attributes, diversity attributes, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and diversity-related attitudes were significant \((r = .209 \text{ to } .395)\). These results support the correlation between employees’ rating on key company attributes performance and employee behaviours. All correlations were moderate and significant \((p < .01)\).

Table 5.31 Correlation matrix among key company attributes and employee attitudes (N = 305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key company attributes of an organisation</th>
<th>Employee Attitudes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance of key company attributes</td>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>.341**</td>
<td>.323**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation attributes</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td>.275**</td>
<td>.240**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant level at \(p < .05\)
** Significant level at \(p < .01\)

To expand upon the correlation findings, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and diversity-related attitude were used as dependent variables separately in a series of multiple regression analyses. Each of the independent variables, Job attributes, Organisation attributes and Diversity attributes, was used as a predictor variable. Hierarchical regressions were conducted for each of the dependent variables.

The analyses showed that performance of key company attributes significantly predicted all three employee attitudes measures. The results are presented in Table 5.32. The independent variable job attributes was found to significantly predict job satisfaction \((t = 3.20, p < .01)\), organisational commitment \((t = 2.29, p < .05)\) and diversity-related
attitudes (t = 3.64, p < .001). Those respondents with higher satisfaction toward job attributes were more likely to report engaging in higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and diversity-related attitudes. Organisation attributes was also found to significantly predict job satisfaction (t = 2.34, p < .05) and organisational commitment (t = 4.69, p < .001). It appears that respondents who reported higher levels of satisfaction toward organisation attributes were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Diversity attributes (t = 2.17, p < .05) were found to be a significant predictor, suggesting that respondents more satisfied with the performance of diversity attributes within the workplace were more likely to report more positive diversity-related attitudes. As a result, the findings of this section support the view that the performance of key company attributes can affect employee attitudes.

Table 5. 32 Multiple regression analyses of employee perceived performance of key company attributes on employee attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting “Job satisfaction”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant no.</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational attributes</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.152 .020*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.111 .077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting “Organisational commitment”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant no.</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.147 .023*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational attributes</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.300 .000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.038 .541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting “Diversity related attitude”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant no.</td>
<td>2.332</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.243 .000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational attributes</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.020 .765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.138 .031*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*pSignificant level at p < .05; **Significant level at p < .01; ***Significant level at p < .001

5.6.2. Predicting employee behaviour by performance of key company attributes

The four employee behaviour measures (dependent variables) and the three variables of key company attributes performance (independent variables) were used to explore whether satisfaction with key company attributes influences employee behaviours. The
researcher sought to assess whether, if employees were more satisfied with the performance of the company attributes, they would be likely to report more positive work behaviours. The correlation between key company attributes and employee behaviours was also examined prior to conducting the regression analysis. Table 5.33 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients between the variables.

Table 5.33 Correlation matrix among key company attributes and employee behaviours (N = 305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key company attributes of an organisation</th>
<th>Employee Behaviours</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>Organisational citizenship behaviour</td>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>Diversity related behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance of job attributes</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.162**</td>
<td>-.249**</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation attributes</td>
<td>.247**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>-.144*</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>.170**</td>
<td>-.180*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant level at p < .05
** Significant level at p < .01

The correlations between performance of job attributes and turnover intention were significant ($r = .249$ to .162). Additionally, no correlation relationship was reported between job performance and diversity-related behaviour. The correlations among performance of organisation attributes and job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour and turnover intention were significant ($r = -.144$ to .247) but there was no correlation with diversity-related behaviour. The correlations between performance of diversity attributes, job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour ranged from 0.145 to 0.170. These results support the correlations between employees’ ratings on importance and performance of key company attributes and some forms of employee behaviours. The majority of the correlations were low and significant ($p < .05$), but some were moderate and significant ($p < .01$).

Table 5.34 shows the results for predictions of the effects of perceived satisfaction with company attributes on employee behaviours. In terms of job performance, the independent variables perceived performance of Job attributes ($t = 4.70$, $p < .001$), Organisation attributes ($t = 5.37$, $p < .001$) and Diversity attributes ($t = 2.08$, $p < .05$) were found to predict behaviour significantly. Respondents who were more satisfied
about job, organisation and diversity attributes were more likely to report engaging in more positive job performance. The independent variable perceived performance of Organisation attributes was found to be the only variable significantly predicting organisational citizenship behaviour (t = 6.69, p < .001). It appeared that respondents who were more satisfied about Organisation attributes performance were more likely to report a tendency toward positive organisational citizenship behaviour. Moreover, the two independent variables perceived performance of Job attributes (t = -4.14, p < .001) and Diversity attributes (t = -2.12, p < .05) were found to predict turnover intention significantly. That is, the employees who were more satisfied about job and diversity attributes were more likely to report lower levels of turnover intentions but the three attributes of perceived performance of attributes did not predict any significant variance in the other employee behaviour scale – diversity-related behaviour. Finally, the results of this section support the view that performance of key company attributes could partially impact employee behaviours. More importantly, the findings suggest that employees who are more satisfied with the performance of diversity attributes within hotels report better job performance and have a lower turnover intention.

Table 5.34 Multiple regression analyses of employee perceived performance of key company attributes on employee behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting “Job performance”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = 0.126, Adjusted R² = 0.118, F (df) = 14.514 (301), P = 0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant no.</td>
<td>2.839</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.312 .000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational attributes</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.352 .000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.131 .039*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting “Organisational citizenship behaviour”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = 0.163, Adjusted R² = 0.154, F (df) = 19.389 (302), P = 0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant no.</td>
<td>2.554</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.070 .283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational attributes</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.435 .000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.002 .970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting “Turnover”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = 0.076, Adjusted R² = 0.067, F (df) = 8.239 (304), P = 0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant no.</td>
<td>3.621</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.282 .000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational attributes</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.057 .403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.138 .035*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predicting “Diversity related behaviour”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² = 0.012, Adjusted R² = 0.002, F (df) = 1.206 (304), P = 0.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant no.</td>
<td>3.175</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job attributes</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.035 .624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational attributes</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.126 .072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity attributes</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.010 .883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant level at p < .05; **Significant level at p < .01; ***Significant level at p < .001
5.7. Cluster Analysis

Cluster analysis was performed to divide the data into specific categories based on similar responses to the seven employee attitudes and behaviours measures. Subsequently, chi-square tests and one-way ANOVAs were used to analyse the differences between the groups and to use the differences in responses to cluster employees. Mahalanobis distances were measured by multiple regression analysis, using seven employee attitude and behaviour measures as the independent variables, and the ethnic backgrounds of employees as the dependent variable. Prior to cluster analysis, any outliers in the sample were identified using the Mahalanobis distance and, due to the substantial impact of outliers on hierarchical methods, eighteen cases with significant Mahalanobis distances ($\chi^2 = 14.3$, $p = 0.05$) were subsequently removed from the hierarchical cluster analysis. Three cases that contained incomplete data were also eliminated. A series of possible solutions ranging from two to six clusters were examined to find the best solution and consequently five clusters with unique characteristics were formed. Afterwards, K-mean cluster analysis was performed. K-mean cluster analysis resulted in two hundred and eighty-four respondents being grouped into five clusters which were named: “strong positive work attitudes with lowest turnover intention”; “less positive work attitudes and behaviours “; “positive work behaviours with highest turnover intention”; “strongest work performance with best attitudes”; and “average level of work performance. ANOVA tests also indicated that all seven employee attitude and behaviour measures made a significant contribution to differentiating the five clusters ($p < .001$). Table 5.35 shows the profile of the five clusters with the seven employee attitude and behaviour measures. These clusters are detailed in the following.

Cluster 1: Strong positive work attitudes with lowest turnover intention. This cluster represented 17.3% of the sample. The respondents in this cluster displayed the second-highest cluster score on job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and diversity-related attitude. However, the cluster scores on “turnover” were the lowest. It seems that the respondents in this cluster were more likely to have a high level of positive work attitudes, and strong intentions to remain in their organisation.
Cluster 2: Less positive work attitudes and behaviours. This cluster represented 21.5% of respondents and those grouped in this cluster showed the lowest cluster scores on job satisfaction, organisational commitment, organisational citizenship, and diversity-related attitude, and the second-lowest cluster scores on job performance and diversity-related behaviour. In general, this cluster showed a low level of attitude and behaviour with moderately low cluster scores on turnover intention. This suggests that this group tends to be disengaged from work, but also happy to stay in the organisation.

Cluster 3: Positive work behaviours with highest turnover intention. This cluster represented 22.5% of the sample, which was the second-largest proportion of cases. The respondents in this cluster showed the second-highest cluster score on job performance, and organisational citizenship behaviour among the five clusters, with the exception of the highest turnover intention cluster score. That is, the respondents were likely to have positive work behaviours (e.g. job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour) but were not interested in remaining in the organisation long term.

Cluster 4: Strongest work performance with the best attitudes. This cluster represented 13.7% of the sample, which represented the smallest percentage of cases, and comprised the employees who showed the highest cluster scores on job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, organisational citizenship, and diversity-related attitude. The respondents in this cluster indicated strong positive work attitudes and behaviours and were more likely to have positive diversity-related attitudes in the workplace. They tended to be the best performers at work with the strongest level of positive attitudes.

Cluster 5: Average level of work performance. This cluster represented 25% of the sample, the largest proportion of cases. The respondents in this cluster showed moderate cluster scores on all seven scales among the five clusters. The respondents in this cluster tended to perform moderately well at work with moderately positive attitudes. That is, this group tended to be the employees with average work attitudes and behaviours with average levels of performance.
In the following section, chi-square tests and ANOVAs were utilised using demographic characteristics and diversity levels, in order to further investigate the characteristics of the five clusters.

### 5.7.1. Profiling the clusters by ethnic background

Chi-square tests were performed to see if there were differences in the clusters in the distributions of indigenous and non-indigenous Taiwanese (see Table 5.36). The results showed that there were significant differences in the proportions of indigenous and non-indigenous workers in the five clusters. The highest proportions of indigenous employees were found in Clusters 1 and 2, whereas there were high percentages of non-indigenous employees in Clusters 3 and 5. Non-indigenous Taiwanese were more likely to have positive work behaviours with strong turnover intentions or average levels of work performance, while indigenous employees were more likely to indicate strong work attitudes with the lowest turnover intentions or less positive attitudes and behaviours at work. That is, although non-indigenous Taiwanese workers tended to indicate positive work behaviours, they had less interest in remaining in their current organisations than indigenous employees. It can also be noted that indigenous employees were more likely to report the strongest work performance and best attitudes
compared to the majority of the non-indigenous workers who were more likely to report having average levels of performance at work.

Table 5.36 Comparison of the clusters between Taiwanese indigenous and non-indigenous Taiwanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-indigenous</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong positive work attitudes with lowest turnover intention</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less positive work attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive work behaviours with highest turnover intention</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongest work performance with best attitudes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of work performance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents

5.7.2. Profiling the clusters by ethnic diversity level

Chi-square tests were also performed to see if there were differences in the clusters in the distributions of the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity (see Table 5.37). The analysis reveals that the hotels with the low levels of ethnic diversity were found mostly in Clusters 1, 2 and 5. Similarly, the hotels with medium levels of ethnic diversity were also found primarily in Clusters 1 and 5. In contrast, the hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were found in Clusters 3 and 4. It seems that the hotels with low and medium levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to have employees with strong and positive work behaviours and lowest turnover intentions or average levels of work performance, while the hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to have employees with the strongest work performance attitudes or with positive behaviours but high turnover intentions.

This result suggests that employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to indicate strong positive behaviours but high turnover intentions or report the strongest work performance and best attitudes at work. Similar to earlier results, non-indigenous employees were more likely to indicate strong positive behaviours but with high turnover intentions, whereas Taiwanese indigenous employees were more likely to indicate strong work attitudes with low turnover intentions or less positive...
attitudes and behaviours at work. The hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity had more equal proportions of non-indigenous and indigenous workers, and as such the two major work outcomes (e.g. positive work behaviours with highest turnover intentions and strongest work performance with best attitudes) from the two ethnic groups were observed in this type of hotel.

**Table 5.37 Comparison of the clusters between levels of ethnic diversity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Low diversity</th>
<th>Medium diversity</th>
<th>High diversity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong positive work attitudes with lowest turnover</td>
<td>27 (25)</td>
<td>16 (25)</td>
<td>6 (5.4)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less positive work attitudes and behaviours</td>
<td>29 (26.9)</td>
<td>11 (17.2)</td>
<td>21 (18.8)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive work behaviours with highest turnover</td>
<td>20 (18.5)</td>
<td>15 (23.4)</td>
<td>29 (25.9)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongest work performance with best attitudes</td>
<td>3 (2.8)</td>
<td>6 (9.4)</td>
<td>30 (26.8)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average level of work performance</td>
<td>29 (26.9)</td>
<td>16 (25)</td>
<td>26 (23.2)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108 (100)</td>
<td>64 (100)</td>
<td>112 (100)</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N indicates number of respondents

**5.7.3. Profiling the clusters by demographic characteristics**

Demographic characteristics were also utilised to investigate the differences between the five clusters. The data were first split into indigenous and non-indigenous employees and further divided based on demographics characteristics. As shown in Table 5.38, for indigenous employees, the chi-square tests showed that the five clusters were significantly different with respect to the four demographic characteristics; ethnic diversity, age, education and employment duration. The results demonstrated that the employees in the hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were the majority in Cluster 4. Employees in the hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity were the biggest group in Cluster 1. The results illustrated that indigenous employees in the hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to report the best work performance and attitudes whilst those in the hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to report strong positive work attitudes with lowest turnover intention.
The indigenous employees in the age group 30 to 39 years were dominant in Clusters 1 and 2. Those in the age group 40 to 59 years were the largest group in Cluster 4. The findings suggest that indigenous employees in the 30 to 39 years group were more likely to report either positive work attitudes with lower turnover intentions or less positive attitudes and behaviours, whilst those aged 40 to 59 years were more likely to indicate the best work performance and attitudes. In terms of educational background, indigenous employees with senior high school level were the largest cohort in Cluster 1; those with college or above were the largest cohort in Cluster 3 and those with junior high school or less was the largest cohort in Cluster 4. The analysis suggests that indigenous employees with higher educational levels reported higher turnover intentions, and indigenous employees with lower educational levels displayed positive attitudes and behaviours at work.

Indigenous employees employed for less than 3 years had a higher level of representation in Cluster 2. Those employed for 3 to 5 years were dominant in Cluster 1, whereas employees employed for more than 6 years were the majority in Cluster 4. That is, indigenous employees employed for the longest period are more likely to report the most positive work performance and attitudes, whilst those employed for 3 to 5 years are more likely to indicate positive work attitudes with the lowest turnover intentions, and those employed for less than 3 years are more likely to display less positive work attitudes and behaviours. No statistically significant differences were found between the five clusters in regard to indigenous employees’ gender and management status.

Table 5.39 shows that the five clusters were significantly different with respect to two demographic characteristics of the non-indigenous employees. The non-indigenous employees 18 to 29 years old were mainly in Cluster 5 and those 30 to 39 years were dominant in Cluster 3. Non-indigenous employees from 40 to 59 were the largest proportion in Cluster 2 compared to indigenous employees in the age group 40 to 59 years, who were the largest proportion of Cluster 4. In terms of non-indigenous employees’ management status, non-managers were the largest group in Clusters 3 and 5, which indicated that non-indigenous non-managers are more likely to display positive work behaviours but have the highest turnover intentions or average levels of
performance. It can also be noted that non-indigenous managers were dominant in Cluster 2, which demonstrated that non-indigenous managers in this cluster tend to be disengaged from work, but are quite happy to stay in the organisation.

5.8. Summary of Quantitative Key Findings

The findings of the quantitative phase of the study are presented in the following table (Table 5.40). First, each of the research questions and sub-questions were presented. Following this, the key findings to the research questions were summarised and listed. The final chapter of the thesis will present the discussion and conclusions that can be drawn from this study in relation to the research questions posed in chapters 4 and 5, discuss these findings in relation to previous research, and illustrate how this study has contributed to the body of knowledge on the influences of organisational diversity in the Taiwanese hotel sector.

| Table 5.38 The relationship between indigenous demographic characteristics and the clusters |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Lowest | 21 (30.9) | 19 (27.9) | 12 (17.6) | 1 (1.5) | 15 (22.1) |
| Medium | 11 (36.7) | 4 (13.3) | 5 (16.7) | 5 (16.7) | 5 (16.7) |
| Highest | 5 (8.5) | 14 (23.7) | 8 (13.6) | 24 (40.7) | 8 (13.6) |
| Gender | 1. Male | 14 (28.6) | 13 (26.5) | 9 (18.4) | 7 (14.3) | 6 (12.2) |
| | 2. Female | 23 (21.3) | 24 (22.2) | 16 (14.8) | 23 (21.3) | 22 (20.4) |
| Age | 1. 18-29 | 16 (23.9) | 17 (25.4) | 15 (22.4) | 6 (9) | 13 (19.4) |
| | 2. 30-39 | 18 (27.7) | 18 (27.7) | 5 (7.7) | 14 (21.5) | 10 (15.4) |
| | 3. 40-59 | 3 (12) | 2 (8) | 5 (20) | 10 (40) | 5 (20) |
| Education | 1. Junior high or less | 8 (16.7) | 11 (22.9) | 5 (10.4) | 14 (29.2) | 10 (20.8) |
| | 2. Senior high | 26 (30.6) | 21 (24.7) | 11 (12.9) | 14 (16.5) | 13 (15.3) |
| | 3. College/University or above | 3 (13) | 5 (21.7) | 9 (39.1) | 1 (4.3) | 5 (21.7) |
| Employment duration | 1. Less than 3 | 14 (18.4) | 22 (28.9) | 15 (19.7) | 8 (10.5) | 17 (22.4) |
| | 2. 3-5 | 13 (38.2) | 10 (29.4) | 3 (8.8) | 3 (8.8) | 5 (14.7) |
| | 3. >6 | 10 (25.6) | 3 (7.7) | 7 (17.9) | 15 (38.5) | 4 (10.3) |
| Management status | 1. Manager | 18 (36) | 12 (24) | 5 (10) | 9 (18) | 6 (12) |
| | 2. Non-manager | 19 (17.8) | 25 (23.4) | 20 (18.7) | 21 (19.6) | 22 (20.6) |

χ² (8) = 38.49, p = 0.000* for Indigenous Taiwanese Frequency (% within cluster)
Table 5.39 The relationship between non-indigenous demographic characteristics and the clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity levels $\chi^2 (8) = 12.59, p = 0.127$</td>
<td>Non-indigenous Taiwanese Frequency (% within cluster)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
<td>10 (25)</td>
<td>8 (20)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>14 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5 (14.7)</td>
<td>7 (20.6)</td>
<td>10 (29.4)</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
<td>11 (32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>1 (1.9)</td>
<td>7 (13.2)</td>
<td>21 (39.6)</td>
<td>6 (11.3)</td>
<td>18 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender $\chi^2 (4) = 4.71, p = 0.319$</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 (16.7)</td>
<td>4 (11.1)</td>
<td>10 (27.8)</td>
<td>3 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6 (6.6)</td>
<td>20 (22)</td>
<td>29 (31.9)</td>
<td>6 (6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age $\chi^2 (8) = 18.64, p = 0.017*$</td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>2 (3.8)</td>
<td>9 (17)</td>
<td>16 (30.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>6 (11.5)</td>
<td>9 (17.3)</td>
<td>17 (32.7)</td>
<td>7 (13.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>6 (28.6)</td>
<td>5 (23.8)</td>
<td>2 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education $\chi^2 (8) = 11.59, p = 0.171$</td>
<td>Junior high or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
<td>9 (36)</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior high</td>
<td>6 (9.2)</td>
<td>13 (20)</td>
<td>18 (27.7)</td>
<td>6 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College/University or above</td>
<td>6 (16.7)</td>
<td>3 (8.3)</td>
<td>12 (33.3)</td>
<td>1 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment duration $\chi^2 (8) = 12.30, p = 0.138$</td>
<td>Less than 3</td>
<td>4 (8.3)</td>
<td>8 (16.7)</td>
<td>18 (37.5)</td>
<td>1 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>4 (9.1)</td>
<td>9 (20.5)</td>
<td>10 (22.7)</td>
<td>2 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;6</td>
<td>4 (11.4)</td>
<td>7 (20)</td>
<td>11 (31.4)</td>
<td>6 (17.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management status $\chi^2 (4) = 22.69, p = 0.000*$</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>9 (22.5)</td>
<td>12 (30)</td>
<td>5 (12.5)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-manager</td>
<td>3 (3.4)</td>
<td>12 (13.8)</td>
<td>34 (39.1)</td>
<td>5 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.40 Summary of quantitative key findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1.</strong> To what extent is organisational diversity (ethnic, gender, age, and education diversity) associated with employee attitudes and behaviours?</td>
<td>Ethnic diversity levels did predict more of the variation in employee attitudes and behaviours than the remaining types of organisational diversity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **RQ2.** What differences do selected demographic characteristics make in regard to employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity? | **a)** Respondents in the hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to indicate more positive employee behaviours (e.g. job performance, organisational citizenship and diversity related behaviour) than the respondents in the hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity.  

**b)** Non-indigenous workers, younger employees or those with higher levels of education were more likely to report significantly higher levels of turnover intention than indigenous employees, older age or lower education levels. Managers were more likely to express higher levels of employee attitudes than the non-managers.  

**c)** In the hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity, indigenous workers rated the significantly higher levels of job satisfaction than did the non-indigenous. On the other hand, in the hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity, indigenous employees rated significantly lower levels of job satisfaction than did the non-indigenous employees. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Summary of key findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3.</strong> What is the nature and extent of associations between employee perceived importance and performance of key company attributes within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>a) Employees in the hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity rated the importance of the diversity attributes significantly higher than performance. This suggests that the hotels with the low levels of ethnic diversity are not meeting employees’ expectations. It appears that Taiwanese hotels with the low levels of ethnic diversity must address a range of issues concerning the diversity attributes in order to improve the perceived performance on relevant attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Are there differences between importance and performance of key company attributes in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>b) Indigenous employees rated significantly higher importance but lower performance of diversity attributes than did the non-indigenous employees in the hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. It shows that diversity attributes are more important but less satisfactory to indigenous than non-indigenous in the hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Are there differences between indigenous and non-indigenous employee perceived importance and performance of key company attributes in hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity?</td>
<td>c) The findings suggest that organisational performance can predict employee attitudes and behaviours. Specifically, the finding suggests that employees who are more satisfied about the performance of diversity attributes within the hotels, report better diversity-related attitudes, job performance and less turnover intention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does satisfaction with performance of key company attributes predict employee attitudes and behaviours?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Six

Data Integration, Discussion and Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

The aims of this chapter are: to interpret and discuss the results presented in Chapters 4 and 5; to summarise and integrate the results of quantitative and qualitative analysis in order to answer the research questions, and to develop conclusions concerning the research questions; to outline the implications of this study for theory, human resource management, the hospitality industry, local and national governments, and indigenous communities; and to make recommendations for further research. The chapter is divided into the following sections: 1) introduction; 2) discussion; 3) limitations; 4) implications; and 5) recommendations for further research.

The fundamental purpose of this study was to examine the influences of organisational diversity levels on employees’ perceptions of work attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hospitality organisations. Levels of ethnic composition in hotels rather than the remaining measure of organisational diversity were found to be the best predictor of employee attitudes and behaviours. Thus, organisational diversity was represented by different levels of ethnic composition within the hotels in the study. Moreover, the differences in employee attitudes and behaviours for selected demographic characteristics of employees within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity were examined. Additionally, differences between the perceived importance and performance of key company attributes within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity were tested. The employees’ work-related attitudes and behaviours, viewed in the light of two theories (Tajfel social identity theory and Blau’s macrostructural inquiry), were utilised and seven variables (job satisfaction, organisational commitment, diversity-related attitudes, job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour, turnover and diversity-related behaviour) were studied. These variables were
explored in the qualitative chapter and then incorporated into the quantitative phase of study, which suggested these key variables are influenced by organisational diversity (Gregory, Way, LeFort, Barrett, & Parfrey, 2007; Guimareas, 1996). As discussed in Chapter 3, integration with evidence from the existing literature was adopted to summarise and integrate the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis in order to answer the research questions. The main findings relating to these research questions are discussed in the following section.

6.2 Discussion

6.2.1 RQ1: To what extent is organisational diversity associated with employee attitudes and behaviours?

*Actual and perceived diversity*

This study found that the levels of ethnic diversity as perceived by employees is consistent with the actual level of ethnic diversity according to the demographic data provided by the hotels. The literature reported mixed results regarding the relationship between actual and perceived diversity (de Chermont & Quiñones, 2003; C. M. Riordan, 2000). For example, Tsui et al. (2004) stated that perceptions of diversity may be inaccurate and demographic attributes may not embrace the same meaning or importance for all groups or people. De Chermont and Quifiones (2003) found that actual and perceived diversity were weakly correlated. However, the present study suggests that employees’ perceived levels of ethnic diversity matched the actual levels of ethnic diversity. The findings from the present study vary from those studies that found differences between actual and perceived diversity (De Chermont & Quifiones, 2003). This may be because the target population in the De Chermont and Quifiones study was 176 employees consisting of five ethnic backgrounds, being Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian American and “others”. However, the three participating organisations in the qualitative phase of the present study contained 37, 40 and 44 employees, respectively, with only two ethnic categories (indigenous and non-
indigenous). The employees in a work environment with smaller numbers of staff and fewer categories of ethnic backgrounds may therefore more easily be able to perceive more accurate proportions of ethnic diversity compared to those in a work environment with larger numbers of staff and more categories of ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, the researcher noted during the qualitative phase that some employees perceived slightly higher numbers of indigenous employees than the actual numbers of indigenous employees in each organisation. The possible explanation for this is that these respondents might feel more politically correct and proper if they named the greater numbers of indigenous employees, and perhaps they are attempting to avoid the judgement of being ignorant about the nature of minority groups in the workplace.

Briefly, the results demonstrated that what employees perceived as the diversity of their hotels was similar to the diversity reflected in the demographic data. Having demonstrated that perceived and actual levels of diversity were consistent, diversity levels were subsequently measured by the actual diversity in the hotels to further answer the remaining research questions.

*Ethnic diversity level is a main predictor of employee attitudes and behaviours*

West, Tjosvold and Smith (2003) demonstrated that the performance of ethnically diverse teams is significantly improved when such teams are embedded in a larger social context that is also characterised by ethnic diversity. The current study found that ethnic diversity levels in the hotels appeared to predict more of the variation in employee attitudes and behaviours than the remaining forms of organisational diversity. Therefore, hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity are used to represent organisational diversity for the remaining research questions. Much of the literature suggested that other types of diversity (e.g. gender and age diversity) influence group outcomes and behaviours (Ali, et al., 2011; Leonard & Levine, 2006; West, et al., 2003). Earlier research suggested that dissimilarity and heterogeneity are negatively related to organisational effectiveness, thereby influencing work-related attitudes (Choi, 2009; Gonzalez, 2009). The latter study indicated that
workplaces that emphasise the need to consider diversity will greatly benefit employees, because diversity will increase their satisfaction, motivation, morale, and commitment, and in turn increase productivity and improve the bottom line (Wegge, et al., 2008).

6.2.2 RQ2: What differences do demographic characteristics make in regard to employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels with different levels of organisational diversity?

**Demographic variables impacts**

Several studies have compared behaviour and attitude differences in organisations based on demographic characteristics (Branca, 2008; Davis, 2005; Edgar & Geare, 2004). The importance of the association of demographic characteristics of employees with employees’ attitudes and behaviours is reasonably well established (Boxall, et al., 2003). The results of this study revealed that demographic characteristics such as ethnicity, age, education, employment duration and management status have some association with employee attitudes and behaviours. Each demographic characteristic is discussed below.

**Ethnicity**

In the quantitative phase, the results demonstrated that non-indigenous workers were more likely to report higher turnover intentions than indigenous workers. Indigenous workers were more likely to report more positive attitudes toward diversity than their non-indigenous co-workers. This finding can be linked with the qualitative results, as the indigenous employee stated that “honestly, we are indigenous and we are already fine with having a job so that we shouldn’t complain too much; I should be happy where I am.” It seems that indigenous employees perceived that they would have less opportunity of getting a job should they leave the current one. As a result they displayed significantly less turnover intention than non-indigenous employees.
Additionally, when the researcher divided the two ethnic groups into three types of organisations with high, medium and low levels of diversity, findings showed that indigenous employees indicated significantly lower levels of job satisfaction and job performance than non-indigenous employees in the hotels with low ethnic diversity levels. This finding is consistent with research that workers from minority ethnic groups expressed less positive work attitudes when they were in a minority within the workgroup (C. Riordan & Shore, 1997). Other research has suggested that being the minority may impact on people differently (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004; McKay & McDaniel, 2006), and it seems that the effects of being different are not the same for ethnic minorities as they are for ethnic majority members. Therefore, further discussion in terms of differences in employee attitudes and behaviours between indigenous and non-indigenous employees in the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity is detailed in a later section.

**Gender**

The quantitative results showed that among the independent variables, only gender was not related to employee attitudes and behaviours. Specifically, there were no significant differences between males and females in their attitudes and behaviours toward work and diversity. However, earlier research on gender differences in attitudes and behaviours has produced mixed findings (Finkelstein & Farrell, 2007; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004). For example, Finkelstein and Farrell (2007) found that female employees were more likely to have stronger organisational citizenship behaviour than male employees. On the other hand, other researchers found that gender differences did not have any effect on employees’ work commitment (Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004). One reason for the mixed findings may be that some studies did not look beyond gender differences in individual work attitudes and behaviours within workplaces with different diversity levels. The current study further divided the gender groups into three types of organisations with high, medium and low levels of diversity, and the results showed significant differences in organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour between males and females in hotels with different ethnic diversity levels. Female employees in hotels with greater numbers of
ethnic minority employees are more likely to report higher levels of organisational commitment than male employees. Female employees in the hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity also report significantly higher organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviour than those in the hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. One explanation may be that female employees are often perceived as a gender minority within the workplace, and therefore where there are greater numbers of minority employees in the organisations, female employees may perceive themselves less as a minority and feel that the organisations actually treat all employees fairly. This explanation supports the work of Tsui et al. (2002), who found that where men are dominant in the workforce, women may consider there is unfair competition for positions, causing them to perceive a more threatening atmosphere. Therefore, the researcher suggests that the impact of low ethnic diversity on female employees’ organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behaviours was negative. Combining the results above, the researcher concludes that every organisation has its own distinctive culture and the impacts of gender differences could be crucial. When investigating the association between gender differences in employee attitudes and behaviours, the impacts of organisational cultures (e.g. diversity influences) therefore should be included.

**Age**

The results from both qualitative and quantitative phases suggest that older employees were more likely to have higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance and organisational citizenship than younger employees. Younger employees are more likely to have higher levels of turnover intention than older age groups. In addition, no statistically significant differences were found between age groups within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity.

Velde (2003) established that organisational commitment increases with age. Studies of the relationship between age and job performance are common and they suggest that older employees are more likely to demonstrate higher job performance (Li, Chu, Lam, & Liao,
The above statements can be explained by the qualitative result where employees thought that the hospitality industry often prefers to employ someone younger and attractive and that it would not be easy for them to find another job because of their older age. Therefore, the older employees are more likely to be satisfied and committed to their present job than younger employees. Selmer et al. (2000) also suggested that when analysing the connection between age differences and employee attitudes and behaviours, a number of selection factors such as job positions or level of education may be operating that either increase or reduce the apparent productivity of older workers.

**Educational background**

The quantitative results suggest that employees with higher education levels were more likely to have stronger intentions to leave the job than those with lower education levels. The findings are consistent with the qualitative study where employees thought it would be difficult for them to find another job because of insufficient educational background. Previous research found that university graduates had the highest turnover rates (Wiersema & Bird, 1993). Additionally, Milem (1992) discovered that people who had higher educational levels demonstrated statistically significant shifts in the direction of greater social, racial, ethnic, and political tolerance and greater support for individual rights. Although the results in the present study did not show any relationship between educational level and positive diversity-related attitudes and behaviours, the researcher found that only non-indigenous employees with higher levels of education were more likely to indicate more positive diversity-related behaviour. The mean scores of diversity-related behaviour for those with a college education or above were significantly higher than those with only senior high school and those with junior high school education or lower. The results suggest that indigenous employees may retain the same attitudes and behaviours related to diversity no matter what level of education they have attained. However, the higher the education level of non-indigenous employees, the more positive their behaviour toward diversity. This finding is partially supported by the work of Milem (1992), which found
people with higher educational levels had a greater tolerance toward diversity.

**Employment duration**

The quantitative results show that those employees employed the longest were more likely to express higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, positive diversity-related attitudes, job performance and organisational citizenship behaviours than the employees with shorter periods of employment duration. However, employees with shorter periods of employment duration were more likely to have higher levels of turnover intention.

The above findings are supported by Thatcher, Stepina and Boyle (2003), which found consistent, reliable relationships between employee attitudes and positive business outcomes, such as profits, productivity and employees’ employment duration. That is, employees with more positive attitudes had been employed in the organisation for longer periods.

The researcher also observed from the qualitative results that employees with longer employment duration were more likely to express more positive diversity-related behaviour than employees with the lowest employment duration. “I have been working here for more than 10 years. I have seen and get used to the work situation that indigenous and non-indigenous employees interact actively with each other in our hotel. We are not only working together, but also hangout all the time after work.” This comment illustrates how employment duration may affect diversity-related behaviours. Employees who have been employed for a longer period are more likely to get used to an organisational culture where indigenous and non-indigenous employees interact actively at work. That is, they may be more likely to have more positive behaviours toward diversity.

**Management status**

Managers were more likely to indicate more positive work attitudes and behaviours than
non-managers. On the other hand, non-managers were more likely to have stronger turnover intention than managers. According to Armstrong-Stassen (2001), people in non-management jobs report significantly lower job satisfaction, greater job insecurity, and lower organisational trust and morale compared with those in management positions. Similarly, Velde (2003) established that work attitude may become more negative with lower levels of job positions. Klinefelter (1993) also found that nurses in lower-level positions had a more negative attitude toward the hospital for which they worked. Thus, staff nurses reported a lower level of job satisfaction than nurses in higher positions. Aronson et al. (2005) and Parker (2007) indicated that since job positions are positively associated with job satisfaction, overall levels of job satisfaction were higher where employees held higher-level positions in the organisation. Additionally, employees in supervisory positions tended to demonstrate higher levels of commitment than non-supervisors because their levels of communication, motivation, knowledge, and skill secured their high level positions (Fang, 2001). Therefore, it may be that job position is heavily associated with work attitudes and job performance. There is also an additional explanation for these findings. For instance, Clark et al. (2009) suggested that a high income generally accompanies a higher level of job status and position; people who hold high-level jobs are happier with their jobs than those in lower positions due to higher wages.

The current quantitative phase of this study found that there were no significant differences between managers and employees in relation to their diversity-related attitudes and behaviours. Several managers in the qualitative phase reported stronger diversity acceptance attitudes and behaviours in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity than those in hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity. Managers in the hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity were likely to report the disadvantages of organisational diversity more frequently than those in the hotel with a high level of ethnic diversity. These conflicting responses of managers between hotels with high and low levels of ethnic diversity may moderate the diversity-related attitudes and behaviours in the quantitative phase.
The researcher further investigated differences in individual diversity-related attitudes and behaviours between management status in workplaces with different ethnic diversity levels. The results showed significant differences between managers and non-managers within hotels with different ethnic diversity levels on employee diversity-related attitudes and behaviours. That is, managers in hotels with a high level of ethnic diversity were more likely to report more positive diversity-related attitudes and behaviours than those in hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity. Similarly, non-managers in hotels with a high level of ethnic diversity were more likely to report more positive diversity-related behaviours than those in hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity. One reason may be that higher levels of ethnic diversity in the workplace increase the opportunity of interactions, communications and collaborations between managers and indigenous employees, which could actually reduce the negative consequences stemming from cultural differences. Collaboration may enhance communication and learning, and build trust between co-workers in the workplace (Güth, 2007). Where trust has been built, managers are more likely to have a more positive impression about indigenous employees, and subsequently their attitudes and behaviours toward diversity improve.

**Differences in employee attitudes within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity**

In the quantitative phase, the ANOVA analysis revealed that employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity and those with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity did not differ in their perceptions of employee attitudes such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment. However, the regression results suggested that employees who worked in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction and organisational commitment. The different statistical results may explain this because the organisations were only categorised into three levels of ethnic diversity for ANOVA, but the regression analysis used actual ethnic diversity scores to predict employee attitudes. Therefore, ANOVA did not show statistically significant differences among hotels with varying levels of ethnic diversity in terms of job satisfaction and organisational
commitment. It can be noted that the mean scores for job satisfaction and organisational commitment were the highest in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity and lowest in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. The researcher found that categorising the organisations into three levels of ethnic diversity separately may be less precise than using the actual diversity scores on the basis of a continuum of ethnic diversity levels. In other words, some organisations were categorised as having medium levels of ethnic diversity when they could have been close to, or may even have overlapped, the boundaries of those with either high or low levels of ethnic diversity. The regression analysis was therefore more suitable for investigating the relationship between employee attitudes within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. Unlike regression, ANOVA does not assume linear relationships and handles interaction effects automatically (Chappell, 2009). That is, the researcher concludes that higher levels of ethnic diversity are associated with more positive employee work attitudes such as job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

These findings correspond with social identity theory in that group identity is used to make comparisons. That is, people pay attention to how members of their group are treated by others. In regard to the current sample, higher levels of ethnic diversity were positively related to employees’ attitudes. This could be explained by macrostructural inquiry, which argues that employees’ perceptions of in-group and out-group memberships could be minimised if employees were more equally distributed over the categories of their ethnic identity. Therefore, interracial communication and interaction would be more difficult to avoid in a workplace with high levels of ethnic diversity. As such, high levels of heterogeneity could decrease the negative consequence of cultural conflicts. Organisations that foster increasing levels of diversity may also indicate to minority employees that the organisation is fair and does not discriminate, in turn, improving their work attitudes. This result is important considering not all other research supports this view of organisational diversity impacts (P. Weaver, Willborn, McCleary, & Lekagul, 2003).

Research in organisational psychology and sociology has argued that people different from the dominant group in the workplace have less satisfaction toward the job, lower levels of
organisational commitment, and perceive less social integration than do those
demographically similar to their cohorts (Tsui et al., 2002; Williams & O'Reilly, 1998).
Several findings illustrate that being the minority does not impact all persons in the same
way. As Tsui et al. (2002) discovered, the effects of being different are not the same for
ethnic minorities as they are for ethnic majority members. Cunningham and Sagas (2004)
also found that the effects for black and white staff differed. With respect to the former,
staff who were in groups with a relatively even mix of whites and racial minorities were the
least committed to the organisation. At the same time, the levels of commitment did not
vary between staff in groups that were mostly white or mostly racial minorities. That is, it
is necessary to investigate how the work attitudes and behaviours of majority and minority
groups may vary within workplaces with different levels of heterogeneity, for a better
understanding of diversity impacts at work.

The findings of the present study revealed that ethnic diversity levels did predict indigenous
employee attitudes, such as job satisfaction. This result could be explained by Earley and
Mosakowski (2000), who found that minority group members would be seen as out-group
members and experience negative attitudes within homogeneous groups. In contrast, where
there are minorities within a highly heterogeneous environment, out-group discrimination is
less likely to occur and positive attitudes increase. Moreover, ethnic diversity levels did not
predict employee attitudes in the non-indigenous employee group. This is consistent with
the research that demonstrates that diversity may have positive effects on minority staff
work attitudes, while not necessarily affecting the attitudes of the majority group (D. R.
Avery, 2003). This is a critical finding because one of the strategies for diversity
management has been to increase diversity in organisations by including ethnic minorities
and women and to minimise discrimination and civil rights violations (Foley, et al., 2005).
As such, it is likely that non-indigenous employees may feel alienated by increasing ethnic
diversity levels and expressing less positive employee attitudes. However, this study found
no such effect.
One explanation could be that in the Western context, social identity theory primarily reflects an intergroup orientation, rather than emphasizing intragroup relations. Social identity theory identifies intergroup comparison as a key source of in-group identification. In contrast, the Chinese Asian context is often considered as having a collectivism focus, which is based largely on the promotion of cooperative behaviours and maintenance of relational harmony within groups (Hofstede, 2001). As a result, the Asian perception of self is personally connected with other members of the in-group. Asians' in-group representations involve a network of such interpersonal connections rather than a differentiation between in-groups and out-groups. On the basis of the notion between social identity theory and Chinese Asian collectivism, the researcher argues that contrary to group identification as understood by social identity theory, Chinese Asian collectivism is an intragroup rather than an intergroup phenomenon. In keeping with this point of view, it can be suggested that Westerners (culture of individualism) tend to demonstrate stronger in/out-group membership than do people in the Chinese Asian culture of collectivism.

Additionally, earlier literature suggested that other forms of diversity could be more influential than ethnic diversity. For instance, some studies (Cunningham & Sagas, 2004; Wheeler, et al., 2007) found that non-observable diversity had a stronger relationship with various forms of satisfaction toward the group than did cultural dissimilarity such as race and ethnicity (non-observable diversity may occur when members of a workgroup differ in terms of what they think the group’s real task, goal, target, or mission should be). Sagas and Cunningham (2004) suggested that non-observable diversity is a more salient predictor of job satisfaction than ethnic dissimilarity, as ethnic dissimilarity did not impact work outcomes such as job satisfaction. These findings could also be linked to the concept of individualism and collectivism. When individualism is the dominant orientation, individuals tend to define themselves as independent of groups, autonomous, unique and guided by their personal goals and values. In contrast, in collectivist cultures there is a strong emphasis on social goals, a feeling of interdependence and a concern to maintain harmony within groups (Hofstede, 2001). In order to increase the reliability of social
identity theory, the impacts of both collectivism and individualism in cross-cultural settings need to be taken into account. By doing so, the researcher suggests that the future research agenda on diversity will need to be broadened to include an array of non-observable diversity elements such as organisational goals, values, experiences and personalities in different cultural contexts.

**Differences in employee behaviours within the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity**

The ANOVA results of this study indicated that respondents in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity report more positive job performance and higher levels of organisational citizenship behaviours than those employees in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. Similarly, these findings were also supported by the regression results, which indicated that employees who worked in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to report higher levels of job performance and organisational citizenship behaviours. According to social identity theory, employees’ behaviours are based to a significant degree on their perception of their standing within the social system and their similarity or dissimilarity with the group members and the organisation. In organisations with high levels of ethnic diversity, the employees’ sense of being supported by the systems creates in them a sense of belonging. Within the organisational context, the degree to which the desire to belong is facilitated by the organisation can therefore affect employee behaviours.

Earlier research by Srivastava (2006) found there is a negative relationship between levels of team heterogeneity and organisational citizenship behaviour. Specifically, his study demonstrated that when white employees (when not a minority) perceived themselves as different in race from their work groups, they were more likely to have lower levels of organisational citizenship behaviour. Research has found higher overall group performance when groups are homogeneous rather than heterogeneous (Martins & Parsons, 2007; Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004). Roberto (1998) also suggested that individuals show less
organisational citizenship behaviour in racially dissimilar groups than in racially similar groups. These studies suggest that lower levels of diversity were more positive for individual and group behaviours in an organisation than those in the organisation with a higher level of diversity. Conversely, the findings in the current study revealed that respondents in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity indicated significantly stronger job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour than those in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. The current findings could be explained by some of the evidence, which argues that in-group homogeneity is more important for Western than North-East Asian contexts (Satterwhite, Feldman, Catrambone, & Dai, 2000; Watanabe, 1991).

Research suggests that North-East Asians do not depict individual perceptions of their in-group as depersonalised entities, as social identity theory would predict; conversely, they perceive their in-groups as complex networks of interrelated individual members (Linnehan, Konrad, Reitman, Greenhalgh, & London, 2003). Confucianism actually considers the ideal society as a massive and complicated role system. Confucianism has had a deep influence on Chinese Asian perspectives, attitudes and behaviours for more than two thousand years and this representation is the basis for Asians' conception of larger groups (M. Y. Lee & Mjelde-Mossey, 2004). Confucius advised that social interaction should begin with an assessment of the role of the relationship between oneself and others, so that individuals can select behaviour that is appropriate to the relationship (Zhang, 2003). In accordance with this point, social groups in the North-East Asian context are often constructed so that members can monitor one another's behaviour. The high visibility of individual members may serve as a mechanism for inhibiting potential poor work behaviour (Miller & Kanazawa, 2000). For instance, a study demonstrated that Japanese became less cooperative and less trusting toward the in-group when there was no system of in-group monitoring and sanctioning, whereas Americans did not change their level of cooperation and trust in the presence or absence of a monitoring and sanctioning system (Yamagishi & Kiyonari, 2000). This could be linked to the current qualitative phase of the study, which found that some non-indigenous managers preferred not to hire indigenous employees due
to their different work ethic; however, they also stated that they liked to hang out and socialise with them. Yamagishi and Kiyonari (2000) explained that Asians are less willing to engage in discriminative social behaviours against out-groups when they perceive themselves as being monitored or judged. Therefore, Asians are more likely to select non-discriminative behaviour that is appropriate to the relationship when discrimination does not manifestly benefit the group. In contrast to the principle of positive intergroup distinctiveness governing intergroup behaviours as depicted by social identity theory, Asian intergroup behaviours can be characterised as those that maximise one's own personal interest by maintaining mutually beneficial relationships with fellow in-group members (Yuki, 2003). This may explain why Taiwanese employees in hotels with higher levels of ethnic diversity are more likely to indicate more positive organisational citizenship behaviour. They may think that it is more appropriate to select non-discriminative behaviour to the group when the chance of receiving a reciprocal reward of favour from the out-group is increased, and when discrimination does not benefit the in-group.

Another possible explanation for the present findings not being consistent with results from earlier studies is that the qualitative finding of the current study suggests that staff in hotels with higher levels of ethnic diversity (in which employees were more evenly distributed over the ethnic category) perceived that they have been treated fairly. Mays, Coleman, and Jackson (1996) explained that when the staff believe or sense they have been treated equally in the workplace, organisational citizenship behaviour is more likely to occur. That is, the staff may show less organisational citizenship behaviour when they experience or feel that there is discrimination in the environment. For example, the minority staff in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity may experience more out-group membership, which they perceive as a form of discrimination (González & Garazo, 2006). Another study (Hofhuis, et al., 2008) suggested that when ethnic minority employees felt insufficient support for their needs and interests, they consequently feel like they do not belong to the company. As a result, the absence of recognition of diversity can be a reason for employee
frustration and dissatisfaction with the lack of support from the company regarding equal opportunities and acceptance of cultural differences.

Moreover, the present study found no relationship between employee turnover intention and levels of ethnic diversity. As such, the findings are inconsistent with those of earlier studies. For example, previous research suggested that diverse groups are associated with increasing staff turnover intentions (Hofhuis, et al., 2008). According to Abdel-Monem, Bingham, Marincic and Tomkins (2010), heterogeneity and dissimilarity amongst group members are associated with more difficulty communicating, and communication difficulties usually lead to higher turnover. In contrast, Wise and Tschirhart (2000) stated that diversity and diversity programs could reduce turnover intention and turnover rate. One of the benefits of increasing numbers of minorities as Walker, Field, Giles, Bernerth and Jones-Farmer (2007) indicated, is that diversity-management strategies such as increasing the number of representatives of minority groups attract ethnic and other minorities and have a positive effect on their retention rates. Previous research has supported the suggestion that diversity has a linkage with staff turnover in both negative and positive ways. This study did not show any significant differences in turnover intention between the hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. Additionally, Leonard and Levine (2006) found that staff turnover rates are lower in more diverse workforces, and diversity mostly decreases turnover among minority groups. Their findings suggest that additional research should be dedicated to the effects of being ethnically different based on the subjective perceptions of employees.

In the quantitative phase, the results demonstrated that non-indigenous workers were more likely to report higher turnover intentions than indigenous workers across all organisations with different levels of diversity. This finding is consistent with the qualitative results of the current study. The indigenous employees perceived that merely having a job was important. They also stated they would have less opportunity of getting another job due to their ethnic backgrounds. Some indigenous employees believed that they did not have
many employment choices. Consequently, indigenous workers displayed significantly less turnover intention than non-indigenous employees.

In brief, the results of this study found that ethnic diversity levels positively affect employee behaviours such as job performance and organisational citizenship behaviours. Taiwanese indigenous staff are more likely to report lower turnover intention than non-indigenous employees. Therefore, the researcher suggests that awareness of some of the impact of diversity and ethnic backgrounds on employee behaviours could assist in the development of strategies to better manage diversity in order to improve employees’ work performance. As suggested by Ali, Kulik and Metz (2011), groups can be unaware of the effect of different types of diversity on performance and should select team members for their contributions along multiple diversity categories that enhance group performance. This is also supported by McKay et al. (2008), who argued that organisations are increasingly using work teams as functional tools to achieve their strategic objectives and employees’ performance. As the workforce becomes increasingly diverse, these teams will also probably become increasingly diverse. According to Guzman (2000), several studies predict that the global workforce will continue to become more diverse due to more affordable transportation options and rising immigration. Organisations will be forced to hire and retain a diverse set of employees in order to retain a competitive advantage. Matthewman and Matignon (2004) showed that the function of human resources departments has moved from simple regulatory compliance to motivating diverse employees to apply their different skills and abilities to deliver higher levels of performance. Taken as a whole, these results provide direction for increasing levels of diversity and valuing a diverse workforce in order to enhance employees’ performance. However, a few studies have illustrated that diversity itself may not be enough to ensure innovation and positive employee performance; the organisation may also need to minimise conflict in groups with high levels of diversity. The key objective is that organisations should have human resource management policies and training programs (e.g. conflict resolution, problem solving and team capacity building) that recognise natural differences
in groups to capture the positive consequences of heterogeneity. In other words, conflict among diverse employees in the organisation should be managed to enhance the positive effect of diversity on performance.

**Differences in employee diversity-related attitudes and behaviours within hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity**

Employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity and those in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity in this research did not differ in their diversity-related attitudes. On the other hand, the quantitative results demonstrated that only respondents with non-indigenous backgrounds who worked in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to indicate more positive diversity-related behaviour.

It is important to note that different levels of ethnic diversity in hotels have no effect on employees’ diversity-related attitudes. This finding could correspond with those of Marsh (2002) who investigated social identity and class interest in Taiwan. He argued that social class identity is quite unimportant in Taiwan because people’s attitudes toward class are not influenced by their class identity. Taiwanese respondents generally have similar and open attitudes toward the issues of identity and class, and therefore it seems that social identification has little influence on Taiwanese attitudes toward class issues. This may suggest that although social identity theory provides a broadly accepted social theory of group dynamics and behaviour and has received substantial support from many studies conducted in Western contexts (Chattopadhyay, et al., 2004; M. A. Hogg & Terry., 2000; Solnet, 2006), findings from the current study indicate that social identity theory may not fully account for Taiwanese attitudes and behaviours toward identity-related issues. Similarly, other studies have argued that the extent to which the social identity theory is applicable in different cultural contexts is questionable (Chow & Crawford, 2004; Jetten, Postmes, & McAuliffe, 2002).
Furthermore, the finding that only non-indigenous employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity were more likely to indicate more positive diversity-related behaviour could be explained by variations in education levels. The researcher noted that almost 80% of non-indigenous employees in hotels with high levels of ethnic diversity had senior high school and college educations. Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007) argued that people who have higher educational levels express more positive social, racial, ethnic, and political tolerance and exhibit greater support for individual rights. Similarly, Chandler and Tsai (2001) demonstrated that university students tend to change the degree of openness in their behaviours to racial, cultural, and value diversity from their first to their senior year. Students’ opinions become less rigid, dogmatic and ethnocentric. A number of studies have explained that those with a higher educational level have more positive diversity-related behaviours and that this is also associated with high self-esteem. For example, Van Eckert et al. (2012) observed that as the educational level of people increased, so did measures of their self-esteem. Moreover, Sotelo (2000) established that young people with low self-esteem have lower levels of acceptance and tolerance toward minorities or homosexuals; this is because those with low self-esteem are more likely to view others as being threatening. Lozano and Etxebarria (2007) also found self-esteem was associated with behaviours toward people from other countries. This suggested that for certain groups, high self-esteem might be related to more positive diversity-related attitudes and behaviours.

According to social identity theory, "social identity and intergroup behaviour is guided by the pursuit of evaluative positive social identity through positive intergroup distinctiveness, which in turn is motivated by the need for positive self-esteem" (Hogg & Terry, 2001, p.6). In other words, a person's behaviour will be affected by their positive association with their in-group, when their self-esteem and/or status are raised by that association. Social identity theory states there is a focus on the esteem of the group members that stems from their status within the group. Individual group members use the status from their membership in the group to gain and maintain self-esteem (Derks, et al., 2009). This self-esteem fulfils the need for a positive social identity and will motivate individuals to collaborate within the group to achieve the desired outcome of their group.
On the other hand, an individual’s personality can obstruct or support the motivational behaviour of a group. Some people are generally individual oriented, obtaining their own self-esteem from their individual achievements and fulfilments, while others in the group may need to perceive values and accomplishments as belonging to their group (Stangor, 2004). Group self-esteem refers to the positive self-esteem and self-identity gained through membership in a group (Duffy, Shaw, Scott, & Tepper, 2006). In order to identify one's self as a member of a group, membership in the group must hold some value for the person, such as improvement in their status or positive personal identity through the association with the group. An example of this would be how memberships in sororities and fraternities constitute high social status among peers, and lifelong association with these groups produces additional personal identity benefits, including self-esteem. The theory suggests that “the better one's group looks in comparison to other groups, the more status the group gains, and the more self-esteem it can provide for its members” (Morton, Postmes, Haslam, & Hornsey, 2009, p. 661).

It seems clear that self-esteem could be constructed through the process of social identification, and higher self-esteem is also more likely to be associated with positive diversity-related attitudes. The researcher concluded that for some Taiwanese employees, more positive diversity-related attitudes may be associated with their own self-esteem and perhaps group-self-esteem. At the same time, the link between more positive diversity-related attitudes and self-esteem suggests a helpful message: it may be possible to improve employees’ positive diversity-related attitudes and their acceptance toward diversity with something as simple as a boost in their personal and group self-esteem. Mathis and Roessler (2010) suggested that employees who are recognised for their efforts generally have better self-esteem than employees who are ignored, regardless of their efforts. In addition, group activities, training opportunities and motivational tools all work toward building employees’ self-esteem, thereby also improving organisational productivity (Patterson, Warr, & West, 2004). Thus, one effective means of increasing employees’ diversity-related attitudes may be the need to address the sources of self-esteem that
underlie it. Future studies of self-esteem should be included in measuring the relationship between group work outcomes and employees’ diversity related attitudes and behaviours.

6.2.3. **RQ3: What is the nature and extent of the association between employee-perceived importance and performance of key company attributes within hotels with different levels of organisational diversity?**

**Identified key company attributes**

More and more organisations increasingly focus on their human resources for competitive advantage. The attractiveness of companies during the recruitment process is crucial, as attracting and retaining a talented labour force has increased relevance for business success (Ng & Burke, 2005). The major attributes attracting employees’ choice of hospitality organisation to work for, as identified by employees of Taiwanese hotels, were salary and employment conditions, job suitability, job interest, job security, opportunities for rapid advancement, training opportunities, the reputation and image of the company, level of work environment harmony, clarity of rewards and discipline systems, stability of company systems, location of the company and a desire for increasing numbers of ethnic minority employees. After careful analysis of all the qualitative data, these attributes were grouped and summarised based on the literature and categorised into five main categories: job, network, geographic location, reputation and diversity. Additionally, key company attributes were reduced from five to three categories (job, organisation and diversity) by performing factor analysis. These three categories were used to examine the differences between employee expectations and their satisfaction with regard to key company attributes within the hotels. Diversity was identified as the common reason that attracted indigenous employees’ choice of organisation or influenced a possible move to another organisation. This finding demonstrates that diversity does matter to Taiwanese indigenous employees’ decisions to work in the hotel sector. Each of these categories is discussed below.
**Job attributes**

In the quantitative phase, employees rated job characteristics as the most important criteria for attracting them to work for the organisation. The importance mean scores of the job attributes were also significantly higher than the performance mean scores. That is to say, the organisations did not meet employee expectations in terms of the job-related features (levels of salary, job suitability, job security, challenging and interesting work, training opportunities, opportunities for rapid advancement). These results could be explained by the findings of the qualitative phase, where job-related items were the most frequently reason across the three organisations attracting people to work in an organisation. It seems that employees have higher expectations concerning job-related attributes and this may cause lower satisfaction levels. This result was supported by earlier research (Ghiselli, et al., 2003; Holzer & Michael, 2001), which indicated that job attributes such as salary, benefits and job security were the most common and important responses affecting job satisfaction.

**Organisation attributes**

Organisation attributes (location of company; clearly stated policies; friendly work environment; relationships with co-workers; and company image and reputation) did not meet employees’ expectations. There were significant differences between importance and performance mean scores in all three hotels with different levels of ethnic diversity. These results can be linked to the findings from the qualitative phase in which network and system factors (e.g. harmonious network, interaction between co-workers, and clarity of the rewards and discipline systems) were frequently reported as affecting employee attitudes and behaviours. This finding emphasises that respondents want to experience a stable and harmonious workplace with clear rewards policies, which would be likely to increase their satisfaction with their job and the organisation.
Diversity attributes

According to the results of the quantitative phase, in low ethnic diversity hotels, the diversity attributes (e.g. ethnic composition of organisation; majority of employees are of my ethnic background) did not meet employee expectations. The employees in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity rated diversity attributes with significantly higher importance but with lower satisfaction. On the other hand, there was no significant difference between importance and performance scores for diversity within hotels with medium and high levels of ethnic diversity. These results were supported by the qualitative findings where most employees in hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity reported that they were happy to see high levels of diversity within the workplace.

Furthermore, the quantitative results indicated that indigenous employees revealed significantly higher importance and lower performance mean scores with regard to the diversity-related features than non-indigenous employees in hotels with medium and low levels of ethnic diversity. The finding suggests that the work environment in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity could actually influence indigenous employees’ perceptions about satisfaction with performance on diversity attributes, as well as their rating of the importance of diversity attributes. It appears that the ethnic composition of Taiwanese hotels is an important feature to indigenous employees, which leads to the key finding that diversity matters to indigenous Taiwanese when they choose to work in the hotel sector. Therefore, recruitment campaigns need to focus on attracting a growing share of the Taiwanese ethnic minority labour force into the hospitality industry. For instance, Ng and Burke (2005) found that recruitment advertisements showing that the company has clear diversity-management guidelines or policies are more likely to interest minorities and high achievers and attract them to the company. Walker et al. (2007) also suggested that recognition and rewards for employees through diversity policies when clearly indicated in the recruitment process also attract relatively more minority employees to the workforce.
Moreover, a comparison of the responses of indigenous and non-indigenous employees on the importance of key company attributes demonstrated that there were no differences between the groups in terms of job and organisation attributes. However, indigenous employees reported that the diversity attributes were significantly more important than did non-indigenous employees. In the qualitative phase, the indigenous employees mentioned that they feel more comfortable working with someone who comes from a similar background. It is easier for them to get along with the staff who are indigenous, as they usually speak the same language and have more in common. This finding can be explained through social identity theory, which suggests that the development of social identity involves a process of both group categorisation and an attachment of value to the particular social category. Organisations may consist of diverse groups (e.g. ethnic minority groups, women, people with disabilities, and sexual orientation minority groups), and every individual represents one or more of these groups when interacting with others in the organisation. Social identification process refers to the element of the individual’s self-perceptions, which is taken from the individual’s awareness of their membership in the social group, together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership. Being in the minority has considerable effects on an individual’s experiences in the workplace, particularly the feeling of isolation in work groups and sense of separation from the mainstream. Alesina and Ferrara (2004) suggested that people are less trusting of people who are ethnically different to them and individuals generally prefer to interact with people who belong to the same ethnic group. In order for indigenous employees to have a sense of sense of belonging, they need to feel they are being supported by the hotel. This may explain why indigenous employees are more likely to express the importance of working in organisations with greater numbers of indigenous group members, as this may help them perceive themselves as being part of the in-group. It is also noted that these indigenous employees had attained a primary to senior high school level of education. Therefore, ethnicity and a lower level of education could be associated with employees being attracted by the diversity features of an organisation. Fong and Isajiw (2000)
illustrated that people with lower levels of educational backgrounds are more likely to form ties with their own ethnic group.

Non-indigenous employees cited many differences in work attitudes between the two ethnic groups that cause conflict within the workplace. As such, they prefer not to have many indigenous employees in the organisations. The prejudice Taiwanese indigenous employees have experienced in the workplace may explain why the ethnic minority employees have a stronger desire to work with people from the same ethnic background. Aydemir and Skuterud (2005) found that ethnic minorities reported experiencing significantly greater discrimination and prejudice than ethnic majorities in various contexts, including obtaining work, salary levels and being considered for promotion or advancement.

As a result, the researcher suggests that organisations should offer diversity training programs for employees, managers and employers as a method of reducing or eliminating prejudice and discrimination in the workplace. These programs could provide employees with education about multiple cultures, promote awareness and tolerance of differences, and apply concepts of diversity to personal working experiences and life situations. Organisations should also emphasise that recruitment policies justify, value and reward diversity and develop strategies to manage diversity by recognising cultural differences and recruiting more indigenous and other minorities. In many developed countries, diversity policies seek to increase the representation of minorities (ethnic and gender), especially in higher management positions (Myaskovsky, Unikel, & Dew, 2005). Management of diversity (e.g. increasing the level of diversity in the organisation) could reduce the possible negative consequences of diversity, such as group conflict (Barkema et al., 2002), as well as attract women and ethnic minorities and subsequently positively affect their retention in the organisation (Walker, Field, Giles, Bernerth & Jones-Farmer, 2007).

Furthermore, social identity theory may not be equally applicable in explaining differences between Taiwanese non-indigenous and indigenous. Current results regarding ethnicity differences in diversity attraction showed that indigenous employees are more attracted by
in-group memberships than non-indigenous when working with each other. Ethnic differences also lie in the way non-indigenous and indigenous employees respond to out-group members. Indigenous employees respond more positively to in-group than to out-group members with respect to ethnic attraction. Non-indigenous members, on the other hand, are not so concerned about in-group or out-group memberships in socialising and interacting in the workplace, whether they were working in hotels with high or low levels of ethnic diversity. Hwang (2006) indicated that through widespread intermarriage between Han Chinese and indigenous communities from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, the indigenous Taiwanese began to be assimilated in Taiwan. Another study has shown a pattern of cultural shift mutually experienced by both Han and indigenous Taiwanese, resulting in a hybrid culture. Today people who comprise Taiwan's ethnic Han demonstrate major cultural differences from Han elsewhere and have been described as new Taiwanese (M. J. Brown, 2004). It appears that indigenous Taiwanese identify more with the in-group compared with non-indigenous Taiwanese, who identify with both the in-group and out-group, with a less clear distinction. Despite evidence that acculturation entails two-way processes of change between the majority and minority, the current research suggests that acculturation among indigenous groups is influenced by traditional cultural norms. Indigenous identifications have changed little over time compared with those of non-indigenous Taiwanese.

Although social identity theory has viewed social identification as a dynamic process that is equally prevalent for all people. The results from this research suggest there may be important individual differences in the ways social identities are understood and used. The current findings suggest there may be differences in how people perceive their own and others’ identity, and that these differences may be perception and knowledge oriented, arising independent of the intergroup context. When people only perceive and recognise human characteristics as reified and apparent, they may see these characteristics as arising from particular group memberships. Theoretically, this finding is important because ethnic minorities tend to be the focus of diversity research, but little research has examined how
ethnic minorities are affected by diversity levels in the North-East Asian context. Thus, the current study suggests that it may be enriching for research on social identity to pay attention to majority and minority perceptions about the identity characteristics of their own and another groups, because these perceptions may result in different social identity-related effects.

\textit{Satisfaction with the performance of key company attributes predict employee attitudes and behaviours}

The present quantitative findings showed that employees with higher satisfaction with the performance of job attributes (e.g. potential for salary increases, opportunities for rapid advancement, job interest and suitability, and training opportunities) were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, diversity-related attitudes, job performance and lower turnover intentions. These findings are consistent with the current qualitative findings and are also supported by earlier research. For example, a substantial number of studies indicated that salary and job-related characteristics were common factors in affecting employees’ work outcomes (Aksu & Aktas, 2005; Derrick, 2006; Holzer & Michael, 2001; Kirk-Brown & Wallace, 2004; Schmidt, 2007; Wheeler, et al., 2007). On the other hand, extensive literature also suggests that levels of salary, job security, and opportunities for rapid advancement actually help to reduce staff turnover intentions (Ghiselli, et al., 2003; Lee & Eyraud, 2008; Moynihan & Landuyt, 2008; Wheeler, et al., 2007).

Furthermore, the respondents who reported higher levels of satisfaction with the organisation attributes (e.g. work environment harmony, stability of working structure, clear company policies and reward system, and location of the company) were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance and organisational citizenship behaviour. The results may be explained by the qualitative findings, which suggested that Taiwanese employees prefer a stable and harmonious
workplace with clear policies and rewards systems, as these help increase their satisfaction and commitment with their job and organisation. Studies suggest that if companies are able to provide harmony between work environments and employees’ needs, communication and interaction between co-workers will be more effective and co-worker relationships in the workplace will be better; and subsequently, levels of satisfaction and commitment of employees will be higher (Vora, 2002; Wall & Berry, 2007; Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). Ozgan (2011) and Bergen et al. (2005) also suggested that rewards and support from the company can help to increase employee satisfaction with their job and the organisation. If employees’ efforts are recognised and rewarded, their motivation increases, and they become more contented with the job and the company.

The current quantitative results also indicated that Taiwanese employees who were more satisfied with the diversity attributes (e.g. ethnic composition of the organisation) within the workplace were more likely to report more positive diversity-related attitudes, job performance, and lower levels of turnover intentions. This finding could be linked with the qualitative results that indicated that many indigenous employees would love to see more indigenous employees, which they believed would facilitate higher levels of both job satisfaction and work performance. It seems that higher satisfaction with performance of the diversity attributes is associated with more positive employee attitudes and behaviours. Both the quantitative and qualitative findings could be explained by the view that group heterogeneity could decrease the negative consequences of cultural conflict (D.R Avery, 2003; Hamilton, et al., 2004; Strachan, et al., 2009; Waight & Madera, 2011).

Over the years, researchers have attempted to find ways to indicate the factors that best predict employee attitudes and behaviours (Charmine, 2004; Saari & Judge, 2004). This research suggests that employers and managers aiming at increasing the frequency and level of positive employee work outcomes should be more aware of the antecedents of employee satisfaction toward their job and the organisation. Taiwanese hotels should consider the likely effects of positive employee experiences on the atmosphere in the
workplace. Improving salary and rewards systems could be seen as a critical approach for reducing Taiwanese employee turnover intentions. Crucially, inducing harmony in the work environment by increasing levels of diversity in the organisations may also be a strategy of choice. The qualitative findings indicated that some managers negatively stereotype their indigenous employees as having low ability or willingness to work. This negative attitude may lead to low expectations and to treating employees without respect. Thus, a negative managerial attitude results in not hiring indigenous workers. The researcher suggests that cultural learning opportunities and programs should be made available for employers, managers, and employees so that their negative attitudes might be minimised, which in turn may lead to more positive behaviours toward minority employees.

Additionally, the current qualitative study found that in order to develop and sustain positive public relations with local communities, some hotel managers were willing to utilise the full potential of the labour market from local indigenous villages. That is, increasing levels of diversity in hotels may not only facilitate employee attitudes and behaviours, but may also lead to better public relations with the local community. This leads to a win–win situation: employees enhance attitudes and behaviours, in turn increasing their productivity, whilst employers promote the company image and build closer relationships with the local community.

6.2.4 The employee management and human resources development implications of the effect of ethnic diversity and demographics on employee attitudes and behaviours in Taiwanese hotels

Employees work attitudes and behaviours were investigated in relation to the characteristics of the five clusters of predominantly minority (indigenous) and non-minority (non-indigenous) groups. The two ethnic groups showed quite different results across the clusters with regard to employee attitudes and behaviours. A discussion of each cluster with recommendations for human resource management is outlined below.
The employees in this cluster were more likely than others to report more positive work attitudes with low turnover intention. This cluster is composed mainly of Taiwanese indigenous respondents with senior high school education and employment duration from 3 to 5 years. Therefore, the researcher suggests that in the future, organisations should provide fair recruitment processes for hiring applicants who do not necessarily hold a college or university degree, as they may be more likely to display more positive work attitudes and stronger intentions to remain in the organisation. The organisation could also implement workforce development programs to increase these particular employees’ skill levels so they can compete in the workforce.

According to the qualitative findings, network factors (e.g. clear rewards and discipline systems) were identified as the main impediments to positive employee attitudes. Recruitment factors (e.g. insufficient numbers of staff) were also classified as a main impediment for increasing turnover intentions among employees. Therefore, it is necessary for human resource management to ensure there is explicitness in rewards and discipline systems, as well as sufficient numbers of staff within the organisation in order to maintain this particular cluster of positive employee work attitudes with low turnover intentions. Organisational psychology and sociology research also indicates that individuals who are different from others in the workgroup have less organisational commitment, experience less social integration, and have greater turnover intentions than do persons who are demographically similar to their cohorts (Gonzalez, 2001; Lee, 2005; Tsui et al., 2002). Therefore the researcher also suggests that hotels could bolster their employment of more minority group members to enhance diversity in the workplace and reduce the in-group/out-group identities and potential conflict.
Less positive work attitudes and behaviours

This cluster mostly comprises Taiwanese indigenous employees with less than three years’ employment and Taiwanese non-indigenous managers in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. They tended to have less positive work and diversity-related attitudes and behaviours but with a moderately low level of turnover intention. In other words, the employees in this cluster tend to be disengaged from work, but they are quite happy to stay in the organisation.

This finding shows that Taiwanese non-indigenous managers in the hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity are likely to express lower satisfaction toward the job and diversity. This is contradictory to earlier literature, which indicated that higher managerial-level employees tended to view their jobs as being rewarding and expressed higher work satisfaction ratings than those in lower managerial-level positions (Manning, 2002). The staff with higher-level positions within the company probably have greater power and autonomy and rewards. They may also be in a better position to understand, learn, and be involved in job design and work decisions, and in turn have higher work satisfaction than those with lower-level positions (Tu, et al., 2006). The qualitative phase of the current study found that non-indigenous managers in the hotel with a low level of ethnic diversity tend to describe indigenous employee work behaviour as reflecting a “poor work ethic”. They may have difficulties managing indigenous employees. The quantitative phase of the present study demonstrates that managers in the organisation with a low level of ethnic diversity perceived that they feel less positive work and diversity-related attitudes and behaviours. On the other hand, the interviews indicated that employees in hotels with higher levels of ethnic diversity actually appreciated interactions between non-indigenous and indigenous employees more than those in hotels with a low level of ethnic diversity. This may suggest higher levels of diversity in the workplace could actually reduce the negative consequences stemming from cultural differences. Güth (2007) suggested that collaboration between indigenous workers and non-indigenous managers could enhance communication and learning, and build trust between co-workers within the workplace.
Therefore, hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity may need to encourage and emphasise collaboration skills and strive to build collaborative norms into their organisational culture (e.g. emphasise the importance of each employee’s efforts and demonstrate how all of their jobs operate together to move the entire organisation closer to its goals). Creativity, innovation, and different viewpoints should be expected and supported by organisations. In turn, this may help non-indigenous managers recognise the contributions of minority employees and motivate both non-indigenous managers’ and minority employees’ work attitudes and behaviours more positively in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity.

Based on the qualitative results, job factors (e.g. potential for salary and employment conditions improvement) and network factors (e.g. clear rewards and discipline systems, and levels of affirmation from the organisation) were deemed by employees in general to facilitate their more positive work attitudes. Ozgan (2011) mentioned that employees usually want to be acknowledged and rewarded on their constructive contribution and this will increase motivation and satisfaction with work.

Moreover, co-worker factors (communication and interaction between co-workers) and diversity factors (learning the value of ethnic cultural differences) were also perceived to assist with positive work performance. Taiwanese hotels should concentrate on attributes such as improving salary and employment conditions, clarifying policies or principles, and clearly defining rewards systems for this particular cluster of employees. This could actually help to increase employee satisfaction with both the job and the organisation. The positive communication and interaction between colleagues and learning about cultural differences need to be reinforced in the organisation and this could enhance employees’ work performance and their acceptance of diversity. Hellesø and Fagermoen (2008) highlighted both theoretically and practically how cultural diversity must be taken into account when planning for future delivery of integrated employee interactions and cooperation. This could be linked to the finding that communication and interaction between co-workers and learning about cultural differences were found to be significant factors for facilitating Taiwanese work performance.
**Positive work behaviours with highest turnover intention**

The employees in this cluster were more likely to report strong positive behaviours but also had the highest turnover intentions. This cluster mainly consisted of indigenous employees in the age group from 18 to 29 years with college or university degrees, or non-indigenous employees in the age group between 30 and 39 years. In the literature, positive work attitudes and behaviours are said to be correlated with lower turnover intentions but this is not supported in this study. Earlier research found that heterogeneity of age, job position, and university education were significant correlates of high levels of turnover rate (Wiersema & Bird, 1993). Wise and Tschirhart (2000) found evidence that diversity and diversity programs in organisations reduced both turnover intention and actual turnover. One conclusion that can be drawn from the above is that, next to the key company attributes, diversity factors, diversity programs and diversity policies, when consistently communicated to new employees, may reduce turnover. Hence, diversity policies and programs should be offered or emphasised to this cluster of employees. Policies must be translated into actual behaviours and the managers also need to be visible examples of all these in the workplace.

Employees in this specific cluster reported more positive work performance but also a lack of interest in remaining in the organisation long term. Together with the qualitative results in this study, co-worker factors (e.g. communication and interaction between co-workers, and relationship with co-workers) and diversity factors (learning about ethnic cultural differences) influenced employee behaviours. According to Groschl and Doherty (1999), the issues of high levels of staff turnover and high levels of business failure in hospitality organisations can potentially be minimised by better managing diversity. Therefore, the researcher recommends that managers should monitor the relationship and interaction between majority and minority employees, as well as provide cultural training activities in order to reduce turnover intention.
Additionally, Ghiselli et al. (2003) found there is a clear connection between turnover and levels of salary and benefits. The findings from the recruitment literature also suggest that salary is one of the most significant factors in the decision to accept a job (Carless & Imber, 2007). The results of both studies are consistent with the qualitative finding that levels of salary increases and company rewards could actually decrease Taiwanese employees’ turnover intentions. The organisations should also look into the potential improvement of salary and employment conditions for this cluster of employees in order to decrease their turnover intentions.

**Strongest work performance with the best attitudes**

This cluster, largely consisting of Taiwanese indigenous employees in the age group of 40 to 55 years with employment duration of more than 6 years, tended to be the best performers with the most positive attitudes. This result could be a positive indicator for the organisation to value and appreciate the employees in this particular cluster more and to increase recruitment efforts to attract mature-age Taiwanese indigenous workers, as they are more likely to achieve more positive work performance and be loyal to the company. Literature demonstrated that discrimination against older staff in the hospitality industry is not unusual (Magd, 2003; Wilson, Parker, & Kan, 2007), as mature-age workers may be classified as being resistant to change, less active and difficult to train (R. E. Lucas, 1993). Although hospitality organisations in particular use recruitment and retention programs to employ and attract a large number of young workers (Martin & Gardiner, 2007), other research has suggested that employers often see more mature-age employees as more committed, more reliable, and harder working than those who are younger (Gringart, Helmes, & Speelman, 2008). The current study supports the view that more mature age Taiwanese indigenous employees are more likely to report positive attitudes and the best performance at work, as well as more loyalty to the company. In order to retain and attract this cluster of employees, organisations need a strategic rewards system demonstrating the valuing of older workers. One study suggested that employees’ rewards and recognition should not depend solely on the job they have. Instead, differences in the performance of
individuals or groups, seniority, knowledge, skills, and contributions are used as a foundation for differentiating rewards and recognition among employees. Rewards and recognition can motivate, facilitate and influence employee behaviour and work outcomes (De Cieri, et al., 2008). Through incentive rewards systems, employees can be led to focus their attention and efforts on job tasks and remain in the company longer. Research has found that older employees did not like rewards that take them away from home. They often prefer rewards such as days off and flexible scheduling (Parker, 2007). Flexible scheduling can have considerable benefits for employees and have been shown to lead to reduced absence, increased motivation and higher levels of staff retention (Boxall, et al., 2003). Flexible work arrangements may be included in company agreements and all managers should recognise and emphasise the importance of flexibility for managing ethnic diversity and workforces of different ages.

Moreover, since this cluster includes mainly Taiwanese indigenous employees, ethnic background also needs to be considered. Based on the qualitative finding, indigenous employees expressed salary and ethnic composition in hotels as significant factors for facilitating their work performance and retention. This suggests that Taiwanese hotels need to use salary effectively. This particular reward should be offered for employees with high levels of work performance and be implemented as innovative rewards and recognition programs as retention strategies for a diverse workforce. On the other hand, creating a work environment that is inclusive of employees of all backgrounds could also benefit this particular cluster of employees. A diverse workforce requires effective diversity policies and practices. For example, with regard to work design, older employees need flexible schedules to increase motivation and retention (Magd, 2003). With regard to rewards, benefits such as increasing salary should be included in rewards systems to accommodate the needs of an older workforce. With regard to the composition of organisations, it is clear that all employees need to be made aware of the benefits of diverse workforces and inclusive work practices. This also needs to be reflected in recruitment policies and in the employment and training of more indigenous managers.
**Average level of work performance**

This cluster includes mostly Taiwan non-indigenous workers in the age group from 18 to 29 years with non-managerial status. They were more likely to record average levels of performance. This group tended to be employees with neutral work attitudes and behaviours.

In conjunction with the present qualitative results, job suitability, opportunities for rapid advancement, interesting job, and training opportunities were more important to non-indigenous groups than indigenous groups. Network factors (e.g. clarity of the rewards and discipline systems, and levels of affirmation from the organisation), co-worker factors (communication and interaction between co-workers) and diversity factors (learning ethnic culture differences) were also reported to positively affect the attitudes and behaviours of non-managers. The researcher proposes that the organisation could stimulate this cluster of employees’ attitudes and behaviours by allocating work tasks based on their interests or qualifications. The organisations also need to set guidelines for emphasising the recognition of the work contribution and recognition of outstanding performance, in order to develop opportunities for employees’ rapid advancement. Since many studies indicated that workplace training opportunities are crucial and influence employee outcomes such as job performance (Boselie, Dietz, & Boon, 2005; Dysvik & Kuvaas, 2008), the researcher suggests that training opportunities should be implemented to facilitate employee development. In conjunction with coaching and mentoring, employee development and motivation are then more likely to occur.

In the interviews, the non-managers indicated that miscommunication and lack of cooperation between departments can cause severe problems and create frustrations within the work setting. These problems are in turn creating a poor and ineffective work environment. Therefore, these respondents were eager to see effective and frequent communication and cooperation between managers and non-managers among the departments of the hotel. The qualitative results also suggest that encouraging higher levels
of interaction between co-workers and offering cultural training opportunities could facilitate non-managers’ work outcomes. Thus, effective communication and cooperation should be seen as important to the success of Taiwanese hotels. Improved communication and cooperation could possibly promote creativity and increase productivity of employees in this particular cluster.

Additionally, the researcher noted that non-indigenous workers were more likely to report having average levels of work performance compared with indigenous employees, who reported either overall good performance or low performance at work. In other words, a lower percentage of non-indigenous Taiwanese staff self-reported strong positive job performance than did indigenous employees. This finding suggests that the two ethnic groups may have exhibited different perceptions about the definition of good performance at work. These results could be reflected in the qualitative results, where non-indigenous employees expressed there is a different work ethic and work value between the two ethnic groups. This is something worth further examination in future research.

6.3 Conclusion

Based on the results and the discussion, the following conclusions are made in relation to this study:

1. The levels of ethnic diversity perceived by employees is consistent with the actual level of ethnic diversity according to the demographic data provided by the hotels.

2. The levels of ethnic diversity in the hotels rather than other types of organisational diversity appeared to predict more of the variation in employee attitudes and behaviours.
3. The ethnic composition of the hotel workforce is an important attribute of the Taiwanese hospitality industry. This suggests that diversity is an important organisational feature that attracts Taiwanese indigenous employees.

4. Indigenous employees were more likely to report significantly lower levels of turnover intention and more positive diversity-related attitude than non-indigenous workers.

5. Older employees and employees with longer employment durations were more likely to have higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance and organisational citizenship, and less turnover intention than younger employees.

6. Employees with lower education levels were more likely to have less turnover intentions, than those with higher levels of education.

7. Managers were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance and less turnover intentions than non-managerial employees.

8. Employee attitudes and behaviours are positively associated with higher levels of ethnic diversity in the organisations. Employees also appreciated and participated in cross-ethnic interactions more regularly in the workplace with high levels of ethnic diversity.

9. The hotels with the low levels of ethnic diversity were not meeting employees’ expectations of diversity attributes (e.g., ethnic compositions in the hotel). Diversity attributes were also the significantly least well performing feature to the employees across the three types of hotels.
Organisational performance can affect employee attitudes and behaviours. Specifically, employees who are more satisfied about the performance of diversity attributes within the hotels, report better diversity-related attitudes, job performance and less turnover intention.

6.4 Contribution of the Study

This study was based on the line of the effects of organisational diversity on employees’ work outcomes, which have been examined broadly in business management studies (Spataro, 2005; Svyantek & Bott, 2004; Thomas, 2005; Waight & Madera, 2011; Wickham & Parker, 2007). The majority of former research has been undertaken in the Western context, while very few studies have been conducted in North-East Asian countries. There is substantial research in Australia, Canada and the United States of America in relation to minority employees in the business sector. Nearly two per cent of Taiwan’s population is indigenous, which is similar to the indigenous proportion of the national population in Australia, but little research has investigated diversity in the Taiwanese business sector. However, it was crucial to the researcher that this research produces both theoretical and practical benefits in Taiwan. This study has contributed to the theoretical development of diversity management in a number of ways.

1. The findings of this study contribute to the body of literature that informs research on diversity management, by analysing employee attitudes and behaviours, as well as selected key company attributes, with a specific emphasis on the Taiwanese hotel context across low, medium, and high levels of ethnic diversity. Accordingly, the research findings provide clear evidence of positive impacts of diversity in the Taiwanese hotel sector, as well as the need to consider the effects of the ethnic composition of the workplace due to the increasing numbers of ethnic minority employees in the labour force in Taiwan. The findings of this research also suggest that organisations need to promote high levels of ethnic composition in the workplace in order to attract minority employees. The topic of organisational diversity has not
previously received much attention in the Taiwan and this research opens a window for future investigation in the area.

2. Social identity theory argues that individuals define themselves in relation to their social environment and identify with others based on perceived similarity (Tajfel, 2010). Consistent with this theory, several scholars have found that demographic dissimilarity predicts negative attitudes towards supervisors and peers (Schaubroeck & Lam, 2002), work groups (Polzer, Milton, & Swann, 2002), as well as the organisation (Chattopadhyay, et al., 2004). The current findings suggest that social identity theory may be more applicable to intergroup situations involving people from Western cultures than those from Eastern cultures. For example, a recent theoretical framework proposed by Yuki (2003) suggests that the predominant characteristics of group cognition and behaviour may differ across certain cultural contexts. The typical characteristics of group cognition and behaviour for North-East Asians may be qualitatively different from those of Westerners. Although people in Western cultures tend to emphasise the categorical distinctions between individualism and collectivism, North-East Asians may have a stronger tendency to think about themselves as predominantly group-based (Yuki, 2003). Additionally, there may be important individual differences in the ways that social identities are processed. The current findings suggest that there may be differences in how people perceive their identity and that of others, and that these differences may affect individuals' group behaviours. Therefore, the current study contributes the claim that a full theory of group attitude and behaviour should incorporate both aspects of individualism and collectivism, as well as intergroup and intragroup relations, while applying social identity theory in different cultural settings.

3. This study supports the view that Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) is a useful tool. The researcher used this framework to address the gaps occurring between employee expectations and satisfaction in meeting employee needs. A set of items
measuring key company attributes in the Taiwanese hotel context, based on the IPA model, was developed and evaluated. The results indicated that diversity-related features were deemed to be highly important attributes for employees in hotels with low level of ethnic diversity, while diversity attributes were the least satisfactory feature for them. Therefore, the recommendation can be made to hotel employers and managers that it is crucial to improve diversity attributes in organisations to meet employee expectations in these particular types of hotels.

4. This research contributes to the mixed-method approach by adopting two phases to investigate diversity influences in the Taiwanese hotel sector. The study used both qualitative and quantitative approaches to integrate the results and detailed examples to explain the research findings and conclusions. This contribution allows for a greater selection of research approaches and supports the use of mixed methods in order to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of human behaviour.

Additionally, there are three applied contributions.

1. This study provides a comprehensive and useful tool for hotel employers and managers to measure employee attitudes, behaviours and the importance of the performance of key company attributes in an organisational setting.

2. This project merges many of the findings from earlier research to attain a clearer picture of the impacts of diversity on employee attitudes and behaviours in the hotel sector and thus contributes to the classification of particular attributes that are important to employees (e.g. ethnic composition of organisation, friendly work environment and levels of salary) when they choose to seek employment in a particular Taiwanese organisation.

3. The findings of this research inform Taiwanese employers and managers that diversity does matter to employees. By combining the demographic characteristics of employees
and employee attitudes and behaviours measures and then dividing these into five clusters, recommendations were made based on each particular cluster. The researcher also provided strategies (e.g. emphasising the recognition of work contributions and encouraging higher levels of interaction between co-workers, cultural training and minority recruitment) to stimulate more positive work attitudes and behaviours by adapting these approaches to different clusters of employees’ needs.

6.5 Implications of the Study

With increasing globalisation affecting the hospitality industry due to the growth of cross-cultural contacts with a range of workers and customers, there is a need for business leaders and managers to strategically manage cultural diversity and interaction in their organisations. People travel all over the world, not only for holidays, but also for business, education, health and other purposes. This has increased the market for the hospitality industry. In order to generate income from diverse visitors, it is necessary to reflect and meet the demands of an increasingly diverse customer base with varied needs. Organisations that are receptive to diverse employees are more likely to better understand the increasingly complex needs of both domestic and global customers and, therefore, compete more effectively (American Hospitality Academy, 2005; Richard, et al., 2004). Employees may come from minority backgrounds, have different characteristics and behaviours to the majority group and exhibit diverse behavioural patterns. Diversity may also influence employee work outcomes; in turn, employee work outcomes affect customer perceptions about the quality of their experience. Many researchers have demonstrated that effective diversity management can increase international orientation and team performance, improve business decision making and innovative ideas, enhance service quality and image, foster equity opportunities, provide competitive advantage and increase productivity (Chavan, 2005; Dickie & Soldan, 2008; Diefendorff, Richard, & Gosserand, 2006; Dunphy, 2004; Guzman, 2000; Hamilton, et al., 2004; Luthans, 2012; Maxwell, 2004; Salomon & Schork, 2003; Strachan, et al., 2009; Waight & Madera, 2011).
implications as well as implications for the hospitality industry, human resource management, local and national government, and indigenous communities are provided below.

*Theoretical implications*

This study has demonstrated that social identity theory and macrostructural inquiry may be viable frameworks to explore the effects of organisational diversity levels on employee attitudes and behaviours. Many scholars have suggested that the influence of diversity in the business context is ambivalent. According to social identity theory, cultural homogeneity in the workplace may consequently increase the satisfaction and cooperation levels of employees and decrease emotional and cultural conflict (Schaubroeck & Lam, 2002). Earley and Mosakowski (2000) also found that moderately heterogeneous groups showed relationship conflict, communication problems, and low identification of members with the overall work group. However, macrostructural inquiry (Blau, 1977) suggested that high levels of heterogeneity could actually decrease conflict, negative emotions and communication problems, since group members will be more evenly distributed over the categories of identity, and the identities of in-group/out-group members will be reduced. The findings of the current study were consistent with macrostructural inquiry by Blau (1977) and demonstrated that high levels of organisational diversity could actually help to increase positive employee attitudes and behaviours.

Some theoretical implications can be summarised from the current review of empirical studies and the results of present research. First, it is suggested that social identity theory, predominantly developed in the Western context, lacks supportive knowledge from North-East Asian perspectives. Generally, the Asian perception of self is connected with other members of the in-group, often defined as collectivism, while the Western perspective is predominantly individualism. Asian collectivism is an intragroup focus rather than an intergroup phenomenon of individualism. Social identity theory tends to be more applicable
to Westerners than to the North-East Asian culture of collectivism. However, while Asian culture is often considered to be collectivist, this may not be strictly the case. For instance, Chinese Asians may select behaviour that is appropriate to relationship perspectives and they may be less likely to engage in discriminative social behaviours against out-groups for the benefit of the group, which is deeply influenced by Confucianism, while other regions of Asia (South East and Middle East) are less likely to be influenced by Confucianism. Social identity theory may also need to focus on distinguishing different psychological processes underlying "collectivistic behaviour" in different cultures and regions. It is still unknown, however, what types of collectivism or other constructs predominate in regions other than Chinese Asia and thus further research is needed to explore group behaviour in other regions of Asia.

Second, the present evidence suggests that group behaviours in the two cultures (e.g. indigenous and non-indigenous in Taiwan) may derive partly from different cognitive foundations. For instance, ethnicity could be a central element of self-definition and may be an important social identity for particular groups. Hwang (2006) mentioned that the Taiwanese government undertook to assimilate indigenous groups into the Han Chinese culture in order to eliminate ethnic diversity over a number of years. The present research indicates that Taiwanese indigenous employees were attracted to and happier to work in a workplace with higher numbers of indigenous employees. This supports social identity theory, which proposed that ethnically similar groups possess increased levels of intergroup attraction and decreased levels of in-group conflict. It seems that Taiwanese indigenous groups still tend to retain their own ethnic identity, which is different from mainstream ethnic groups. Indigenous people may emphasise social identity because they are more aware of their differences from mainstream populations by virtue of their physical appearance and language. This research project extended these previous findings, demonstrating that social identity may be more applicable to indigenous than non-indigenous groups in the Taiwanese context. The researcher therefore argues that social identity theory may have limited applicability as a general model encompassing all ethnic
group behaviours. Subsequently, the researcher suggests that integrating both aspects of intergroup and intragroup relations could further develop the utility of social identity theory for explaining group interactions and behaviours.

Third, the researcher suggests that social identity theory could be a useful tool in improving indigenous employees work attitudes and boosting their self-esteem and group self-esteem. The present study reported that indigenous employees in the hotels with high and medium levels of ethnic diversity display significantly higher levels of job satisfaction and job performance than those in hotels with low levels of ethnic diversity. Increasing levels of ethnic diversity in the workplace could significantly facilitate Taiwanese indigenous employees’ work outcomes, and in turn raise their self-esteem and group self-esteem, while they do not perceive themselves as minority and explicit out-group members in the organisation.

Fourth, organisations may improve their internal processes through a better understanding of the interaction between majority and minority employees using the concept of social identity theory. Social identity theory argues that individuals identify themselves based on characteristics like ethnicity, age, gender, or race. They identify more with similar people (in-group) than with those who are less similar (out-group). Due to factors such as in-group attraction and negative stereotyping, minorities may be often excluded from recruitment selection or group membership and decision-making activities. This, in turn, reduces job or career advancement opportunities, resulting in a perception of unfair treatment and a negative work environment. An understanding of the importance of social identity theory by managers and employers can help ensure that minority groups are included in functional groups and decision-making processes, providing a better work environment for all employees (Chow & Crawford, 2004).

Finally, with increasing globalisation, diversity has become a popular element in organisational life. One reason diversity is of such high interest is because social
identification processes play an important role in influencing individual and group
behaviours in the organisational setting. However, the researcher notes that it is necessary
to take different cultural contexts into account while applying social identity theory in
research on diversity impacts (e.g. Western and North-East Asian, individualism and
collectivism, indigenous and non-indigenous). In addition, this research project represents a
significant opportunity to assess whether macrostructural inquiry derived from a Western
context is applicable to a North-East Asian settings. To the extent that employees define
themselves in terms of a particular group, it affects the behaviours they represent for
themselves and the way they interact with others who may be members of different groups.
That is, this study suggests that diversity should be taken into account in the facilitation of
employee work outcomes in different cultural settings.

Implications for the hospitality industry

One of the major attractions for both domestic and international tourists in Taiwan is
Taiwanese indigenous culture (e.g. heritage, arts, music and performance), all of which are
considered to be major components of cultural tourism (Tao, 2006). Because of the
important effects of ethnic diversity on the hospitality industry in Taiwan, the findings of
this study may assist in the development of policies to help educate ethnic minorities to
adapt to the hospitality industry and, equally, to educate managers and CEOs in the
hospitality industry about the value of employing ethnic minority members. Indigenous
labour may be used by hospitality service marketers to maintain indigenous cultural
traditions and promote indigenous cultural features such as languages, food, music and
dress to contribute to international and national cultural tourism marketing.

This study suggests that for Taiwanese hotels to enhance employee attitudes and behaviours,
workplaces need to be more diversity aware. Diversity among people (employees and
clients) is a business reality. This diversity can have either positive or negative impacts on
the business, depending on how well it is understood and utilised. The question is not
whether diversity is good for a business but how it can be incorporated into the company to ensure that the business benefits. It is not sufficient to increase diversity in the workforce; the benefits of diversity can only be realised if differences are valued and effectively managed. Taiwanese organisations have not always been the most accepting of differences and in some respects they have been socially conservative. In the past, organisations in Asia have attempted to employ homogeneous groups of employees and wanted them to conform to the ideal employee image. However, times have changed and diversity has become an element in organisational life consistent with increasing transnationalism and globalisation. As competition in hotels and other sectors of the hospitality industry increases, and as travellers and other customers become more knowledgeable about the environment around them, consumers are becoming more demanding and critical. This trend generates a number of future challenges for the tourism and hospitality industry. One way to overcome these challenges is for the industry to view this research as a source of answers to questions about diversity and see diversity as a competitive advantage. Diversity offers a pool of talented employees who can be developed into future leaders of the industry, who can meet diverse customer needs, and can serve as a source of learning about multicultural differences and similarities.

**Implications for human resources management**

Organisational management will need to empower employees through improving their knowledge and skills, and also explicitly express the importance of an interactive work environment characterised by cultural awareness and sensitivity (Smeenk, Eisinga, Teelken, & Doorewaard, 2006). Donkin (2007, p.18) stated that “the popular argument I have encountered time and again is that diversity is good for business.” However, nothing much is done in organisations. Donkin (2007) also stressed that workplace diversity will actually help reduce unconscious bias and prejudices and make a better workplace. A positive work environment may need to be reinforced before the organisation can benefits from more positive attitudes and behaviours from a more diverse workforce. In addition, there could
be enhanced productivity through diversity. A number of studies have suggested that workplace heterogeneity helps avoid the problems of ‘groupthink’, consequently increasing productivity and reducing costs (Lockwood, 2005; Moore, 1999). Likewise, diverse groups with the skills and support systems to integrate effectively are likely to be significantly more effective than non-diverse or homogeneous groups. The current study found that co-worker relationships could facilitate positive employee behaviours. The need to form better work relationships among employees was frequently mentioned as a reason for organisations to manage diversity (Strachan, et al., 2009). Better interaction and communication among employees, more effective work teams, more motivated employees, less conflict and misunderstanding among employees, and more satisfied and happy employees were mentioned as ways of forming better work relationships. According to Luthans (2012), unless employees understand, respect, and value one another, organisations cannot develop trust and cooperation among employees, which is the key for an effective work environment with productive work teams. Well-managed diversity leads to effective work teams, which in turn leads to the development of high-quality products and services. The extent to which an organisation functions effectively is dependent on effective interactions among its staff.

The present study found that levels of organisational diversity may not be the only factor which affects employee work attitudes and behaviours; the demographic characteristics of the employees were also related. For example, relatively older employees with longer employment duration and management positions had more positive work attitudes than non-management employees. This may indicate that they survived their formative years with the organisation and are now part of the organisational culture. These employees may also find satisfaction in advancement to a management position that enables them to have the chance to implement methods of doing the job, authority to make decisions, leading other employees by personal example, involvement in a variety of job responsibilities, a sense of job security, and a chance to represent the organisation to the community by their success and a sense of personal achievement. Overall, managers’ salaries and benefits are
higher, thereby resulting in a better lifestyle, which may enhance their work performance in order to secure their jobs (Wang, Tao, Ellenbecker, & Liu, 2012).

The study found that indigenous employees were likely to report more positive diversity-related attitudes than their non-indigenous co-workers. Farren and Nelson (1999) suggested that corporations can greatly enhance employee retention by including diversity policies in the job description of every manager. When managers can pass on information about diversity initiatives to other employees through their knowledge and behaviour, it shows employees that the organisation cares about them as individuals, which will in turn equate to improved trust and satisfaction. Additionally, the implications of the study for managers are that employees need career development opportunities and flexible rewards, as well as transparent appraisal and promotion processes, with feedback and involvement in decision-making about careers.

Bertone et al. (1999) has emphasised that senior managers will only adopt diversity-management programs if they think these will improve the organisation’s business performance. In general, organisations may need to make an important first step towards embracing diversity in their day-to-day operations and promote diverse work teams to raise commitment and productivity by making all employees feel included. Employees’ differences may also need to be encompassed and integrated with human resource and operational policies in organisations. In particular, diverse human capital creates an organisation with unique experiences, synergies, and relationships that cannot be easily duplicated. As such, a diverse workforce is a valuable resource for meeting the challenges of competing in a global economy (Moules, 2007). The evidence suggests that the management of diversity will reap economic rewards (Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle, 2005; Jose G Montalvo & Reynal-Querol, 2005).
Implications for national and local governments

From a national government perspective, data suggested that Taitung is the most multicultural county in Taiwan (Council of Indigenous Peoples, 2006). However, the study revealed that there was only a small population of employees from different ethnic groups in the five-star hotels. In the study, the managers of the hotels explained that most five-star hotels do not hire indigenous Taiwanese as service providers, because they are perceived to have a different work attitude and behaviour from non-indigenous Taiwanese. Managers stated that the hotel’s reputation and the provision of high-quality services are the most important things for a five-star hotel and it would be risky to hire too many indigenous employees. These comments seemed discriminatory and stereotypical and contravene the Declaration of Human Rights. The managers used words such as ‘lazy’ and ‘too relaxed lifestyle’ to explain that indigenous Taiwanese do not make suitable employees for a five-star hotel working environment. Indigenous workers have a different attitude to the relationship between work and non-work. This attitude was interpreted by both indigenous and non-indigenous workers as a better work life balance. Managers’ attitude seems to contradict this as they concentrated their thoughts only on the work ethic in the workplace. They went on to say that such hotels may need indigenous Taiwanese employees as performers or entertainers but not as service providers. They therefore are like ‘specimens in a jar’ in a museum where they are brought out for special occasions. As there are unequal employment opportunities in the Taiwanese hospitality industry, this study argues that the national government needs to incorporate equal opportunity requirements, training and education programs into policy and strategic initiatives. Equal opportunities can only take place in an overall environment of understanding and enthusiasm for equality. The national government may need to spearhead change and lead by example. Within the hospitality industry, employees need the government’s commitment to equal opportunity, so that equal opportunity requirements are incorporated into policy and strategy.
Moreover, training and education programs should be considered important for such areas as awareness development and skill building. Awareness development includes helping employees understand the need for and meaning of managing and valuing diversity, improving employee understanding of the cultural mix within the organisation, and assisting employees in learning about the culture and the community the organisation is serving. Skill building should help provide the skills necessary for working in diverse work teams, educating employees on specific cultural differences and how to respond to differences in the workplace. There is also a necessity to provide skills and development activities for minority groups to be able to integrate within the organisation and do their job effectively and have the opportunity for advancement.

It should also be through the commitment of local government that resources and personnel are made available for the implementation of programs concerning awareness raising, training, education, capacity building, development and personnel support. It may also be both national and local government’s responsibility to educate ethnic minorities to adapt to the workplace and equally to educate managers and CEOs about the value of employing ethnic minority members. In other words, local government may not only help minority employees overcome constraints caused by the prevailing cultural environment, but may also assist in the recognition of and respect for the importance of their value differences in terms of attitudes and behaviours in hospitality organisations.

Implications for indigenous communities

The numbers of employees are increasing in the Taiwanese hospitality industry; however the turnover rate is high. Although this study found that indigenous workers were more likely to stay in their jobs may be because of the risk of discrimination and unemployment that still exist in the society which many also damaged individuals’ confidence and self-reliance of indigenous group. Literature demonstrated the positive correlations between educational levels and self-esteem (Van eckert, et al., 2012), therefore in order to improve
indigenous self-esteem, sufficient educational resources and assistance are especially needed to apply within the indigenous community. Job training opportunities and motivational tools in organisations are also required to build indigenous employee self-esteem within the workplace. Hence, indigenous individual and community capacity needs to be built to increase an individual’s and community’s awareness of its skills, values, experiences and distinctiveness.

Understanding the effect of diversity in the hospitality industry can help indigenous people discover how their social and cultural realities and contributions to the Taiwanese business setting could be recognised. This study offers results that suggest that differences should be valued, respected and used productively. It generated information for the Taiwanese government, industry and indigenous communities to establish work programs and revise organisational policies and procedures so that they can better support minority employees. This is one of the most critical areas for the development of diversity initiatives in order to meet the needs of indigenous communities. These ideas include changing policies to focus on recruiting minority groups and ensuring pay equity for all workers, and this may change the way companies do business to ensure that everybody can use their full potential and reduce indirect or direct discrimination within the workplace.

The Taiwanese government reported that although the proportion of indigenous people unemployed in 2010 was much lower than in earlier years, the indigenous unemployment rate was still higher than the national average in 2010. This suggests that ethnic minorities may perceive higher barriers to finding a job than did those from the majority group (Smith, 2004). The application of organisational diversity policies and hotel-management procedures may help increase the number of job opportunities. The ethnic labour force could be used by ethnic communities to maintain and promote their cultural traditions in cooperation with the Taiwanese hospitality industry. The average monthly income for indigenous peoples in the labour force was less than 30% of the national average in Taiwan. The proportion of indigenous people working as government administrators, business
executives, and managers was 5% lower than that of the general population. Tourism could be included in strategies for providing partial solutions to the many challenges facing indigenous people and communities, as it has the potential to reduce their marginalised economic position and enhance their political power in organisations and society. Moreover, the positive outcomes of tourism development for indigenous people will most likely happen when indigenous people are directly involved in and control tourism activities, and indigenous culture serves as the essence of the attraction. Thus, indigenous people and local communities should enjoy the full measure of human rights, collective rights, and fundamental freedoms without hindrance and discrimination. This includes the right to equal employment opportunities as well as ownership. This research may offer guidelines for the establishment of monitoring and evaluating policies for equal opportunity of employment and ownership.

In summary, based on the results of this study, hospitality service managers can obtain a better understanding about the dynamics within an organisation with regard to the attitudes and behaviours of employee groups within organisations with different diversity levels. They can use this information to develop effective strategies for managing diversity in the organisation. The government may further manage the ethnic and cultural challenges of Taiwanese tourism marketing through culturally appropriate policies and services. Eventually, diverse groups may better respect each other in work or service settings, thus helping achieve the goal of organisational and social harmony.
6.6 Limitations of the Study

Besides the significant conclusions arising from the findings presented in the previous section, particular characteristics of the research setting that may limit the generalisability of these findings need to be acknowledged. This section discusses any limitations that have emerged during the development of the research. The six limitations identified in this study are discussed below.

1. Due to time and money restrictions and difficulties with data collection, this study is restricted to employees in Taiwanese hotels. Thus, generalisations from this study to other forms of tourism and leisure organisations in Taiwan are limited. Additionally, all respondents were selected from the City of Taitung and therefore the results may not represent the entire Taiwanese population or other countries.

2. In the qualitative phase of the research, the researcher interviewed employees who work in hospitality organisations, and then asked the interviewees to nominate appropriate employees who also work in the same or other hospitality organisations. As the procedure of data collection uses certain employees’ social networks to reach other interviewees, a potential bias may emerge because of like-mindedness among respondents. On the other hand, in snow ball sampling, the participants should provide the researcher’s information to prospective participants, rather than providing the researcher with their name, as the researcher is provided with names of people who may have preferred to remain anonymous. As the data-collection procedure involved face-to-face interviews, employees may chose not to give critical and honest answers but rather socially acceptable ones in order to save face or guard the reputation of the organisations.

3. In the quantitative approach, a limitation may be the nature of the data collected. The researcher had no chance to explain the survey items to respondents because the
participant hotels used a self-administration method to collect responses. This may have affected respondents’ understanding and interpretation of the items. Consequently, results could be influenced to some degree by potential response bias. Therefore, a pilot study was conducted but no adverse comments were received. This procedure may have overcome the potential limitations described above.

4. In addition to the quantitative approach, all of the assessment instruments used in the study were based on the self-reporting of employees. Some respondents may also have chosen not to be honest in responses to some items in the questionnaire. The survey sought self-evaluation of work performance, which may have been influenced by different work ethics or values. That is to say, some employees may have responded more positively about job performance than others. The issue of comparative standards of performance across the respondents requires caution in considering these results. A way of overcoming the issue of self-evaluation bias is that employee’s performance should also be reported by managers to see if there is any gap or discrepancy between a person’s self-perceptions and how they are perceived or rated by managers.

5. There was one study limitation which may cause biased responses and which could thus affect the results. The researcher gave participants notes explaining that the questionnaire related to a study of diversity. This may have affected respondents’ perceptions and interpretations of the questions which may also lead participants to provide answers that the researcher was seeking.

6. Another limitation through the quantitative phase was natural disasters. Due to the many natural disasters (e.g. typhoon and flood) that occurred throughout the data-collection period, some participant organisations were heavily affected and therefore the completed surveys were received in a different timeframe (from one to eight months). Two organisations had to withdraw due to natural disaster impacts, as the employees had to take unpaid leave resulting in very few staff remaining at the hotels.
7. Finally, the target sample was Taiwanese and the research findings may not be applicable to all Asian countries. However, this research project displays considerable evidence of the positive impacts in a North-East Asian setting of organisational diversity suggested by literature derived from a Western context.

6.7 Recommendations for Future Study

There are several issues raised by the present research that would be fruitful for further research. First, further study could investigate relationships between employees’ valuing of diversity (e.g. organisational goals or missions) and their attitudes and behaviours toward work and diversity. The study suggests that the higher the education of non-indigenous employees, the more positive diversity-related behaviour they have expressed. Literature also demonstrates the close relationship between educational levels and high self-esteem. More importantly, Hogg and Terry (2001) suggested that social identity and intergroup behaviour is linked to self-esteem, and therefore further research should include self-esteem as a variable to discover whether there is a relationship between employees’ diversity-related attitudes and behaviours and their level of self-esteem.

Second, Chapter six suggested that although social identity theory provides a broadly accepted social theory of group dynamics and behaviour and has received substantial support from many studies conducted in Western contexts, findings from the current study indicate that social identity theory may not fully account for Taiwanese attitudes and behaviours toward identity-related issues. The researcher therefore argues that the extent to which the social identity theory is applicable in different cultural contexts is questionable and the measurement of social identity theory in Asian settings should be included in any future study.
Third, Hwang and Chi (2005) suggested that employees are the most important resource in the hospitality industry and are the primary marketers who provide excellent service to the customer. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the model of Employee-Customer-Profit Chain (Rucci, et al., 1998) suggested there is a strong relationship between employees and customers and it is important to investigate customer variables in the model of Employee-Customer-Profit Chain. While the current study indicates that outside personal and diversity factors do influence employee variables, further research could include a sample of customers to see if customers’ satisfaction relates to employee attitudes and behaviour toward work and diversity. According to McQuitty et al. (2005), for businesses to thrive in the long term, the expectations of shareholders, customers, and employees need to be satisfied. Employee attitudes and behaviours impact the level of customer satisfaction and retention. In turn, customer attitudes and behaviours determine organisational profits.

Fourth, the researcher chose small to medium hotels (between 60 rooms and 150 rooms and between 30 and 78 employees) and excluded five-star hotels in Taitung. According to the information provided by one hotel in Taitung (Hotel A), there are more indigenous employees in these smaller hotels. One of the reasons people come to Taitung for holidays is that Taitung is the most culturally diverse (indigenous and non-indigenous) county in Taiwan. Thus, these smaller hotels tend to hire more indigenous employees to benefit from this form of tourism. However, the results from the present investigation suggest that further research could include larger five-star hotels, as the demographic characteristics such as level of education, age and employment duration were also associated with employee attitudes and behaviours.

Finally, the research did not investigate the impact of diversity policies on employee attitudes and behaviours. However, this study found that the clarity of organisational policies is one of the important attributes that attracts employees to work in the organisation. Equal opportunity and affirmative action policies and managing diversity can be considered in future research. Organisations that complement equal opportunity and affirmative action policies with managing diversity will probably be most effective (Kirton & Greene, 2005;
Wrench et al., 2008). Changes in the representation of ethnic minorities in employment are the result of both recruitment and turnover of minority groups and indigenous employees that may be differently affected by different policies. Research could examine whether equal opportunity and affirmative action are achievable in attracting or retaining ethnic and other minority employees. Literature indicates that hotels with advertised diversity-management practices are perceived to be more attractive to employers and are more successful in recruiting and retaining minorities (Avery, 2003; Choi, 2009).

6.8 Concluding Statement

In summary, identifying ways to increase workforce diversity is becoming a significant research trend. It is ethical to recruit minority employees in an organisation in order to offer equal opportunities in the workplace. Substantial research suggests that a global economy requires that organisations have a diverse workforce so they can effectively deal with an increasingly varied customer base. A diverse workforce can lead to an increased market share, whereas a lack of diversity in the workforce can lead to a shrinking market share. Furthermore, due to differences in culture, customs, and ethnic characteristics in Taiwanese society, there is a need to conduct research to enhance the understanding of similarities and dissimilarities between ethnic majority and minority employees in their attitudes and behaviours toward work and diversity. Investigation of the influence of different ethnic backgrounds will not only increase the ability to generalise, but also significantly facilitate the implementation of creative, innovative, and improved group problem solving, which will in turn enhance the competitiveness of the organisation in the context of increasing transnationalism and globalisation. This especially may be the case in the leisure industry setting, which has great potential to bring people with different backgrounds together in order to satisfy diverse customer needs. Finally, further research should investigate more comprehensive topics of ethnic variation (e.g. educational background, management status, age and gender with ethnic backgrounds) in the leisure business context.
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Purpose

The aim of this study is to evaluate the effect of level of organisational diversity in hospitality organisations on employee attitudes and behaviour in Taiwan. This questionnaire seeks your reactions to organisational diversity in the work place.

Participation

This study uses a questionnaire to collect data. Samples of Taiwanese employees’ who are working in hospitality organisations will be surveyed by Survey I. The questionnaire will be delivered to the participants face-to-face and participants should take about 10 minutes to complete it. After completion of the questionnaire, respondents can return the completed survey to the reception of the hospitality organisations. After one month, the
participant organisations will collect completed surveys from groups of employees and then contact the researcher to collect all of the completed forms.

**Benefits**

This research has several benefits for individual participants, hospitality organisations and Taiwanese society. For example, this research can help organisations become more open, exploring diversity matters as a means to reduce staffing and training costs, increase marketing opportunities, and create a workplace conducive to higher productivity and teamwork. Moreover, it can help government establish an integrated work program, develop policies promoting job equability for indigenous people and reduce indirect discrimination as well as enhance personal well-being in the society.

**Risks**

There are no risks identified in this research. Participants can cease your participation at any time.

**Confidentiality**

The questionnaire does not ask you to disclose your name. Participants will be given a code only known to the researcher. The data collected from this research will be reported in general terms and will not involve any identifying personal features. All data will be kept confidential and in a locked filing cabinet under the custody of the main researcher for a period of 5 years before being destroyed. A brief report of the general findings from the study will be made available to participants.
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Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary. Participants are able to withdraw their consent at any time.
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Interview Schedule

1. These questions seek information about you and your employment in this organisation.

Checklist:

☐ When did you come to this organisation?
☐ What is your current position or title (fields)?
  Employee ☐; Manager ☐
☐ How long have you been this organisation?
☐ What attracted you to work in this organisation?
☐ How old are you?
☐ What is your ethnic background?
  Indigenous ☐; Non-indigenous ☐
☐ What is your educational background?
☐ Have you work in the hospitality industry elsewhere?

2. What has it been like for you working in this job and this organisation?

3. What is it like working with the people in this organisation?

4. Are you happy working in this organisation?

Check list:

☐ General speaking, how would you describe your level of satisfaction working in this organisation?
☐ Why?

5. Could you please talk about your perception about the diversity in this organisation and does diversity matter to you?

Checklist:

☐ How would you describe the composition of people in your organisation with respect to (1) ethnicity (2) gender (3) age (4) educational level (5) duration of employment? (from very similar to very different)
In what way, if any, might types of composition of people in terms of (1) ethnicity (2) gender (3) age (4) educational level (5) duration of employment influence the way you approach your job? Or provide any idea of diversity levels may influence your attitudes and behaviour toward the work.

Are diversity levels helpful for you to work in the organisation?

6. **How would you describe your performance at work?**

Checklist:

- How do you measure you performance? What is good performance to you?
- What keeps you motivated and energized to perform well in the work?
- What is discouraging and de-motivating in the work?

7. **Do you intend to retain working in this organisation?**

Checklist:

- Have you ever thought about quitting? Why or why not?
- How likely is it that you could find a job with another employer with about the same pay and benefits you now have?
- What job (fields) would you choose if you do not work in this organisation?
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English Version of Questionnaire

Research on the effect of levels of diversity in Taiwanese hospitality organisations on employee attitudes, behaviours and expectations

Your input is critical to the success of this research and we appreciate your time. The survey should not take more than 10-15 minutes to complete. Please write the answers on the line provided or tick the answers that you prefer.

1. What is the name of your company?
_____________________________

2. What is your ethnic background?
   Indigenous□ Non-indigenous□ Other□
   Taiwanese□

3. What is your gender?
   Male□ Female□

4. What is your age?
   ____________________________ yrs

5. What is your highest education background?
   Primary □
   Junior High school □
   Senior High school □
   University/College □
   Masters degree or above □

6. What is your duration of employment in the organisation?
   ________________ yrs

7. What is your job title in the organisation?
   ____________________________

8. Do you supervise any employee in the organisation?
   Yes□ No□
1. To what extent do you Agree with the following statements?

*Please complete the following items on the basis of your previous perceptions about the importance of attractions to the present organisation or future organisations. Please tick one number for each statement.*

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging and interesting work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for rapid advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate image and reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies are clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic composition of organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender composition of organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of employees are my ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of gender are same as my gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just need a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent do you Agree with the following statements?

*Please consider each statement below and use the scale to indicate your level of agreement with each. Please tick one number for each statement.*

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fairly satisfied with my present job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each day at work seems like it will never end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find real enjoyment in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my job rather unpleasant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I satisfied about my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. To what extent do you **Agree** with the following statements?

*Please consider each statement below and use the scale to indicate your level of agreement with each. Please tick one number for each statement.*

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organisation be successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I praise this organisation to my friends as a great organisation to work for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that my values and the organisation’s values are very similar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organisation really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am extremely glad that I chose this organisation to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me this is the best of all possible organisations for which to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really care about the fate of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. To what extent do you **Agree** with the following statements?

*Please consider each statement below and use the scale to indicate your level of agreement with each. Please tick one number for each statement.*

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

At my work at the hotel I:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequately complete assigned duties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfil responsibilities specified in job description.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform tasks that are expected of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet formal performance requirements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in activities that will directly affect my performance evaluation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect aspects of the job I am obligated to perform.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail to perform essential duties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. To what extent do you **Agree** with the following statements?

*Please tick one number for each statement.*

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will probably look for a new job in the next year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could easily find a job with another employer with about the same pay and benefits I now have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. To what extent do you **Agree** with the following statements?

*Please consider each statement below and use the scale to indicate your level of agreement with each. Please tick one number for each statement.*

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help others who have been absent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend at work above the norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help others who have heavy workloads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give advance notice when unable to come to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist supervisor with his/her work (when not asked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take undeserved work breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take time to listen to co-workers’ problems and worries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend a great deal of time with personal phone conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go out of way to help new employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complain about insignificant things at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a personal interest in other employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass along information to co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhere to informal rules devised to maintain order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **To what extent do you think the following in your organisation?**

*To answer, tick the box beside the number for your preferred response*

How would you describe the mix of people in your organisation with respect to ethnic background?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No indigenous</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Almost no indigenous (up to 10%)</td>
<td>Some indigenous (11%–29%)</td>
<td>Approximately 30–45% indigenous</td>
<td>Approximately 50% indigenous</td>
<td>More than 50% indigenous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you describe the mix of people in your organisation with respect to gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No male</td>
<td>No male (up to 10%)</td>
<td>Almost no male (11%–29%)</td>
<td>Some male (11%–29%)</td>
<td>Approximately 30–45% male</td>
<td>Approximately 50% male</td>
<td>More than 50% male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **To what extent would you like to see the following in your organisation?**

*To answer, tick the box beside the number for your preferred response*

The mix of different ethnic background would be….

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No indigenous</td>
<td>No indigenous (up to 10%)</td>
<td>Almost no indigenous (11%–29%)</td>
<td>Some indigenous (11%–29%)</td>
<td>Approximately 30–45% indigenous</td>
<td>Approximately 50% indigenous</td>
<td>More than 50% indigenous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mix of different gender would be…..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No male</td>
<td>No male (up to 10%)</td>
<td>Almost no male (11%–29%)</td>
<td>Some male (11%–29%)</td>
<td>Approximately 30–45% male</td>
<td>Approximately 50% male</td>
<td>More than 50% male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. To what extent do you **Agree** with the following statements?

*Please consider each statement below and use the scale to indicate your level of agreement with each. Please tick one number for each statement.*

1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

“Diversity” below refers any mix of ethnic background, gender, age, religion and sexuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like to join an organisation that emphasizes getting to know people from diverse background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like experiences that feature music, art or food from other countries.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often listen to music of other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in learning about the many cultures that have existed in this world.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I attend events where I might get to know people from diverse background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know someone of diverse background is generally an uncomfortable experience for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am only at ease with people of a similar ethnic background to mine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s really hard for me to feel close to a person from a different background to mine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very important that a friend agrees with me on most issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel irritated by persons of a different ethnic background to mine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Please rate your satisfaction levels with the following items within your current organisation.

1= Strongly dissatisfied, 2= Dissatisfied, 3= Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4= Satisfied, 5= Strongly satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job suitability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging and interesting work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for rapid advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate image and reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies are clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly work environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic composition of organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender composition of organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of employees are of my ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of gender are same as my gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other reason would help your work attitudes?

__________________________________________________________________________

Which one of the above makes you most satisfied?

__________________________________________________________________________
Thank you for completing this survey.
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研究說明

研究題目：組織內部多樣性和休閒產業員工態度及行為

研究者：博士候選人：蕭惟仁 (Aaron)
澳洲 Griffith University—休閒管理博士班
聯絡電話：辦公室: 0061-7-3735 7489 (澳洲)
行動電話: 0423531034 (澳洲)
Email: a.hsiao@griffith.edu.au

指導教授：Dr. Ray Hibbins: r.hibbins@griffith.edu.au
Dr. Chris Auld—c.auld@griffith.edu.au

研究目的

本研究目的在於研究於休閒產業中，公司組織內部多樣性的程度對員工態度及行為的影響為何？組織內部多樣性 (Organisational Diversity) 在此研究中意指公司內部雇員個人不同的背景、性別、學歷、擔任職位，等等多元特質。填寫這個問卷調查將花費約十分鐘的時間，您的回答對本研究、台灣休閒產業的發展，以及其人力資源管理相當重要，請您回答所有的問題 (填滿所有的空格)，您提供的所有資料將僅用於學術研究，並會持續的列為機密且妥善的保管。

研究好處

在西方國家中有越來越多的證據說明管理組織內部多樣性可以提升收益，多元化和在生產產品有更多的創意替代方案和從不同觀點來提升品質有關。由於休閒產業的顧客層面極度廣，意及需要多樣性的員工組成來達到顧客的多樣性需求。本研究對於了解組織內部多樣性的程度、多元人力資源的整合、以及雇員態度及行為的發展皆有極為重要的意涵。本研究的結果預期能提供公司對雇員工作態度及行為的了解，且以此來制定更完善，更有幫助的政策來促成休閒產業組織內部多元人力資源的整合，進而達到多樣性顧客的需求。

危險

由於本研究是不具名且保密，因此參與本研究並沒有任何可能的危險存在。

研究回應

假如參與者對本研究的結果有興趣，想要了解的話，可以聯繫研究者。研究者將會把結論摘要寄到您指定的地址，並隨時接受您的詢問。
自願參加
此研究的參加是完全自願的。您可以自由選擇參加(填完並寄回問卷)、或不參加(不填問卷)。

道德實踐
Griffith University 要求研究者需要遵循國家人類研究道德實踐(National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans). 假如參與者有任何的問題或是抱怨可以聯絡Manager, Research Ethics on 3875 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

研究回應
假如參與者對本研究的結果有興趣、想要知道的話，可以聯絡研究者。研究者將會把結論摘要寄到您指定的地址，並隨時接受您的詢問。
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Interview Schedule

1. These questions seek information about you and your employment in this organisation. 以下問題將詢問有關你在此公司的個人及就業背景

Checklist:

☐ When did you come to this organisation? 你何時來這家公司的?
☐ What is your current position or title (fields)?
  Employee □; Manager □; 基層工作人員 □; 管理階級 □
☐ How long have you been this organisation? 來了這家公司多久了?
☐ What attracted you to work in this organisation? 來這家公司工作的理由為何?
☐ How old are you? 幾歲
☐ What is your ethnic background (ethnicity: indigenous □; or non-indigenous □)? 原住民 □; 非原住民 □
☐ What is your educational background? 教育程度?
☐ Have you work in the hospitality industry elsewhere? 曾在其他旅館相關行業工作過嗎?

2. What has it been like for you working in this organisation? 請你談一下你在這家公司工作的看法好嗎?

3. What is it like working with the people in this organisation? 請你談一下你在這家公司與其他工作人員一起工作的情形好嗎?

4. Are you happy working in this organisation? 你在目前的公司工作開心嗎?

Check list:

☐ General speaking, how would you describe your level of satisfaction working in this organisation? 你滿意你現在的工作嗎?
☐ Why? 爲什麼?
5. Could you please talk about your perception about the diversity in this organisation and does diversity matter to you? 你可以談一下你對組織差異性的看法嗎？以及組織差異性對你有影響嗎？

Checklist:

☐ How would you describe the composition of people in your organisation with respect to (1) ethnicity (2) gender (3) age (4) educational level (5) duration of employment? (from very similar to very different) 你可以描述一下這家公司人員的組成？ (原住民及非原住民之分；性別；年齡；教育背景；資歷等等)

☐ In what way, if any, might types of composition of people in terms of (1) ethnicity (2) gender (3) age (4) educational level (5) duration of employment influence the way you approach your job? Or provide any idea of diversity levels may influence your attitudes and behaviour toward the work 如果這家公司人員的組成 (原住民及非原住民之分；性別；年齡；教育背景；資歷等等) 可能對你工作態度及行爲產生影響，請描述是如何影響或是為什麼?

☐ Are diversity levels helpful for you to work in the organisation? 組織差異性的程度對你在這家公司工作有幫助嗎？

6. How would you describe your performance at work? 你會如何描述你在公司的工作表現？

Checklist:

☐ What is good performance to you? 對你而言什麼是良好的工作表現？

☐ What keeps you motivated and energized to perform well in the work? 什麼會幫助你工作表現良好？

☐ What is discouraging and de-motivating in the work? 什麼會讓你工作無法表現良好？
7. **Do you intend to remain working in this organisation?** 請你談一下你可能轉換工作的看法及想法?

Checklist:

☐ Have you ever thought about quitting? Why or why not? 你有沒想過辭職或換工作?

☐ How likely is it that you could find a job with another employer with about the same pay and benefits you now have? 容易找到另一家公司同樣給付相同的薪水及待遇嗎?
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以下為您個人的基本背景資料，請您在屬於您的選項中打√或填寫資料。請儘可能照實填寫。由於本問卷採不具名方式進行，所以請您不用擔心，並感謝您提供寶貴的時間來完成這份問卷。

1. 請填寫您公司的名稱 ______________________________________ 飯店

2. 您個人的種族背景是 (請打√)  原住民□；非原住民台灣人□；其他□

3. 您的性別是  男性□  女性□

4. 您的年齡是？ _______ 歲

5. 您的教育背景？
   □ 國中以下 □ 高中職畢業 □ 大學/專科畢業 □ 碩士以上

6. 您在本公司工作年資？ _______ 年

7. 您的職稱是？ __________________

8. 您在現任公司內有管理任何部屬嗎？  有□  沒有□

1. 請依您本身的感受為根據填寫下列當初吸引您到這家公司工作的因素。請以下列的次序選項選出最能表達您的感受的答案並在□打√。
   1=非常不同意,2=不同意,3=不同意也不反對,4=同意,5=非常同意

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>因素</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>薪資</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作合適度</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作內容有趣且富挑戰性</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作有保障</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>快速晉升的機會</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>培訓機會</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作地點</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公司的形象與地位</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公司政策明確</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>同事間的關係</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友善的工作環境</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>該公司內部員工的種族背景的比例 ●編制</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>該公司內部員工的性別比例 ●編制</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大部分的員工與我的種族背景相同</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大部分員工的性別與我的相同</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>僅因我需要一份工作</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. 請以您個人最近對於工作的感受為根據完成下列項目。請勾選您選項
   1=非常不同意, 2=不同意, 3=不同意也不反對, 4=同意, 5=非常同意

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目内容</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>大部分的時間我對於我的工作充滿熱情</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對於我目前的工作相當滿意</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>每天工作時都感覺時間過的很慢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在工作中我找到真正的樂趣</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我覺得我的工作有點討厭</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>總而言之，我滿意我現在的工作</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 請您依最近對工作的感覺為依據，填寫完下列的問題。請以下列的次序選項選出最能表達您的感受的答案並在□打 \(\checkmark\)。
   1=非常不同意；2=不同意；3=不同意也不反對；4=同意；5=非常同意

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目内容</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>爲了公司機構的成效，我願意花上比平常預期還要多的努力來協助公司。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會向我的朋友們讚揚我所服務的公司。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我覺得我個人的價值與公司機構的價值非常近似。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>當我對其他人提及我屬於該公司的一員時，我感到相當榮幸。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>這個公司機構激發了我內在的最佳工作表現。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我非常慶幸當初在挑選工作時，放棄了其它工作機會而選擇了這間公司。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>爲了能夠繼續在這間公司工作，我願意接受幾乎各種類型的工作任務。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>對我來說，這個公司是我能找到的工作中最好的一個。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我非常在意這個公司的成功與否。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. 請您個人最近對於工作的感受為根據完成下列項目。請勾選您選項下方的數字作答：
   1=非常不同意, 2=不同意, 3=不同意也不反對, 4=同意, 5=非常同意

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目内容</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>當我在公司工作時，切實地完成分配給我的工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>履行在工作內容中所列出之應盡責任。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在對我有期盼的工作項目中力求表現。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>當我在公司工作時，會達到正式的表現要求。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>參與對我的工作表現評估有直接影響之活動。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>對於我有責任履行的工作並不在意。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>當我在公司工作時，無法完成基本的工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. 請以您個人最近對於工作的感受為根據完成下列項目。請勾選您選項下方的數字作答：
1=非常不同意,2=不同意,3=不同意也不反對,4=同意,5=非常同意
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目描述</th>
<th>1 □</th>
<th>2 □</th>
<th>3 □</th>
<th>4 □</th>
<th>5 □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我明年有可能開始找新的工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我經常想要辭職。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我可以輕易的找到一個與現在薪水與福利差不多的工作機會。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. 請以您個人最近對於工作的感受為根據完成下列項目。請勾選您選項下方的數字作答：
1=非常不同意,2=不同意,3=不同意也不反對,4=同意,5=非常同意
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>當我在旅館工作時，我：</th>
<th>1 □</th>
<th>2 □</th>
<th>3 □</th>
<th>4 □</th>
<th>5 □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>會協助其它缺席的同事。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>會參與本份外的工作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>幫助其它工作量較大的同事。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在沒辦法工作時會預先請假。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>幫助上司的工作（在沒有被要求的情況下）。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在該休息的時間休息。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>傾聽同事的問題與煩惱。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>花上不少時間在講私人電話。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>竭盡所能的協助新同事。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>抱怨工作上微不足道的小事。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>佔其它同事的便宜。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>將訊息傳給其它同事。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不管有沒有公司的正式規定,只要被要求就會盡力達到。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. 請根據種族背景來形容您服務公司機構的人員配置比例
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>以您的認知,有多少比例的原住民員工在您現任公司內服務?</th>
<th>1 □</th>
<th>2 □</th>
<th>3 □</th>
<th>4 □</th>
<th>5 □</th>
<th>6 □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>沒有原住民</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>幾乎沒有原住民(最多 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>有部分原住民(11%-29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大約 30-45%的原住民</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>差不多 50%的原住民</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>多於 50%的原住民</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>以您的認知,有多少比例的男性員工在您現任公司內服務?</th>
<th>1 □</th>
<th>2 □</th>
<th>3 □</th>
<th>4 □</th>
<th>5 □</th>
<th>6 □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>沒有男性</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>幾乎沒有男性(最多 10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>有部分男性的男性(11%-29%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大約 30-45%的男性</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>差不多 50%的男性</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>多於 50%的男性</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. 請依據種族背景來表示您所希望您服務公司機構的人員配置比例
您希望/喜歡有多少比例的原住民員工能在您現任公司內服務？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>選項</th>
<th>比例範圍</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 □</td>
<td>沒有原住民</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 □</td>
<td>幾乎沒有</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 □</td>
<td>有部分原住民</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 □</td>
<td>大約 30-45%原住民</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 □</td>
<td>原住民</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 □</td>
<td>多於 50%原住民</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>選項</th>
<th>比例範圍</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 □</td>
<td>沒有男性</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 □</td>
<td>幾乎沒有</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 □</td>
<td>有部分男性</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 □</td>
<td>大約 30-45%的男性</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 □</td>
<td>多於 50%的男性</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. 請您依您的感覺為依據，填寫完下列的問題，請以下列的次序選出最能表達您的感受的答案並在 □ 打 √。

- 1= 非常不同意；2= 不同意；3= 不同意也不反對；4= 同意；5= 非常同意

#### 以下「多元化」乃指種族背景、性別、年齡、與宗教之混合

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>問題</th>
<th>1 □</th>
<th>2 □</th>
<th>3 □</th>
<th>4 □</th>
<th>5 □</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>我希望加入一個強調能認識來自不同背景的人之公司機構。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我希望體驗帶有其它國家特色的音樂、藝術與食物。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我經常聆聽來自其它文化的音樂。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我對於認識這世界上所存在的許多文化感到有趣。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我會參加有機會能夠認識來自多元背景的人之聚會。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>對於認識來自不同背景的人讓我感到不愉快。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我只有跟來自相同種族背景的人相處才會感到自在。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我非常難以親近跟我來自不同背景的人。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>對於大部分的事情來說，朋友能夠認同我的觀點是很重要的。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>我很容易被來自不同種族背景的人激怒。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. 請針對你目前的公司，在下列項目描述中，選出你對於每個項目的滿意度或感覺:
1=非常不滿意; 2=不滿意; 3=無法決定; 4=滿意; 5=非常滿意。
以下“多元化”乃指種族背景、性別、年齡與宗教之混合。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>薪資的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作合適的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作內容有趣且富挑戰性的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作有保障的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>快速晉升的機會的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>培訓機會的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>工作地點的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公司的形象與地位的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>公司政策明確的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>同事間關係的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>友善工作環境的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>該公司內部員工的種族背景的比例編制的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>該公司內部員工的性別比例編制的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>對於與我種族背景相同的員工數量的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>對於與我性別相同的員工數量的滿意度</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

以上哪項因素你對公司最為滿意？____________________
你對公司感到滿意的其他因素？____________________

感謝您提供寶貴的時間來完成這份問卷，敬祝您生意興隆，事業順利!
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