Erroneous Tour Advice: Response Styles of Potential Tourism Staff to a Visitor Complaint

Glenn F. Ross
James Cook University of North Queensland

Recommended Citation

Ross, Glenn F. (1994) "Erroneous Tour Advice: Response Styles of Potential Tourism Staff to a Visitor Complaint," *Visions in Leisure and Business*: Vol. 13 : No. 3 , Article 4.
Available at: https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/visions/vol13/iss3/4

ERRONEOUS TOUR ADVICE: RESPONSE STYLES OF POTENTIAL TOURISM STAFF TO A VISITOR COMPLAINT

BY

DR. GLENN F. ROSS, SENIOR LECTURER IN PSYCHOLOGY

JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY OF NORTH QUEENSLAND
CAIRNS CAMPUS
P.O. BOX 6811
CAIRNS MAIL CENTRE
CAIRNS Q 4870
AUSTRALIA

ABSTRACT

The supply of accurate and helpful information by tour operations staff is generally regarded as being of fundamental importance by most people within the tourism industry. When inaccurate or misleading advice is received by a visitor, a complaint often follows. This study seeks to examine major service quality response styles as a reaction to such a complaint among a sample of school leavers within a major Australian tourist city. The study also examined a range of human resource management variables as they may predict such response styles. Two basic styles were identified, involving Investigation and Avoidance. Employment motivators involving Job Interest and Pressure were found to predict the Investigation style, whereas a much wider range of employment motivators, including Job Autonomy and Fringe Benefits, were found to predict Avoidance. The implications of these findings for the industry and for those school leavers who may find themselves employed in the industry are examined.

INTRODUCTION

Incorrect tour advice can have disastrous effects on a tight schedule for many tourists. Moreover, the manner of dealing with any visitor's complaint arising from such a situation is of critical importance for the visitor, the staff member and the entire organization. Such responses are at the core of high or low quality service within this arena of the tourist industry. The notion of service quality, and its role in assuring a competitive edge for tourism/hospitality establishments is now recognized by many. Berger, Fulford and Krazmein (5), Enz (9) and Power (20) have all made the point that service quality in various forms will take on even more importance in the future of hospitality and tourism employment. Dienhard, Gregoire, Downey and Knight (8) have pointed out that service oriented employees have been described as attentive, pleasant and responsive to customers' needs which, in turn, leads to better customer service. They argue that to better serve the individual customer, organizations need to understand and realize that managers can

have a positive or negative influence on an employee's service orientation. They also point out that there is an increased interest in service, and that there is a very limited number of studies that have attempted to measure service orientation of employees (10, 13).

SERVICE ORIENTATION--AN OVERVIEW

Schneider, Parkington and Buxton (25) were among the first researchers to identify the importance of service orientations. They concluded that customers' perceptions of service were highly related to employees' service orientations. The better the quality of service, the stronger the employees' service orientation. Service orientation may be regarded as the disposition to be helpful, thoughtful, considerate and co-operative. In addition, service oriented employees have been found to be likeable, popular and contribute to the morale and cohesion of their workgroup (13). Service oriented employees not only project a positive image of the organization to the customer, they are said to reflect the quality of life in the workplace. Thus Hogan suggests that if an organization is to understand and avoid service quality problems, then management must contend with the characteristics people bring to and experience while performing the act of service. Albrecht and Zemke (1) have argued that high-quality service orientation is a powerful competitive weapon that is typically regarded as an essential characteristic of a business strategy, not a luxury feature. They argue that a strong focus on service orientation throughout an organization will depend on the degree of employees' job involvement and job satisfaction (1). They maintain that job involvement is a stable work attitude in the sense that it is a predisposition.

However management, they say, may find it difficult to change (6). Specifically, organizations may have somewhat less control over job involvement and job satisfaction than is commonly believed. Arvey et al. (2) have suggested that management can reasonably predict employees' future degree of job satisfaction to be experienced with a new job, given current knowledge of their degree of satisfaction with their present job.

There is general widespread agreement in the service management literature that the provision of service quality is concerned with generating customer satisfaction. Gronroos (12), Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (18) and Johnston (14) define service quality in terms of customer satisfaction, that is, the degree of fit between customers' expectations and perceptions of service. Some authors have attempted to deal specifically with the issue of service quality measurement. Smith (26) argues in support of the proposition that service quality is difficult to quantify, and also identifies measures used in manufacturing firms. Gronroos (12) proposed that it is the intangible aspects of the service package which are most difficult to measure, and concluded that as a result service quality tends to be ignored. Johnston and Morris (15) argue that service organizations tend to measure only what is easy to measure and quantify, and shy away from the use of soft, qualitative measures. Kaplan (16) argues similarly, but for manufacturing businesses, that there is a tendency to measure only what is easily quantifiable (such as financial performance and productivity) even though other aspects such as perceived quality, innovation and flexibility may be crucial to a company's competitive success.

Sparks (27) has written that the service encounter is characterized by a number of

factors which distinguish it as one specific form of human interaction. Service encounters are goal oriented, limited in scope, task related and roles are normally fairly clearly defined. She points out that the service encounter is very much a communicative encounter. Yet, little is known about how specific elements of the communicative style affect the judgements made about performance in the service encounter. Indeed, it has been argued that there is no clear conceptualization of the kinds of interaction that customers look for in making evaluations of service. She believes that a central element in the process is the service provider/customer interaction, in which a range of communication strategies can be incorporated in order to influence the outcomes of the service encounter. This recognizes that the quality of the service encounter and its communicative aspects are determined by situational, organizational, and individual factors.

Speaks has also pointed out that there are a number of contextual variables which influence the communicative aspects of the service encounter. The setting in which the encounter takes place has an impact on the nature of the encounter. For instance, it is possible that the formality of the interaction may be influenced by the actual physical environment in which the encounter takes place. Furthermore, organizational culture is a powerful contextual variable, communicating messages about the standards and nature of the service within the organization. Role expectations about the service encounter are determined through the organizational culture of the hotel. The values and beliefs communicated through organizational channels, both formal and informal, about the serving of customers leaves an enduring effect on the delivery of service. Finally she notes that individuals involved in service encounters bring with them a range of personal variables which will, in turn, affect the service encounter. Individual differences such as sex, status, cultural background, and past experience may influence communicative aspects of the service encounter. Indeed, communicative aspects of the service encounter will, to a large extent, be influenced by the attitudes service providers hold toward customers and vice versa.

Coyle and Dale (7) report a study across a variety of hospitality service providers on the determinants of quality from the customer and provider viewpoints. Basically their study identified a number of gaps existing between the perceptions of customers and those of providers. Managers believed that competence of staff was a key factor in the service transaction, but this was not supported by customers. They presented as valuing more highly the more intangible and psychological variables such as courtesy and responsiveness. Coyle and Dale report that whilst customers ranked facilities lower than service, many providers have invested heavily in upgrading facilities, and show much less interest in increasing service performance. George and Tan (11) have studied service perceptions among managers and service personnel in the food service industry. Their results also indicate major differences between the two groups. Service personnel saw themselves as being more customer oriented and less procedures oriented than their managers. The managers saw themselves as being more procedures oriented than the service staff. George and Tan suggest that any gap between procedural and personal perspectives of service should be narrowed if high quality service is to be delivered by an organization.

THE GUEST COMPLAINT

Lewis and Pizam (17) have pointed out that guest dissatisfaction and its management is one of the most important issues that faces management and employees within the hospitality industry. Pearce and Moscardo (19) have argued that two concepts from social psychological research may be usefully combined in an attempt to interpret and understand tourists' complaints. The first is the concept of the person-environment fit while the second, 'attribution theory', is concerned with how people explain their behavior. The person-environment fit can be related to a long and still continuing debate in psychology about the relative importance of personality and situation variables in affecting behavior. Most social psychologists favour an interactionist perspective, i.e. a point of view which emphasizes how persons and situations are involved in a process of mutual influence in shaping behavior. Pearce and Moscardo point out that people deliberately seek situations which they feel match their personalities and orientations. The implications of this idea of person-situation matching or fit they say can be seen as particularly appropriate to tourist settings where individuals make a conscious choice to visit a specific tourist destination. They point out that it has also been argued in the psychological literature that situations are not infinitely modifiable and at times people find themselves in social episodes or settings where their personalities, values and orientations do not fit or match the situation. This 'mismatch' leads to the individual feeling stressed, anxious and uncertain about their feelings. Examples of mismatched tourists might include the historian who is annoyed by the theatricality of a 'frontier town' theme park, an adventure-seeker who is bored by tours of museums or a food connoisseur who has to cope with poorly-cooked food.

The second explanatory system for Pearce and Moscardo is attribution theory, the crux of which is that in problematic, uncertain and ambiguous situations people need to explain and interpret their behavior. Tourists, for example, seek the cause of their dissatisfaction. A good deal of systematic thinking and research in social psychological theory has been done on attribution theory, and most relevant to the current discussion is that the cause of the tourists' dissatisfaction can be attributed either to properties of the situation (external attribution) or to properties of the actor (internal attribution). Finally Pearce and Moscardo point out that relatively little work has thus far been done in the application of these theoretical formulations to the tourism/hospitality industry.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND THE TOURISM/HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

Baum (3, 4), in summarizing tourism publications from many international contexts, has written that there is a clear indication of the pre-eminent concern of professionals within the industry for human resource matters. Baum points out that the same themes emerge, with some local or cultural modification, worldwide, and within both developed and developing economies. He lists the following major themes from his survey of the literature:

* demography and the shrinking employment pool; labour shortages; the industry's image as an employer,
* cultural and traditional perceptions of the industry; rewards and benefits; personnel recruitment; labour retention; staff

turnover, education and training, in-company and within colleges;

* skills shortages, especially at higher technician and management levels;
* the impact of labor issues on service and product;
* presentation of, primarily, reactive policy statements, initiatives and remedial programs

Ross (21) has found that there is generally a high level of interest among secondary school students in tourism/hospitality industry management work, with many students being prepared to undergo university/college level training to achieve these vocational goals. Ross (21, 22, 23) has offered some support for the utility of specific personality variables in the understanding of vocational choice involving industries such as tourism and hospitality. He has found that variables such as Locus of Control and the Protestant Work Ethic are predictors of career choice in this context, with an internal Locus of Control being associated with more realistic career path perceptions and further education intentions, and the Protestant Work Ethic being associated with an intention to pursue a management career within the tourism and hospitality industry. This study has investigated the expectations of a sample of school leavers many of whom will soon seek employment in the tourism/hospitality industry. This study sought to investigate a range of expected responses associated with a tour information complaint made by a visitor together with a range of human resource management measures which may predict such responses.

METHOD

1) Subjects
Four hundred and sixty-seven students enrolled in Years 11 and 12 in five state high schools from the Far North Queensland area were sampled. Sampled classes were chosen by the careers counsellors so as to represent adequately the range of ethnic groups, academic skill levels and post secondary school education/employment interests and aspirations. The sample was drawn from a total population of approximately 2500 students. Year 11 and 12 students were chosen as subjects for this particular study because they represent a major pool of potential employees for the tourism/hospitality industry of the Far North Queensland region. Indeed, many of those students who do not proceed to tertiary education seek employment directly in the tourism/hospitality industry or cognate industries serving this industry. Far North Queensland is one of Australia's fastest-growing tourist areas. Ross (22, 23) has found that many school leavers in this region do evince a clear work interest in the tourism and hospitality industry, most likely because of its employment/career potential. Students were surveyed during August and September, when most were considering post-high school study or employment options.

2) Measures
Respondents were asked to respond to the following situation: You are working for a tour company and a tourist approaches you with a complaint about a staff member who appears to have given the tourist some incorrect information which has caused them to miss a tour. What would you do:

A. Apologize
B. Seek more information
C. Apologize profusely
D. Seek explanation from staff member
E. Take little notice of the tourist complaining
F. Tell the tourist you're too busy now but will do something when you can

G. Tell the tourist that such incidents/events are bound to happen occasionally
H. Become firm with the tourist
I. Become rude to the tourist if they are rude to you
J. Try to get more information on the incident
K. Tell the tourist you will get back to them with a full explanation as soon as you can
L. Be pleasant at all times

Respondents were also asked to respond to the following as employment motivators:

IMPORTANT 5 4 3 2 1 UNIMPORTANT

Recognition
Job status
Job interest
Personal development
Job autonomy
Social interaction
Pay
Advancement
Fringe benefits
Variety
Good leadership
Working conditions
Admin. and exec. power
Low job stress
Sense of achievement
Skill utilization
Job security
Pleasant co-workers
Supervision
Influence
Pressure

Respondents were also asked to rate the following tourism impacts upon their community and themselves:

Generally how would you describe the impact of tourism on the community in this area:

High Positive Impact 5 4 3 2 1 No Positive Impact
High Negative Impact 5 4 3 2 1 No Negative Impact

The socio-demographic measures of age and gender were also recorded. The non-response rate for this survey was an acceptable 21.5%.

RESULTS

The first set of analyses involved Factor Analysis of the employee response set. A principal components factor analysis of these twelve responses revealed two interpretable factors with eigen values greater than unity. The first factor accounted for approximately 33% of the variance and loaded on items B, D and J. This factor has thus been labelled visitor Investigation factor. The second factor accounted for approximately 14% of the variance and loaded on items E, F and K, and was thus labelled visitor Avoidance factor. Each of these two sets of responses have been summed and used in subsequent analyses.

Repeated Measures ANOVA procedures have been used in this study so as to investigate differences between these two Tourism Employee Response styles. From Table 1 it can be seen that there were significant differences found between the two styles, with Investigation being found to be more highly rated as a response than was Avoidance. Post Hoc Analysis confirmed this difference.

Repeated Measures ANOVA statistical techniques have also been used in order to

comprehend possible differences among the four Social Impact Assessment Measures. From Table 2 it can be seen that significant differences were found between these measures. An inspection of the means reveals that Positive community impacts were found to be most highly rated. Positive personal impacts were also found to be reasonably highly rated. Negative community and Negative personal impacts were the lowest rated of the measures. An inspection of the Posthoc analyses suggests that the Negative impacts were significantly different from each of the Positive impacts but not from each other.

Multiple Regression Analysis has been used here to gauge the relative predictive efficiency of each of the four Social Impact Measures on both response styles. One analysis proved significant, involving the Investigation response style. Here only Positive personal impacts were found to predict the Investigation response factor.

Multiple Regression Analyses were also applied to the 21 Job Motivation Factors, with both Investigation and Avoidance as criterion variables. Both analyses produced significant functions. Table 4 reveals that the Job Motivators involving Job Interest and Pressure were found to be predictive of the Investigation response style. Table 5 reveals a somewhat more complex predictive pattern. Higher levels of the Job Motivators: Job-Autonomy and Fringe Benefits, together with lower levels of the Job Motivators, Job Interest, Personal Development, Social Interaction and Advancement were found to be predictive of the Avoidance response style.

The final analyses involved cross tabulation of each of the response styles by the Job Interest motivator. An inspection of the standardized residuals in Table 6 reveals

that those respondents registering higher levels of the Investigation response style were associated with assent to the highest level of importance ratings for this Job Motivator. Lower Investigation levels were found to be associated with a lessened likelihood to regard this Job Motivator as important. An inspection of standardized residuals in Table 7 reveals a quite different pattern. Here three separate groups may be identified. Higher Avoidance levels were found to be associated with Unimportant and Mid-range Ratings of the Job Interest motivator, and also found less likely to be associated with Importance ratings for this motivator.

DISCUSSION

Incorrect tour advice and its consequences can have disastrous effects upon the perceptions of enjoyment and satisfaction surrounding a vacation. This study has sought to examine styles of responses among a sample of potential tourism/hospitality industry employees in the face of a complaint concerning incorrect tour advice. Such response types and associated variables may be indicative of those potential employees who will respond positively and those who may respond negatively, to the detriment of the complainant, the organization and their own future career. First of all, this study has identified two major styles of response in the face of incorrect tour advice and visitor dissatisfaction. The most prominent response style has been labelled as Investigatory, and denotes a response wherein potential employees would react in a positive manner, seeking further information as the first step in an endeavor to rectify the situation to the greatest degree possible. The other response type has been labelled Avoidance, and denotes a type of

response characterized by a desire not to address the problem, but rather to attempt to evade the issue and get rid of the visitor making the complaint. These potential employees who would elect for Investigation are clearly the individuals most of value to the tourism/hospitality industry. Their conceptualization of service and problem-solving would appear to be such that they are potentially able to make a valued contribution to the industry and its customers. Moreover they would soon to be advantaged in their career prospects by such a perspective. On the other hand, those who demonstrated little insight into the benefits of attempting to solve this relatively common problem for visitors may not, at least with their present views, make productive or satisfied employees within the industry. Human Resource personnel, in their staff selection procedures, may utilize such findings of use in their staff selection endeavors.

This study has also examined perceptions of the social impacts of tourism upon the local community. It is possible that such perceptions may have some bearing upon attitudes toward the industry and employment intentions among these school leavers, many of whom will soon be seeking tourism employment and career opportunities. It has been found that the most prominent perception involved positive community impacts. Respondents would thus appear to be indicating that generally the influence of tourism was a positive one, particularly at the community level. However, those individuals most disposed towards an Investigation response were found to be associated with positive personal impact judgements. Thus those individuals who perceived themselves as benefiting from the development of the tourism industry in the region were the ones more likely to respond more positively in

the fact of a complaint about incorrect tour advice. It may thus be in the interest of the tourism/hospitality industry to make greater efforts within such communities to point out the benefits which can flow to many locals when the industry prospers. In such a manner, it is possible that a more helpful perspective vis a vis visitors is engendered among potential employees.

The predictive efficiency of a set of employment motivators has also been investigated here in regard to the two major styles of responding to a complaint about incorrect tour advice. The individuals most likely to investigate such a complaint were found to be motivated by an overall interest in a particular job together with job pressure. Thus these people seem to prefer an employment situation wherein the job was very interesting and not at all dull. In fact new challenges and opportunities for problem solving appeared to be welcome to such individuals. There may be a lesson here for tourism/hospitality industry employers who wish to attract and retain the most positive and helpful employee: provide a workplace that is interesting, diverse in duties and one that regularly offers new challenges and problem-solving opportunities.

The individuals with a preference for the Avoidance response style revealed a somewhat more complex motivational profile, and may indeed be a far less homogenous group of individuals. These people indicated a motivation involving autonomy and fringe benefits, but not job interest, personal development, social interaction or advancement. No apparent pattern would seem to be in evidence here. It would seem of use here to explore further this group of people. It is possible that some have an antipathy toward the tourist/hospitality industry and indicate this

in a less than helpful approach toward visitors. They may not like a great deal of interpersonal interaction such as is often required in the industry, but rather a context offering more autonomy than is typically found in tourism where there is often a great interdependence of roles and functions. Yet others here may be motivated by factors such as fringe benefits but not opportunities for advancement or personal development which may seem to be characteristic of emergent and rapidly growing industries such as tourism/hospitality. Such questions may well be explored further among industry derived samples.

The employment motivator Job Interest has also been explored in this study by way of nonparametric analyses, so as to investigate possible relationships between this type of motivation and styles of responding to the incorrect tour information complaint. This analysis revealed that individuals highly committed to an Investigatory response were the ones most motivated by an interest in a selected job. These people would thus seem to be evidencing a very high drive level in regard to employment that they find absorbing and one to which they can commit all of their interest and thus energies. They would seem to be an homogenous group, reasonably easily identifiable, and one that human resource management could target in their recruitment practices. In contrast those who are less inclined to positive service in the face of such a guest complaint have been found to be more heterogeneous as a group. In fact non-parametric analyses have revealed the possibility of more than one group, and possibly two or three groups. Those with the higher preferences for avoidance strategies saw job interest as completely unimportant. Those with the higher preferences for the Avoidance strategy also saw job interest as neither important nor unimportant, but rather within a mid-range category. Finally those preferring lower levels of Avoidance were found to be associated with a perception that job interest was an important employment motivator. Thus there are possibly two or three groups of respondents here preferring an avoidance style who demonstrate different levels of this employment motivation. It would now seem of value to explore these groups further, so as to understand with greater clarity how they differ from each other as well as how they differ from the individuals who would elect for a more positive service orientation when faced with such a visitor complaint.

REFERENCES

1. K. Albrecht and R. Zernke, Service America: Doing Business in the New Economy, Dow Jones-Irwin, Homewood, Illinois, 1984.

2. R. D. Arvey, T. J. Bouchard, N. L. Segal and L. M. Abraham, Job Satisfaction: Environmental and Genetic Components, Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 2(74), pp. 187-192, 1989.

3. T. Baum, Human Resource Issues in Tourism, World Travel and Tourism Review, Vol. 1, pp. 231-234, 1991.

4. T. Baum, National Tourism Policies, <u>Tourism Management</u>, Vol. 15, pp. 259-266, 1994.

5. F. Berger, M. D. Fulford and M. Krazmein, Human Resource Management in the 21st Century, <u>Hospitality Research Journal</u>, Vol. 17, pp. 87-103, 1993.

6. G. Blau and K. B. Blau, Using Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment Interactively to Predict Turnover, <u>Journal of Management</u>, Vol. 15(1), pp. 115-127, 1989.

7. M. P. Coyle and B. G. Dale, Quality in the Hospitality Industry: A Study, <u>International Journal of Hospitality Management</u>, Vol. 12, pp. 141-153, 1993.

8. J. R. Dienhart, M. B. Gregoire, R. G. Downey and P. K. Knight, Service Orientations of Restaurant Employees, <u>International Journal of Hospitality Management</u>, Vol. 11, pp. 331-346, 1992.

9. C. A. Enz, Organizational Architectures for the 21st Century, <u>Hospitality Research Journal</u>, Vol. 17, pp. 103-113, 1993.

10. J. M. George and K, Bettenhausen, Understanding Prosocial Behavior, Sales Performance, and Turnover: A Group-Level Analysis in a Service Context, <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, Vol. 76, pp. 698-709, 1990.

11. R. T. George and Y. F. Tann, A Comparison of the Importance of Selected Service-Related Factors as Perceived by Restaurant Employees and Managers, <u>International Journal of Hospitality Management</u>, Vol. 12, pp. 289-298, 1993.

12. C. Gronroos, A Service Quality Model and its Marketing Implications, <u>Journal of Marketing</u>, Vol. 18, pp. 36-44, 1984.

13. J. Hogan, R. Hogan and C. M. Busch, How to Measure Service Orientation, <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, Vol. 69, pp. 167-173, 1984.

14. R. Johnston, <u>A Framework for Developing a Quality Strategy in a Customer Processing Operation</u>, University of Warwick working paper, March, 1987.

15. R. Johnston and B. Morris, Monitoring and Control in Service Operations, <u>International Journal of Operations and Production Management</u>, 1985.

16. R. S. Kaplan, Measuring Manufacturing Performance: A New Challenge for Managerial Accounting Research, <u>The Accounting Review</u>, Vol. 58, p. 48, 1983.

17. R. C. Lewis and A. Pizam, Guest Surveys, <u>Cornell Hospitality and Restaurant Administration Quarterly</u>, Nov. pp. 37-44, 1981.

18. A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml and L. L. Berry, A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and its Implications for Further Research, Journal of Marketing, Vol. 49 (Fall), pp. 41-50, 1985.

19. P. L. Pearce and G. M. Moscardo, Making Sense of Tourists' Complaints, Tourism Management, March, pp. 20-23, 1984.

20. T. F. Power, The Standard World of 2005, Hospitality Research Journal, Vol. 16, pp. 1-19, 1992.

21. G. F. Ross, Tourism and Hospitality Industry Job-Attainment Beliefs and Work Values among School Leavers, International Journal of Hospitality Management, Vol. 11, pp. 319-330, 1992.

22. G. F. Ross, Management and Life Values as Predictors of Tourist/Hospitality Employment Interest Levels among Potential Employees, Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 31, pp. 104-117, 1993.

23. G. F. Ross, What Do Australian School Leavers Want of the Industry?, Tourism Management, Vol. 15, pp. 62-67, 1994.

24. A. C. Rossander, The Quest for Quality in Service, Quality Press, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1989.

25. B. Schneider, J. J. Parkington and V. M. Buxton, Employee and Customer Perceptions of Service in Banks, Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 70(1), pp. 423-433, 1890.

26. S. Smith, How to Quantify Quality, Management Today, October, 1982.

27. B. Sparks, Communicative Aspects of the Service Encounter, Hospitality Research Journal, Vol. 17, pp. 39-51, 1994.

Table 1

Repeated Measures ANOVA of the Two Major Tourism Employee Response Factors

SUMMARY STATISTICS TABLE

Source	df:	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-test	P value
Between subjects	381	2647.944	6.95	.375	1
Within subjects	382	7074.5	18.52		
treatments	1	4226.713	4226.713	565.484	.0001
residual	381	2847.787	7.475		

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS TABLE

Factor	Count	Mean	St. Dev.	Std. Error
Investigation	382	11.929	3.005	.154
Avoidance	382	7.225	2.322	.119

POST-HOC ANALYSIS TABLE

Comparison	Mean Diff.	Fisher PLSD	Scheffe F-test
Investigation vs. Avoidance	4.704	.389*	565.484*

*Significant at .05

Table 2

Repeated Measures ANOVA of the Four Social Impact Assessment Measures

SUMMARY STATISTICS TABLE

Source	df:	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-test	P value
Between subjects	308	342.453	1.112	.663	1
Within subjects	927	1555.75	1.678		
treatments	3	499.737	166.579	145.755	.0001
residual	924	1056.013	1.143		
TOTAL	1234	1898.203			

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS TABLE

Factor	Count	Mean	St. Dev.	Std. Error
Positive (community)	309	4.055	.919	.052
Negative (community	309	2.553	.981	.056
Positive (personal)	309	3.178	1.237	.07
Negative (personal)	309	2.463	1.097	.062

POST-HOC ANALYSIS TABLE

Comparison	Mean Diff.	Fisher PLSD	Scheffe F-test
Positive (c) vs Negative (c)	1.502	.169*	101.608*
Positive (c) vs Negative (p)	.877	.169*	34.66*
Positive (c) vs Negative (p)	1.592	.169*	114.241*
Negative (c) vs Positive (p)	-.625	.169*	17.58*
Negative (c) vs Negative (p)	.091	.169	.37
Positive (p) vs Negative (p)	.715	.169*	23.05*

Table 3

Multiple Regression Analysis of the Four Social Input Assessment Measures, Employing
the Investigation Response Factor as Criterion Variable

SUMMARY STATISTICS TABLE

R	R-squared	Adj. R-squared
.247	.061	.046

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE

Source	DF	Sum squares	Mean square	F-test
Regression	4	145.187	36.297	4.212
Residual	260	2240.572	8.618	p=.0025
TOTAL	264	2385.758		

BETA COEFFICIENT TABLE

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Coeff.	t-Value	Probability
Intercept	10.078			
Positive (community)	.093	.028	.429	.6685
Negative (community)	.167	.055	.816	.4155
Positive (personal)	.537	.218	3.481	.0006
Negative (personal)	-.239	-.086	1.325	.1865

Table 4

Multiple Regression Analysis of the 21 Job Motivation Factors, Employing the
Investigation Response Factor as Criterion Variable

R	R-squared	Adj. R-squared
.384	.147	.092

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE

Source	DF	Sum squares	Mean square	F-test
Regression	21	472.088	22.528	2.653
Residual	323	2742.553	8.491	p=.0001
TOTAL	344	3215.641		

BETA COEFFICIENT TABLE

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Coeff.	t-Value	Probability
Intercept	7.909			
Recognition	-.121	-.049	.759	.4484
Job status	.085	.031	.452	.6515
Job interest	.524	.193	2.843	.0047
Personal devel.	-.007	-.003	.044	.956
Job autonomy	.129	.051	.74	.4599
Soc. interaction	.275	.11	1.723	.0859
Pay	-.301	-.101	1.714	.0874
Advancement	.17	.061	.896	.371
Fringe benefits	-.143	-.054	.818	.4138
Variety	-.036	-.014	.203	.8395
Good leadership	.152	.055	.765	.4446
Work. conditions	.086	.03	.405	.686
Admin/Exec. power	-.223	-.089	1.345	.1796
Low job stress	-.055	-.025	.394	.6937
Sense of achiev.	.194	.079	1.175	.2408
Job security	.087	.036	.528	.5981
Pleasant co-workers	.313	.055	.806	.4209
Supervision	-.041	-.16	.243	.8078
Influence	-.133	-.059	1.059	.2903
Pressure	.375	1.53	2.499	.0129

Table 5

Multiple Regression Analysis of the 21 Job Motivation Factors, Employing the Avoidance Response Factor as Criterion Variable

R	R-squared	Adj. R-squared
.385	.148	.092

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE

Source	DF	Sum squares	Mean square	F-test
Regression	21	281.03	13.382	2.64
Residual	319	1617.228	5.07	p=.0002
TOTAL	340	1898.258		

BETA COEFFICIENT TABLE

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Coeff.	t-Value	Probability
Intercept	9.91			
Recognition	.049	.025	.395	.6932
Job status	.17	.082	1.162	.246
Job interest	-.387	-.182	2.695	.0074
Personal devel.	-.266	-.138	2.021	.0441
Job autonomy	.384	.195	2.812	.0052
Soc. interaction	-.359	-.187	2.902	.004
Pay	.032	.014	.232	.8167
Advancement	-3.69	-.169	2.481	.0136
Fringe benefits	.288	.14	2.119	.0349
Variety	-.091	-.045	.643	.5205
Good leadership	.1	.047	.643	.5204
Work. conditions	-.178	-.08	1.061	.2896
Admin/Exec. power	-.045	-.023	.347	.7287
Low job stress	.195	.115	1.81	.0713
Sense of achiev.	.063	.034	.497	.6192
Job security	-.218	-.117	1.7	.09
Pleasant co-workers	-.02	-.011	.159	.8738
Supervision	.152	.076	1.171	.2425
Influence	.052	.029	.526	.5994
Pressure	-.051	-.027	.436	.6633

Table 6

Cross-tabulation of the Investigation Response Factor by the
Job Interest Motivation Factor

INVESTI-GATION TYPE		UNIMPORTANT		TO		IMPORTANT
Lower	1.	14	7	27	47	93
Investigation	2.	11.059	4.021	18.599	40.717	113.604
Levels	3.	1.293	2.129	2.91	1.578	-4.358
Higher		8	1	10	34	133
Investigation		10.941	3.979	18.401	40.283	112.396
Levels		-1.293	-2.129	-2.91	-1.578	4.358

1. Observed frequency
2. Expected frequency
3. Standardised residual

Note 1:   The Investigation Factor has been categorised at the 50% percentile for this analysis.

Note 2:   Standardised residuals are the difference between the observed and expected frequencies divided by the square root of the expected frequencies. The overall Chi Sq statistic represents the sum of squares of these standardised residuals, and each standardised residual represents the degree of fit for the no-effects model for each cell.

SUMMARY STATISTICS

DF	4
Total Chi-Square	23.103 p = .0001
G statistic	24.033
Contingency Coefficient	.241
Cramer's V	.249