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(ABSTRACT)
The purpose of this study was to investigate cultural diversity training practices and to
determine the deterrence factors associated instituting cultural diversity training. It
attempted to measure the overall effectiveness of cultural diversity training in franchise
restaurants. A total of 300 franchise restaurants were surveyed. Three practicing and fifty-
eight non-practicing cultural diversity training companies participated in the study.

The findings indicated that high turnover rates of employees were the most important
deterrence factor in developing and using cultural diversity training programs in the
franchise restaurants studied. Respondents reported that such training was more successful
in improving interpersonal skills for cross-cultural interactions than in enhancing
performance of inter-cultural job tasks and decreasing perceptions and attitudes about
culturally diverse people.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND

It has been said in the hospitality industry that the United States workforce is undergoing a lot of changes that include an increase in the female and non-white shares of new entrants. These changes, which are associated with the workforce 2000 study (Johnston, 1991), have become the buzzword among hospitality industry managers and researchers. What is less understood is what effects, if any, these changes have on the American hospitality business and how the hospitality industry can respond, in a proactive way, to these changes.

In the United States roughly 45 percent of all net additions to the labor force will be non-white; half of them will be first generation immigrations, mostly from Asian and Latin countries (Cox, 1993). In the hospitality industry, minorities, such as Asians and Hispanics, will compose a larger share of the labor force by the year 2000. It is reported that immigrants are estimated to fill more than 20 percent of the labor force positions by the year 2000 (National Restaurant Association, 1988). Asians, the group that includes Native Americans and Pacific Islanders, will show a 3.6 percent annual labor force increase, while African Americans increase by 1.9 percent per year, a much higher rate than the 1.2 percent annual growth for the entire civil labor pool (Michalski, 1990).

Beyond these workforce facts there are more surprising U.S. demographics. It is estimated that by the year 2000, a majority of public school-age children in the United States will be non-White (Cox, 1993). These figures imply that growth of the labor force groups will come from immigration or from increasing labor-force participation by groups that are presently underrepresented.
Corporations appear to be responding to these demographics for the purpose of creating a competitive advantage by emphasizing the importance of cross-cultural teamwork. This trend toward acknowledging and using the cultural diversity of the workforce for their own advantage is beginning to appear in some hospitality companies (Hughes, 1992; Shames, 1986).

The hospitality industry can be considered diverse in other respects such as its increasing emphasis on global customers and multinational business operations. Tourism from Asia, Mexico, Africa, Europe, and Australia is expected to grow by more than 10 percent in the 1990s according to the U.S. Travel Service (1990). By the year 2001, Asia's share of the world tourism market is expected to increase from 20 percent to 40 percent. According to Clark and Arbel (1993), the top six American international chain hotels operate in more than 40 countries in South America, Europe, and Asia.

The increase of ethnic foodservice operations is another indication of the diversity of American customers as well as their interest in multicultural cuisine. Customers can taste Korean, Japanese, Chinese, French, Indian, Caribbean, or German cuisine within the U.S.

Understanding the effects of cultural diversity on business's competitive advantage is an imperative to the global hospitality business. It is likewise necessary for the hospitality industry and educational researchers to understand and prepare for the effects of this cultural diversity in the hospitality business environment. As one of the biggest service industries, hospitality, involves business with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. What is necessary in the hospitality industry is an on-going emphasis on training managers and employees to understand multicultural customers and employees and, thereby, manage them effectively.
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Diversity in an organization enriches it by adding new cultures and ideas and alternative methods of solving problems. But diversity likewise has associated problems, particularly in older, traditional organizations which manage a homogeneous workforce.

Recent immigrants and individuals holding close ties to their primary ethnic culture may tend to use their native languages, other than English, for communication purposes. This may effect not only communications with their supervisors and co-workers but also communication with guests and customers. Fiedler (1966) found that culturally heterogeneous groups reported less pleasant work atmospheres and experienced greater communication difficulties than did homogeneous groups. Communications involving multiple languages likewise make the human resource functions of recruiting, training, evaluation, promotion, and pay decisions more complex and difficult.

The lack of understanding of the beliefs and values inherent in different cultures may also lead to the use of ineffective management techniques to direct, motivate, and reward culturally diverse employees. Supervisors accustomed to managing homogeneous workgroups are often unaware that traditional "American" management techniques are ineffective when used with individuals from some cultures. For instance, using an individual, public reward system such as an "Employee of the Month" could be dysfunctional when applied to employees from a culture based on private acknowledgment of group or team effort.

Finally, group cohesiveness is thought to be reduced by an increase in cultural diversity among group members. This suggestion is derived from the theory that people feel more comfortable, are more highly attracted to, and are satisfied with group
members who are like themselves (Cox, 1993). A group dynamics study showed that highly cohesive groups have higher member morale and better communication than less cohesive groups (Randolph & Blackburn, 1989). Diversity in the work may place potentially lower member morale and make communication more difficult.

In summary, the presence of cultural diversity may negatively affect group functioning. Misunderstanding can increase, conflict may rise, and group members in the company may feel less comfortable with members of different cultures. These effects combine to make human resource management more difficult and time-consuming. Culturally diverse employee groups are more complicated to manage effectively than those that are culturally homogeneous. The challenge for hospitality organizations is to train employees in such a way as to maximize the potential benefits of diversity while minimizing its potential disadvantages.

Multicultural training has been viewed as an effective method for facilitating cross-cultural interactions, thereby addressing some of the above mentioned problems. It does appear that American business organizations are quickly adopting cross-cultural training. The respondents in one study of U.S. hotels indicated that one third of the companies studied had no multicultural training for either supervisors or managers (Gamio & Sneed, 1992). The reasons stated for the absence of such programs were cost, lack of usefulness, and difficulty in implementation. The unavailability of specialized trainers for the multicultural training was cited as an additional reason for the absence of such programs. The lack of support from top management for such programs has also been a major deterrent (Black & Mendenhall, 1990).

Many hospitality companies will face more difficulties in dealing with their diversified employees, customers, and even owners if they are not ready for diversity.
The need, therefore, exists for a comprehensive study on multicultural training that examines multicultural training practices in the hospitality industry.

1.3 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

Multicultural training can be used to assist hospitality industry managers in successfully managing diversified employees and customers. Multicultural training provides:

"... a framework in which people can develop skills and acquire the knowledge that increases their ability to function effectively from the cross-cultural experience. It fosters sensitivity to, appreciation of and respect for all cultures. It is an affirming experience and this affirmation works to reinforce the role and the position of diverse groups in a pluralistic society. It functions to reduce tensions and build bridges among people of differing cultural backgrounds. It also puts heavy stress on the learning potential available in cross-cultural encounters, ways to take advantage of those opportunities and the acceptance of cultural diversity as a human resources management rather than merely as an impediment of communication." (Seelye, 1979, p.276)

Depending on the specific goal or goals chosen, a multicultural training package may use different strategies. Multicultural training contents may vary according to the company's different training focus. It is important to remember that no one method or approach is likely to be effective unless it is systematically aimed at the needs of the organization and its employees (Sue, 1991).
The purpose of this study is to investigate current practices of multicultural training in the hospitality industry. The results of the proposed study, focusing on the multicultural training practices, may not be generalizable to the entire industry because of its limited use. However, they should contribute to the body of knowledge in the multicultural training practices.

The objectives of this study can be described as follows:

1. To investigate the current practices of multicultural training in the hospitality industry.
2. To investigate why hospitality companies do not have multicultural training.
3. To provide an information framework for guiding multicultural training research.

1.4 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY

By accomplishing the three above-mentioned objectives, this study provides:

1. An investigation and a further understanding of multicultural training practices in the hospitality industry,
2. A theoretical support of multicultural training, and
3. A contribution to the body of knowledge and literature in the hospitality human resource management area.
1.5. SUMMARY

This chapter presented an overview of a proposed study on multicultural training. As the American hospitality business environment becomes culturally diversified, problems and opportunities will present themselves to hospitality organizations. Many can be addressed through the use of cultural diversity programs. The lack of research efforts in this area was addressed.

The objective of this study is to examine the practices of cultural diversity training. Some learning theories will be studied in the context of multicultural training practices. As a result, this study will contribute to the body of knowledge and literature in the area of hospitality human resources management.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter presented the research objective of this study in the area of multicultural training practices followed by associated cultural diversity problems. The purpose of this chapter is to present the study's theoretical understanding of culture, diversity aspects, and multicultural training practices. To move toward a theoretical understanding of the multicultural training practices, one should begin with a basic understanding of cross-cultural interactions and their impact on individuals.

To achieve the above objectives, the first part of this chapter will consist of a literature review of culture, the acculturation process, and aspects of cultural diversity at the individual level. The second part of the chapter will discuss the literature on multicultural training practices in the hospitality industry and learning theories about incentives, motivation, and evaluation.

2.1.1. DEFINITION OF CULTURE

Most research on cross-cultural interaction begins with culture. The concept of "culture" is a useful tool for understanding human behavior around the world, as well as within the United States. Insights about the concept come mostly from the behavioral sciences of sociology, psychology, and anthropology, which study and inform us about individual behavior and its relationship to organization (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Culture influences and in influenced by every face of human activity:

"...human beings create culture as an adaptation to their environment. Among culturally homogeneous people, traditions and customs are passed along from
generation to generation. Subsequent generations accept or reject traditions about them, certain values are established, and people are informed of the "accepted" behavior for living in that group. Individuals are strongly inclined to accept and believe what their culture tells them. Thus we are influenced by the common knowledge of the community in which we are raised, regardless of the objective validity of the different input. We tend to ignore what is contrary to our cultural truth or what conflicts with our beliefs. Often this is the reason for prejudice towards other groups, for refusing to change when our notions are challenged to change. It may become a problem when a culture lags behind the realities of "changing demographics." In spite of the above discussion, culture facilitates organization performance by providing ready-made solutions to problems, establishing relation patterns, and preserving group cohesion and consensus." (Harris, 1987, p.190)

Based on extensive review of culture, Kluckhohn and Kroeberg (1952) concluded that culture consists of patterns of behaviors that are acquired and transmitted by symbols over time, which become generally shared within a group and are communicated to new members of the group in order to serve as a cognitive guide for future actions.

Bochner (1982) argued the necessity of interaction between people with diverse cultural backgrounds. Faulty understanding of the diverse culture may bring difficulties since an individual's understanding is based on one's own cultural norms and views. Cross-cultural interactions may bring people together with different behavior patterns, beliefs, and cognitive blueprints for interpreting the world (Trainidis, Vassiliou, Tanaka, & Shanmugam, 1972).
2.1.2. CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURE

To understand the behaviors of people from different cultures, it is necessary to understand the characteristics of culture. Harris (1987) presented a model of culture characteristics as the first step for understanding cultural diversity:

1. Sense of self and space: different cultures have different expressions of one's comfort with oneself. Some cultures are very structured and formal, while others are more flexible and informal. Each culture validates self in a unique way.

2. Communication and language: verbal and nonverbal communication systems vary from culture to culture. Some countries have more than ten different dialects with diverse slang and jargons. The meaning of gestures often differ by culture. Body language may be universal; its manifestation differs by regions.

3. Food and feeding habits: the way in which food is selected, prepared, and eaten differs by culture. One culture's pet is other culture's delicacy. Feeding habits likewise differ, from hands through chop sticks to full sets of cutlery.

4. Values and norms: cultures may vary according to the priorities people attach to certain behaviors in the group. From its value system, culture sets norms for behavior for that society. These acceptable standards for groups may vary from work ethics to obedience to the boss. People in different cultures are pleased or embarrassed about different things because they perceive situations from different points of view.

5. Work habits and practices: another characteristic for a culture is people's attitudes toward work, types of work, and work habits or practices of promotion or rewards. Asian cultures encourage a work ethic in which all members are expected to engage in a consensus way. For American cultures, the work performance is often measured in terms of output produced in a short time span (Harris, 1987, p.190-195).
Although these classification dimensions do not include every aspect of culture, this approach will enable managers to examine diverse people systematically.

2.1.3. ACCULTURATION

Acculturation refers to resolving cultural differences and cultural changes and adaptation between groups, especially if one group is being merged into a larger, more dominant group (Tung, 1993). In an organizational context, determining a dominant group is somewhat confusing. In the U.S., the dominant culture group is White Male Americans. The acculturation may provide strategies for managing cross-cultural interactions and will probably produce positive performance outcomes for organizations and individual employees.

Tung (1993) and Cox, and Finley-Nickelson (1991) described modes of acculturation in organizations as follows: assimilation, separation, deculturation, and pluralism / integration. In these acculturation modes, assimilation and pluralism /integration are viewed as bringing positive outcomes for the company.

1. Assimilation is a one-way adaptation in which an organization's culture becomes the standard of behavior for all other cultures merging into the organization. The goal of assimilation is to eliminate cultural differences, or at least the expression of nondominant cultures, at work. To achieve this goal, culturally different entering members need to reject or at least repress the values and practices of cultures from which they have come.

2. Pluralism /Integration means that both the organization and culturally diverse entering members exchange learning and adaptation processes to some degree with respect to the cultural norms and values of others. Integration emphasizes interdependence and mutual understanding among diverse cultures and the importance
of preservation of cultural identity of minority groups. Pluralism is an acculturation process in which the entering members assimilate a limited number of core behaviors and values while keeping important differences along other dimensions.

Hannigan (1990) likewise conceptualized adjustment and adaptation for facilitating the understanding of acculturation processes.

1. Adjustment can be defined as a psychological concept which has to do with the process of achieving concord between the employee and the company. Usually this harmony is achieved by changing the individual's knowledge, attitudes, and emotions about the company working environment. Adjustment reaches the pinnacle with job satisfaction, comfort with work environment, improved performance, and increased interaction and communication with other culture members.

2. Adaptation implies cognitive, attitudinal, psychological, and behavioral changes in an individual who lives in a diverse culture. These changes are the results of the individual's movement to diverse culture settings. It could be a broad term which includes adjustment and assimilation.

In short, these terms, adjustment, adaptation, acculturation, and assimilation describe positive changes to facilitating cross-cultural interactions when individuals or groups have contact with a different culture.

2.1.4. MULTICULTURALISM

The hospitality industry can build on work performance and mutual beliefs among employees when we advocate multiculturalism in the workplace. Multiculturalism is the attempt to create a sociocultural environment through an ethic and policy where people of varied ethnic, racial, religious and cultural heritages are
valued and respected -- both as individuals and groups. Thus, multiculturalism seeks to support and promote individual and group identities.

Cox (1993) used the term "multicultural in the organization" to achieve the objective of managing diverse people to create organizations in which members of all diverse cultural backgrounds can contribute and achieve their full potential by creating specified multicultural visions within the company frame. Thus a true multicultural organization can be made by organizational change.

McLeod (1984) demonstrated the ideas and principles inherent in multiculturalism in society. We may revise them for the purpose of an organizational context as follows:

1. Equality of status of all cultural and ethnic groups within the company.
2. Freedom of all individuals and groups to retain and develop their cultures as part of the American identity.
3. The equality of opportunity and access within the company and benefits of multicultural organization.
4. A commitment to sharing ones own cultures within the mainstream of multicultural organization.
5. The right and responsibility to participate in a multicultural organization environment.
6. A belief that individuals have the freedom to choose the particular cultural attributes they prefer within the framework of multicultural principles.
2.2. CULTURAL DIVERSITY

There are cultural diversity issues we can find at the individual level in an organization when diverse people work together. Cultural diversity may include group identity, prejudice, and stereotyping (Falkenberg, 1990).

2.2.1. GROUP IDENTITY

A group identity is a personal affiliation with other people with whom one shares certain things in common. A culture identity group is based on sociocultural, as opposed to physical differences. Members of identity groups tend to share certain values and shared norms. Cox (1993) used the term "culture identity structure" to refer to a particular culture group configuration. The structure had two components: "culture identity profile," referring to the culture group or groups with which an individual personally identifies, and "identity strength," referring to the relative importance or value that an individual places on a particular culture group identity.

Cox (1993) argued that most American employees have a relatively high awareness of the individual identity in a particular business environment setting and have considerably less awareness of group identities. In large Japanese companies, employees showed a well-known tendency for a high degree of company loyalty and group identification (Johnson, 1988).

2.2.2. PREJUDICE

There may be biases in personal attitudes and behavior toward others based on differences in group identity. Prejudice refers to the attitudinal bias and means to prejude someone on the basis of some characteristics. Most experts interpret prejudice in terms of negative attitudes toward certain groups (Bobo, 1988). Discrimination
refers to behavioral bias toward a person based on the person's group identity. Prejudice and discrimination are closely related.

Prejudice may arise from communication barriers that may be related to group identities (Trotman-Reid, 1988). Negative attitudes towards persons whose primary language is not English can link with the discomfort and frustration experienced by English speaking employees. Non-English speakers also feel isolation and respond by seeking the companionship of others with the same language usage.

2.2.3. STEREOTYPING

Stereotyping is a perceptual and cognitive process in which specific behavioral traits are ascribed to individuals on the basis of their membership in a group. Stereotyping is a process of group identity categorization and is based on the assumed traits of these categories, whereas prejudice is about attitudes and emotional reactions to people. Research has shown that, in culturally diverse environments, people tend to process personal information through mental filters based on social categories (Taylor, Fiske, Etcott, & Ruderman, 1978). Stereotyping impacts interpersonal relations based on racioethnicity and nationality (Lobel, 1988) and people's career opportunities (Everett, 1990). Gregory (1990) argued that inaccurate stereotypes affect a high level of inefficiency in decision making and identified the factors involved in developing stereotypes.

A typical stereotyping is based on the assumption that any particular group member will be characteristic of the group. Respondents listed stereotypes familiar to them which are negative for all culture groups. The point was that stereotyping meant not only acknowledging differences of other groups but judging them as somehow
inferior or undesirable. Thus one of the challenges for organizations and individuals is to create the ability to acknowledge differences in positive ways (Cox, 1993).

Stereotyping may impact career developments in the company in several ways:

1. It may exclude certain culture group members in hiring and promotion.
2. Men of the majority ethnic group are granted higher role status than minority group men in the company.
3. Upward mobility of Asian Americans is limited by stereotypes of having technical ability with little management capability and interest (Khoo, 1988).
4. Stereotyping may impact the evaluation of performance about the ability of certain culture groups may limit the high positions in the company available to them.
5. Job segregation is the tendency for certain culture members to be concentrated into certain job categories in some hotels (Hughes, 1992).

2.3. MULTICULTURAL TRAINING

Multicultural training may enable the individual in an organization to learn both knowledge and skills that could facilitate effective cross-cultural interactions by reducing misunderstanding and inappropriate behaviors. By studying multicultural training practices and learning theories, we could develop more detailed research questions.
2.3.1. MULTICULTURAL TRAINING PRACTICES

1. TRAINING DETERRENCE

Although multicultural training has long been supported as a means of providing effective cross-cultural interactions (Bochner, 1982; Tung, 1981), its use in American business organizations is not very widespread: only 30 percent of managers have multicultural training before their assignments (Black, 1988; Tung, 1981), many hotel companies had no multicultural training (Gamio and Sneed, 1992). The reasons for the absence of such training programs were cost, lack of usefulness, difficulty in implementation, no foreign employees, and few international guests. Lack of specialized trainers for the multicultural training was cited as an additional reason for the absence of such programs.

Studies of acculturation training practices in multinational companies indicated problems associated with training included overly general training content and no training evaluation (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Tung, 1981). Reasons for not investing in multicultural training were a feeling of no effectiveness, past dissatisfaction from the trainee, no time for training, and not being aware of cultural diversity. The most apparent reasons for low use of multicultural training was its ineffectiveness (Mendelhall & Oddou, 1985; Tung, 1981) and thus top management was unwilling to support such training. It seems that the field of multicultural training still suffers from basic problems: inadequate understanding of the diversity facts, inappropriate training methods, and lack of evaluation methods. It is felt that recent multicultural training practice studies do not include all the reasons behind the above mentioned responses. It may be management’s unsupportive attitudes towards multicultural training, lack of
incentives to trainees, industry's high-turnover rates of employees, management's different view towards training, or trainees' unwillingness or lack of motivation.

2. TRAINING PROGRAMS -- CONTENT AND METHODOLOGY

Most training programs, which are designed to manage and facilitate cross-cultural interactions, may vary depending on the company's goal or objectives in adopting different contents and methodologies:

(1) A cultural difference awareness program's in recognition of values, attitudes, behavior, and communication across cultures or sub-groups (Welch, Tanke & Glover, 1988);

(2) A social interactions program of international guests and co-workers, and non-verbal communications including cultural orientation programs such as culture assimilator, sensitivity training, and field experiences (Tung, 1981);

(3) A communication competency program (Tung, 1981; Tung, 1993) of English as a Second Language for minorities or a Second Language program for Americans (Gamio & Sneed, 1992);

(4) In-house orientation programs as part of managing diversity training (Cox, 1991); and

(5) A joint education programs to create schools of its own and customized education programs with community agencies and private schools (Cox, 1993).

The scope of the training program may include all aspects of the acculturation. Training that focuses on a limited number of dimensions may be unfair to the trainees because the individual trainee might naturally be skilled at the topics covered in the
training program and assume that he or she has nothing to worry about while dealing with cultural diversity situations. To a larger degree, these problems could be avoided with proper selection of the training topic beforehand.

3. DEPTH OF THE TRAINING

When dealing with the multicultural training programs, the depth of the training should be a function of the type of involvement, the degree of interpersonal interaction, and the likelihood of the cross-cultural skills.

With the increased need for a degree of integration with the diverse cultures, the type of training should increase in depth from being "information-giving" to being increasingly "affective" and "intensified" in nature. Respondents recommended "more rigorous" training programs for top management and functional head jobs (Tung, 1981). As the degree of integration increases, the length of needed training time should increase likewise.

4. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

Only one third of companies with multicultural training programs evaluated the effectiveness of such programs. Among them, companies adopted some form of the evaluation process of trainee's or supervisor's subjective evaluations instead of objective ones (Tung, 1981).

As it is a vital part of the training process, training evaluation must be planned when training objectives are set, and become part of subsequent needs analysis to plan future programs. It has been found that an effective and ongoing evaluation system for training is essential for ensuring success of training (Milkovich & Boudreu, 1991).
5. QUALIFICATIONS FOR TRAINERS

Kohls (1984), a long-time cross-cultural trainer, suggested the following trainer's qualifications: international experience, knowledge about the different cultures, ability to differentiate different cultures, attitudes about new cultures and interpersonal experiences, and the ability to work with trainees one-on-one in skill-building (not being limited to only giving seminars or speeches).

It is likewise important to select a diverse group of trainers, including the minority identity group in the organization. Study has found that the use of line managers to facilitate diversity training with their personal experiences can help build a company's commitment to the training effort (Cox, 1993).

6. GUIDELINE

Research has shown that successful multicultural training practice companies tend to adopt different criteria for selecting different types of training programs for each job categories with the recognition that different jobs involve different degrees of contact with other cultures (Tung, 1981). It seems that there is no one best training program that would be appropriate for all job categories. It may be useful to design multicultural training programs to meet the needs of trainees by following steps developed by Richard Inns (Berger & Farber, 1986) (1) examine the attitudes and self-perceived needs of the prospective trainees, (2) combine seminar training with on-the-job training for maximum output, and (3) get feedback from the trainees along with trainers for training evaluation.
2.3.2. LEARNING THEORIES

Noe (1986) proposed a model of how training facilitates job performance. He suggested that two aspects of motivation of individuals had a crucial impact on the effectiveness of training; an individual's motivation to learn and his or her motivation to transfer what was learned into action were critical elements of training effectiveness. Social learning theory encompasses the motivational aspects emphasized by Noe (1986) and covers the issues of how individuals learn and use what they learned during a training session. Bandura (1977) described incentives as one of central elements in social learning theory along with attention, retention, and reproduction. Incentives and motivational processes come from the work environment and the individual. Incentives influence the level of retention and the rehearsal of behavior that individual has learned during the training session (Bandura, 1977; Black & Mendenhall, 1990).

Bandura (1977) reviewed fundamental elements in the learning process: gradual learning is more effective than one-shot learning; individuals as thought to learn completely through symbolic learning by watching actions and mentally rehearsing actions; participatory reproduction, in which the observer actually practices the modeled behavior, is generally more effective than the symbolic process. One study found that the motivations of adults to learn were the desire for social contact, professional advancement, and cognitive interest (Long, 1983). Aiken (1980) postulated that adults may not feel that formal testing is the best type of evaluation. Trainers need to develop new evaluation methods while allowing trainees to have similar type exams, avoid stress, and explain how the results can used for the trainee.

Researchers feel that multicultural training could increase skill, adjustment, and performance that facilitate cross-cultural interactions within social learning theory (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Moreover, researchers investigating individuals familiar
with multicultural training reported higher confidence levels in dealing with diverse people than those individuals who did not interview such individuals (Church, 1982). Furthermore when trainees actually confront cross-cultural situations, individuals can recall the models and imitate them better than those who have not been trained. Training additionally provides a means for modeling behaviors such as being tolerant of ambiguity or reserving judgment about different behaviors of diverse people. Thus training may serve as an important learning experience substitute and can result in improved behavior and successful job performance.

In conclusion, with proper motivation, incentives, and training matched to job tasks, there will be a greater learning experience for the trainee. Thus, the hospitality industry needs to match the training program to the needs of the trainee. An overly general training program may not achieve goals because trainees do not perceive that the training relates to their specific tasks. To date, there has been little research investigating multicultural training practices in the hospitality industry. This study will take the initiative in investigating multicultural training practices in the hospitality industry and will describe the reasons of training practices and training effectiveness.

2.4. SUMMARY

This chapter provides an overview of culture, the acculturation process, multicultural training practices, and learning theories. An overview of culture, acculturation process, and cultural diversity is presented to stress the importance of dimensions which are different from those of a homogeneous culture. Learning theories were constructed and adopted for better understanding of multicultural training effectiveness. Finally, it is implied that there is a need of research efforts to examine cultural diversity training practices in the hospitality industry.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters presented the proposed area of research for this study and relevant research in the area of multicultural training. The following objectives guide the present research.

1. To investigate the current practices of multicultural training in the hospitality industry.
2. To investigate why hospitality companies do not have multicultural training.
3. To provide an information framework for guiding multicultural training research.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the study’s research questions, propose a methodology through relevant information, and inform how to collect data in order to address these questions.

3.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research in the area of multicultural training effectiveness has yet to produce substantial theories concerning the important variables in measuring content and effectiveness. Therefore, this research study will focus on primary research questions relating to the content of such programs in the hospitality industry. It is felt that such investigation should be collected before more empirical study proposing to test qualitative hypotheses is considered.
A review of the current literature, presented in chapter two, reveals that multicultural training is viewed as important for improving skills, performance, and productivity (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). Little work has been done in the hospitality industry to assess the presence and the effectiveness of multicultural training programs. Therefore the first research question of this study is:

1. What are the current multicultural training activities taking place in the hospitality industry?

In literature reviews on multicultural training programs, there are several reasons that reoccur as a general theme for companies instituting the training (Gamio & Sneed, 1992; Tung, 1993). Moreover, employment training literature suggests that the ultimate success of any training program instituted by a company is affected by well thought out goals of the program (Murrmann, 1991; Milkovich & Boudreau, 1991). Therefore the second research question is:

2. What are the primary goals that influence hospitality firms to institute multicultural training?

As important as it may be to investigate the reasons why companies have multicultural training programs, it is equally important to find out why they don't have the programs. This may be even more critical to a service industry with higher levels of customer contact than the manufacturing sector. Therefore the third research question is as follows:
3. What are the primary factors that deter hospitality firms from instituting multicultural training?

Finally, models derived from the training literature suggest that the most effective training programs evaluate themselves by using a feedback loop to see whether they have been effective in achieving their goals (Murrmann, 1991). The final objective of the study, therefore, is:

4. Are current multicultural training programs successful in achieving their goals?

3.3. VARIABLES

MULTICULTURAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

Training programs designed to manage and facilitate cross-cultural interactions may vary by implementing different contents and methods. Research has been done on multicultural training program contents as follows:

1. Cultural awareness programs of difference recognition in values, attitudes, behavior, and communication existing across cultures (Welch, Tanke, & Glover, 1988);
2. Social interactions programs of international guests and co-workers and non-verbal communications programs including cultural orientation (Tung, 1981 & 1993); and
Studies of multicultural training illustrated the training methods as follows:

1. In-house training packages as part of cross-cultural transfer (Shames, 1986); and
2. Joint education programs for creating schools of its own and customized education programs with community agencies and private schools (Cox, 1993).

The following are two examples of the type of specific information elicited in the survey questions.

Multicultural training contents:

In your estimation what percentage of your total training time is allocated to the following multicultural components?

- awareness training,
- sensitivity training,
- spectrum policy,
- conflict resolution,
- communication training,
- language training

Multicultural training methods:

What type of methods do you use to teach your program?

- on-the-job training,
- simulation,
- lecture-pupil instruction,
- interactive video,
- seminar,
case studies,
joint programs with educational institute,
mentor program,
new member orientation,
minority advisory groups

REASONS FOR MULTICULTURAL TRAINING

Multicultural training may be structured to enable the individual to develop skills, acquire knowledge, and increase sensitivity to diverse cultures. In addition, the training can build bridges between people from different cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, multicultural training emphasizes learning potential available in cross-cultural encounters by taking advantage of cultural diversity as opportunities more than as problems (Cox, 1991).

Black & Mendenhall (1990) stated that multicultural training was generally effective as a means of facilitating effective cross-cultural interactions, and as a way of developing greater feelings of well-being and self-confidence in dealing with diverse people. In addition, multicultural training is thought to provide skills related to improving relationships and decreasing negative perceptions relative to diverse culture members.

In order to collect information on the reasons hospitality organizations initiated multicultural training programs, the following questions are proposed:

1. What reasons motivated your company to commit to the multicultural training strategic planning for incorporating cultural diversity,
the organization's diverse workforce,
the organization's diversified customer base, 
government mandate (AA, EEOC)

2. What are the specific goals of the content of the multicultural training program conducted by your organization? 
develop technical skills, 
acquire knowledge, 
increase sensitivity, 
appreciate and respect other cultures, 
facilitate cross-cultural interactions, 
decrease negative perceptions, 
increase employee teamwork

MULTICULTURAL TRAINING DETERRENCES

Despite the literature supporting the benefits of multicultural training, there appeared to be few multicultural training practices in the industry. It seems that the quoted reasons (cost, no use, no trainer, no international guests, or no diverse employees) do not explain the real cause (Gamio & Sneed, 1992). The real deterrents may be the presence of high turnover rates of employees, the organization's view of the need for training to initiate such programs, lack of incentives and/or motivation, or problems with training effectiveness in other areas.

The following question is proposed for the study to collect information in this area:

Which do you feel most deter the development and use of multicultural training programs in franchise foodservice organizations?
high turnover rates,
no use and/or necessity,
lack of support from top management,
time,
cost,
difficulty in implementing,
lack of specialized trainer,
few culturally diverse employees,
few culturally diverse customers

MULTICULTURAL TRAINING SUCCESS

Companies that send individuals into a multicultural work setting expect trained individuals to perform well. Thus the relationships of cross-cultural training to job success is a critical concern: Does such training help job performance in the cross-cultural work setting, or are its effects negligible in the hospitality industry?

There have been studies which examined the relationship between cross-cultural training and job performance success. The study found a positive relationship between cross-cultural training and job performance (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). In their extensive literature review, Black and Mendenhall (1990) found three variables to be indicators of multicultural training success: cross-cultural skill development, adjustment, and job performance. In their empirical study, Porter and Lawler (1968) argued that ability, motivation, opportunity, and role perceptions were the key indicators of the performance. Jeffcoate (1981) suggested cross-cultural understanding, skills, attitudes, and experiences of diverse culture as four emphasis categories in cultural diversity training programs.
Based on prior studies and the nature of this study, training effectiveness or success is measured by structuring a multi-dimensional reference. The measurement of the training effectiveness used for this research covers the following three dimensions:

1. **Interpersonal Skills** includes greater responsiveness to customers, increased cooperation and trust between co-workers, more acceptance of diverse cultures, and more information about specific job tasks.

2. **Job Performance** includes efficient communication, enhanced company loyalty, and job satisfaction.

3. **Perceptions/Attitudes** includes decreased stereotypes, cultural barriers, language barriers, and positive attitude changes.

The following survey items on the success of multicultural training are based on the works of Black & Mendenhall (1991), Porter & Lawler (1986), and Jeffcoate (1981).

The following statements have been designed to solicit the feelings about the overall success of your multicultural training program, and whether it is achieving its desired objectives.

**Interpersonal skills** -- greater responsiveness, increased cooperation, trusting morale, more acceptance, specific job task information

**Job performance** -- job satisfaction, employee loyalty, communication, job promotion, operational decision making, corporate image
Perceptions/attitudes -- decreased stereotypes and prejudice, decreased language and communication barriers, positively changed attitudes

3.4. RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to examine the multicultural training practices of the franchise foodservice organizations in the United States through the investigation of current activities of multicultural training, goals for the multicultural training, and reasons for deterring the multicultural training practices. This study, in addition, investigated whether multicultural training is successful in achieving its goals.

Companies who currently have multicultural training programs were asked to provide motivations, goals, components, and evaluations of the training. Non-practice companies were asked about the deterrence factors for development and use of multicultural training programs.

3.4.1. SAMPLE SELECTION

Franchise foodservice organizations were selected for this study. In an attempt to get a mailing list of foodservice organizations, the researcher was able to obtain the list from Worldwide Franchise Directory (1992). This franchise directory lists all franchise names and last known addresses in the U.S.

Franchise systems has also been adequately established within the economy, with ample opportunity for training, and many have units nationwide and worldwide. Its size was seen as increasing the possibility of a larger number of response from companies that practice multicultural training.
3.4.2. DATA COLLECTION METHOD

A mail survey was used as the method of data collection in the research (The full instrument is found in Appendix A). The questionnaires were to franchise foodservice organizations. The questionnaire contained two sections: general company information and multicultural training practices information. The questionnaire was circulated among selected faculty and graduate students in the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management at Virginia Tech to pre-test the questionnaires. Their input was used to refine the final questionnaire which was sent out to the franchise foodservice organizations.

The questionnaire sent to the foodservice organizations consisted of 24 questions for companies that currently practice the training and 5 questions for the non-practicing companies. The questionnaire was accompanied by a pre-paid postage envelope and a cover letter with departmental letterhead addressing the nature of the research and requesting the respondent to cooperate. They were sent via first class mail with hand-written addresses on a department envelop to increase the response rate. Respondents were promised a copy of the findings as an incentive for responding.

3.5. SUMMARY

This chapter presents research methodology and an overview of the questionnaire. Current multicultural training will be operationalized by asking training activities in detail. Training success will be operationalized by asking training manager’s opinions of the multicultural training practices at multi-dimensional levels. The data collection method will be through a mail survey. A total sample of 300 franchise foodservice organizations were selected. The results of descriptive analysis and cross-tabulation will be presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapters presented the research questions and proposed a data collection methodology of the mail survey and overview of the questionnaire in terms of cultural diversity training activities, training deterrence factors, and measurement of the training effectiveness. The purpose of this chapter is to present the results in descriptive analysis due to this study's exploratory nature.

4.2. RESPONSE RATE

The data for this study were collected through the use of a questionnaire. The mailing list of foodservice organizations from the *Worldwide Franchise Directory* (1992) were selected and surveys were sent out to franchise restaurants in the United States. A total of 300 questionnaires were sent out between April of 1994 and May of 1994 across the United States. The data were collected between April of 1994 and June of 1994. Table 2 presents a total of 61 completed questionnaires, 3 (5%) were received from current cultural diversity training practice companies and 58 (95%) from non-practice companies. There were 30 questionnaires that were undeliverable and returned. Allowing for the undelivered surveys, this yielded a response rate of 23%. Table 1 summarizes the number of responses obtained from returned surveys.
Table 1. Response rate from company-owned franchise restaurants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of survey mailed</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-delivered</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of surveys returned</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unusable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total response</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Percentage of cultural diversity training practice companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

This section will present responses to the questions asked to foodservice organizations about cultural diversity training practices. There are two major categories: general organization information and cultural diversity training information. Twenty additional questions were included for cultural diversity training practice companies. Responses to these questions are presented after the general organization information.

4.3.1. General Organization Information

1. Percentage of Company-Owned Units

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which units within the organizations were company-owned. As can be seen from Table 3, 44.2% of franchise foodservice organizations reported 0% - 19% company-owned units out of their total franchise units, followed by 21.3% reporting 20% - 39% company-owned units, 19.7% reporting 80% - 100% company-owned units, and 8.2% foodservice organizations reporting 40% - 59% company-owned units.
### Table 3. Franchise Unit Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Company-Owned Units</th>
<th>Number of Companies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% - 100%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% - 79%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% - 59%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% - 39%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 19%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 61 100.0
2. Estimated racial composition of the workforce

Respondents were asked to estimate the composition of the workforce in their company-owned foodservice organizations. Data presented in Table 4 shows 37.7% of the foodservice organizations estimate their workforce to be comprised of 60% - 79% White/Anglo employees, followed by 23.0% reporting 80% - 100% White/Anglo employees in their workforce. Ninety-one point two percent foodservice organizations estimate 0% - 39% of African American employees, 96.7% of foodservice organizations report 0% - 39% Hispanic American employees, and 93.4% report 0% - 19% Asian and other ethnic workers in their workforce.

Current employment figures for 1994 (non-seasonably adjusted) report 12,402,000 Black, 10,436,000 Hispanic, and 103,037,000 White workers in the civilian workforce (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1994). The total workforce is estimated to be 166,755,000. This would place the Black and Hispanic workforces at approximately 7.4% and 6.3% respectively. Thus, the estimated racial compositions of these companies far exceed national estimates.

3. Estimated racial profile of the customers

Respondents were asked to describe the ethnic profile of their overall customer base. The data presented in Table 5 shows that a substantial percentage of the responding firms (73.8%) view their customers as being predominantly White individuals, i.e., from 60% to 100%. Figures on the civilian (non-institutional) population include 11.6% Black and 9.1% Hispanic individuals (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1994). Using these figures as comparisons, it appears that the reporting companies in this study, to a significant extent, estimate the racial composition of their customers to be higher than the national percentages.
Table 4. Estimated racial composition of the workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>White Anglo n (%)</th>
<th>African American n(%)</th>
<th>Hispanic American n(%)</th>
<th>Asian American &amp; Other n(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% to 100%</td>
<td>14(23.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 79%</td>
<td>23(37.7)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% to 59%</td>
<td>16(26.2)</td>
<td>2(9.8)</td>
<td>2(3.3)</td>
<td>2(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% to 39%</td>
<td>8(13.1)</td>
<td>35(32.8)</td>
<td>22(36.1)</td>
<td>2(3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% to 19%</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>35(57.4)</td>
<td>37(60.6)</td>
<td>57(93.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Estimated racial profile of the customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>White Anglo n(%)</th>
<th>African American n(%)</th>
<th>Hispanic American n(%)</th>
<th>Asian American &amp; Other n(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% to 100%</td>
<td>20(32.8)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 79%</td>
<td>25(41.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% to 59%</td>
<td>2(19.7)</td>
<td>2(3.3)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% to 39%</td>
<td>4(6.5)</td>
<td>20(32.8)</td>
<td>16(26.2)</td>
<td>4(6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% to 19%</td>
<td>0(0.0)</td>
<td>39(63.9)</td>
<td>45(73.8)</td>
<td>57(93.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2. Research Questions

Four research questions were addressed in this study. Three of these research questions, numbers one, two, and four, relate to the basic cultural diversity training activities carried on by organizations, specific goals of training, and their perceived success. Data from companies (n=3) presently engaged in these activities were analyzed to address these questions. The remaining research question, number four, investigated the primary factors thought to deter the implementation of such training. Data received from all companies (n=61) was used for its analysis.

1. Research Question 1

"What are the current cultural diversity training activities taking place in the hospitality industry?"

Respondents were asked to specify the reasons that motivated their organizations to commit to cultural diversity training. The three companies having such training responded that "strategic planning for incorporating cultural diversity" as a primary reason for committing to the training. Two additional companies indicated that such training was necessary due to "government (or legal) mandate" (see Table 6). As seen in Table 4 and 5 the respondents' workforce and customers are regarded as highly diverse, when compared to natural figures. This would not explain why diversity, both in terms of workforce and customer base, were not viewed as overriding concerns for instituting diversity training programs. Only one of the three firms felt that a highly diverse workforce was a reason for initiating their training program.

Methods used in the various cultural diversity training programs reported by companies are presented in Table 7. Two of the three companies reported using on-the-
job training, lecture-pupil instruction, and workshops or seminars. One company combined these with mentor programs, new member orientation, and minority advisory groups. None used joint programs with an educational institute or interactive video and CD-ROM. It appears there is a better likelihood for the use of traditional training methods (on-the-job training, lecture-pupil instruction, and workshops) than for more innovative methods (interactive video or CD-ROM or joint programs with an educational institute). Company 3 appeared to be somewhat more progressive in its training methods due to its adoption of mentor programs, new member orientation, and minority advisory groups designed for minorities.

Foodservice organizations were asked to estimate the percentage of the training time allocated for a variety of cultural diversity components. The results, found in Table 8, shows that foodservice organizations place heavy importance on communication components (exploring differences in communication styles) by allocating 45.7% of their training time to that component. They appear to also stress sensitivity training components, i.e. exposing prejudice and hostility toward different people (30%), conflict resolution training (18.3%), and recognition or awareness components (6.7%). No time allocation was reported for language training or spectrum policy, i.e. preserving the identity of original cultures. Lack of the former is surprising given the estimated percentages of Hispanics in both the company's workforce and customer pool.

It was interesting to note how each company used different mixes in their training programs. Company 1 allocated its training time equally among communication components, sensitivity training components, and conflict resolution components. Company 3, on the other hand, invested 80% of its training time to communication components and 10% to both sensitivity components and awareness.
Company 2 emphasizes sensitivity training (50%) but also includes in its program communication components and conflict resolution (25% each).

Companies responding to the survey were asked how they evaluated their cultural diversity training programs. As Table 9 indicates, all three companies reported that they evaluated their training programs in some way. All reported the evaluation of the content of their programs; two of the three reviewed their training methods. In addition to these two factors Company 3 also reported that it further evaluated training facilities. Cost-benefit effectiveness, and contribution of the program to job performance were not employed as evaluative methods. This could be due to the substantial amount of time, experience, and developing costs necessary for such evaluation to occur. Such methods are also much more difficult to employ in comparison to those reported by the companies.
Table 6. Reasons for cultural diversity training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Company 1</th>
<th>Company 2</th>
<th>Company 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning for incorporating cultural diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government (legal) mandate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's highly diverse workforce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization's highly diverse customer base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Methods of cultural diversity training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Company 1</th>
<th>Company 2</th>
<th>Company 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on-the-training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecture-pupil instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops or seminars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simulation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor programs for minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new member orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority advisory groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint programs with an educational institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactive video or CD-ROM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8. Time allocation of cultural diversity training program components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Diversity Components</th>
<th>Percentage of total training time allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Company 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Training</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Training</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum Policy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Evaluation of cultural diversity training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Company 1</th>
<th>Company 2</th>
<th>Company 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Benefit Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Research Question 2

"What are the primary goals that influence hospitality firms to institute cultural diversity training?"

Table 10 presents data relating to the goals reported by the responding foodservice organizations for instituting their training programs. It appears that increasing sensitivity about cultural diversity was viewed as the most goal of cultural diversity training. All three companies reported this to be important. Acquiring knowledge, respecting and appreciating diverse cultures, decreasing negative perceptions, and increasing employee teamwork were also reported as goals for at least two of the three companies.

Company 1 seemed to set its goal for cultural diversity training much more broadly than the others by including increasing sensitivity, appreciating and respecting diversity, decreasing negative perceptions, and increasing teamwork and overall productivity. Company 2 on the other hand set the goals more narrowly, and included increasing sensitivity, acquiring knowledge, and decreasing negative stereotypes and perceptions. Company 3 fell between these two companies.

To some extent, the training goals of Company 1 and Company 3 are slightly more productivity-oriented in that they included the goals of increasing teamwork and overall productivity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Goals</th>
<th>Company 1</th>
<th>Company 2</th>
<th>Company 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase sensitivity about cultural diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire knowledge about cultural diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease negative perceptions &amp; stereotypes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate &amp; Respect other cultures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase employee teamwork</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase overall productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop technical skills in dealing with diverse cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate cross-cultural interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Research Question 3

"What are the primary factors that deter hospitality firms from instituting cultural diversity training?"

Table 11 presents the reasons perceived by respondents in the foodservice organizations for the deterrence factors of development and use of cultural diversity training programs. The scale was used from 1=the most important factor, 2 =next most important factor, to 9= least important factor.

Data from all respondents (n=61) were used to investigate this question. 62.3% of respondents ranked high turnover rates of employees as the most important deterrence factor of instituting cultural diversity training programs. It should noted that the mean for this factor (Mean=2.3, SD=2.0) is substantially higher (using reverse scaling) than for subsequently important factors such as Cost (Mean=4.3, SD=2.1), Time (Mean=4.4, SD=1.9), and Difficulty (Mean=4.7, SD=2.4). The data suggest that even in the absence of the latter three factors, training programs may not be instituted because of problems with turnover.

Though Cost, Time, and Difficulty in implementing such programs are ranked as the second, third, and fourth deterrence factors, these appears to be significant deterrents among respondents in their rankings. For example, though 62% of the respondents (n=38) felt Cost to be an "important" to most important factor in deterrence for training programs, 48% indicated responses in the less important area of the scale. A similar pattern emerged for Time and Implementation difficulty.

The factors thought to be of least important to the deterrence of such programs were the presence of diverse employees (Mean=6.1, SD=2.2), and the presence of diverse customers (Mean=7.1, SD=2.2). This ranking coincides with the reasons that
the study's three companies gave for instituting cultural diversity training programs. That is, none of the three saw such diversity as an overriding reason for developing such programs. However, as mentioned earlier, it does not necessarily coincide with minority employment and population measures.
Table 11. Deterrence factors of cultural diversity training program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Least Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>3  4  5  6  7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High turnover</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>38 4</td>
<td>2  8  5  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2  10</td>
<td>14 12 6 7 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2  8</td>
<td>12 14 8 0 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2  17</td>
<td>6  2 8 12 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of specialist</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8  4</td>
<td>6  6 11 4 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2  13</td>
<td>8  7 6 0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2  0</td>
<td>9  4 12 14 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few diverse employees</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2  5</td>
<td>4  2 3 13 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few diverse customers</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3  0</td>
<td>0  6 2 9 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD= Standard Deviation
4. Research Question 4

"Are current cultural diversity training programs successful in achieving their goals?"

Respondents were asked to estimate the overall success of their cultural diversity training programs. To gather this information respondents were asked about the success of their programs in three different areas: interpersonal skills, job performance, and perceptions/attitudes. Tables 12 to 14 present this data.

As Table 12 shows, respondents agreed that their programs had achieved success in increasing the interpersonal skills of their employees in all five areas included in the survey: greater responsiveness to diverse customers, increased cooperation among diverse workers, improved morale and work atmosphere, more acceptance to diverse values, and more information about cross-cultural job tasks.

Survey respondents either agreed that success was achieved or were neutral in the area of overall effectiveness of job performance (See Table 13). They appear to believe that training was most successful in terms of achieving enhanced job satisfaction or productivity, and promoting more efficient communication between unit manager and employees. The goals of increasing employee loyalty, and improving a corporate image which emphasize diversity where achieved by at least two companies. Finally, it is interesting to note that two respondents were neutral in their feelings concerning their program's success in promoting for diverse employees and developing better business or operational decision making. The remaining respondents agreed that these goals had been met.

Finally respondents were asked about their perceptions of the success of their company's cultural diversity training program in achieving positive perceptions/attitude
changes. Their responses were similar to those expressed in influencing job performance. That is, they expressed either agreement or neutrality concerning success in decreasing stereotypes, reducing prejudices, and positively changing attitudes, and decreasing language and communication barriers (See Table 14).

Fifteen statements on the training effectiveness tell us that respondents are in agreement on achieving more in terms of interpersonal skills, which may be achieved relatively short-time period, than achieving the goals of improved job performance and decreased perceptions/attitudes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items in Interpersonal Skills</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not an objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater responsiveness to diverse customers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased cooperation among diverse workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved morale and work atmosphere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More acceptance to diverse values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More information about cross-cultural job tasks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Overall success of job performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Items</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not an objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items in Job Performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced job satisfaction or productivity</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient communication</td>
<td>0 3 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased loyalty</td>
<td>0 2 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved corporate image emphasizing diversity</td>
<td>0 2 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More promotion for diverse employees</td>
<td>0 1 2 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better decision making</td>
<td>0 1 2 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Overall success of perceptions/attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Items</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not an objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items in Perceptions/Attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased stereotypes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced prejudices</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively changed attitudes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased language and communication barriers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. SUMMARY

This chapter presented with the results of the data analysis. The mail survey was conducted over the two month period which yielded an 23.0% response rate from franchise foodservice organizations. Of the completed surveys, 4.9% of foodservice organizations (n=3) currently implement cultural diversity training.

44.2% of the respondents reported 0% - 19% company-owned units. The majority of the workforce and customers in these companies are estimated to be White but significant percentage include individuals who are African American and Hispanic American.

Respondents indicated that the high turnover rates of employees was what they conceded to be deterrence factor of implementing cultural diversity training programs. This was followed by the cost associated with such training, and the time associated with such training. Incorporating cultural diversity as the strategic planning was regarded as the biggest motivator for committing to cultural diversity training programs. The major goals indicated for cultural diversity training goals were to increase cultural sensitivity and acquire knowledge about cultural diversity. Most of the time allocated for training programs was in the areas of communication and sensitivity training.

It appears that cultural diversity training programs were perceived as more successful in achieving interpersonal skills in dealing with culturally diverse people than in improving job performance and decreasing perceptions/attitudes towards diverse customers and co-workers.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1. INTRODUCTION
The preceding chapter presented the survey results of this study in the area of cultural diversity training practices in the franchise restaurants. The purpose of this chapter is to present an overview and discussion of the study's results, discussions, limitations, and recommendations for future study.

5.2. OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS
The purpose of this study was to examine current practices of cultural diversity training in foodservice organizations by investigating the training program motivation, goals, methods, time allocation of training components, evaluation, and overall success of the program itself. Perceived success of the cultural diversity training was measured in terms of interpersonal skills, job performance, and perceptions/attitudes. The results also focused on the deterrence factors of developing and using cultural diversity training programs. Data were collected through mail surveys of 300 foodservice organizations in the United States.

The mail survey was conducted over the two month period. Three companies with cultural diversity training programs and 58 companies without such programs responded to the survey, with a resulting 20.3% response rate. Gamio and Sneed(1992) found that about 30% of hotels provide cultural diversity training programs for their employees. Why does the foodservice industry have less of a percentage of companies instituting cultural diversity training than that of hotel industry? Is the number of employees in the hotel unit larger than that of foodservice
organizations? Is the number of culturally diverse customers and employees in hotels larger than that of foodservice?

The most important deterrence factors for instituting cultural diversity training programs found for foodservice organizations were high turnover rates of employees, cost associated with such training, and time associated with such training. The results do not fully support past research of the hotel industry's deterrence factor since the former study did not list high turnover rates of employees as deterrence factor (Gamio & Sneed, 1992). Respondents in this study cited strategic planning for incorporating cultural diversity in the organization as the main reason for instituting cultural diversity training. The organizations seem to achieve training goals by setting cultural sensitivity increase and diversity knowledge acquisition as major goals of the training programs. To achieve the training goals, foodservice organizations allocate much of their cultural diversity training time on communication, sensitivity training, conflict resolution, and awareness components. The hotel industry on the other hand appears to include language training as a major component of cultural diversity training (Gamio & Sneed, 1992). Foodservice organizations do not provide language (including second language) training as a training component. It is said that the number of employees in the foodservice organization unit is less than that of the hotel unit. The above fact may be one of the deterrences for not instituting language training as a cultural diversity training component. It would be very good if we could match the racial composition of the employee to the customer base. Then, we may not have to employ language training in the foodservice organizations. Or we may employ language training in most highly diverse units first and then, expand to remaining foodservice units.
Foodservice organizations generally adopt more traditional training methods for their cultural diversity training such as on-the-job training, lecture-pupil instruction, and seminar than more innovative approaches such as the use of CD-ROM or interactive video. It is argued that multimedia training using CD-ROM or interactive video reduces employee training time, and improve learning and retention and multimedia training programs are an efficient means of training for technical skills and conceptual development (Harris & West, 1993). Developing simulation, case studies, and interactive video or CD-ROM material for the foodservice work environment may require substantial amount of training experience and developing costs.

Training success was measured in terms of interpersonal skills, job performance, and perceptions/attitudes. The reason why the respondents may have perceived more success in improving interpersonal skills for dealing with culturally diverse people is that interpersonal skills might be improved within a relatively short time period, and, is more easily noticeable than enhanced job performance and positively changed perceptions and attitudes. The effectiveness measurement of the cultural diversity training needs more elaboration and in-depth study. A longitudinal study would be useful to measure relatively long-term success such as job performance and perceptions and attitudes. People may feel differently about the effectiveness or success of cultural diversity training. The training materials and contents may not reflect the real necessity of each employee's different needs in the foodservice organization's culturally diverse work environment. We may need to look again whether we have a training specialist fit for the cultural diversity training. Because we may need a specialist to train culturally diverse people than homogeneous people.
5.3. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Due to a limited sample size, the results of this study can not be generalizable to the population of all foodservice organizations in the United States. The topic of this study may be sensitive to some foodservice organizations. It would be a much easier task if the study had received full support and cooperation from the franchise foodservice organizations. For future study, it is recommended that formal support be solicited from the International Franchise Association to expand the sample size and thus increase response rate.

This study is exploratory in nature and is meant to provide insight and raise questions for further development and investigation of the subject. It is believed that such investigation may provide ways for more detailed empirical study to test a hypothesis and, furthermore, produce substantial theories concerning the variables of importance in measuring effectiveness of cultural diversity training.

The results do not attempt to generalize the deterrence factors, information, and success measurement of cultural diversity training programs. Many survey questions were eliminated on the final version of the questionnaire to achieve a desirable and comfortable length for the study. This may limit the breadth of the study. Although a longitudinal study is ideal for measuring cultural diversity training effectiveness, time and financial constraints restricted a longitudinal design, thus limiting the depth of the findings.
5.4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The use of longitudinal research design would enable the investigation of how cultural diversity training effectiveness changes through the planned time. The cultural diversity training effectiveness may vary from employee to employee with different cultural backgrounds, experiences, and learning abilities. Therefore we may need to set up a limited time frame (i.e. 3 years after the cultural diversity training) to see if we are successful in achieving the training goals. Furthermore, it is highly recommended that a study be conducted on how different training methods, traditional ones (on-the-job training and lecture-pupil instruction) and innovative ones, (interactive video or CD-ROM), affect the training success.

Questions on overall cultural diversity training success did not satisfactorily provide an in-depth understanding of the training success. The measurement of cultural diversity training effectiveness is not a question that can be easily answered by a few structured questions. A more in-depth, less structured case study of the training practice foodservice organizations can be conducted with a company's full support, before any attempt to consider the hypothesis. The measurement of cultural diversity training effectiveness requires further refinement. More variables, such as knowledge about the specific job tasks on cross-cultural interactions and awareness level of cultural diversity, can be included and expand the discussion on how to measure the success of the cultural diversity training. It is believed that a qualitative longitudinal study would be most suitable to further explore the measurement of cultural diversity training success. A qualitative approach would make up for the small and limited sample, and a longitudinal study would provide the depth of the study.
5.5. SUMMARY

This study was exploratory in nature and thus raised many questions. The objective of the study was to investigate deterrence factors and overall success of cultural diversity training programs. A total of 300 foodservice organizations were surveyed by using a structured questionnaire. Sixty-one franchise foodservice organizations participated in the study, yielding a response rate of 20.3%. High turnover rates of employees was found to be the most important deterrence factor of instituting cultural diversity training programs. Also, cultural diversity training motivations, goals, and allocation time of the training contents were investigated. Through 15 questions, cultural diversity training effectiveness was limitedly investigated.

The findings were satisfactory in terms of deterrence factors, however they leave room for improvement and refinement in the section of training success measurement. Nevertheless, the study provides a contribution to the body of knowledge on cultural diversity training and hospitality literature and paves the way for future research.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
Survey Instrument
SURVEY OF MULTICULTURAL TRAINING PRACTICES
IN COMPANY-OWNED RESTAURANT UNIT

Section I: General organization information

This section intends to identify franchise unit control, composition of the workforce, profile of the customers, and multicultural training information.

1. Approximately what percentage of your total franchise units are company-owned?

   ___%

2. Please describe the composition of the workforce in your company-owned restaurant units? (use EEO-1 form)

   ___% White/Anglo
   ___% African-American
   ___% Hispanic-American
   ___% Asian-American
   ___% Other

3. How would you describe the ethnic profile of your overall customer base?

   ___% White/Anglo
   ___% African-American
   ___% Hispanic-American
   ___% Asian-American
   ___% Other

4. Does your organization have a multicultural training program?

   ___ Yes    ___ No

The question below is seeking reasons that deter instituting multicultural training program.

5. Please rank those factors (1=most important, 2=next most important and so on) which you feel most deter the development and use of multicultural training programs in franchise foodservice organizations.
___ High turnover rates of employees
___ No apparent need for such training
___ Lack of support from top management
___ Time associated with such training
___ Cost associated with such training
___ Difficulty in implementing such training
___ Lack of multicultural training specialists
___ Few culturally diverse employees in the organization
___ Few culturally diverse customers in the organization

IF YOU DO NOT PRESENTLY HAVE A MULTICULTURAL TRAINING PROGRAM PLEASE STOP HERE.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT IN FILLING OUT THE SURVEY.
PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ACCOMPANYING ENVELOPE TO;
Charles Lee, Department of HTM, Va Tech, Blacksburg, Va, 24060

Section II: Information on multicultural training practices in your organization

Questions 6 and 7 are about reasons to institute multicultural training in foodservice organizations.

6. What reasons motivated your company to commit to multicultural training? (please check all that apply)

___ strategic planning for incorporating cultural diversity
___ the organization's highly diverse workforce
___ the organization's highly diverse customer base
___ government mandate (AA, EEOC)
___ other (please specify): ________________

7. What are the specific goals of the content of the multicultural training program conducted by your organization? (check only those that apply to the basic content of your program, not those that are by products of having such a program).

___ to develop technical skills in dealing with diverse cultures
___ to acquire knowledge about cultural diversity
___ to increase sensitivity about cultural diversity
___ to appreciate and respect other cultures

71
___ to facilitate cross-cultural interactions
___ to decrease negative perceptions and stereotypes about other culture members
___ to increase employee teamwork
___ other (please specify): ____________________________

The questions below (Q-8 to Q-10) are about the current multicultural training activities, such as methods, contents, time allocation of multicultural components, and evaluation of the foodservice organizations.

8. What types of methods do you use to teach your program? (check all that apply)

___ on-the-job training
___ simulation
___ lecture-pupil instruction
___ interactive video or CD-ROM
___ workshops(discussion groups) or seminar
___ case studies
___ joint programs with an educational institute
___ mentor programs for minority employees
___ new member orientation program
___ minority advisory groups

9. In your estimation what percentage of your total training time is allocated to the following multicultural components?

___ % recognition or awareness training (discovering value and individual uniqueness)
___ % sensitivity training (exposing prejudice and hostility toward different people)
___ % spectrum policy (preserving the identity of original culture)
___ % conflict resolution (exploring differences and solving problems)
___ % communication (exploring differences in communication styles)
___ % language training (including second language)
___ % other (please specify): ____________________________

10. What parts of your program are evaluated? (check all that apply)

___ the training methods
___ the training content
___ the training facilities
___ cost-benefit effectiveness
___ the contribution of the program to job performance
___ we do not evaluate the program
The following statements are designed to obtain the overall effectiveness of the organization's multicultural training program to see if it is achieving its desired objectives.

The following statements have been designed to solicit your feelings about the overall success (gain) of your multicultural program, i.e. whether it is achieving its desired objectives. Please circle the appropriate response for each item using the following scale:

1 - strongly agree           4 - disagree
2 - agree                    5 - strongly disagree
3 - neutral                  6 - not an objective of our program

INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
Greater responsiveness in dealing with diverse customers.......................... 1 2 3 4 5 6
Increased cooperation among culturally diverse co-workers.........................1 2 3 4 5 6
More trusting morale and open work atmosphere among diverse co-workers....1 2 3 4 5 6
More acceptance to different values of diverse cultures..........................1 2 3 4 5 6
More information about the specific job tasks about cross-cultural interactions1 2 3 4 5 6

JOB PERFORMANCE
Enhanced job satisfaction or productivity in cross-cultural interaction...........1 2 3 4 5 6
Increased employee loyalty and communication by recognizing unique cultures..1 2 3 4 5 6
More efficient communication channels between unit manager and employees..1 2 3 4 5 6
More promotion opportunities for diverse employees.................................1 2 3 4 5 6
Better business or operational decision making........................................1 2 3 4 5 6
Improved corporate image which emphasizes cultural diversity.....................1 2 3 4 5 6

PERCEPTIONS/ATTITUDES
Decreased stereotypes of culturally diverse co-workers.............................1 2 3 4 5 6
Reduced cultural prejudice of culturally diverse team members..................1 2 3 4 5 6
Decreased language and communication barriers among diverse employees.....1 2 3 4 5 6
Positively changed attitudes towards diverse customers and employees..........1 2 3 4 5 6

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.
PLEASE RETURN IT IN THE ACCOMPANYING ENVELOPE TO;
Charles Lee, Department of HTM, Va Tech, Blacksburg, Va, 24060
APPENDIX B:
Cover letter for franchise foodservce organizations
May 5, 1994

Dear sir / madam:

I am a graduate student in the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management at Virginia Tech collecting data about company-owned franchise restaurants to complete my Master's Thesis. Your restaurant has been randomly selected from the Franchising Opportunity Directory.

Please help me and take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. The questionnaire contains questions regarding your organization's multicultural training practices. Once completed, please return the questionnaire to Virginia Tech in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by May 25, 1994 or fax to (703) 231-8313. These data will be used only for the purpose of research and all information received in this study will be held in strict confidence.

Even if you do not have multicultural training program, please complete and return section 1 of the questionnaire.

If you have any questions concerning the survey, please feel free to contact me at (703) 552-8115.

Thank you for help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Charles Lee
Assistant Researcher at Va Tech
APPENDIX C:
Questionnaire for franchise foodservicer organizations
QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF MULTICULTURAL TRAINING PRACTICES
IN COMPANY-OWNED RESTAURANT UNITS

Section I: General organization information

1. Approximately what percentage of your total franchise units are company-owned?
   ___%

2. Please describe the composition of the workforce in your company-owned restaurant units?
   (use EEO-1 form)
   ____% White/Anglo
   ____% African-American
   ____% Hispanic-American
   ____% Asian-American
   ____% Other

3. How would you describe the ethnic profile of your overall customer base?
   ____% White/Anglo
   ____% African-American
   ____% Hispanic-American
   ____% Asian-American
   ____% Other

4. Does your organization have a multicultural training program?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

5. Please rank those factors (1=most important, 2=next most important and so on) which you feel most
deter the development and use of multicultural training programs in franchise foodservice
organizations.
   ____ High turnover rates of employees
   ____ No apparent need for such training
   ____ Lack of support from top management
   ____ Time associated with such training
   ____ Cost associated with such training
   ____ Difficulty in implementing such training
   ____ Lack of multicultural training specialists
   ____ Few culturally diverse employees in the organization
   ____ Few culturally diverse customers in the organization

IF YOU DO NOT PRESENTLY HAVE A MULTICULTURAL TRAINING PROGRAM
PLEASE STOP HERE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT IN FILLING OUT.
PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ACCOMPANYING ENVELOPE TO:
Charelis Lee, Department of HTM, Va Tech, Blacksburg, Va, 24060
Section II: Information on multicultural training practices in your organization

6. What reasons motivated your company to commit to multicultural training? (please check all that apply)

___ strategic planning for incorporating cultural diversity
___ the organization's highly diverse workforce
___ the organization's highly diverse customer base
___ government mandate (AA, EEOC)
___ other (please specify): __________________________

7. What are the specific goals of the content of the multicultural training program conducted by your organization? (check only those that apply to the basic content of your program, not those that by products of having such a program).

___ to develop technical skills in dealing with diverse cultures
___ to acquire knowledge about cultural diversity
___ to increase sensitivity about cultural diversity
___ to appreciate and respect other cultures
___ to facilitate cross-cultural interactions
___ to decrease negative perceptions and stereotypes about other culture members
___ to increase employee teamwork
___ other (please specify): __________________________

8. What types of methods do you use to teach your program? (check all that apply)

___ on-the-job training
___ simulation
___ lecture-pupil instruction
___ interactive video or CD-ROM
___ workshops(discussion groups) or seminar
___ case studies
___ joint programs with an educational institute
___ mentor program for minority employees
___ new member orientation program
___ minority advisory groups

9. In your estimation what percentage of your total training time is allocated to the following multicultural components?

___ % recognition or awareness training (discovering value and individual uniqueness)
___ % sensitivity training (exposing prejudice and hostility toward different people)
___ % spectrum policy (preserving the identity of original culture)
___ % conflict resolution (exploring differences and solving problems)
___ % communication (exploring differences in communication styles)
___ % language training (including second language)
___ % other (please specify): __________________________
10. What parts of your program are evaluated? (check all that apply)

- the training methods
- the training content
- the training facilities
- cost-benefit effectiveness
- the contribution of the program to job performance
- we do not evaluate the program

The following statements have been designed to solicit your feelings about the overall success (gain) of your multicultural program, i.e. whether it is achieving its desired objectives. Please circle the appropriate response for each item., using the following scale:

1 - strongly agree, 4 - disagree
2 - agree, 5 - strongly disagree
3 - neutral, 6 - not an objective of our program

**INTERPERSONAL SKILLS**
- Greater responsiveness in dealing with diverse customers........................................ 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Increased cooperation among culturally diverse co-workers...................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- More trusting morale and open work atmosphere among diverse co-workers............ 1 2 3 4 5 6
- More acceptance to different values of diverse cultures......................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- More information about the specific job tasks about cross-cultural interactions..... 1 2 3 4 5 6

**JOB PERFORMANCE**
- Enhanced job satisfaction or productivity in cross-cultural interaction.................... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Increased employee loyalty and communication by recognizing unique cultures...... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- More efficient communication channels between unit manager and employees........... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- More promotion opportunities for diverse employees............................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Better business or operational decision making..................................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Improved corporate image which emphasizes cultural diversity.............................. 1 2 3 4 5 6

**PERCEPTIONS/ATTITUDES**
- Decreased stereotypes of culturally diverse co-workers....................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Reduced cultural prejudice of culturally diverse team members............................ 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Decreased language and communication barriers among diverse employees.......... 1 2 3 4 5 6
- Positively changed attitudes towards diverse customers and employees.................. 1 2 3 4 5 6

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY.
**PLEASE RETURN IT IN THE ACCOMPANYING ENVELOPE TO:**
Charles Lee, Department of BTM, Va Tech, Blacksburg, Va, 24060
VITA
CHANG-UK (CHARLES) LEE

1211 UNIV. BLVD. APT. R-170, BLACKSBURG, VA, 24060
PHONE: (703)552-8115

EDUCATION
M.S. in Hospitality and Tourism Management, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Va, December 1994

B.S. in Electrical Engineering, HanYang University, Seoul, Korea, August 1987

EXPERIENCE
Graduate Intern, Virginia Tech Culinary Services, Blacksburg, Va, 07/93 to 09/93
- Performed serving at deli-bar, vegetable-bar, salad-bar, and dishwashing
- Communication coordinator between staff and the management

Public Relations Manager, Seoul Palace Hotel, Seoul, Korea, 08/90 to 08/91
- Coordinated advertising for the Palace Hotel in Korean and international publications
- Responsible for public relations with English speaking hotel guests
- Accomplished as the official English Translator for the hotel
- Made hotel sales brochures such as fact sheets, room rate tariffs and hotel greetings

Marketing Assistant Manager, Seoul Palace Hotel, Seoul, Korea, 08/89 to 07/90
- Developed marketing strategy for marketing director
- Led sales task force for American corporations in Seoul
- Coordinated cross-department weekly-marketing meetings among sales, front office, and food & beverage departments

Front Desk & Reservation Clerk, Seoul Palace Hotel, Seoul, Korea, 08/88 to 07/89
- Monitored the check-in and check-out of guests
- Assisted business center in English translation work
- Created weekly and monthly "front desk operation" reports
- Assisted room reservations manager in weekly and monthly tasks
- Wrote weekly & monthly reports to the general manager for the room reservations department

English Teacher, Seoul Tourism and Translation Institute, Seoul, Korea, 08/88 to 08/91
- Taught beginning level tourism English
- Taught intermediate level tourism English
- Participated in publication of English Tour Guide

Systems Operator, STM, Seoul, Korea, 08/87 to 07/88
- Responsible for operating IBM 3090 System Resources at Integrated Processing Center
- Education coordinator between EDS and Gold Star
- Taught Korean employees on IBM 3090 operating system

HONORS/ACTIVITIES
Director of the Korean Catholic Student Association at Va Tech, 01/92 to 12/93

Official English translating volunteer for the 1988 Seoul Olympics at the Sheraton Hotel, Seoul, Korea, 08/88 to 09/88

Director of YoungDong Junior High Alumni Association at HanYang University, 09/83 to 07/87