

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt



Mohamed Hany B. Moussa¹, Dalea Helal², Mohamed Hussein Abdel Gaber³

¹Head of Department, FTH, Helwan University

²Tourism Specialist, Egyptian Tourism Promotion Board, Cairo, Egypt

³Lecturer, Institute for Hospitality Management, General Coordinator for the Egyptian Tourism Federation Projects

ABSTRACT: COVID - 19 caused a lot of economic, political and social conflicts to all world populations and states. Many researches to explored the impacts of COVID - 19 on these perspectives. However, few if any were focused to measure the shift in moral models adopted due to this pandemic. This paper targets to explore the moral shifts in these models as a result of moral disengagement caused by the pandemic. The impacts on total performance, reputation, present and future image of operations and the role of accumulated experience to mitigate these impacts are also in focus. A questionnaire tool built in five -point Likert scale was distributed and 202 forms were validated via Survey Monkey. Online ANOVA, percentages and Pearson correlation were used. Conclusions indicate the importance of accumulated experience to limit immoral decisions resulting from disengagement. Findings also show strong correlations among disengagement and reputation and present and future image of the business.

Keywords: Moral Disengagement, Immoral Decisions, Reputation, Total Performance, Present and Future Image, Accumulated Experience

BACKGROUND

Moral disengagement is a concept used in social psychology to describe the act of persuading one's self that ethical standards do not apply to them in a given situation. This is accomplished by isolating moral reactions from inhumane behaviour and inhibiting the self-condemnation process. As a result, moral disengagement is re-framing or re-construing destructive activity as morally acceptable without modifying the behaviour or the moral standards.

Furthermore, job happiness, organisational citizenship actions, and counter-productive behaviours have all been demonstrated to be influenced by perceptions of organisational justice. The current study investigates organisational justice perceptions in connection to self-reported deviant work practises.

In the link between injustice and deviant work behaviours, we propose that two strategies of moral disengagement – diffusion and displacement of responsibility – act as mediating mechanisms. Risk-taking, non-compliance, and lack of involvement are operationalized as deviant work behaviours in the current setting. Our assumptions were tested using structural models, and the results suggest that self-reported deviant work equation behaviours are positively linked with feelings of organisational injustice. Individual moral disengagement was also elevated by views of injustice, which partially moderated the influence of justice perceptions on deviant work actions. The findings of this study add to existing research on the impact of organisational justice and indicate to moral disengagement as a possible mechanism for sustaining workplace deviant behaviour.

Self-regulatory processes rooted in moral standards and self-sanctions, according to social cognitive theory of morality, translate moral reasoning into behaviours, resulting in moral agency. As a result, the moral self is part of a larger sociocognitive self-theory that includes self-organizing, proactive, self-reflective, and self-regulatory systems. This selfregulatory mechanism, which is based on moral agency, has three key sub-functions. The first sub-function is selfmonitoring, which is the first step towards gaining control over one's behaviour. "Action gives rise to self-reactions through a judgmental function in which conduct is evaluated against internal standards and situational circumstances".

As a result, moral judgments have a self-reactive effect. The second and third sub-functions are the self-reactive and judgmental mechanisms.

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

Deceptive behaviour and unethical decision-making

When addressing the many causes of moral disengagement, Bandura et al. (1996) claimed that humane personal standards are insufficient to abandon brutal behaviour. To maintain moral personal control and "compassionate" behaviour, civilised existence necessitates safeguards as an intrinsic feature of social systems.

James R. Detert, Linda K. Trevio, and Vicki L. Sweitzer (2008) found empirical evidence to support their hypothesis that moral disengagement is positively related with immoral decisions when they investigated the effects of moral disengagement. When people are morally disengaged, they are more likely to make immoral decisions. Internalized deterrents that might otherwise prohibit people from acting unethically are less activated when there is a gap between internal moral norms and "contemplated acts."

In addition, Barsky (2011) conducted two research to look into the impact of moral disengagement and participation in unethical job behaviour. Moral disengagement was studied through moral justification and responsibility displacement, as well as unethical behaviour as deceptive behaviours such as "outright lying" and "attempts to disguise the truth". In organisational literature, both of Adam Barsky's research empirically established a substantial relationship between moral disengagement and people's risk of making immoral decisions. In the second study, Barsky (2011) found empirical evidence that goal-setting involvement, i.e., a collaborative decision-making process, is positively connected to deception. "Perhaps most interesting, while moral justifications tended to increase in the reported incidences of unethical behavior, this was only true when employees did not feel that they had the opportunity to participate in setting their performance goals at work."

Similarly, McGraw, Best, and Timpone (1995) suggested that moral arguments have substantial political repercussions. They discovered that moral arguments lead to a more positive evaluation of a contentious decision. Character judgement can also be impacted, resulting in more positive public perceptions of the politician involved. McGraw came to the conclusion that moral arguments might be exploited cleverly by politicians to sway public opinion on controversies and bolster their own reputations without fear of repercussions.

Moral Disengagement as a Result of the COVID-19 Outbreak

Moral disengagement research has shown that the ability to recognise one's moral obligations and discriminate what is right from what is wrong is not always accompanied by the will and capability to act accordingly (Caprara et al., 2014). People might avoid taking complete responsibility for the consequences of their actions that are contrary to their own norms and beliefs, and whose admission would result in a loss of self-esteem, by selectively disengaging their own sense of moral culpability. However, given the high level of infectivity of the COVID - 19 virus, evading constraints intended at preserving public health during the breakout of a pandemic may come at a significant personal and societal cost (Task force COVID - 19, 2020).

Moral disengagement is a changeable social cognitive orientation that is influenced by both individual dispositions and social context perceptions, such as generalised social trust (henceforth GST), which is described as "the idea that most people can be trusted" (Uslaner, 2012, p. 7). Individual normal personality traits (such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability; Caprara et al., 2013, 2014) and so-called dark personality traits (such as narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy; DeLisi et al., 2014; Fossati et al., 2014) have been linked to moral disengagement in empirical studies. Similarly, other research have demonstrated that perceptions of the social environment, such as GST, might encourage or inhibit moral disengagement (Hystad et al., 2014).

We tested a theoretical model assigning moral disengagement the role of the proximal predictor of two important classes of rule-respecting behaviours: social distancing and stay-at-home, with the goal of furthering our understanding of the mechanism fostering rule-respecting behaviours during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Of course, research into the characteristics that may keep people engaged in rule-following behaviours should continue. The COVID - 19 epidemic gives a once-in-a-lifetime chance for social science to contribute to the well and being of our hospitality society in a meaningful and timely manner.

Relationships between Moral Disengagement and Cumulative Experience

Moral disengagement, in particular, was investigated to explain the processes by which labour traits are related to previous cumulative experience. The goal of the study was to see if there were any links between job qualities, satisfaction, moral disengagement, and work experience.

Employees who had unfavorable feelings about their jobs were more likely to have negative affect and thought it was appropriate to damage others, according to the findings.

Workplace conduct of employees Despite the fact that identifying the influences on employees' workplace behaviour has been a goal of many industrial and organisational psychologists for more than four decades (Latham and Budworth, 2007; Oldham and

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

Hackman, 1981), harassment has not been studied to the same extent as other influences in workplace behaviour studies. Nonetheless, it has been suggested that harassment has an equal impact on organisations and their personnel (Leiter and Maslach, 1988). Employees who have been harassed are more likely to report low levels of organisational commitment, greater intentions to quit, higher levels of turnover, higher levels of absenteeism, and lower job performance ratings if harassment is similar to other workplace behaviours.

Employees who have been harassed are more likely to report low levels of organisational commitment, greater intentions to quit, higher levels of turnover, higher levels of absenteeism, and lower job performance ratings if harassment is similar to other workplace behaviours. If there are linkages between harassment and other workplace behaviours, it's possible that knowledge obtained from study on variables influencing other workplace behaviours can be applied to understanding harassment. It's possible, for example, that employees who work in organisations with high levels of harassment have lower levels of organisational commitment than employees who work in organisations with low levels of harassment. Furthermore, individuals with low levels of dedication to their organisation may be less concerned about the well-being and courteous treatment of their coworkers, which will reflect directly to the cumulative experience.

Job Satisfaction and Workplace Perceptions

Organizational climate and job characteristics-dealing with others were significantly associated with job satisfaction among the work characteristics measured in this study undertaken to characterise employees' work attitudes (organisational climate, interpersonal job characteristics dealing with others, and friendship opportunities). Employee perceptions of how their organisation treats them are reflected in the organisational atmosphere. Employees with higher organisational environment scores were more content with their jobs than those with lower organisational climate scores, indicating that they felt respected and treated respectfully by their employer. Employees who reported having fewer opportunities for interpersonal interaction than they would like were less satisfied with their occupations than those who reported having enough opportunities. This association is congruent with research that revealed favorable relationships between job satisfaction and social support (Cohrs et al., 2006), which is conceptually related to the belief that one has enough opportunities for interpersonal interaction at work, albeit not identical. This association could be regarded as demonstrating individual differences in social contact preferences. For example, both scotopic (i.e., people who need others to feel safe, help, or gratification; Sturman et al., 2006) and extraverted (i.e., people who are outgoing, talkative, and sociable) people are likely to see opportunities for social interaction as important, if not necessary, to be satisfied at work. How well such individuals were able to meet their interpersonal contact needs at work may have an impact on how they feel about their jobs. Employees' thoughts that their employment does not allow them to meet their social demands may manifest themselves in low job satisfaction.

Cumulative Effect on Reputation

In the workplace, unethical behaviour and other bad interpersonal interactions are common.

The consequences of harassment and other issue behaviours such as those listed above can clearly have a negative impact on the operation of organisations and individuals.

According to the findings of this study, work qualities, contentment, and moral disengagement are all linked to unethical behaviour. The results of this study provide suggestions on how to successfully administer interventions to prevent or reduce harassment, which is a practical implication of this relationship.

Modifying organisational characteristics (e.g., structure, policies, and employee programmes) to improve employees' evaluations of their work, for example, is likely to be beneficial in minimizing harassment encounters.

It may also be helpful to target specific employees or groups of employees for intervention. Education regarding what types of unethical behaviour harm individuals and their organisations, as well as how to successfully prevent or deal with unethical behaviour on an individual and/or organisational level, could be one of these interventions.

Causes and Manifestations of Moral Disengagement

According to moral disengagement theory, morally disengaged employees are more likely to engage in activities that negatively impact the company, its members, or both (Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1999; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Based on organisational control theory and moral disengagement theory, we suggest that slack formal organisational control increases workplace deviance by enabling employees to morally detach. We further claimed that the strength of the positive relationship between perceived organisational control and workplace deviance is influenced by moral disengagement, because morally disengaged people are more inclined than morally engaged people to make actions that benefit the organisation (Moore, 2008). As a result, based on the above real facts and theoretical ideas previously given.

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

The Mediating Role of Moral Disengagement in the Relationship between Empathy and Employee Ethics

Empathy has received considerable interest in the morality literature (see Batson 2011). Baron-Cohen (2012, p. 12) defines empathy as, "our ability to identify what someone else is thinking or feeling, and to respond to their thoughts and feelings with an appropriate emotion".

Scholars agree that empathy has both affective and cognitive components (Davis 1980; Hoffman 1984). Adam Smith (2009) in his influential *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Smith 1759/2009, p. 11) captured both elements of empathy when he wrote of the moral emotion(s) of pity and compassion as, "the emotion which we feel for the misery of others, when we either see it, or are made to conceive it in a very lively manner. That we often derive sorrow from the sorrow of others is a matter of fact too obvious to require any instances to prove it".

Furthermore, in the business ethics literature, empathy has been demonstrated to lead to less unethical bargaining strategies (Cohen 2010) and more principle-based moral judgments (Mencel and May 2009). According to the research on moral psychology, empathy leads to benevolence, collaboration, and pro-social behaviour (see Batson and Ahmad 2009; Eisenberg and Miller 1987 etc.). In a study of the research on empathy and antisocial/aggressive behaviour, Miller and Eisenberg (1988) discovered a negative association between the two.

Also, according to Detert et al. (2008), there is a link between empathy and unethical decision-making. Empathy has not been examined explicitly in relation to the various components of consumer ethics, which is a limitation of the consumer ethics literature.

Empathic concern and perspective taking should be negatively connected to views of consumer activities that are unjust, unfair, or damaging to others, as empathy is negatively related to cheating (Brown et al. 2010) and other antisocial behaviours (Miller and Eisenberg 1988).

Passively benefiting from the seller's blunders (mistakes that affect the seller) and actively benefiting from questionable but legal activities are examples of these actions. Furthermore, because empathy boosts generosity, it is likely to have a favourable impact on ideas about "doing good" and "recycling" activities. Empathy should not be directly tied to impressions of 'no harm, no foul' activities because there is no direct harm resulting from these actions. The formal hypotheses listed below are proposed.

Negative thoughts about passively profiting at the expense of the seller are linked to empathy. H1b: Empathy is linked to unfavourable thoughts about actively benefiting from illegal but legal activities. H1c: Empathy has nothing to do with notions about 'no harm, no foul' behaviour. H1d: Empathy is linked to positive ideas about 'doing good' and recycling.

Empathy and moral disengagement have been shown to be adversely associated in previous study. According to Hoffman (1987), empathetic responses result in the internalisation of moral thinking that is concerned with the wellbeing of others. According to Eisenberg et al. (2004), empathy-related responses are associated with pro-social moral reasoning. As a result, empathy should be inversely related to moral disengagement, because moral disengagement is associated with cognitive systems that support immoral behaviour.

In addition, Detert et al. (2008) found that moral disengagement mediates the negative link between empathy and unethical decision-making. As previously noted, their study used an eight-item scale to assess unethical decisionmaking, with just two of the questions relating to consumer activities. Their findings could be applied to a variety of unethical consumer behaviour. Moral disengagement is expected to mitigate the negative associations between empathy and attitudes about various sorts of unethical consumer actions (e.g., passively profiting from seller faults and actively benefiting from questionable but legal actions).

Moral detachment should, in turn, lead to more positive ideas about "no harm, no foul" behaviour. Individuals may employ moral justification (e.g., claiming that duplicating a CD does not directly harm anyone) or beneficial comparison to make these types of behaviours acceptable (e.g., by believing that downloading software without paying for it is not as unethical as stealing physical products from a store).

Displacement/diffusion of blame can also be used by employees to justify "no harm, no foul" acts (e.g. by believing that many other employees also copy music or download software without paying for it). Because a lack of empathy leads to increased moral disengagement, which leads to more positive judgments of "no harm, no foul" behaviours, an indirect negative association between empathy and beliefs about "no harm, no foul" actions can be predicted, mediated by moral disengagement.

METHODOLOGY

This paper adopts a descriptive quantitative analysis technique. The tool used in this paper is a questionnaire form of twelve questions. The first four questions were meant to reveal the demographic data of respondents whereas the rest of the questions meant to reveal the level of moral disengagement and how and to what extent does this impact immoral decisions taking in the

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

enterprise from one side and its effect on reputation, image and accumulated experience of the enterprise. To do this a Likert scale of five points was used. The questionnaire was tested for validity and reliability where values were 0.83 and 0.81 which refer to acceptable levels of both. The questionnaire form was circulated among employees via Survey Monkey platform. A number of 366 questionnaire were received of which 202 were valid for analysis. This number is adequate as a sample according to Online Sample Size Calculator. The handling of this questionnaire extended between March to June 2021. Employees of all hospitality ranks participated in this study aside from their job titles. The tool was allowed only to Cairo hotels since other destinations hotels were closed or confined to work at very low capacity 815% due to COVID - 19 restrictions. This poses a limitation to the generalization of the results of this study. In the next phase, data collected were tabulated and coded for analysis. Percentages, ANOVA and Pearson correlation tests were later instituted using online analytical platforms restrictions. This poses a limitation to the generalization of the results of this study. In the next phase, data collected were tabulated and coded for analysis. Percentages, ANOVA and Pearson correlation tests were later instituted using online analytical platforms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of questionnaire forms obtained from employees revealed a lot of interesting findings. This part is geared to shed the light on these findings.

Regarding demographics of respondents the following table summarizes these data.

Table 1. Demographics of respondents.

Attribute	male	%	Female	%	
Gender	122	60.7	80	39.8	
Age	20-30	<30-	<40-50	<51-	N/A
	48	66	59	26	5
Marital Status	single	%	married	%	divorced %
	53	26.6	100	50.3	45 22.6
Education	Graduate	%	P. Graduate	%	
	131	65.8	68	34.2	

Respondents were asked whether they exercised or suffered any moral disengagement in the enterprises where they work, surprisingly 143 reported they did. This constitutes 71.5% of total respondents or round three quarters of the sample. Thus, respondents were asked to carry on with the consequent part of the questionnaire.

Next respondents were asked to express their views whether the policies of the enterprises where they work lead to any form of moral disengagement. A number of 140 respondents of total sample (77.3%) reported positive. However, when comparing this number to those who affirmed they were subject to moral disengagement, the percentage of respondents who experienced moral disengagement and traced this to enterprises' policies amounts to (97.9%). Moreover, when asked on the extent to which moral disengagement affects employees, 82(59.9%) of employees see this disengagement very effecting, 33(24.1%) see it is just affecting, 10 employees (7.3%) were neutral, 9 (6.6%) see it has a little effect and only 3 employees (2.2%) see it is of very little effect. In other words, 84% of employees investigated see moral disengagement very effecting or effecting employees.

Next, employees were asked whether they witnessed any negative impact of immoral decisions stemming from moral disengagement on the image of the enterprise. A majority of 120 (71%) of employees confirmed this negative impact on enterprise reputation. To measure the extent of this negative impact employees were asked to use a five- point Likert scale. Results indicate that 54(38%) employees see that negative impact is very high impact, 62(43.7%) see it is of high impact, 10 (7%) see no relation, 8 (5.6%) see it has limited impact and 9(6.3%) see it has very limited impact. It could be concluded here that 81.7% of respondents see that immoral decisions stemming from moral disengagement negatively impacts or highly impacts the enterprise reputation.

The accumulated experience of the enterprise was also tested in what concerns the involvement in such immoral decisions. On five-point Likert scale employees were asked to asses to which extent does accumulated experience can limit such immoral decisions. A number of 87 (51.5%) of employees see that accumulated experience can highly limit such immoral decisions, 50 employees (29.6%) see that it can limit these types of decisions, 17 employees (10.1%) see no connection among these two variables, 10 employees (5.9%) see it has little effect and 6 employees (3.6%) see it has very little effect. Stated in a different way,

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

81.1% of employees investigated see that accumulated experience can highly limit of limit the occurrence of immoral decisions stemming from moral disengagement and negatively impacting the reputation of the enterprise.

From an Operational standing point, the impact of these immoral decisions was tested against the total performance of the enterprise. Employees investigated On a five-point Likert scale, they were asked to rate this. Responses indicate that 58(33.9%) of employees confirm that immoral decisions highly impact total enterprise performance, 81 (47.4%) see that they impact total performance, 14(8.2%) see these are irrelevant, 14(8.2%) see these slightly impact performance, 6(3.5%) see that they very slightly impact total performance. From that operational lens it can be concluded that a majority of 81.3% of employees confirm that immoral decisions negatively impact total performance of the enterprise.

From a marketing standing point, immoral decisions were tested against present and future image of the enterprise in the eyes of its internal customers. A number of 82 employees (47%) see that immoral decisions negatively highly impacts the image of the enterprise at present, 56 employees (32.6%) see these decisions merely negatively impact present image, 21 (12.2%) see these are irrelevant, 10(5.8%) see these slightly impacting image, and 5(2.9%) see these decisions very slightly impact present image of the enterprise. This means that a majority of 72.6% of employees see such decisions impacting present image negatively. In regards to future assessment, the values were 80(46.8%), 65(38%), 10 (5.8%), 13 (7.6%) and 3 (1.8%) respectively, which means that a majority of 86.6% of employees see a jeopardy to future image of the enterprise from such immoral decisions. It is interesting to recognize that employees see future jeopardy out ways present one in reference to immoral decisions.

To further investigate the case the case ANOVA test was performed among response to the five indicative questions on reputation, accumulated experience, total performance and present and future image of the enterprise. The following table represents results.

Table 2. ANOVA test of five groups of respondents.

<i>Treatments</i>						
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
N	5	5				25
$\sum X$	136	143				796
Mean	27.2	28.6				31.84
$\sum X^2$	7938	7005				46216
Std.Dev.		32.553	26.9963			29.4897
Result Details						
<i>Origin</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>MS</i>			
Midst- treating	265.36	4	66.34	$F = 0.06439$		
Inwards- treating		20606	20	1030.3		
Overall	20871.36		24			

0.06439 represents the f-ratio. 991762 is the p-value, the result is insignificant.at $p < .01$.

The aforementioned result indicates that employees' To add more dimension to the case, Post Hoc Tukey (beta) viewpoints towards the five elements investigated were was employed to test the honestly significant differences homogeneous and in the same momentum and direction since between pairwise comparisons within ANOVA data. no significant differences were detected among groups.

Table 3. Post Hoc Tukey HSD (beta).

Pairwise Comparisons		HSD _{.05} = 60.7480			
Pairwise Comparisons T ₁ :T ₂				HSD _{.01} = 75.9842	Q _{.05} = 4.2319 Q _{.01} = 5.2933
M ₁ = 27.20					
T ₁ :T ₂	M ₂ = 28.60				
T ₁ :T ₃	M ₁ = 27.20	1.4	Q = 0.10 ($p = .99999$)		
T ₁ :T ₃	M ₃ = 34.00				
T ₁ :T ₄	M ₁ = 27.20	6.8	Q = 0.47 ($p = .99705$)		

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

T ₁ :T ₄	M ₄ = 34.60			
			7.4	Q = 0.52 (<i>p</i> = .99591)
T ₁ :T ₅	M ₁ = 27.20			
T ₁ :T ₅	M ₅ = 34.80			
T ₂ :T ₃	M ₂ = 28.60	7.6		Q = 0.53 (<i>p</i> = .99547)
T ₂ :T ₃	M ₃ = 34.00			
T ₂ :T ₄	M ₂ = 28.60	5.4		Q = 0.38 (<i>p</i> = .99880)
T ₂ :T ₄	M ₄ = 34.60			
			6	Q = 0.42 (<i>p</i> = .99819)
T ₂ :T ₅	M ₂ = 28.60			
T ₂ :T ₅	M ₅ = 34.80			
T ₃ :T ₄	M ₃ = 34.00	6.2		Q = 0.43 (<i>p</i> = .99794)
T ₃ :T ₄	M ₄ = 34.60			
			0.6	Q = 0.04 (<i>p</i> = .00000)
T ₃ :T ₅	M ₃ = 34.00			
T ₃ :T ₅	M ₅ = 34.80			
T ₄ :T ₅	M ₄ = 34.60	0.8		Q = 0.06 (<i>p</i> = .00000)
T ₄ :T ₅	M ₅ = 34.80	0.2		Q = 0.01 (<i>p</i> = .00000)

Results indicate that moral decisions, reputation and accumulated experience have significant differences among them in groups. This means that moral disengagement differs in a way on how it correlates to these elements. The following analysis is meant to reveal these differences.

Person correlation test was performed to better understand the case and reinforce findings. On correlating immoral decisions to negative impact on enterprise reputation the value ($p = -0.7741$) which refers to a strong negative correlation meaning the less such decisions are there the better the reputation of the enterprise. Correlating such immoral decisions to the availability of accumulated experience value ($p = -0.9816$) this refers to very strong negative correlation meaning that the more the operation possess of accumulated experience due to high retention of employees the less it is probable that this operation exercises such immoral decisions. The correlation between immoral decisions and total performance of the enterprise person test value was ($p = -0.6801$). This means that immoral decisions negatively impact total performance of the enterprise, the more there are of these decisions the lower the total performance gets. In regards to the correlation between current image of the enterprise and existence of immoral decisions a value of ($p = -0.9521$) meaning that the more such immoral decisions are taken the more a negative image of the enterprise is reflected at present, the value turned out to be ($p = -0.9105$) to reflect the same correlation in the future.

To further explore the correlations, a very high positive correlation exists between accumulated experience and positive present image of the operation ($p = 0.9924$) and future image ($p = 0.9657$), reputation of the operation ($p = 0.7995$). Current reputation of the operation is also positively correlated to its present and future image ($p = 0.9128$) and ($p = 0.9613$) respectively.

Research Implications

Generally speaking, to sum up all results it can be concluded that moral disengagement leads the enterprise to take immoral decisions specially at the absence or deterioration of accumulated experience. This leads to negatively impacting the reputation of the enterprise and reflected negatively on the total performance. Eventually this leads to deterioration of the enterprise image at present and in the future. Despite geographical limitations and time constraints due to COVID - 19 pandemic, however, this research has many contributions to both science and. To the body of science this may be the first or one of the earliest studies on the impact of COVID - 19 on moral disengagement and morals models adopted by enterprises during pandemics. To the body of knowledge this research may shed the light on the increased need to exert more efforts to retain employees at the presence of moral disengagement during pandemics and crisis.

From an academic view point, data collected were analyzed overall away from variables like gender, age, marital status and education. More research is seen in demand to cover these areas. Many questions can be answered like which gender suffers more of moral disengagement consequences, which age, what marital status are more exposed and which age generation is more liable to bear impacts of such disengagement.

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

REFERENCES

- 1) Baron-Cohen, S. (2012). *Zero degrees of empathy: A new theory of human cruelty and kindness*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- 2) Bandura, A. (1986). Fearful expectations and avoidant actions as co-effects of perceived self-inefficacy.
- 3) Bandura, Albert; Barbaranelli, Claudio; Caprara, Gian Vittorio; Pastorelli, Concetta (1996). "Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 71 (2): 364–374.
- 4) Bandura, Albert (1999). "Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities". *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 3 (3): 193–209.
- 5) Bandura, Albert (2002). "Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency". *Journal of Moral Education*. 31 (2): 101–119.
- 6) Barsky, Adam (2011-06-16). "Investigating the Effects of Moral Disengagement and Participation on Unethical Work Behavior". *Journal of Business Ethics*. 104 (1): 59–75.
- 7) Batson, C. D. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 8) Batson, C. D., & Ahmad, N. Y. (2009). Using empathy to improve intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social issues and policy review*, 3 (1), 141-177.
- 9) Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G., Tisak, M. S., Paciello, M., Caprara, M. G., Gerbino, M., et al. (2013). Individual differences in personality conducive to engagement in aggression and violence.
- 10) Caprara, G. V., Tisak, M. S., Alessandri, G., Fontaine, R. G., Fida, R., and Paciello, M. (2014). The contribution of moral disengagement in mediating individual tendencies toward aggression and violence.
- 11) Cohrs, J. C., A. E. Abele and D. E. Dette: 2006, 'Integrating Situational and Dispositional Determinants of Job Satisfaction: Findings from Three Samples of Professionals', *The Journal of Psychology* 140 (4), 363– 395.
- 12) Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy.
- 13) DeLisi, M., Peters, D. J., Dansby, T., Vaughn, M. G., Shook, J. J., and Hochstetler, A. (2014). Dynamics of psychopathy and moral disengagement in the etiology of crime.
- 14) Detert, James R.; Treviño, Linda Klebe; Sweitzer, Vicki L. (2008-01-01). "Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: A study of antecedents and outcomes". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 93 (2): 374–391.
- 15) Eisenberg, N., Valiente, C., & Champion, C. (2004). Empathy related responding: Moral, social and socialization correlates. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), *The social psychology of good and evil* (pp. 386–415). New York, NY: Guilford.
- 16) Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological bulletin*, 101 (1), 91.
- 17) Fiske, Susan T. (2004). *Social beings: core motives in social psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: J. Wiley.
- 18) Fossati, A., Pincus, A. L., Borroni, S., Munteanu, A. F., and Maffei, C. (2014). Are pathological narcissism and psychopathy different constructs or different names for the same thing? *J. Pers. Disord.* 28, 394–418.
- 19) Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T. (2010). Mixing interview and questionnaire methods: Practical problems in aligning data. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 15 (1), 1.
- 20) Hoffman, M. L. (1984). Interaction of affect and cognition in empathy. *Emotions, cognition, and behavior*, 103-131.
- 21) Hoffman, M. L. (1987). The contribution of empathy to justice and moral judgment. *Empathy and its development*, 4780.
- 22) Hystad, S. W., Mearns, K. J., and Eid, J. (2014). Moral disengagement as a mechanism between perceptions of organizational injustice and deviant work behaviors. *Safety Sci.* 68, 138–145. doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2014.03.012.
- 23) Latham, G. P. and M.-H. Budworth: 2007, 'The Study of Work Motivation in the 20th Century', in L. Koppes (ed.), *The History of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Laurence Erlbaum Associates Inc., New Jersey).
- 24) Leiter, M. P. and C. Maslach: 1988, 'The Impact of Interpersonal Environment on Burnout and Organizational Commitment', *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 9 (4), 297– 308.
- 25) Macones, G. A., Hankins, G. D., Spong, C. Y., Hauth, J., & Moore, T. (2008). The 2008 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development workshop report on electronic fetal monitoring: update on definitions, interpretation, and research guidelines. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing*, 37 (5), 510-515.
- 26) McGraw, Kathleen M. (1998). "Manipulating Public Opinion with Moral Justification". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 560: 129–142.
- 27) McGraw, Kathleen M.; Best, Samuel; Timpone, Richard (1995). "What They Say or What They Do?" The Impact of Elite Explanation and Policy Outcomes on Public Opinion". *American Journal of Political Science*. 39 (1): 53–75.

Impact of COVID - 19 Pandemic on Moral Disengagement Models Adopted by Hospitality Operations: A Case Study of Cairo, Egypt

- 28) Mencl, J., & May, D. R. (2009). The effects of proximity and empathy on ethical decision-making: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85 (2), 201-226.
- 29) Miller, P. A., & Eisenberg, N. (1988). The relation of empathy to aggressive and externalizing/antisocial behavior. *Psychological bulletin*, 103 (3), 324.
- 30) Oldham, G. R. and J. R. Hackman: 1981, 'Relationships Between Organizational Structure and Employee Reactions: Comparing Alternative Frameworks', *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26, 66–83.
- 31) Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of management journal*, 38 (2), 555-572.
- 32) Sturman, E. D., M. Mongrain and P. M. Kohn: 2006, 'Attributional Style as a Predictor of Hopelessness Depression', *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly* 20 (4), 447–458.
- 33) Task force COVID - 19 (2020). Task force COVID - 19 del Dipartimento Malattie Infettive e Servizio di Informatica, Istituto Superiore di Sanità. *Epidemia COVID - 19, Updates 24 March-6 April 2020*. Rome: Istituto Superiore di Sanità.
- 34) Uslaner, E. M. (2012). *Segregation and Mistrust*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.