CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the study described in the previous chapter. The chapter is divided into three parts. The first part of the chapter describes the survey response data collection procedures and the sample. The second part of the chapter addresses the data analysis in relation to the 11 hypotheses. The final part of the chapter profiles the results of the study.

Survey Response

Nine hundred and ninety-eight surveys were mailed to members of AH&MA. A total of 144 surveys were returned for a response rate of 14.43 percent. Four of the surveys were incomplete and one was returned because of an address change. Thus the remaining 139 created a usable response rate of 13.93 percent.

Non-Response Bias

Eight hundred and fifty-four surveys were not returned. This high non-response rate is not uncommon with surveys in the hospitality and tourism industry, specifically those regarding diversity (Gamio & Sneed, 1992; Gregory & Hughes, 1996; and Lee, 1994). The fact that the study was a mail survey is another factor contributing to the high non-response rate. In an attempt to better understand the non-response bias, individuals who did not respond were contacted by telephone. Using the data bank rented from AH&MA, individuals were randomly selected for a follow-up call. Approximately 12 non-respondents were contacted by telephone. Their comments as to why they did not respond to the survey are found on Table 4.1. It should be noted that these comments were very similar to the feedback given from the participants of the pre-test and pilot tests. Respondents were not willing to complete the survey over the phone. This did not allow for a comparison of respondents and non-respondents. However, a comparison of early and late respondents was completed.

Surveys were coded according to the time of response. Two groups were identified. The groups were labeled "on-time" and "late" according to their response time. Crosstabs and frequency distributions were analyzed to test for homogeneity of responses across the two groups. Visual profiles indicated no inherent differences existed in the data. The frequencies revealed that each of the variables when compared across times had similar response distributions. Crosstabs were run to quantitatively test for differences in the data.

According to the chi-square tests of independence (Pearson and Likelihood Ratio) there were no differences between the two groups for the distribution of responses in 49 out of 50 diversity management training initiatives and no differences between the 13 demographic questions. The analysis of the data using the crosstabs and frequencies supported the assumption that no inherent differences existed between the groups based on response time. Thus, the data were combined for further analysis.

Table 4. 1 Comments From Non-Respondents

Non-respondents	Comments as to why the survey was not filled out
Non-respondents 1, 8, & 10	Time - the lack of time to fill out the survey; the survey was too long
Non-respondents 2 & 9	Lost survey - misplaced the survey and didn't receive a second one, just a post card.
Non-respondent 3	Time and Lack of Necessity - the lack of time; did not feel it was necessary to fill out the survey because the company does not offer such a program.
Non-respondent 4	Non-participant - the company offers the program, but I do not participate. So why bother? Not worth while. We should just get along. It's just another buzzword.
Non-respondent 5	Did not receive the survey.
Non-respondents 6 & 12	I knew nothing about the program. We do not have the need for such a program in my hotel.
Non-respondent 7	My company does not offer multicultural programs; therefore I did not feel that I could assist.

Data Analysis

This section will discuss the procedures used to analyze the data, describe the sample, and give the results of the analysis in relation to each of the hypotheses. It is subdivided into five sections. The first four sub-sections correspond to the four parts of the survey. The fifth subsection addresses the 11 hypotheses. Descriptive Statistics, Multiple Regression, ANOVA, Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient, Spearman's Rank-order Correlation Coefficient, and Two-Mean T-test were used to analyze the data and will be further explained within the appropriate sections.

Demographics

The sample in this study consisted of managers in the lodging industry. These individuals were members of AH&MA and were subscribers to Lodging Magazine. Respondents represented purchasing, food and beverage, housekeeping and engineering, and sales and marketing managers.

The mean year of birth for survey respondents was 1958, which corresponds to an average age of 41. Sixty-six and seven-tenths percent of all respondents were males. Seventy-three and two-tenths percent were white and the vast majority (56.8%) held at least a bachelor's degree. The average length of time with their present employers was close to seven years (6.9 years). Forty-three percent (n=58) of all respondents represented food and beverage operations (9.6% managers, 26.7 directors, and 6.7% executive chefs). The salaries were somewhat evenly distributed between the $20,000 to $39,999 and $40,000 to $59,999 groups, with the latter of the two receiving the largest percentage at 33.6%. Please refer to Table 4.2 for a demographic profile of the survey respondents.

Respondents were also asked if they considered themselves a member of an identifiable (diverse) group. Fifty and four-tenths percent of respondents (n=66) to the survey said they did consider themselves to be members of an identifiable (diverse) group. Reasons for the respondents' diversification groupings varied. The most frequently selected diverse groups were gender (56.3%), nationality (32.4%) and mental ability (25.4%). Sexual orientation rounded off the most frequently selected diverse

groups with (23.9%) of all respondents; please refer to Table 4.2 for the remaining portion of the demographics.

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics for Part IV - Demographics

Description	N	Mean or Valid Percent
Year of Birth	137	1958 - mean
Gender		
Female	46	33.3
Male	92	66.7
Racio-Ethnicity		
Asian	8	5.8
Black	14	10.1
Hispanic/Latino	7	5.1
Native American	2	1.4
White	101	73.2
Other	6	4.3
Education		
High School/GED or Less	21	15.1
Technical/Vocational	25	18.0
Bachelors	79	56.8
Masters Degree	4	2.9
Other	10	7.2
Time with Company	139	6.9 years - mean
Current Position		
Engineering	6	4.4
Housekeeping managers	4	3.0
Housekeeping directors/ Executives	17	12.6
F&B managers	13	9.6
F&B directors	36	26.7
F&B executive chefs	9	6.7
Front office managers	8	5.9
Front office directors	4	3.0
General management	10	7.4
Human Resource managers	4	3.0
Security directors	3	2.2
Service directors	7	5.2
Miscellaneous	14	10.4

Table 4.2 continued		
Description	**N**	**Mean or Valid Percent**
Salary		
Under 20,000	4	3.1
20,000 to 39,999	41	31.3
40,000 to 59,999	44	33.6
60,000 to 79,999	30	22.9
80,000 to 99,999	7	5.3
100,000 or more	5	3.8
Member of a Diverse Group		
Yes	66	50.4
No	65	49.6

Company and Work Environment Profile - Part I

The company and work environment profile of the respondents follows. Thirty-three and three tenths percent of all surveyed (n=45) worked at properties that were affiliated with international chains. Thirty-eight and seven tenths percent of all respondents (n=53) represented lodging properties located in downtown areas. The property size hovered around the 150-300 and 301-450 groupings with 28.30% (n=39) and 27.50% (n=38), respectively. Thirty and seven tenths percent (n=42) of all individuals surveyed worked at properties with between 150-299 employees.

Collectively, the majority of the respondents worked at medium sized properties located in downtown areas. It can further be suggested that these properties represent the major chains because of their international affiliation. Please refer to Table 4.3 for a full profile of a descriptive summary of Part I - Company and Work Environment.

Table 4.3
Descriptive Summary Profile of Part I - Company and Work Environment

Description	N	Valid Percent
Property Ownership		
International chain	45	33.3
National chain	27	20.0
Franchise	21	15.6
Independently owned	42	31.1
Property Location		
Airport	14	10.2
Downtown	53	38.7
Resort	34	24.8
Suburb	24	17.5
Highway	12	8.8
Property Size		
0-150 rooms	12	8.7
151-300 rooms	39	28.3
301-450 rooms	38	27.5
451-600 rooms	16	11.6
More than 600 rooms	33	23.9
Number of Employees		
Less than 150	23	16.8
150-299	42	30.7
300-449	32	23.4
450-600	15	10.9
More than 600 employees	25	18.2

Personal Outputs: General Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment - Part II

The Taylor and Bowers (1972) general satisfaction scale was used to profile respondent satisfaction based on six principal items. These items were satisfaction with one's workgroup, supervision, the job itself, the organization, pay, and progress/mobility. Respondents used a 5-point likert scale (1=very dissatisfied to 5= very satisfied) to voice their level of dissatisfaction or satisfaction with the aforementioned items. Individual scores could have ranged from a minimum of 7 to a maximum of 35, with the higher score representing a higher level of one's overall satisfaction. Variable mean scores ranged from a low of 3.23 on “satisfaction with the organization” to a high of 4.09 on “satisfaction with the job” The overall mean composite score for respondents was 26.62, which indicated that most respondents were satisfied with their work situations. A total of

138 cases were reviewed. Please refer to Table 4.4a for a full profile of the descriptive summary on these personal outputs.

Table 4.4a

Descriptive Summary Profile of Part II - Personal Outputs: General Satisfaction

General Satisfaction Variables	%	%	%	%	%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	
Satisfaction with workgroup	.7	2.9	18.7	59.0	18.7	3.92
Satisfaction with supervision	3.6	2.9	19.4	42.4	31.7	3.96
Satisfaction with job	.7	2.2	12.9	56.1	28.1	4.09
Satisfaction with organization	.7	6.5	19.4	48.9	24.5	3.90
Satisfaction with pay	5.	18.0	36.0	30.9	10.1	3.23
Satisfaction with progress	.0	8.6	23.0	38.1	30.2	3.90
Satisfaction with getting ahead	4.3	10.9	26.1	35.5	23.2	3.62

1- very dissatisfied through 5- very satisfied

The Cook and Wall's Organizational Commitment Scale was used to profile respondents with regard to their organizational identification, involvement and loyalty. The organizational commitment scale will be used to measure organizational identification and job involvement. Additionally the scale will provide a measure of loyalty, a personal input. Using a seven-point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree with a high score reflecting a higher level of commitment, individual scores could range from 9 to 63. Survey question mean scores ranged from a low of 4.55 (on question #4 "Being reluctant to change employers") to a high of 6.23 (on question #6 "Making some effort for myself and the organization"). In studies conducted by Cook & Wall the survey instrument's mean scores were 44.64 and 45.37 (Cook, et al., 1981). The mean composite respondents score for the present study was 50.50, which indicated that the majority of respondents were "quite" committed to the organization. Please refer to Table 4.4b for a full profile of the descriptive summary of these personal outputs.

Table 4.4b Descriptive Summary Profile of Part II - Personal Outputs: Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment Variable	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Proud to tell	.7	.7	5.8	6.5	10.1	36.0	40.3	5.94
Feel like leaving the organization – a	18.8	29.0	18.1	15.2	8.0	8.0	2.9	5.00
Not willing to put myself out – a	37.5	39.0	14.0	3.7	1.5	2.2	2.2	5.92
Reluctant to change employers	5.0	12.9	9.4	20.1	14.4	23.0	15.1	4.55
I feel a part of the organization	1.4	3.6	3.6	7.2	11.5	38.8	33.8	5.76
Making effort – myself & organization	-	.7	.7	4.3	5.0	47.5	41.7	6.23
A bit more money to change job	3.6	6.5	7.9	10.1	10.8	38.8	22.3	5.24
Would not recommend joining the staff – a	40.3	23.7	10.1	9.4	8.6	6.5	1.4	5.53
Knowledge of contribution pleasing	-	.7	.7	4.3	47.5	5.0	41.7	6.49

1 – strongly disagree through 7 – strongly agree

a - statements were re-coded so that “5”, “6”, and “ 7” represent positive satisfaction and organizational commitment levels and “1”, “2”, and “3” represent negative satisfaction and organizational commitment levels.

Diversity Management Training Initiative Importance and Involvement Profile - Part III

Using a five-point likert scale, diversity management training initiatives were rated based on their perceived level of importance, with 1=very unimportant to 5=very important. Please refer to Table 4.5 for a full profile of the importance ratings of the 50 diversity management training initiatives given by all survey respondents. Mean scores ranged from a low of 3.13 on "teleconferencing" to a high of 4.55 on "sexual harassment training." These items have been bolded on Table 4.5 for ease of identification. Please note that all mean scores were greater than 3.

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics for Importance of Diversity Management Training Initiatives- All Respondents

Initiative	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Speeches	131	3.66	1.26
Videos	124	3.44	1.31
Teleconferencing	**122**	**3.13**	**1.16**
Executive forum	127	3.46	1.23
Corporate vision	130	3.95	1.16
Corporate mission	133	3.96	1.16
Corporate policy	132	4.02	1.20
Written policy	131	3.96	1.16
Senior management behavior modeling	129	4.03	1.16
Section in the handbook on diversity	127	4.09	1.08
Employee newspaper	131	3.76	1.12
Second language programs	131	3.82	1.24
Newsletter or status report	127	3.35	1.21
New manager discussion	129	3.94	1.14
Diversity briefings for senior managers	127	3.82	1.10
Sexual harassment training	**135**	**4.55**	**.95**
Diversity awareness integrated in exec education	129	4.03	1.05
Diversity awareness training for managers	131	4.13	1.06
Integrating diversity into other programs	26	4.27	.83
Cross-race/gender training teams	131	3.81	1.17
Task force and teams	130	3.53	1.20
Study groups	128	3.53	1.29
Focus groups	129	3.25	1.26
Diversity council	128	3.25	1.25
Corporate advisory committees	127	3.19	1.25
Business unit steering committee	123	3.50	1.15
Networking groups	127	3.30	1.23
Identification of high potential employees	131	3.41	1.02
Public posting of positions	133	3.97	1.11
Developmental assignments	131	4.18	1.08
Career path planning	133	3.86	.99
Individual development planning	131	4.22	.97
Exec MBD programs	127	4.23	1.22
Minority internships	126	3.44	1.14
Self development planning	131	3.67	1.01
Developmental programs for non-traditional employees	127	4.06	1.02
ESOL	131	3.56	1.14
Remedial education	124	3.88	1.05
Linking diversity performance to corporate objectives	125	3.54	1.11
Developing diversity performance measures	119	3.59	1.15
Defining and rewarding behaviors	127	3.51	1.18
Performance tied to team bonuses	125	3.71	1.30
Internal diagnostic studies	122	3.34	1.25
Attitude surveys	127	3.77	1.22
Benchmarking	125	3.53	1.21
Total quality strategy integration	124	3.55	1.19
Stand alone diversity position	120	3.18	1.22
Responsibilities added to EEOC and AA	119	3.47	1.10
Flexible managers	129	4.19	.98
Policies	126	3.98	1.01

1 = Very Unimportant through 5 = Very Important

The mean perceived level of importance of the diversity management training initiatives were calculated separately for those respondents who indicated that the initiative was offered by their company. Please refer to Table 4.6. Mean scores ranged from a low of 3.64 on "teleconferencing" to a high of 4.65 on "sexual harassment training." Please note that all mean scores were greater than 3. Those individuals who had been involved with diversity management training programs, in general, had more positive feeling towards the importance of the diversity management training initiatives than those who had not been involved.

Table 4.6 -Descriptive Statistics for Importance of Diversity Management Training Initiatives - Initiative Offered by Company

Initiative	N	% of Sample	Mean	Std. Deviation
Speeches	58	4.33	4.05	1.09
Videos	41	30.8	3.97	1.13
Teleconferencing	22	16.4	3.64	1.14
Executive forum	42	32.1	3.80	1.16
Corporate vision	62	47.3	4.30	.96
Corporate mission	71	53.4	4.27	.98
Corporate policy	73	54.9	4.31	1.00
Written policy	71	53.0	4.27	.99
Senior management behavior modeling	61	46.6	4.34	.96
Section in the handbook on diversity	74	55.6	4.26	.99
Employee newspaper	46	34.8	4.33	.88
Second language programs	68	51.5	4.24	1.03
Newsletter or status report	28	21.4	4.15	1.05
New manager discussion	60	45.5	4.27	.94
Diversity briefings for senior managers	42	32.3	4.19	.92
Sexual harassment training	116	87.2	4.65	.87
Diversity awareness integrated in exec education	49	37.4	4.37	.93
Diversity awareness training for managers	67	51.1	4.30	1.05
Integrating diversity into other programs	11	44.0	4.33	.71
Cross-race/gender training teams	43	34.1	4.40	.94
Task force and teams	29	22.0	4.45	.78
Study groups	25	18.9	4.12	1.30
Focus groups	26	20.0	3.85	1.19
Diversity council	14	10.6	4.36	1.15
Corporate advisory committees	30	22.7	4.14	1.22
Business unit steering committee	18	13.7	4.11	.96
Networking groups	21	16.0	3.81	1.25
Identification of high potential employees	45	33.8	4.34	.75
Public posting of positions	86	66.2	4.40	1.02
Developmental assignments	64	48.5	4.33	.83
Career path planning	72	55.0	4.30	.99
Individual development planning	80	61.1	4.37	.88
Exec MBD programs	18	13.7	4.06	.94
Minority internships	43	32.8	4.05	.91
Self development planning	63	48.8	4.31	.86
Developmental programs for non-traditional employees	30	23.3	4.00	.93
ESOL	66	50.0	4.32	.81
Remedial education	30	23.3	4.28	.80
Linking diversity performance to corporate objectives	29	22.3	4.17	.93
Developing diversity performance measures	24	18.6	4.22	.74
Defining and rewarding behaviors	31	23.7	4.37	1.03
Performance tied to team bonuses	26	20.0	4.35	1.02
Internal diagnostic studies	15	11.7	3.67	1.05
Attitude surveys	55	42.6	4.22	.94
Benchmarking	24	18.9	4.21	.66
Total quality strategy integration	34	26.8	4.12	.89
Stand alone diversity position	17	13.6	3.71	1.36
Responsibilities added to EEOC and AA	30	24.2	3.79	1.18
Flexible managers	73	57.5	4.44	.75
Policies	63	49.6	4.20	.81

1 = Very Unimportant through 5= Very Important

Hypotheses

This portion of the analysis is divided into 11 sections. Each section profiles the results of a hypothesis. Hypotheses will be restated along with their appropriate statistical techniques followed by the results.

Research Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between age of employees and DMTI.
Statistical Technique Used: Pearson's Product Correlation Coefficient

The bivariate test of significance (Pearson Product Correlation) revealed that there was no relationship between the year of birth and DMTI. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was not accepted. The expectation that the research hypothesis will fail to be accepted in favor of the null hypothesis was true. The Pearson correlation was -.086 with a 2-tailed significance of .318. The low non-significant correlation was indicative of a negative sloping relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it would not be possible to predict one variable from the other (Black, 1993).

Research Hypothesis 2: There is a relationship between educational level of employees and DMTI.
Statistical Technique Used: Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient.

A commonly used nonparametric measure of correlation between two ordinal variables, this bivariate test of significance (Spearman's Rho Correlation) revealed that there was no relationship between the educational level and DMTI. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was not accepted. The expectation that the research hypothesis will fail to be accepted in favor of the null hypothesis was true. The Spearman's Rho Correlation was -.010 with a 2-tailed significance of .905. The low non-significant correlation was indicative of a negative sloping relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it would not be possible to predict one variable from the other (Black, 1993).

Research Hypothesis 3: There is a relationship between involvement gender of employees and DMTI.
Statistical Technique Used: Two Mean T-test

The two independent sample t-test comparing two groups of cases on one variable revealed that there was no relationship between gender and DMTI. According to the test, of significance, the research hypothesis was not accepted. The 2-tailed significance was .370. The expectation that the research hypothesis will fail to be accepted in favor of the null hypothesis was true. The results indicate that the mean scores of DMTI on females and males were not significantly different for the two independent groups. (See Table 4.7)

Table 4.7 - Gender Test of Significance

	Equal Variance Assumed	**Equal Variance Not Assumed**
F	.009	
Sig.	.925	
T	.009	.898
Dt	136	89.768
Sig. (2-tailed)	.370	.371
Mean difference	8.90	8.90
Std. Error Difference	9.89	9.91
95% confidence	Lower	Upper
	-10.66	28.47
	-10.78	28.59

Research Hypothesis 4: There is a relationship between loyalty of employees and DMTI.
Statistical Technique Used: Multiple Regression and Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients

The Multiple Regression analysis revealed that there was a relationship between the loyalty of an employee and DMTI. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was accepted. With an R-value of .278, Adjusted R Square of .057, F value of 3.75, the model was significant at the .013 level. The low R Square value was indicative of the weak, yet significant, explanatory power of the regression equation (Black, 1993). Therefore, a significant proportion of the variance of DMTI was explained by loyalty of employees. Three survey questions or predictors defined the sub-construct entitled - loyalty of an employee. "I sometimes feel like leaving this organization for good" had a significant correlation with the diversity management training involvement of .236 with a 2-tailed significance of 0.01 level and carried the highest Beta of .170. "Even if the firm were not doing well financially, I would be reluctant to change to another employer" had a significant correlation of .200 with a 2-tailed significance of 0.05 and carried a Beta of

.113. "The offer of a bit more money with another employer would not seriously make me think of changing my job" had a significant correlation of .179 with a 2-tailed significance at the 0.05 level and carried a Beta of .083, thus contributing the least to the model. Please refer to Table 4.8

Table 4.8 - Loyalty's Model Summary

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the estimate	
		.278	.077	.057	53.12	
		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Regression		31764.083	3	10588.028	3.752	.013
Residual		378155.518	134	2822.056		
Total		409919.601	137			
		DMTI	**Feel like leaving**	**Reluctant to change**	**Money not enough**	
DMTI	**Pearson Correlation**	1.000	.236**	.200**	.179*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005	.018	.035	
	N	139	138	139	139	

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

Research Hypothesis 5: There is a relationship between racio-ethnic backgrounds of employees and DMTI.
Statistical Technique Used: ANOVA

This hypothesis was not testable. Due to the small sample size of most of the racio-ethnic groups, neither ANOVA nor the nonparametric counter part Krushal -Wallis could be run.

Research Hypothesis 6: There is a relationship between seniority of employees and DMTI.
Statistical Technique Used: Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient

The bivariate test of significance (Pearson Product Correlation) revealed that there was a relationship between the length of time with one's present company and DMTI. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was accepted. The Pearson correlation of .281 was significant at the 0.01 level with a 2-tailed significance of .001. The low significant correlation was indicative of a positive sloping relationship between

the two variables. Given the significant relationship between seniority and DMTI, it is possible to predict one variable from the other (Black, 1993).

Research Hypothesis 7: There is a relationship between DMTI and job/career satisfaction.
Statistical Technique Used: Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient

The bivariate test of significance (Pearson Product Correlation) revealed that there was no relationship between DMTI and job/career satisfaction. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was not accepted. The expectation that the research hypothesis would fail to be rejected was false. The Pearson correlation of .155 was not significant. The 2-tailed significance was .069. The low correlation was indicative of a negative sloping relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it would not be possible to predict one variable from the other (Black, 1993).

Research Hypothesis 8: There is a relationship between DMTI and organizational identification of an employee.
Statistical Technique Used: Multiple Regression and Pearson's Product Correlation Coefficients

The Multiple Regression analysis revealed that there was no multivariate relationship between DMTI and organizational identification of an employee. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was not accepted. With an R-value of .197, Adjusted R Square of .017, F value of 1.817, the model's significance was .147. Therefore, a significant proportion of the variance of DMTI was not explained by organizational identification of employees. Further investigation into the sub-construct's survey questions using Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients revealed partial support for the research hypothesis. Three survey questions defined the construct organizational identification of an employee. "I am quite proud to be able to tell people who I work for" did not have a significant correlation with diversity management training involvement. The Beta weight of .032 was the second greatest in the model. "I feel that I am a part of the organization" had a significant correlation of .195 with a 2-tailed significance of 0.05 and carried a Beta of .169. This survey question had the greatest influence on the model. "I would not recommend joining our staff to a close friend" did not have a significant

correlation with DMTI. This question carried a Beta of .013, thus contributing the least to the model. Please refer to Table 4.9

Table 4.9 - Organizational Identification 's Model Summary

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the estimate	
		.197	.039	.017	54.08	
		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Regression		15939.80	3	5313.28	1.817	.147
Residual		394794.37	135	2924.40		
Total		410734.23	138			
		DMTI	**Proud to Tell**	**Feel part of organization**	**Would not recommend**	
DMTI	**Pearson Correlation**	1.000	.141	.195*	.111	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.097	.022	.193	
	N		139	139	139	

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

Research Hypothesis 9: There is a relationship between DMTI and job involvement of an employee.
Statistical Technique Used: Multiple Regression and Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients

The Multiple Regression analysis revealed that there was no relationship between DMTI and job involvement of employees. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was not accepted. With an R value of .108, Adjusted R Square of -.011, F value of .518, the model's significance was .670. Therefore, a significant proportion of the variance of DMTI was not explained by job involvement. Further investigation into the sub-construct survey questions using Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients substantiated the multivariate results and gave no partial support for the research hypothesis. Three survey questions defined the sub-construct job involvement of an employee. DMTI did not have a significant correlation with "To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the organization would please me." The Beta weight of .071 was the greatest in the model. DMTI did not have a significant correlation with "I'm not willing to put myself out just to help the organization." It carried a Beta weight of -.058. DMTI did not have significant correlation with "In my

work I feel like I am making some effort, not just for myself but for the organization as well." This question carried Beta weight of .045. Please refer to Table 4.10

Table 4.10-Job Involvement 's Model Summary

Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the estimate	
		.108	.012	-.011	55.00	
		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Regression		4703.43	3	1567.81	.518	.670
Residual		399235.33	132	3024.51		
Total		403938.76	135			
		DMTI	**Knowledge of contribution**	**Not willing to self out**	**Making effort**	
DMTI	**Pearson Correlation**	1.000	.098	-.036	.075	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.251	.675	.383	
	N	139	139	136	139	

Research Hypothesis 10: There is a relationship between DMTI and compensation of employees.
Statistical Technique Used: Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient

The bivariate test of significance (Pearson Product Correlation) revealed that there is no relationship between DMTI and compensation of employees. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was not accepted. The Pearson Correlation was .027 with a 2-tailed significance of .750. The low non-significant correlation was indicative of a positive sloping relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it would not be possible to predict one variable from the other (Black, 1993).

Research Hypothesis 11: There is a relationship between DMTI and opportunities given to an employee.
Statistical Technique Used: Regression and Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient

The Multiple Regression analysis revealed that there was a multivariate relationship between DMTI and opportunities given to an employee. According to the test of significance, the research hypothesis was accepted. With an R of .270, Adjusted R Square of .059, F value of 5.304, the model's significance was .006. Therefore, a significant proportion of the variance of DMTI was explained by opportunities given to

an employee. Further investigation into the sub-construct's survey questions using Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients revealed one of the survey questions had a significant relationship with involvement in a diversity management training program. Two survey questions defined the sub-construct entitled opportunities given to an employee. "How satisfied are you with the progress you have made in this organization up to now?" did not have a significant bivariate correlation with DMTI. Its Beta weight was -.162. "How satisfied are you with your chances for getting ahead in this organization in the future?" had a significant correlation of.239 at the 0.005 level (2-tailed) with DMTI. Please refer to Table 4.11

Table 4.11 – Opportunity's Model Summary

Model		**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the estimate**	
		.270	.073	.059	53.07	
		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Regression		29881.86	2	14940.93	5.304	.0006
Residual		380250.78	135	2816.67		
Total						
			DMTI	**Satisfied with getting ahead**	**Satisfied with progress**	
DMTI	**Pearson Correlation**		1.000	.239**	.053	
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.005	.533	
	N		139	138	139	

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

Profile of Collective Constructs Representing General Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

While none of the 11 generated hypotheses directly addressed the relationships shared between DMTI and overall general satisfaction and organizational commitment, Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients were run to further expand the exploratory findings of the study. The Taylor and Bowers (1972) and Cook and Wall (1980) scales were kept in tack and used to create collective rank scores for all respondents. These scores were then matched with DMTI and analyzed using the biviarate statistical technique. What follows are the results from those tests.

General Satisfaction

Based on the Taylor and Bowers (1972) General Satisfaction Scale, a collective construct representing the respondents overall general satisfaction was created. This was developed using a composite score of the 7 survey questions (Table 4.4a). Respondent's general satisfaction had a significant correlation at the 0.05 level with diversity management training involvement. The Pearson Correlation was .198 with a significance of .020. This indicated that there was a relationship between one's overall satisfaction and DMTI. The significant correlation was indicative of a positive sloping relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it would be possible to predict one variable from the other (Black, 1993). A total of 138 cases were reviewed.

Organizational Commitment

Based on the Cook and Wall's (1980) Organizational Commitment Scale a collective construct representing the respondents overall organizational commitment was created. This was developed using a composite score of the 9 survey questions (Table 4.4b). The collective construct representing the respondents overall organizational commitment had a significant correlation at the 0.05 level with DMTI. The Pearson Correlation was .221. This indicated that there was a relationship between one's organizational commitment and DMTI. The significant correlation was indicative of a positive sloping relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it would be possible to predict one variable from the other (Black, 1993).

A total of 135 cases were reviewed.

Other Findings of the Study

Again for the sake of exploratory research, other survey questions have been asked and analyzed in hopes of better understanding diversity management training programs in the lodging industry. The following section is based on two questions posed on the survey instrument regarding the perceived effectiveness of diversity management training programs.

Effectiveness of Diversity Management Training Programs

Forty-three and eight tenths percent (n=60) of respondents felt that diversity management training programs were effective for minority employees. Similarly, 43.4% (n=59) felt that these same programs were effective for non-minority employees. Of those surveyed, 46.7% (n=63) stated that, in their opinion, their company did offer a diversity management training program. When employees were asked how they thought their human resource mangers would respond to the same question 57% (n=77) said they thought that the human resource manager would say that their company offered a diversity management training program. Please refer to Table 4.12 for a profile of the complete percentages.

Table 4.12 - Effectiveness of Diversity Management Training Programs

Description	N	Valid Percentage
Effective for minority employees		
Very ineffective	5	3.6
Ineffective	18	13.1
Neither	47	34.3
Effective	60	43.8
Very effective	7	5.1
Effective for non-minority employees		
Very ineffective	5	3.6
Ineffective	19	14.0
Neither	44	32.4
Effective	59	43.4
Very effective	9	6.6
Company offers a diversity management training program?		
Yes	63	46.7
No	72	53.3
In your opinion, what would your HR managers response be if asked the same question?		
Yes	77	57.0
No	58	43.0

Summary

With a response rate of 13.93 (n=139), the average age of respondents was 41. The majority of the managers were white (73.2%), yet 50.4% of all respondents considered themselves a member of a diverse group. At least a bachelors degree was

held by 56.8% of those responding. The largest group of respondents (43%) worked in the food and beverage departments in the lodging facilities. The length of time with the present company was 6.9 years. The majority of the respondents work at medium-sized properties located in downtown areas. It can further be suggested that these properties represent the major chains because of their international affiliation

The analysis revealed that two out of the five testable personal inputs shared significant relationships with the DMTI of lodging managers. These inputs include loyalty and seniority. Significant relationships were not found between three personal inputs (age, educational level, and gender) and DMTI. Racio-ethnic backgrounds could not be tested.

Revealed also in the analysis were the relationships between the involvement with DMTI and employee personal outputs. DMTI and opportunities given to employee shared a significant relationship. Partial support was found for the relationship between DMTI and organizational identification. The remaining three personal outputs job/career satisfaction, job involvement, and compensation did not have significant relationships with DMTI.

When reviewing the composite scores of the overall general satisfaction scale (Taylor & Bowers, 1972) and the overall organizational commitment scale (Cook & Wall, 1980) both constructs were found to have significant relationships with the diversity management training involvement of lodging managers. Thus, overall general satisfaction and organization commitment are correlated DMTI of lodging managers.