

# 國立嘉義大學97學年度

## 休閒事業管理研究所博士班招生考試試題

科目：社會科學研究方法（含基礎統計）

一、請閱讀下篇論文，並嘗試回答相關問題：

- (1) 請提出研究架構（含架構圖），並列出可能的研究假設。(5分+5分)
  - (2) 本研究如何進行抽樣？抽樣單位為何？(4分+3分)
  - (3) 何謂中介變數及調節變數？本研究中，Service Behavior 扮演何種角色？請說明其原因。(6分+5分)
  - (4) 本研究如果要進行統計分析，請問分析單位（analysis unit）該如何設計？(5分)
  - (5) 為了釐清變數之間的關係，本研究需要引進控制變數之使用，請問何謂控制變數？該如何選取？如何應用統計方法來進行控制？(3分+3分+3分)
  - (6) 本研究可使用何種統計方法來進行相關假設之檢定？(5分)
  - (7) 作者所認為的研究價值為何？(3分)
- ※請以中文作答。

Title: Promoting Service Quality with Employee Empowerment in Tourist Hotels: The Role of Service Behavior

### Introduction

Delivering quality service is considered an essential strategy for success and survival in today's competitive environment. The special feature of a service industry is the contact and interaction between service providers (employees) and service acceptors (customers). The quality of the service encounter plays an important role for the operation practice of a corporation. Therefore, how to provide better service and retain customers is the key to competitiveness.

Jacobson and Aaker (1987) figured out that if it could generate higher level of customer satisfaction and loyalty for organization by offering higher level of service quality to gain more profit. Factually, customer's satisfaction may only be dependent upon his or her perception about service quality in service encounter. For meeting various demands of customers, employees of service industries should not only behave according to the basic rules and regulations, but also offer expeditious and efficient service to meet customers' satisfaction. In order to achieve the above

objective, how to empower employees with appropriate discretion on their job has become an important issue in the service industry.

The tourist hotel is a typical service industry, offering individual services for tourists. Besides the physical facility, customers' needs include the various service provided by employees. Under keen competition in the tourist hotel industry, how employees offer the best service to customers has become the most important issue for hotel administrators. Due to the intangibility of services and the heterogeneous characteristics of tourist hotels, hotelkeepers must design their own systematic standards of procedure for employees. However, supervisors cannot control the service delivery process too rigidly, because employees need to retain adequate flexibility to satisfy customers within their discretion. From the viewpoint of managerial practice, those hotels, which emphasize individual service, have adopted employee empowerment as a principal credo, so that employees can identify customers' needs promptly and take the initiative to satisfy them.

In the past, a few studies have directly discussed the relationship between employee empowerment and service quality. Sparks, Bradley and Callan [1997] reported that employees who are fully empowered and communicate with customers in attentive manner could evoke more customer satisfaction. Hocutt and Stone [1998] pointed out that if employees could perform with responsiveness and enthusiasm, then customers would be more satisfied in the process of service recovery. In the above studies, the major premise was that service failure had happened. In addition, the authors discussed the satisfaction toward employee empowerment from the viewpoint of the customer, not that of the employee, and empowerment was defined merely as the degree of employee self-determination, which neglected the possible influences caused by healthy environment of empowerment.

The empowered employees might show the customer-oriented service behavior, because they possess more elasticity and capability to match the changeable need of customers. Farrell, Souchon and Durden [2001] indicated that customers' perceptions of service quality would be based almost entirely upon the service behaviors of employees. Customers specially appreciate the service encounter while measuring service quality, therefore service behaviors of employees reveal more important in the service delivery process. Consequently, in service encounters, the empowered employees would present appropriate and flexible service behaviors towards customers, and customers' perceptions of service quality could be improved through the service behaviors of customer-contact employees.

Notwithstanding, most previous researches referred to the measurement of employee empowerment and explore the degree of employee empowerment from the customers' respective, so as to examine the relationship between employee

empowerment and service quality. However, it could not measure the recognition of employee empowerment objectively and strictly from customers' perceptions. Besides, from a purely practical point of view, the inter-connections among employee empowerment, service behavior and service quality may be intuitively appealing.

The current literature indicates a lack of research on the effect of service behavior on the relationship between employee empowerment and service quality. Whether the relationship between employee empowerment and service quality is mediated by service behavior is an issue that deserves to be examined. In other words, through the positive service behavior delivered by empowered employees, the customers' perception of service quality may be improved. Or perhaps, certain aspects of service behavior may disturb the relationship between employee empowerment and service quality. Particularly in the tourist hotel industry, hotelkeepers lay great emphasis on "employee empowerment," "service behavior," and "service quality" for promoting customers satisfaction; consequently, we adopt the tourist hotels as an object to conduct an empirical study.

In this paper, we examine and test the relationship between employee empowerment and service quality in tourist hotels, and the complementary role of the service behavior. Yet, past researches had not been conducted for linking the service behavior performed by service providers and the service quality recognized by customers. Therefore, for linking the viewpoints of organization and customer and reflecting the true relationships among dimensions appropriately, we measure the dimensions of employee empowerment and service behavior from the employees' cognition aspect, and the service quality dimensions from the customers' aspect.

二、請閱讀下列文章，並嘗試回答相關問題：

- (1)請嘗試寫出此論文之「題目」，並說明其研究重要性。(7分)
- (2)請問此論文之「文獻回顧」該如何撰寫？請列出綱要並說明其理由。(8分)
- (3)請嘗試撰寫此論文之「研究設計」，並說明其理由。(10分)
- (4)Table 1, 2, 3 為其研究結果。(a)請解釋每個圖表之統計意涵(9分)；  
(b)試簡要撰寫「研究結果」(10分)；(c)試簡要撰寫「結論與建議」(6分)。

※請以中文作答。

Today the business environment is more competitive and uncertain than in the past. In order to succeed, organizations have to rapidly create new knowledge, products and services. A study of the research literature published over the last decade suggests that some companies have gained benefit from establishing knowledge management (KM) practices. [Parlby \(1998\)](#), [Ahmed, Lim, and Zairi \(1999\)](#) and [Lim, Ahmed, and Zairi \(1999\)](#) have all demonstrated that the benefits include: (a) minimising potential losses on intellectual capital from employees leaving; (b) improving job performance by enabling all employees to easily retrieve knowledge when required; (c) increasing employee satisfaction by obtaining knowledge from others and gaining from reward systems; (d) providing better products and services; and (e) making better decisions. These factors result in retaining and improving competitiveness in the marketplace. In addition, [Beckett's \(2000\)](#) study indicates that KM implementation enables an organisation to eliminate the duplication of knowledge, i.e. to avoid “silo operations”.

KM has been studied in several disciplines. Much of the literature describes KM from an information technology (IT) perspective; a perspective possibly over-emphasised by some scholars and practitioners. IT clearly plays a crucial role in new approaches to managing knowledge. However, as [Nonaka \(1985, 1988\)](#), [Sveiby and Lloyd \(1987\)](#), and [Davenport and Prusak \(2000\)](#) have argued, technology is designed and operated by people, and its contribution to managing knowledge depends on fitting an organizational social context. As [Puccinelli \(1998\)](#) states, “knowledge is fundamentally a product of people and not technology. Sharing is such a valuable component to the success of KM because it focuses on the human side of knowledge (p. 40)”. This human focus is also reinforced by [Buchel and Raub \(2002\)](#). They claim that, as information and knowledge are recorded on devices of IT, sometimes it might be difficult for knowledge receivers to understand the context of the origination of the knowledge.

As a result, individuals play a crucial role in implementing KM practices.

Guthrie (2001) and Stovel and Bontis (2002) indicate that employees are major contributors to overall organisational effectiveness. Consequently, the requirement for employee involvement in organizational knowledge generation is growing in importance. For example, managers can involve employees in developing problem-solving alternatives and enlarging organizational resources. Under these circumstances outcomes can be significantly determined by individual attitudes to learning, sharing and storing knowledge. Yet, in spite of the number of previous KM studies, there seems to be a paucity of research investigating the influence of these factors on knowledge sharing and management.

Recently, increasing numbers of hotels have applied the concept of the profit centre at department level (Arora, 2002). As one department needs a product or service from another, funds are transferred in exchange. This process may lead to the construction of invisible boundaries between departments, and the danger exists that antagonistic rather than collaborative attitudes emerge between competing sections. Therefore, knowledge collecting, sharing and storing may become more difficult. The issue of how this acquiring, sharing and retaining affects hotels' effectiveness has been ignored by academic researchers in hospitality, and apparently also by hotel managers. If these concepts could be applied to business operations, it seems hotel owners could gain valuable assets in terms of knowledge that can improve business competitiveness.

The main purpose of this study is to explore the influence of individual attitudes on the outcomes of KM implementation, in particular of knowledge sharing. The research investigates how individual attitudes to learning, sharing and storing affect knowledge sharing. It also examines how employees process information after they have collected it.

Table 1  
Flow of knowledge (*N* = 499)

Behaviour	Frequency ( <i>n</i> )	Percent
1. Forget it	4	0.8
2. Write it down in a certain place	78	16.0
3. Think about it	55	11.0
4. Directly share with others	34	6.8
5. Think and share with colleagues, and report it to superiors	29	5.8
6. Think about it, share and discuss with colleagues, try to apply it to the work	75	15.0
7. Think, and apply it to the work (trial-and-error); if workable, discuss it with colleagues	60	12.0
8. Think, apply, discuss with colleagues, and report workable cases to superiors; if they agree colleagues pursue the new approach but DON'T update documentation of SOPs	40	8.0
9. Think, apply, discuss with colleagues, and report workable cases to superiors; if they agree colleagues pursue the new approach WITH updating documentation of SOPs	124	25.0

**Table 2**  
Descriptive statistics and reliabilities

Variables	No. of items	Mean	SD	Y	X1	X2	X3
Y Knowledge sharing <sup>a</sup>	12	0.8	4.9	0.9			
X1 Attitude to learning <sup>b</sup>	5	0.9	5.5	0.9	0.7**		
X2 Attitude to sharing <sup>b</sup>	8	0.8	5.5	0.9	0.6**	0.7**	
X3 Attitude to storing <sup>b</sup>	7	0.9	5.8	0.9	0.5**	0.5**	0.5**

Notes: *N* = 499. SD, standard deviation.

<sup>a</sup>7-point scale was used with 1, never; 2, very low; 3, low; 4, moderate; 5, high; 6, very high; 7, extremely high.

<sup>b</sup>7-point scale was used with 1, strongly disagree; 2, disagree; 3, slightly disagree; 4, moderate; 5, slightly agree; 6, agree; 7, extremely agree.

\*\*Significant at the 0.01 level.

**Table 3**  
Regression of individual attitudes on knowledge sharing

Model	Unstandardised coefficients		Standardised coefficient $\beta$	<i>t</i>
	$\beta$	Std. error		
Constant	0.15	0.23		0.67*
Learning attitude	0.45	0.04	0.44	10.13*
Attitude to sharing	0.27	0.04	0.28	6.24***
Attitude to storing	0.79	0.04	0.08	2.07*
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.74			
Adj. <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.54			

*N* = 499.

\**p* < 0.05.

\*\*\**p* < 0.001.