

Hotel Staff Service Sabotage Behavior: Classification and Impact on Consumer Willingness to Pay

Can Chen¹, Junfei Lei¹ & Jingjing Hao¹

¹School of Management, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, P.R. China

Correspondence: Junfei Lei, School of Management, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P.R. China. E-mail: afei19901990@gmail.com

Received: April 27, 2015 Accepted: May 24, 2015 Online Published: July 30, 2015

doi:10.5539/ijms.v7n4p136 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v7n4p136>

Abstract

This paper extracts 18 staff service sabotage behavior in hotels and classifies them into five categories: “negative service attitudes”, “provide wrong service content and information”, “deliberate sabotage behavior”, “delay or not provide service” and “hidden rules”. Next, discuss their negative impact on consumer willingness to pay by separately analyzing roles of genders, ages and educational backgrounds. Results show that (1) Male consumers have higher willing to pay than female consumers and pay more attention on service efficiency. (2) The consumer willingness to pay is negative related with ages and consumers who aged between 25 and 50 focus more in service attitudes. (3) High educational background means low willingness to pay. Interestingly, consumers who educated most rank “hidden rules” as the first, while others rank it as the last.

Keywords: sabotage behavior, hotel staff, classification, willingness to pay

1. Introduction

Staff service behavior is the most important part in improving firms' service quality. When the staff service behavior responses consumer expectations and brings consumers with consumption satisfaction, market needs can be satisfied (Elaine Wallace et al., 2007). From the perspective of service encounter, consumers' purchase decisions are greatly influenced by the staff service behavior. In many cases, the staff is the only intersection between firms and consumers and consumers' willingness to pay can be improved a lot through good staff service credibility, reaction ability, service reliability, empathy ability, and performance (Fiona Harris, 2001). From the perspective of firms, consumers are willing to pay more when they believe firms provide them with good service quality. Once the staffs understand the importance of their service behavior in building a firm brand and the firm culture, they could positively suppress service sabotage behavior caused by ambiguous role and unclear responsibility in work (Lesile de Chernatony et al., 2003).

The term of staff service sabotage behavior had not been clearly proposed until Harris and Ogbonna (2002). In this paper, Harris and Ogbonna define the staff service sabotage behavior as intentional behavior that is deliberately made by organization members and can incur negative impacts. Before Harris and Ogbonna (2002), early researches also have different definitions of the staff service sabotage behavior, but they use other terms to express it. Ackroyd and Thompson (1999) define the service sabotage behavior as staffs' unexpected behavior in daily work. In the definition of Greenberg and Giacalone (1997), the staff service sabotage behavior is a kind of anti-society behavior which includes intentional injury. Robinson and Bennett (2000) define the staff service sabotage behavior as dysfunctional behavior in workplaces. This behavior violates organization laws and is conducted deliberately by organization members, its consequences are harmful to the organization and organization members. The staff service sabotage behavior is also defined as negative actions in firms and can lead to adverse outcomes (decrease profit, market size, or lower consumer loyalty).

Actually, the staff service sabotage behavior is very common in firms. For example, at least 5% employees ever had dishonesty behavior in workplaces, and in an investigation of Slora (1991), this data can be as high as 96%. About 69% to 80% employees have “social loafing” behavior in firms (Boye & Jones, 1997). 33% to 75% employees had dysfunctional behavior, such as stealing, cheating, destruction and absence, in workplaces (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). In addition, the staff service sabotage behavior incurs great economic loss to market. According to Harris and Ogbonna (2009), over 800 thousand US dollars loss were caused by service negligence every year in the late 90s last century, and the staff service sabotage behavior is much harder to be

observed in hotels, we can rationally expect that the staff service sabotage behavior in hotels brings great loss in current years.

Harris and Ogbonna (2002) classify the staff service sabotage behavior by two criteria: covert or overt, routinized or intermittent. Covert means behavior that is hard to be observed by consumers, while overt means behavior that is easy to be observed by consumers; routinized implies standard behavior which is deeply rooted in culture and environment, while intermittent implies accidental and uncommon service behavior.

Many studies try to reveal factors that may trigger the staff service sabotage behavior. Wallace and De Chernatony (2008) demonstrate that unreasonable requirements from consumers may trigger staff's service sabotage behavior or even service retaliation. According to an investigation in a call center, Skarlicki et al. (2008) find that the staff sabotage behavior is positive related with consumers' misbehavior. Based on previous literature and data from interviews, Harris and Ogbonna (2002) propose four factors (individual factor, group and role, organization factor and environment factor) that may lead to the staff service sabotage behavior.

Harris and Ogbonna (2012) point out that the staff service sabotage behavior can result in negative impacts on individual staff, service performance and organization performance. Firstly, after realizing service sabotage behavior in work, individual staff can always feel pressures from his position, self-esteem and job satisfaction. Secondly, the staff service sabotage behavior tremendously decreases staffs' service performance. For example, service errors in service delivery could significantly decrease service quality (Stewart & Chase, 1999). Staffs' service misbehavior would lower consumers' loyalty to firms and hinder relationships between consumers and staffs (Gremler & Gwinner, 2000). Finally, since organization's productivity, profits and growth are closely related with staffs' effective service, sabotage behavior lowers organization's service efficiency, and then decreases organization performance in a long term.

A more detailed research is conducted in Harris and Ogbonna (2006). In this paper, seven factors would influence the service sabotage behavior. These are employees' risk-taking proclivity, employees' need for social approval, employees' desire to stay with and pursue career in current firm, employees' perceptions of the extent of surveillance, employees' perceptions of the extent of cultural control, employees' perceptions of the extent of employee-customer contact, employees' perceptions of labor market fluidity. In terms of individual staff, they believe five outcome variables may exist: employee self-esteem, employees' perceptions of team spirit, employees' perceptions of rapport with customers, employees' perceptions of functional quality, employees' perceptions of company performance.

Traditionally, research in hotel management base on assumption that staffs in hotel can always reach service standards accurately and complete service process effectively, and then provide various strategies in improving hotel service quality and consumer willingness to pay. However, in one investigation of staff service behavior in five hotels, we observe that service sabotage behavior is rather common among staffs (which is also proved by Lee and Ok (2014)), and consumers' willingness to pay can be significantly decreased by these behavior. Considering no study on the staff service sabotage behavior has been made in hotel management, and there has large gap between existing theories and real conditions, we aim at exploring hotel staffs' service sabotage behavior in three aspects. Firstly, generalize typical service sabotage behavior in hotels and classify them into different categories. Next, rank these service sabotage behavior according to their impact on consumer willingness to pay. Reveal roles of genders, ages and educational backgrounds in influencing consumers' purchase decisions. Finally, we try to provide hotels with managerial suggestions to minimize negative impact of the staff service sabotage behavior.

2. Method

2.1 Research Method

This research uses research methods of interview and questionnaire. For comprehensively study the staff service sabotage behavior and its corresponding negative influence on hotels, our paper firstly lists all possible service sabotage behavior in hotels, and then designs questionnaire to examine its feasibility. According to data from the questionnaire, we then classify the staff service sabotage behavior and analyze its negative influence on consumer willingness to pay.

2.2 Questionnaire Design and Data Collection

According to interviews with hotel staffs and feedback from consumers, we extract 18 staff service sabotage behavior in hotels. These are rude language, impatience, negative communication, indifferent attitudes, conceal underserved, exaggerate service quality, mislead customers, delay service time, prolong waiting time, set services barriers, lower service standard, short service process, reduce service content, tease or abuse consumers,

damage consumer property, conceal discount, help colleagues deceive customers and stubbornly adhere to rules.

The questionnaire requests consumers to recall their unsatisfied consumption experience in hotels which caused by the staff service sabotage behavior, and then asks them to evaluate willingness to pay by a Likert 5 scale form (the higher the score, the stronger the willingness to pay). The survey was carried out in Hefei city, Anhui province, P.R. China, and recycled out 800 questionnaires. Eliminate 122 invalid questionnaires, we finally obtain 678 effective questionnaires (the effective rate is 83%). Results of descriptive statistics are as follows. 49.8% male consumers and 50.2% female consumers participate in our survey. Proportions of consumers who aged below 25, between 25 and 50 and over 50 are 42.0%, 50.2% and 7.8% respectively. Consumers who graduated from high school, college/university in bachelor and in master or above are 35.6%, 54.3% and 10.1%, respectively.

3. Data Analysis and Explanation

3.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis

In order to classify 18 staff service sabotage behavior, we choose SPSS18.0 for exploratory factor analysis. (results of KMO test and Bartlett sphere test show: KMO = 0.910, $\chi^2 = 6550.891$, $df = 329$, Sig. value = 0.000). Next, we obtain five main factors by the principal component analysis. Finally, Cronbach Alpha coefficient of reliability test is carried out on the five rotating dimensions. Details of the analysis are shown from Tables 1 to 3.

Table 1. Exploratory factor analysis and reliability analysis

Observation Variable	Principal component matrix with varimax rotation				
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
Rude language	0.741				
Impatience	0.714				
Negative communication	0.700				
Indifferent attitudes	0.695				
Conceal underserved		0.785			
Conceal discount		0.705			
Exaggerate service quality		0.784			
Mislead customers		0.652			
Reduce service content		0.781			
Stubbornly adhere to rules		0.762			
Tease or abuse consumers			0.768		
Damage consumer property			0.791		
Delay service time				0.771	
Prolong waiting time				0.867	
Set services barriers				0.722	
Lower service standard					0.702
Help colleagues deceive customers					0.691
Short service process					0.711
Eigen values	3.978	3.654	3.765	3.186	2.453
Variance Explained /%	12.112	8.346	17.786	10.965	23.145
Total Variance Explained /%	12.112	20.458	38.244	49.209	72.354
Cronbach Alpha coefficient	0.835	0.876	0.819	0.906	0.725

According to the Table 1, we obtain following results: (1) the staff service sabotage behavior is determined by 5 main factors, which implies they can be classified into 5 categories. The total variance explained is 72.354%, which is an acceptable value. Thus, all hotel staff service sabotage behavior belong to 5 catalogues. (2) We name these 5 catalogues as (from factor 1 to factor 5): “negative service attitudes” (includes rude language, impatience, negative communication and indifferent attitudes), “provide wrong service content and information” (includes conceal underserved, conceal discount, exaggerate service quality, mislead customers, reduce service content and stubbornly adhere to rules), “deliberate sabotage behavior” (includes tease or abuse consumers and damage consumer property), “delay or not provide service” (includes delay service time, prolong waiting time and set services barriers), and “hidden rules” (includes lower service standard, help colleagues deceive customers and short service process). All these five names are set after consulting experts in hotels and are affirmed by three hotel CEOs. (3) Five Cronbach Alpha coefficients are all greater than 0.7, which demonstrates that the questionnaire has good reliability.

3.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

In order to examine conclusion of the exploratory factor analysis and to check its reliability and validity, we have a confirmatory factor analysis via AMOS18.0. According the results of the confirmatory factor analysis, we obtain that $\chi^2 = 303.49$, $df = 84$, $\chi^2/df = 3.613$, $NFI = 0.96$, $CFI = 0.97$ and $RMSEA = 0.089$, which implies that our model is good. In Table 2, all composite reliabilities of latent variables are greater than 0.6, so our model is qualified. Combine results from the Table 1 and the Table 2, our conclusion that 18 staff service sabotage behavior in hotels belong to five categories is reasonable.

Table 2. Confirmatory factor analysis

Observation Variable	Different categories of staff service sabotage behavior			
	Latent variable	Load	CR	AVE
Rude language	Negative service attitudes	0.64	0.79521	0.44487
Impatience		0.85		
Negative communication		0.65		
Indifferent attitudes		0.74		
Conceal underserved		0.77		
Conceal discount	Provide wrong service content and information	0.84	0.91008	0.62533
Exaggerate service quality		0.82		
Mislead customers		0.75		
Reduce service content		0.81		
Stubbornly adhere to rules		0.75		
Tease or abuse consumers	Deliberate sabotage behavior	0.84	0.87601	0.71713
Damage consumer property		0.83		
Delay service time	Delay or not provide service	0.80	0.81267	0.5935
Prolong waiting time		0.74		
Set services barriers		0.77		
Lower service standard	Hidden rules	0.68	0.81247	0.56645
Help colleagues deceive customers		0.71		
Short service process		0.74		

Gruys et al. (2003) also divide hotel staff service sabotage behavior into five categories according staffs' counter-product behavior in daily work. The classification is set based on two criterions: if the behavior is organizational or individual orientated, and if the behavior is related with personal tasks or not. In our paper, four categories: "negative service attitudes", "provide wrong service content and information", "deliberate sabotage behavior" and "delay or not provide services" are related with personal tasks, and the rest one: "hidden rules" is internal behavior that happens in organization.

Interestingly, most categories of the staff service sabotage behavior have close links with personal tasks in hotels. Because consumers evaluate a hotel's service quality based on their consumption experiences via interactions with hotel staffs, and hotel staffs are effective ways to show service quality. Thus, according to the conclusion of our paper, "negative service attitudes", "provide wrong service content and information", "deliberate sabotage behavior" and "delay or not provide services" corresponds to negative personal service attitudes, information delivery, aggressive behaviors and work efficiency, respectively. Although the "hidden rules" is not related with hotel tasks and may not be realized by consumers, it can also be harmful to hotels. For example, "hidden rules" widely exists in hotels, if consumers do realize this sabotage behavior, its negative impacts must be shouldered by whole industry.

Next, Table 3 shows correlation of the five categories. If the correlation coefficient is greater than 0.5, two categories are closely related to each other, or irrelevant with each other. Results show that all categories have positive correlation relationships, expect "hidden rules" and "deliberate sabotage behavior". The result suggests that the hotel staff service sabotage behavior is multi-dimensional. For example, staffs' indifferent attitudes may trigger consumers' dissatisfaction, and then these negative feedbacks induce staffs' service retaliation, such as delaying serving time or providing wrong service information and content.

Table 3. Tables of the correlation coefficient

	Negative service attitudes	Provide wrong service content and information	Deliberate sabotage behavior	Delay or not provide service	Hidden rules
Negative service attitudes	1.00				
Provide wrong service content and information	0.64	1.00			
Deliberate sabotage behavior	0.59	0.80	1.00		
Delay or not provide service	0.58	0.59	0.57	1.00	
Hidden rules	0.58	0.66	0.28	0.75	1.00

3.3 Regression Analysis

In the above discussion, we have successfully classified 18 staff service sabotage behavior into five categories, however, one remaining question is that which category has the most serious impact on consumer willing to pay. Early studies have proved that consumer genders, ages and their educational backgrounds may influence their reactions and emotions to negative behavior which may further decrease their consumption satisfactions, however, until now, no research has been done to explore their influences on consumer willingness to pay. Next, we shall analyze roles of genders, ages and educational backgrounds in decreasing consumer willingness to pay.

1) Gender

When considering different genders, we obtain the following data in Table 4-1. Specially, in the Likert 5 scale form of our questionnaire, 1 means no willingness to pay; 2 means little willingness to pay; 3 means not decide; 4 means having high probability to pay and 5 means strong willingness to pay.

Table 4-1. The mean and regression analysis (consider genders)

Gender	Variables	Mean	Std.	Beta	T	Sig.
Male	Negative service attitudes	3.789	.876	.073	3.145	.830
	Provide wrong service content and information	4.166	.357	.165	1.768	.266
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	1.786	.654	.016	4.056	.523
	Delay or not provide service	3.725	.754	.091	3.255	.417
	Hidden rules	3.165	.487	.108	0.768	.867
	Average willingness to pay	3.412	.531			
Female	Negative service attitudes	2.876	.467	.048	3.765	.988
	Provide wrong service content and information	3.111	.712	.159	2.187	.217
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	1.087	.777	.009	4.789	.461
	Delay or not provide service	2.871	.659	.085	3.110	.416
	Hidden rules	2.897	.827	.137	1.267	.694
	Average willingness to pay	3.165	.887			

According to the Table 4-1, we conclude that: (1) male consumers' willingness to pay (3.412) is higher than that of female consumers' (3.165). (2) Based on their influence on consumer willingness to pay, we rank these five categories of staff service sabotage (from high to low). For male consumers, the order is "deliberate sabotage behavior", "delay or not provide service", "negative service attitudes", "provide wrong service content and information" and "hidden rules"; for female consumers, the order is "deliberate sabotage behavior", "negative service attitudes", "delay or not provide service", "provide wrong service content and information" and "hidden rules". (3) Values of Beta in three categories: "deliberate sabotage behavior", "delay or not provide service" and "negative service attitudes" are smaller than 0.1, which implies these three categories have strong negative influences on consumer willingness to pay.

Male and female have different personalities. Firstly, male consumers are more rational and calm. Male consumers choose hotels based on comprehensive considerations, slight staff service sabotage behavior would not change their decisions (willingness to pay). In contrast, female consumers are much more emotional, some slight staff service sabotage behavior may trigger dissatisfaction emotions, and then decrease their willingness to pay. Secondly, female consumers focus more on details. That is why female consumers rank "negative service attitudes" at high position. Finally, male consumers always seek high efficiency, so "delay or not provide

service” ranks at the 2nd position. However, female consumers are more patient, so they are willing to spend more time in waiting, thus “delay or not provide service” ranks at the 3rd position from their side.

2) Age

Next, in Table 4-2, we consider the factor of ages.

Table 4-2. The mean and regression analysis (consider ages)

Age	Variables	Mean	Std.	Beta	T	Sig.
Below 25	Negative service attitudes	2.921	0.853	0.078	5.237	.944
	Provide wrong service content and information	3.163	0.456	0.048	3.159	.333
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	1.386	0.589	0.004	8.774	.563
	Delay or not provide service	2.867	0.677	0.071	6.235	.610
	Hidden rules	2.998	0.811	0.059	1.288	.909
	Average willingness to pay	2.912	0.755			
Between 25 to 50	Negative service attitudes	3.009	0.511	0.068	3.258	.879
	Provide wrong service content and information	3.245	0.698	0.127	1.987	.383
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	2.087	0.782	0.017	7.855	.531
	Delay or not provide service	2.987	0.714	0.088	2.987	.577
	Hidden rules	3.278	0.799	0.128	1.087	.870
	Average willingness to pay	3.214	0.758			
Above 50	Negative service attitudes	3.478	0.758	0.152	1.356	.900
	Provide wrong service content and information	3.158	0.855	0.133	1.235	.320
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	1.887	0.697	0.016	6.253	.557
	Delay or not provide service	3.568	0.398	0.084	2.598	.607
	Hidden rules	3.989	0.785	0.145	0.875	.889
	Average willingness to pay	3.568	0.589			

From the Table 4-2, we obtain the following results. (1) The influence of the staff service sabotage behavior to consumer willingness to pay is negative with consumers’ ages. (2) For consumers who below 25, they are sensitive to almost all categories staff service sabotage behavior. On the contrary, for consumers who aged above 50, they have obvious regression coefficient (<0.1) to only two categories: “deliberate sabotage behavior” and “delay or not provide service”. (3) For consumers who aged below 25 and above 50, their ranks of five categories are the same, that is “deliberate sabotage behavior”, “delay or not provide service”, “negative service attitudes”, “provide wrong service content and information” and “hidden rules”. However, for consumers who aged between 25 and 50, this order is: “deliberate sabotage behavior”, “negative service attitudes”, “delay or not provide service”, “provide wrong service content and information” and “hidden rules”.

To explain above results, two significant backgrounds should be mentioned. For one thing, the elderly consumers (consumers who are over 50 year-old) experience two different market service qualities in China. From an old market in which no hotel focus on improving service quality to a new market in which high service quality management consciousness is more and more strengthened by hotels. Thus, the elderly consumers have the highest willingness to pay among three consumer segments, because they have a low benchmark for comparison. Nevertheless, willingness to pay for young consumers is the lowest, because they have the highest benchmark. For the other, consumers who aged between 25 and 50 rank “negative service attitudes” before “delay or not provide service”. Because these consumers live in hotels for business purposes, they tend to choose hotels which bring them with high satisfaction. Commonly, four or five star hotels would be chosen and staffs in these hotels always keep good service attitudes.

3) Educational Background

Finally, we analyze the factor of consumer educational backgrounds. Previous studies in psychology show that consumers with high educational backgrounds hold higher levels of tolerance than consumers with low educational levels when suffering negative service behavior. In hotel industry, no paper examines influence of educational background to consumer willingness to pay.

Table 4-3. The mean and regression analysis (consider educational background)

Educational Background	Variables	Mean	Std.	Beta	T	Sig.
High school graduates or below	Negative service attitudes	3.628	0.785	0.108	1.409	.778
	Provide wrong service content and information	3.356	0.654	0.078	1.321	.453
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	0.987	0.467	0.005	4.009	.634
	Delay or not provide service	2.333	0.654	0.081	3.327	.601
	Hidden rules	3.885	0.768	0.225	.998	.889
	Average willingness to pay	3.423	0.812			
College graduates	Negative service attitudes	3.312	0.578	0.098	2.126	.834
	Provide wrong service content and information	3.219	0.578	0.087	1.775	.328
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	1.821	0.765	0.023	3.443	.509
	Delay or not provide service	3.068	0.693	0.078	2.669	.535
	Hidden rules	3.218	0.779	0.119	1.679	.809
	Average willingness to pay	3.219	0.722			
Master or above graduates	Negative service attitudes	2.786	0.759	0.072	1.327	.886
	Provide wrong service content and information	3.158	0.869	0.083	2.267	.207
	Deliberate sabotage behavior	2.554	0.658	0.026	3.583	.500
	Delay or not provide service	3.118	0.442	0.089	2.998	.538
	Hidden rules	1.883	0.807	0.439	4.005	.799
	Average willingness to pay	2.868	0.664			

According to the Table 4-3, three main conclusions can be conducted. (1) Consumers' educational background levels are negative with their willingness to pay. (2) Compare data from three consumer segments, consumers who received the highest education level give the lowest score in almost all categories of service sabotage behavior, expect for "deliberate sabotage behavior". Our explanation is that, high educated consumers pay more attentions on spiritual level, that is, they need servants' respects and good attitudes; while, in material level, they show high forgiveness. On the contrary, low educated consumers care more about their material loss. (3) For the first two consumer segments, "deliberate sabotage behavior" ranked first, however, for consumers who received master or above degrees, they rank the "hidden rules" as the first. Ironically, the "hidden rules" are chosen as the last one for the former two consumer segments.

Results from this part challenge our conventional views. To begin with, high educated consumers are more sensitive to the staff service sabotage behavior in hotels. Traditionally, consumers with low educational background are easy to show their discontent emotions or complaints when suffering un-qualified service, which provides us with an illusion that these consumers have low willingness to pay. However, without obvious emotional expression, high educated consumers transfer their dissatisfaction to unwillingness to pay. Next, since high educated consumers gain more than those who are low educated, they care less about material loss. But, impoliteness attitudes and misbehavior may offend these consumers a lot. Finally, high educated consumers have strong feeling of social fairness. The result may be related with these consumers' social statuses which give them responsibilities of eliminating "hidden rules". For these consumer segments, more studies should be made in future.

4. Conclusion and Managerial Suggestions

Our paper generalizes 18 staff service sabotage behavior in hotels, and then classify them into five categories: "negative service attitudes" (includes rude language, impatience, negative communication and indifferent attitudes), "provide wrong service content and information" (includes conceal underserved, conceal discount, exaggerate service quality, mislead customers, reduce service content and stubbornly adhere to rules), "Deliberate sabotage behavior" (includes tease or abuse consumers and damage consumer property), "delay or not provide service" (includes delay service time, prolong waiting time and set services barriers), and "hidden rules" (includes lower service standard, help colleagues deceive customers and short service process). Base on the above five categories, we further explore their negative influences on consumer willingness to pay.

Firstly, we consider the factor of gender. Generally speaking, male consumers have high willingness to pay. Three categories of staff service sabotage behavior: "deliberate sabotage behavior", "delay or not provide service" and "negative service attitudes", have strong negative impacts on both consumer segments. In special, male consumers pay more attention on "delay or not provide service" while female consumers pay more attention on "negative service attitudes". This difference is mainly caused by different personalities between

males and females.

Next, we analyze the impact of consumer ages. Three age groups: below 25, between 25 and 50, and above 50, are discussed in our analysis. Consumers' willingness to pay is negative related with ages. This result is caused by consumers' different life experience. The willingness to pay of young consumers is influenced by every category of staff service sabotage behavior. Unlike the other two consumer segments, consumers who aged between 25 and above 50 focus more on "negative service attitudes". We believe consumption motivation is the key reason for this result.

Finally, we explore the role of consumers' educational backgrounds. Different with our conventional thought, consumers' educational background levels are negative with their willingness to pay. Interestingly, consumers who received the highest education level care less about "deliberate sabotage behavior", but more about "hidden rules". This counter-intuitive result is caused by high educated consumers' psychological needs and social statuses. Since this consumer segment needs social respects more than the other two consumer segments, impoliteness attitudes and behavior can easily decrease its willingness to pay. In additional, because of high social statuses of high educated consumers, they care more about social fairness and have much stronger negative emotion against "hidden rules".

Considering serious consequences in hotel industry if consumers continuously lower their willingness to pay, four managerial suggestions can be adopted to avoid the staff service sabotage behavior.

- 1) Provide staff with rights to know and to choose. Many empirical studies have shown that hotels can recruit more qualified employees if employees have full understanding of their jobs, future developments and difficulties. From perspective of hotel managers, we should match staffs' personalities with job features. For example, an introverted staff should be assigned to serve male consumers; a passionate staff should be encouraged to serve female consumers.
- 2) An open and fair Recruitment Practices. The fairness of hotel recruitment process will influence staffs' work attitudes, job satisfactions and senses of belonging. In the recruitment, hotel managers need to select staffs who are equipped with basic requirements and characters for the jobs. In addition, standards of employing a new staff should be updates according to the market needs. For example, hotels can invite young female consumers to participant the recruitment process, because these consumers normally have strict standards to evaluate staffs' abilities or potential in future work.
- 3) Improve training and strengthen internal supervision. On one hand, hotels should strengthen consumer oriented service consciousness in training system. Through training, hotels can establish good hotel culture which guides staffs to understand their jobs and assists them to deal with emergencies in service. For example, staffs should be trained more to deal with young-high educated-female consumers. If these consumers are satisfied with service, most of other consumers would speak high of the service quality. On the other hand, when staff shows signals of service sabotage behavior, hotel managers must keep an eye for staffs' psychological situations and behavior. Criticism and education to staff are necessary if need. In our investigation, frequency of service sabotage behavior toward young consumers is much higher than frequencies of service sabotage behavior toward other consumers. Managers should pay more attention to rule staffs' behavior when serving this consumer segment.
- 4) Establish a reasonable incentive system. A reasonable compensation system is necessary but not enough for the hotel staffs, because spiritual incentive is also very important. Only be motivated from inner hearts, could staffs have great passions to provide consumers with good service qualities. Firstly, hotels should improve staff's salaries according to their performance. Secondly, indirect rewards such as welfare are also significant. In order to maximize result of indirect motivations, hotels can provide a "buffet" welfare system, that is, staff can choose their preferred types of welfare. Once staff's psychological needs are satisfied, they tend to show positive attitude and behavior in work. The last one is spiritual rewards, like "best staff" reward. The spiritual rewards can fully mining staff's potential abilities and assist hotels to build an ideal work environment. For example, increase competitiveness atmosphere in works via creating a fair and open work environment; fully utilize intelligence resource by adopting participation incentives; motivate a sense of honor by using honor incentive.

References

- Babin, B. J., & Griffin, M. (1998). The nature of satisfaction: an updated examination and analysis. *Journal of Business research*, 41(2), 127-136.
- Balmer, J. M., Harris, F., & de Chernatony, L. (2001). Corporate branding and corporate brand performance. *European Journal of marketing*, 35(3/4), 441-456.

- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of applied psychology, 85*(3), 349.
- Boye, M. W., & Jones, J. W. (1997). Organizational culture and employee counterproductivity. *Antisocial behavior in organizations, 172-184*.
- De Chernatony, L., & Segal-Horn, S. (2003). The criteria for successful services brands. *European Journal of marketing, 37*(7/8), 1095-1118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090560310477681>
- Giacalone, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (1997). *Antisocial behavior in organizations*. Sage.
- Gremler, D. D., & Gwinner, K. P. (2000). Customer-employee rapport in service relationships. *Journal of Service Research, 3*(1), 82-104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/109467050031006>
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2002). Exploring Service Sabotage The Antecedents, Types and Consequences of Frontline, Deviant, Antiservice Behaviors. *Journal of Service Research, 4*(3), 163-183.
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2006). Service sabotage: A study of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 34*(4), 543-558.
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2009). Service sabotage: The dark side of service dynamics. *Business Horizons, 52*(4), 325-335.
- Harris, L. C., & Ogbonna, E. (2012). Motives for service sabotage: an empirical study of front-line workers. *The Service Industries Journal, 32*(13), 2027-2046.
- Lee, J. J., & Ok, C. M. (2014). Understanding hotel employees' service sabotage: Emotional labor perspective based on conservation of resources theory. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 36*, 176-187.
- Skarlicki, D. P., van Jaarsveld, D. D., & Walker, D. D. (2008). Getting even for customer mistreatment: the role of moral identity in the relationship between customer interpersonal injustice and employee sabotage. *Journal of applied psychology, 93*(6), 1335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012704>
- Slora, K. B., Joy, D. S., & Terris, W. (1991). Personnel selection to control employee violence. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 5*(3), 417-426.
- Stewart, D. M., & Chase, R. B. (1999). The impact of human error on delivering service quality. *Production and Operations Management, 8*(3), 240-263.
- Wallace, E., & de Chernatony, N. L. (2007). Exploring managers' views about brand saboteurs. *Journal of Marketing Management, 23*(1-2), 91-106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1362/026725707X178576>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).