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INTRODUCTION

As income increases, consumers eat away from home more frequently and spend a greater proportion of their food dollar on meals away from home. According to the National Restaurant Association (Staff, 1985), foodservices receive 40% of all consumer expenditures for food. Restaurants, cafeterias, and fast food chains account for about 60% of consumer expenditures for food eaten away-from-home. However, slower growth and saturation of the market, coupled with the high costs for labor, energy, and goods make the roles of restaurant managers more diverse and important than ever in maintaining and improving current operation situations. Therefore, managers today need to adopt more sophisticated techniques in order to keep their operations in pace with the dynamic changes the industry is facing.

Numerous studies have been conducted dealing with the content of management development programs in the foodservice area (e.g., Koppel, 1978; Mariampolski, et al., 1980; Pickworth and Fletcher, 1980; Powers, 1980). However, a very minor part of these studies considered the fact that each person learns differently. Although research on learning style in journals of education is legion, there have been few empirical studies of learning style in the foodservice area.
Two general studies in the hospitality industry which incorporated in learning styles have been reviewed. In Stevens' study, a self-developed instrument, Learning Preference Survey, was administrated to more than 500 industry management people at the 62th Annual NRA Restaurant-Hotel-Motel Show in 1981 at Chicago's McCormick Place (Stevens, 1985). Stevens categorized the respondents into three generations: Traditionalists (born before 1937), In-Betweens (born between 1937 and 1947), and Rejectionists (born between 1947 and 1962). The results showed that (1) Traditionalists prefer pedagogy (the art and science of teaching children) more than In-Betweens who prefer pedagogy more than Rejectionists and (2) Traditionalists prefer andragogy (the art and science of helping adults learn) less than In-Betweens who prefer andragogy less than Rejectionists. A follow-up study using the same instrument was conducted at the end of 1985 (Stevens, 1986). Data were obtained from Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management students at five selected universities, who are labeled as Synthesizers (born between 1962 and 1967). The findings showed that the Synthesizers prefer pedagogy and andragogy less than any one of the previous generations.

In Berger's study (1983), the Kolb Learning Style Inventory was administered to students in a four-year hospitality program, the faculty in that program, and
graduates currently working in hospitality management. The results showed that hospitality managers are mostly accommodators (32%) and convergers (32%); the remaining managers are divergers (26%) and assimilators (10%). Due to the accidental sampling method used in those studies, the sampling bias makes the generalizability of the results questionable.

Studies pertaining specifically to the learning styles of restaurant managers are relatively non-existent in the current literature. Believing that high-quality ongoing management development programs in the industry are critical to organizational success and an awareness of the need for such a study have led the researcher to explore this area of interest. The primary purpose of the study is to examine the learning styles of restaurant managers. A secondary purpose of the study is to examine the relationship of restaurant managers' learning styles to selected demographic variables. Thirdly, certain aspects of current management development programs in selected restaurant corporations will be examined. Fourthly, implications for restaurant management development programs will be identified. Finally, the ultimate goal of this study is to stimulate researchers in the foodservice area to engage in more detailed and larger scale studies dealing with learning styles for the purpose of enhancing effectiveness of the
functions of management development programs.

Explanation of the Alternate Dissertation Format

This dissertation will be presented in the alternate dissertation format approved by the Graduate College at Iowa State University. The alternate dissertation format allows for the inclusion of papers that have or will be submitted to referred scholarly journals for possible publication.

The dissertation begins with an introduction and review of literature which provide background for the research study. The body of the dissertation is composed of two manuscripts which address two distinct aspects of the research. The first manuscript, "Restaurant Managers Learning Styles and Their Implications," will be submitted to the International Journal of Hospitality Management. This paper identifies the learning styles of unit and district level restaurant managers and suggests implications for the management development programs in the restaurant industry. The second manuscript, "Management Development Programs: Theories and Practice," will be submitted to The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly. This paper describes certain aspects of current management development programs in selected restaurant corporations.

The final chapter is a summary of the research.
Recommendations for future studies are also included in this chapter.
Learning Theories and Styles

An understanding of how people learn has been discussed and researched for years. Researchers and educators have examined and explained learning in various ways. Piaget explained learning in terms of developmental stages (Flavell, 1963) while Jung (1923) explained it through ways people perceive and process information. Dewey's (1938) explanation depended upon the role experience plays in learning, while Lewin used group dynamics and action research to explain learning (Kolb, 1984). The learning theories of these four educators and researchers, Piaget, Jung, Dewey, and Lewin, have formed the basis for many learning style instruments developed in the last two decades.

Piaget was one of the early pioneers who attempted to explain how children learn. Piaget defined four qualitatively different stages which humans pass through in their intellectual development. These stages provide the framework for his theory. In the first stage, the sensory-motor period, the infant moves from a reflexive level of undifferentiated affective behaviors to a relatively coherent organization of sensory-motor actions.
related to the immediate environment. During the preoperational period, the second stage, the first crude symbolizations occur which are relatively unorganized and fumbling attempts to come to grips with the new and strange world of symbols. The third stage, concrete operations, spans the middle years of a child's experiences in which the child's conceptual organization of the surrounding environment slowly takes on stability and coherence. By this stage the child has a fairly stable and orderly conceptual framework which is used when looking at the world. In the final stage, formal operations, the adolescent is able to deal effectively with reality as well as the world of abstract, propositional statements (Flavell, 1963).

Piaget viewed intellectual development as a maturation process on a single continuum. His stages are defined as separate phases but can easily overlap. The stages are not precise or binding at any age but it is assumed that the stages will be sequential (Wadsworth, 1979).

On the other hand, Jung (1923) developed a framework for describing differences in human adaptive processes to explore the differences in the way people process and perceive information. He distinguished people who are oriented toward the external world and those oriented toward the internal world: extroverts and introverts. He then
proceeded to identify four basic functions of human adaption -- two describing alternative ways of perceiving (sensation and intuition) and two describing alternative ways of making judgments about the world (thinking and feeling). Jung's typology of psychological types includes four pairs of dialectically opposed adaptive orientations, describing individuals' mode of relation to the world via introversion or extraversion, mode of decision making via perception or judgment, preferred way of perceiving via sensing or intuition, and preferred way of judging via thinking or feeling (Kolb, 1984).

Another framework describing how people learn was provided by Dewey, a prominent educator in the early twentieth century. Dewey (1938) postulated that there was a strong relationship between experience and education. Dewey recommended using real life experiences in the design of learning experiences for students. He believed that experiences give ideas their moving force and that ideas give direction to impulses, and that all are components of the learning process (Dewey, 1938).

Using immediate personal or concrete experience as the starting point, Lewin conceived learning as a four-stage process. The second stage of observation and reflection about the experience led to the third stage, formation of concepts and generalizations, which would be tested in the
last stage, new situation. Experience was used to validate abstract ideas and learners were encouraged to examine and evaluate their experiences (Kolb, 1984).

Combining ideas from all four of these earlier theorists, Piaget, Jung, Dewey, and Lewin, Kolb (1976) conceived of learning as a four stage cyclical model in his Experiential Learning Theory (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Kolb's Model of Experiential Learning](image)

Learners have immediate concrete experience, involve themselves fully in the experiences and then reflect on them from different perspectives. After these reflective observations, they engage in abstract conceptualization,
from which they develop generalizations that help them integrate their observations into sound theories or principles. Finally, learners use these generalizations as guides to further action, or active experimentation, and experiment in new, more complex situations using what they have learned. Then they have another concrete experience and the cycle begins again, but each time the learner operates at a more complex level. Thus, the Experiential Learning Theory is a cycle, but it is best thought of as a helix, with learners having additional experiences, reflecting on them, making generalizations about the experiences, and then using these as guides to further action at increasing levels of complexity (Kolb, 1985).

The model is based on the premise that to be effective, all learners need to be able to use all stages of learning at different times and in different situations (Smith & Kolb, 1986). The concrete experience stage of the learning cycle emphasizes involvement with people in everyday situations. Learners emphasizing this stage rely on feelings when approaching problems or learning situations and tend to be open-minded and adaptable to changes. The reflective observations stage of the learning cycle relies on the ability to review ideas and situations from several different perspectives. Learners are patient, objective, and careful not to make hasty judgments. Learners rely on
their own thoughts and feelings to form opinions and learn best by watching and listening. The abstract conceptualization stage uses logic to understand problems and situations. Learners rely on systematic planning and developing theories and ideas to solve problems. Learners prefer situations which allow them to think. The active experimentation stage focuses on the ability to influence people or change situations. Learners are practical in their approach and have a concern for what works. Learners like to get things done and see results from their work (Kolb, 1985).

Close examination of this theory reveals that learning requires abilities that are polar opposites in two separate dimensions (see Figure 1). One dimension represents how learners perceive new information or experiences (the vertical line). This is identified as the concrete-abstract dimension and is conceived of as a continuum (Kolb, 1984). A preference for the concrete end of the continuum indicates that learners favor using their senses, immersing themselves in concrete reality, and relying heavily on intuition when learning new information. They prefer tangible, felt qualities. A preference for the abstract end of the continuum indicates that learners favor grasping information by thinking, analyzing, or systematically planning. They
prefer to learn through more abstract means (Smith & Kolb, 1986).

The second dimension of Kolb's learning theory represents how learners process what they perceive or how learners incorporate new information with old (the horizontal line). This is identified as the active-reflective dimension and is conceived of as a continuum. The active end of the continuum is preferred by those who enjoy using their hands when learning something new or engaging actively in the learning situation. The reflective end of the continuum is favored by those preferring to sit back and observe other learners in action and reflect upon what is observed (Kolb, 1984).

The Experiential Learning Theory implies that learning takes place in an environment reflecting the resolution of certain dialectical tensions between two sets of opposing characteristics. Although the learner, if he/she is to be effective, needs four different kinds of abilities -- concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation, Kolb (1974) argued that people tend to resolve these tensions of the opposing characteristics of learning abilities in a rather consistent and stable pattern. As a result of their hereditary nature, their particular past life experience, and the demands of their present environment, learners
develop ways of learning that emphasize some learning abilities over others. There appears to be widespread agreement supporting the existence of differences in the ways individuals learn (Kolb, 1976; Claxton, Adams & Williams, 1982; Garvey, Bootman, McGhan & Meredith, 1984). The disagreement is in how researchers delineate the ways learners learn. Researchers have developed models of learning styles to measure the different ways individuals learn.

Learning styles have been defined as indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and process information (Keefe, 1984). Keefe (1979) developed a framework for conceptualizing learning styles and the instruments developed for learning style assessment. Keefe identified three modes of learning styles: cognitive, affective, and physiological. He viewed these modes as relatively stable indicators of how people perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment. His conceptualization will be used here to provide a framework for reviewing learning style instruments used by researchers.

Most of the learning style instruments tended to emphasize one or two of the three learning style modes identified by Keefe. Each author of a learning style instrument had a conceptualization of learning style that was unique to his or her instrument. The conceptualization
of four instruments which represent the three modes of learning style and have been used by several researchers will be reviewed: the Kolb Learning Style Inventory (Kolb, 1976), the Gregorc Style Delineator (Gregorc, 1979), the Grasha-Riechmann Student Learning Style Scales (Riechmann & Grasha, 1974), and the Dunn Learning Style Inventory (Dunn, Dunn, & Price, 1979). The Kolb Learning Style Inventory and the Gregorc Style Delineator measure learners' cognitive mode of learning style while the Grasha-Riechmann Student Learning Style Scale and the Dunn Learning Style Inventory assess the cognitive and affective modes of learning style and the affective and physiological modes of learning styles, respectively. The definitions of all three modes of learning style will be reviewed before discussing the instruments.

The cognitive mode of learning style is concerned with information processing habits representing the learner's typical mode of perceiving, thinking, problem solving, and remembering. There are many researchers working in the cognitive area. To better assist educators in understanding how students learn, Kolb and associates (1976) developed a self-description inventory, the Learning Style Inventory, which is designed to measure an individual's strengths and weaknesses as a learner. They have tested the Learning Style Inventory on a number of different groups of people,
such as managers, college students, medical students, and college faculty. Four statistically different types of learning styles have been identified from the results of their studies. Kolb has designated these four types as diverger, assimilator, converger, and accommodator (see Figure 2). On the basis of his research and clinical observations, certain characteristics have been associated with each learning style.

![Kolb's Learning Styles Diagram](image)

**FIGURE 2. Kolb's Learning Styles**
The divergers prefer to perceive information by concrete experience and process it by reflective observation. Their strengths are in their imaginative ability. They like to view situations from different perspectives and then weave relationships into a meaningful whole. They are called divergers because they are good at generating ideas and brainstorming. They tend to be people oriented and emotional.

The assimilators prefer to perceive information by abstract conceptualization and process it by reflective observation. Their strengths are in creating theoretical models. They are called assimilators because they like to assimilate disparate observations into an integrated whole. They are primarily interested in abstract concepts and are more concerned about the soundness of the ideas or theories themselves than their application. They tend to be less interested in people.

The convergers prefer to perceive information by abstract conceptualization and process it by active experimentation. Their strengths lie in the practical application of ideas. They are called convergers because they appear to do well when there is a single correct answer or solution to a question or a problem. They are relatively unemotional and prefer dealing with things rather than people.
Accommodators prefer to perceive information by concrete experience and process it by active experimentation. Their strengths lie in doing things, in carrying out plans and experiments and involving themselves in new experiences. They are risk takers and are called accommodators because they do well in situations in which they must adapt to meet specific immediate circumstances. They tend to solve problems in an intuitive trial and error manner and rely heavily on other people for information rather than their own analytic ability.

According to Kolb (1984), a person's current job role is one of the factors influencing learning style. The task demands and pressures of a job tend to shape a person's adaptive orientation. Executive jobs that require a strong orientation to task accomplishment and decision making in uncertain emergent circumstances require an accommodative learning style. Personal jobs that require the establishment of personal relationships and effective communication with other people demand a divergent learning style. Technical jobs that require technical and problem-solving skills require a convergent learning orientation.

Another learning style instrument that measures the cognitive mode of learning style is the Gregorc Style Delineator. Gregorc (1979) identified learning style as
consisting of distinctive, observable behaviors which provide clues about the mediation abilities of individuals. Gregorc postulated that people through their characteristic sets of behavior indicate how their minds relate to the world and how they learn. Gregorc based his research on the assumption that a person's learning style emerges from inborn, natural predispositions or proclivities. Learning style is described as the preferred way an individual organizes all that is seen, remembered, and thought about (Gregorc, 1982). Gregorc proposed that learning styles are not simple habits, but habitual modes of information processing not easily modified through training (Messick, 1976).

Gregorc (1979) revealed that there is a duality in learning preference. People learn both through concrete experiences and through abstraction. Further, both of these modes have two subdivisions, sequential and random preference. Abstract/Concrete and Sequential/Random proclivities had been found to combine in four distinct learning patterns: concrete sequential, concrete random, abstract sequential, and abstract random. A learner's preference for one of these four dualities indicates a learning style.

Learners who prefer the concrete sequential learning style obtain information through direct, hands-on
experiences and use all five senses in the learning process. They appreciate order, step-by-step directions, and the logical sequence of if-then and premise-conclusion situations. They prefer sequenced presentation and a quiet atmosphere in which to learn.

Learners who prefer the concrete random learning style get the meaning of ideas quickly and demonstrate the ability to make intuitive leaps in exploring unstructured problem-solving experiences. Concrete random learners utilize the trial and error approach in acquiring information. They do not like cut-and-dried procedures that deny them opportunities to find answers in their own ways. They do not respond well to teacher intervention in their dependent efforts. They work well independently or in small groups.

Learners who prefer the abstract sequential learning style are characterized by excellent decoding abilities with written, verbal, and image symbols. They have a wealth of conceptual pictures in their minds against which they match what they read, hear, or see in graphic and pictorial form. They possess and like to use reading, listening, and visual translation skills. These learners prefer a presentation that has substance, is rational, and is sequential in nature. They are able to extract main ideas from a logical
presentation. They learn well from authorities and like vicarious experiences.

Learners who prefer abstract random learning style are very aware of human behavior and have a capacity to sense and interpret atmospheres and modes. Learners associate the medium with the message and tie the speaker's manner, delivery, and personality to the message being conveyed. In doing so, they evaluate a learning experience as a whole. They prefer to receive information in an unstructured manner such as group discussions and activities which involve multi-sensory experiences; and then organize materials through reflection into a meaningful whole (Gregorc, 1979).

In order to assess these dualities, Gregorc developed the Gregorc Style Delineator. This instrument was designed to measure two mediation abilities, perception and ordering, from which abstractness and concreteness emerge (Gregorc, 1979). Within the ordering category, sequence and randomness are found (Davenport, 1985).

The affective mode of learning style indicates the motivational process representing the learner's typical mode of arousing, directing, and sustaining behavior. Research in the affective mode of learning style is combined with learning style research in the cognitive or physiological areas (Keefe, 1979).
Riechmann and Grasha (1974) contended that existing standardized personality tests do not serve as reliable predictors of classroom performance, nor as adequate indicators of which characteristics interact with instructional formats or academic achievement. The Grasha-Riechmann Student Learning Style Scales (GRSLSS) is an instrument that was based on the types of learning styles students demonstrated in the classroom. The GRSLSS is comprised of cognitive and affective factors. In addition to items relating to information processing and cognitive styles, items that express attitudes toward learning styles are also included (Ferrell, 1983).

On the basis of interview and questionnaire data obtained from students, six general styles were distinguished (Grasha, 1972). They were the independent, dependent, collaborative, competitive, participant, and avoidant learning styles. Each of the six response styles was defined around three classroom dimensions: student attitudes toward learning, view of teachers and/or peers, and reactions to classroom procedures (Riechmann & Grasha, 1974).

Students with an independent learning style like to think for themselves. They prefer to work on their own, but they will listen to the ideas of others in the classroom. They learn the content they feel is important and are
confident in their learning abilities. Dependent style students show little intellectual curiosity and learn only what is required. They see teachers and peers as sources of structure and support. They look to authority figures for guidelines and want to be told what to do.

Students with a collaborative style feel that they can learn the most by sharing their ideas and talents. They cooperate with teachers and peers and like to work with others. They see the classroom as a place for social interaction, as well as content learning. Competitive style students learn materials in order to perform better than others in the class. They feel they must compete with other students in the class for the reward. They view the classroom as a win-lose situation where they must always win.

Participant style is characteristic of students who want to learn course content and like to go to class. They take responsibility for getting the most out of class and participate with others when told to do so. They feel that they should take part in as much of the class related activity as possible and do little that is not part of the course outline. The participant students are unlikely to have strong preferences about classroom activities. Generally, they function effectively in the classroom environment.
The avoidant style students are not interested in learning course content in the traditional classroom. They do not participate with other students and the teacher in the classroom. They are uninterested or overwhelmed by what goes on in the classes. Avoidant students tend to be unprepared for class or not to pay attention when they get to class. They do not like to be evaluated or to do assignments.

The physiological mode of learning styles is a biologically-based mode of response that is found on sex-related differences, personal nutrition and health, and accustomed reaction to the physical environment. At this point, no instrument is solely devoted to assessing the physiological component. Dunn and Dunn developed the most widely known instrument to assess both the affective and the physiological modes of learning style (Keefe, 1979).

Dunn and Dunn (1978) defined learning style in terms of conditions that the teacher can change rather than as variables that directly cause learning. The authors have identified 18 elements that affect how individuals learn. These 18 elements have been categorized into four major groups: (1) the immediate environment, (2) learners' own emotionality, (3) learners' sociological needs, and (4) learners' physical requirements.
The environmental conditions of the learning situations form the background against which learning occurs. Learners who prefer certain sounds, light, temperature, and design perceive themselves as better able to concentrate on school assignments under such conditions.

The emotional elements of learning style deal with the factors of motivation, persistence, responsibility, and structure. Learners who were not motivated to learn need resources that complement their perceptual strengths. The use of programmed learning, contracts, or multisensory instructional packages as substitute for class lectures or discussion may help them learn and develop a better self-image. Persistent and responsible learners were found to work at their tasks until they had completed them, while learners who were not persistent or responsible had short attention spans. Motivated, persistent, responsible learners usually required little structure and supervision (Dunn, Dunn, & Price, 1979).

The sociological elements of learning style are categorized into peer, self, pair, team, adult, and varied situations. Some learners are fearful of failing, embarrassed to show inability, and as a result often became too tense to concentrate. For those learners, either learning alone or with peers seems to be a better alternative than working with their teacher. Some learners
are unable to study or concentrate when involved with their peers. They are ashamed to let their peers or classmates see that they cannot learning easily. These learners learn best in a situation that places them in more direct, one-to-one contact with a teacher.

The physical elements of learning style involve perceptual strengths, intake, time, and mobility. Learners who learn through their auditory sense differentiate among sounds and reproduce symbols, letters, or words when they hear them. Learners who learn through their visual sense associate shapes and words and conjure up images or a form by seeing it in their mind's eye. Learners who learn through their tactual sense should be given experiences that involve writing, playing, and piecing things together. Those who learn through their kinesthetic sense should be given real-life experiences in order to learn to recognize words and their meanings.

The Learning Style Inventory associated with Dunn and Dunn's model was designed to yield information concerning learner learning styles and to provide implications regarding instructional techniques associated with these learning styles (Dunn & Dunn, 1978). The inventory can be used with elementary, secondary, and adult learners.

In summary, Kolb, Gregorc, Reichmann and Grasha, and Dunn, Dunn and Price all developed learning style
instruments. Kolb incorporated aspects from Piaget, Jung, Dewey, and Lewin in the development of the Experiential Learning Theory. Kolb applied the concept of stages that children go through in intellectual development to illustrate the process people go through in learning. The difference between Kolb and Piaget is that Piaget assumed that children go through the stages only once while Kolb believes that people go through the cycle many times during their lives.

Piaget viewed learning on a single continuum, from reflex action to formal operations whereas Kolb identified two continuums in the learning process, the abstract-concrete dimension and the active-reflective dimension. Kolb's use of polar opposites in the learning dimensions corresponds to the Jung orientation of opposites when explaining the ways people process and perceive information. Dewey's influence on the Experiential Learning Theory is seen in the emphasis Kolb gives to experience. Kolb assumes that the learning process begins with concrete experience.

Kolb used his Experiential Learning Theory as basis for the development of a learning style instrument which identifies a learner's preferred ways of acquiring information. Kolb and Gregorc developed inventories to assess the cognitive component of learning style; Reichmann
and Grasha developed an instrument to identify the cognitive and affective components of learning style; and Dunn, Dunn, and Price developed an inventory to measure the affective and physiological components of learning styles.

Management Development Programs

The accelerating rate of change in the social, economic, and political environments of business activity has meant that planning for the future occupies an increasing proportion of management's time. An important aspect of this planning involves preparing managers for jobs which may have quite different facets from present positions (James, 1980). Managers need to keep themselves updated on major changes in their environment. They need to understand the significance of these changes and alter their methods and practices accordingly.

Several of the more significant changes which are making a major impact on managers include: (1) environmental changes such as international interdependence, the expansion of multinational organizations, an increasing use of automation, computers, and information technologies, greater government influence, problems of the economy, an increase in knowledge, and the rapid development of technology, (2)
population changes such as increase in minority groups, older employees, an increased number of women employees, and a better-educated population, and (3) attitude and value changes such as less respect for authority, reduced organizational loyalty, a tendency to be less patient and more easily bored, and a greater desire to influence organizational policy (Daly, 1976).

Managers need development programs to fit them for better performance in the jobs they now hold, to prepare them for the changes and challenges that are sure to come in the future, and to add to their years of service to the company. Organizations need development programs to provide a succession of managers for top-level positions, to keep managers at all levels aware of changes that profoundly affect the operations of the organization, and to provide for an orderly evolution of the way the organization operates within its changing environment (Black, 1979). The term development can be defined as: planning for the utilization of an individual's potential by offering him/her opportunities for his/her personal growth (Belman and Hull, 1967). Management development has been defined as the planned experience, guided growth, and training opportunities provided for those who perform management functions (Burr, 1967). Development is seen as a means of fitting and helping an individual to take on jobs at
different levels or in different spheres of management in general. Management development is a process concerned with the acquisition and refinement of knowledge and skills which fit a manager to take on an active role in management (Bennett, 1984).

Management development as an activity within organizations is on the increase (Mukhi, 1984). It is easy to understand why in a highly competitive and dynamic commercial environment, in which management decisions almost invariably have direct consequences for the well-being of the organization, the search for better management skills is pursued with such vigor (Hall, 1984). The immediate objective of management development is to raise the level of effectiveness of managers by improving performance of incumbents in their present jobs. As a result of this immediate effort, development begins and the opportunity to assess the individual's future job potential is created. The long-range objective is to prepare those with recognized potential for future advancement and responsibility in proportion to their capabilities (Burr, 1967).

The well-known functions of management (planning, organizing, staffing, leading, and controlling) tell us little about what managers actually do. At best, they indicate some vague objectives managers have when they work. Mintzberg (1975) had introduced a more supportable and
useful description of managerial work. He believed that, for an important starting point, all managers are vested with formal authority over an organizational unit. From formal authority comes status, which leads to various interpersonal relations; and, from these relations come access to information. Information, in turn, enables the manager to make decisions and strategies for his/her unit. The manager's job had been described in terms of various roles. Mintzberg's description comprised ten roles: formal authority gives rise to the three interpersonal roles (figurehead, leader, and liaison), which in turn give rise to the three informational roles (monitor, disseminator, and spokesman); these two sets of roles enable the manager to play the four decisional roles (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator).

From a different point of view, Parsons (1960) described the functions performed by persons at different levels of the modern organization as follows. At the very top, a small management group is responsible for the organization's relations with those outside the organization: customers, the financial community, the government, and so forth. This top management group, which might include the president and senior officers, is responsible for general organizational direction and goal setting, and represents the firm, as an institution, to
other institutions. Parsons calls this level the institutional system. Below this level is a more populous group concerned with the internal administration and allocation of resources within the organization. Parsons reserved the term managerial system for this level. Last are those concerned with carrying out the work of the company's operations or the technical system.

Katz (1955) suggested a conceptual frame of reference for thinking about management skills which can be applied in tandem with Parsons' model to derive a more specific profile of the skills needed at different levels of the modern organization. Katz categorized the skills needed by administrators as technical, human, and conceptual. Technical skill implies an understanding of and proficiency in a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques. Technical skill involves specialized knowledge, analytical ability within that specialty, and facility in the use of the tools and techniques of the specific discipline.

Human skill is the manager's ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the team. This skill is demonstrated in the way the individual perceives (and recognizes the perceptions of) his/her superiors, equals, and subordinates, and in the way he/she subsequently behaves. Conceptual skill involves
the ability to see the enterprise as a whole; it includes recognizing how the various functions of the organization depend on one another, and how changes in any one part affect all the others; and it extends to visualizing the relationship of the individual business to the industry, the community, and the political, social, and economic factors of the nation as a whole. Recognizing these relationships and perceiving the significant elements in any situation, the administrator should then be able to act in a way which advances the overall welfare of the total organization.

When Katz's concept is merged with Parsons' model, the result is the scheme shown in Figure 3 (Powers, 1980). Technical management skills are needed principally in unit operations by unit managers and their assistants. Technical skills are also needed in the managerial system; however, as the manager progresses up the organizational ladder, he/she finds more and more that he/she requires skills other than technical. Human skills, indicated by Katz (1955), are important at all levels of the organization but are particularly crucial at the lower and middle level. To reflect the realities of the foodservice industry, however, human skills are secondary for technical managers. This is due to the fact that while human skills are valuable a great many unit managers survive largely on technical skills (Powers, 1980). The need for conceptual skills in the
foodservice industry is unquestionable because of the increasingly more complex environment. Only those organizations whose top managers have the conceptual skills necessary to cope with the various unique problems will survive and prosper into the 1990s.
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**FIGURE 3. Management Skills Required at Different Management Levels**

When a person begins a professional career with an organization, his/her first assignment is usually specialized, as employment was based on some specific
technical ability. However, as he/she ascends in the organization's hierarchy, the scope of responsibility widens. The individual becomes less concerned with the technical aspects of the job and more occupied with managing the efforts of others who now hold positions in the organization which he/she held previously. Unfortunately, success in handling technical assignments is no guarantee of success in handling managerial assignments. Therefore, the use of management development programs to broaden a manager's perspectives, or to give him/her new insights, new ways of thinking, and new avenues of complex problem solving are necessary.

A systematic approach to training requires the assessment of training needs, the development/implementation of the program, and the evaluation and continual modification of the training process (Goldstein, 1986). Determining management development needs and program topics that satisfy managers' learning needs is of significant importance to program planners, managers, and organizations alike. Without knowing what managers need or want to learn, appropriate programs cannot be developed. Time, money, and valuable resources are wasted by misdirected emphasis and efforts that result in program offerings that no one is interested in attending. The content design of management development programs depends on various factors relating to
a sound assessment of organizational and individual needs. Management development efforts need to be integrated within a long-term plan for human resource development and designed in terms of desired outcomes (De Bettingnies, 1975).

Development needs assessment is a critical component of the training system (Goldstein, 1980; Hinrichs, 1976; McGehee & Thayer, 1961; Moore & Dutton, 1978) because it provides data to segment the audience, obtain commitment from participants, and determine which criteria to use for evaluation purposes (Scott and Deadrick, 1982). The source for needs assessment information is usually the managers for whom the programs are being planned and designed. However, there are other sources from which useful information can be collected that are sometimes overlooked (Campbell, 1980). These sources have been categorized by Campbell to include subject matter specialists, past program participants, program planners, informed individuals, professional literature, and media and program descriptions from other similar institutions.

The literature on managerial roles and activities suggests that training needs may differ across managerial level and functions. Bernick, Kindley, and Pettit (1984) examined self-assessed training needs of managers for technical, human, and conceptual skills. Managerial level affected self-perceived training needs, with upper
management reporting higher needs for conceptual training and lower level managers reporting higher training needs for technical skills. The profile of training needs for middle management was more closely related to the upper than to the lower management training needs profile. Ford and Noe's (1987) study also found that managerial level and function had some effect on reported administrative training needs.

According to Bowen (1973), development must be aimed at the kind of growth in judgement that enables managers to make hard decisions under actual working conditions. Digman's study (1980) showed that training needs of managers in typical medium-sized organizations included evaluating and appraising employees, motivating others, understanding human behavior, communication, setting objectives and priorities, managing time, organizing and planning, developing leadership, team building, and coping with stress. Knight and Salter (1985) surveyed 20 representatives of food service training programs. Safety, sanitation, leadership and supervision, management, communication, cooking principles, equipment, labor relations, and goal setting were the most common topics included in hospitality management training programs. A case study reported that forecasting and precosting, sales reporting, safety management, professionalism, motivation, delegation, problem solving, management communications, and
management styles were regularly covered in a leading hospitality firm's management development program (Farrell, 1979).

The effectiveness of training depends on the method almost as much as the topic. In a real sense, the instruction determines the content because it is the means by which the content is delivered to the adult classroom (Verduin, Miller, & Greer, 1977). Numerous studies have examined the strengths and weaknesses of various instructional methods. However, the inquiry was necessitated by failures in the attempt to find a best instructional method for the mythical average student (Trent & Cohen, 1973). Each method is more appropriate than the others in some extent, with some students, in some subject areas, and with some type or level of learning (Weston & Cranton, 1986). Training is most effective when individual needs and styles are accommodated in a rich, flexible, multi-path environment (Meier, 1985). According to Knight and Salter (1985), lecture, role-play, videotapes, class discussion, and training circles are the most popular methods used by hospitality trainers.

Corporations cannot afford to waste money on ineffective or inefficient management development programs (Martinetz, 1986). Management development requires an investment of time and money which, like any other type of
investment, must be justified on the basis of the return from that investment (Clegg, 1987). Therefore, a valid system of evaluating development programs is essential to any learning organization. Evaluation should be an integral part of a total development program and should be interwoven with the planning and implementation phases. Evaluation once served the purpose of program description (Anderson, Ball, & Murphy, 1975). The expanded definition now includes the examination of program activities and outcomes in order to provide information regarding program effects, both intentional and unintentional, for the purpose of reducing uncertainty, improving effectiveness, and making decisions (Patton, 1982).

Clegg (1978) reported that training personnel often neglect the evaluation of training because of a perceived lack of time. Brown (1980) pointed out that when the evaluation of management development program is performed, it frequently relies on the reactions of the participants towards the program as the criterion of success. Although participants' reactions to development programs are obviously valuable, actual job performance remains the crucial test in evaluating the benefits of management development program (Hill, 1980). The choice of methods of evaluation will depend heavily upon the reasons for the
evaluation and on the goal or purpose of the instruction it is proposed to evaluate.

Clegg (1987) surveyed 50 Fortune 500 industrial corporations to obtain current information on the status of their management development programs. The most important reasons for evaluating management development programs were determining if there is a payoff, justifying existence of the training function, and measuring progress toward objectives. The most frequently cited evaluation criteria were change in performance on the job, reaction of students to training, and changes in knowledge, skills, or attitudes possessed by the students. The most often used evaluation methods were informal collection of passing comments and student participation for internal objectives. End-of-course student course evaluation sheet and end-of-course report by instructor were used to evaluate immediate objectives. Post-course reaction of superiors, subordinates, and peers to changes observed and post-course on-the-job survey of trainees were used to evaluate intermediate objectives. The continued demand for courses was used to evaluate ultimate objectives.
MANUSCRIPT I.

RESTAURANT MANAGERS' LEARNING STYLES
AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS
This study identified the learning styles of unit and district level restaurant managers by using the Semantic Differential format of Kolb's Learning Style Inventory. Data were collected from 118 unit level managers and 45 district level managers. Learning styles of participating managers were determined by using the scoring procedure of the Learning Style Inventory. Seventy-eight percent of the unit level managers and 76% of the district level managers had a convergent learning style. No significant difference was found between learning styles of unit level and district level managers. Implications for the industry management development programs were suggested.
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RESTAURANT MANAGERS' LEARNING STYLES AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

The hospitality industry has been operating in a constantly changing and uncertain environment. Hospitality managers need to adopt more sophisticated techniques to keep their operations in pace with the dynamic challenges the industry faces. Corporations today need to provide effective development programs for managers to improve their current and future performance on the job and to provide a succession of managers for organizational top-level positions.

The characteristics of individual managers are important factors to be considered when designing management development programs because each person learns differently and individuals learn more efficiently by using their preferred learning methods. This study was designed to identify restaurant managers' learning preferences and strength and weaknesses as learners. By knowing restaurant managers' learning styles, effective management development programs could be developed.
Learning Style Theory

A better understanding of how people learn has been discussed and researched for years. Researchers and educators have examined and explained learning in various ways. Piaget explained learning in terms of developmental stages while Jung explained it through ways people perceive and process information. Dewey's explanation depended upon the role experience played in learning while Lewin used group dynamics and action research to explain learning. Combining ideas from all four of these earlier theorists, Kolb (1976) conceived of learning as a four stage cyclical model in his Experiential Learning Theory (see Figure 1).

Learners first have concrete experiences, involving themselves fully in the experiences, they reflect on them from different perspectives. After these reflective observations, learners engage in abstract conceptualization, from which they develop generalizations that help them integrate their observations into sound theories or principles. Finally, learners use these generalizations as
guides to further action, or active experimentation, and experiment in new, more complex situations using what they have learned. Then, learners have another concrete experience and the cycle begins again, but each time they operate at a more complex level. Thus, the Experiential Learning Theory is a cycle, but it is best thought of as a helix, with learners having additional experiences, reflecting on them, making generalizations about the experiences, and then using these as guides to further action at increasing levels of complexity (Kolb, 1985).

The model is based on the premise that to be effective, all learners need to be able to use all stages of learning at different times and in different situations (Smith & Kolb, 1986). The concrete experience stage of the learning cycle emphasizes involvement with people in everyday situations. Learners emphasizing this stage rely on feelings when approaching problems or learning situations and tend to be open-minded and adaptable to changes. The reflective observation stage of the learning cycle relies on the ability to review ideas and situations from several different perspectives. Learners are patient, objective, and careful not to make hasty judgments. Learners rely on their own thoughts and feelings to form opinions and learn best by watching and listening. The abstract conceptualization stage uses logic to understand problems.
and situations. Learners rely on systematic planning and developing theories and ideas to solve problems. Learners prefer situations which allow them to think. The active experimentation stage focuses on the ability to influence people or change situations. Learners are practical in their approach and have a concern for what works. Learners like to get things done and see results from their work (Kolb, 1985).

Close examination of this theory reveals that learning requires abilities that are polar opposites in two separate dimensions (see Figure 1). One dimension represents how learners perceive new information or experiences (the vertical line). This is identified as the concrete-abstract dimension and is conceived of as a continuum (Kolb, 1984). A preference for the concrete end of the continuum indicates that learners favor using their senses, immersing themselves in concrete reality and relying heavily on intuition when learning new information. They prefer tangible, felt qualities. A preference for the abstract end of the continuum indicates that learners favor grasping information by thinking, analyzing, or systematically planning. They prefer to learn through more abstract means (Smith & Kolb, 1986).

The second dimension of Kolb's learning theory represents how learners process what they perceive or how
learners incorporate new information with old (the horizontal line). This is identified as the active-reflective dimension and is conceived of as a continuum. The active end of the continuum is preferred by those who enjoy using their hands when learning something new or engaging actively in the learning situation. The reflective end of the continuum is favored by those preferring to sit back and observe other learners in action and reflect upon what is observed (Kolb, 1984).

The Experiential Learning Theory implies that learning takes place in an environment reflecting the resolution of certain dialectical tensions between two sets of opposing characteristics. Although the learner, if he/she is to be effective, needs four different kinds of abilities — concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation, Kolb (1974) argued that people tend to resolve these tensions of the opposing characteristics of learning abilities in a rather consistent and stable pattern. As a result of hereditary nature, particular past life experience, and the demands of the present environment, learners develop ways of learning that emphasize some learning abilities over others. There appears to be widespread agreement supporting the existence of differences in the ways individuals learn (Kolb, 1976; Claxton, Adams, & Williams, 1982; Garvey, Bootman, McGhan &
Meredith, 1984). The disagreement is in how researchers delineate the ways learners learn.

Learning Style Measurement

To better assist educators in understanding how students learn, Kolb and associates (1976) developed a self-descriptive inventory, the Learning Style Inventory (LSI), which is designed to measure an individual's strengths and weaknesses as a learner. They have tested the Learning Style Inventory with a number of different groups of people, such as managers, college students, medical students, and college faculty. Four statistically different types of learning styles have been identified from the results of their studies. Kolb has designated these four types as converger, diverger, assimilator, and accommodator (see Figure 2). On the basis of his research and clinical observations, certain characteristics have been associated with each learning style.

-----------------------------
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The divergers prefer to perceive information by concrete experience and process it by reflective observation. Their strengths are in their imaginative ability. They like to view situations from different perspectives and then weave relationships into a meaningful whole. They are called divergers because they are good at generating ideas and brainstorming. They tend to be people oriented and emotional.

The assimilators prefer to perceive information by abstract conceptualization and process it by reflective observations. Their strengths are in creating theoretical models. They are called assimilators because they like to assimilate disparate observations into an integrated whole. They are primarily interested in abstract concepts and are more concerned about the soundness of the ideas or theories themselves than their application. They tend to be less interested in people.

The convergers prefer to perceive information by abstract conceptualization and process it by active experimentation. Their strengths lie in the practical application of ideas. They are called convergers because they appear to do well when there is a single correct answer or solution to a question or a problem. They are relatively unemotional and prefer dealing with things rather than people.
Accommodators prefer to perceive information by concrete experience and process it by active experimentation. Their strengths lie in doing things, in carrying out plans and experiments and involving themselves in new experiences. They are risk takers and are called accommodators because they do well in situations in which they must adapt to meet specific immediate circumstances. They tend to solve problems in an intuitive trial and error manner and rely heavily on other people for information rather than their own analytic ability.

According to Kolb (1984), a person's current job role is one of the factors influencing learning style. The task demands and pressures of a job tend to shape a person's adaptive orientation. Technical jobs that require technical and problem solving skills require a convergent learning orientation. Personal jobs that require the establishment of personal relationships and effective communication with other people demand a divergent learning style. Executive jobs that require a strong orientation to task accomplishment and decision making in uncertain emergent circumstances require an accommodative learning style.
Katz (1955) suggested a conceptual frame of reference for thinking about management skills needed at different levels of the modern organization. Katz categorized the skills needed by administrators as technical, human, and conceptual (see Figure 3). Technical skills imply the understanding of and proficiency in a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques. Human skills refer to the ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the team. Conceptual skills involve the abilities to see the enterprise as a whole, recognizing how the various functions of the organization depend on one another, and how changes in any one part affect all the others.

Figure 3 insert here

Technical management skills are needed principally in unit operations by unit managers and their assistants. Technical skills which are essential to unit restaurant managers include food and beverage management, supervision
of personnel, and daily operation management. Technical skills are also needed by the district level managers. However, as the managers progress up the organizational ladder, they find more and more that they require skills other than technical (Powers, 1980).

Katz indicated that human skills are important at all levels of the organization but are particularly crucial at the lower and middle levels. To reflect the realities of the foodservice industry, human skills are secondary in importance for unit managers. Most unit managers survive largely on technical skills (Powers, 1980). District managers are the liaison between unit managers and headquarter personnel. Personnel management, communication and employee motivation are some of the essential skills for district level managers.

The need for conceptual skills in the foodservice industry by top level managers is unquestionable because of the increasingly more complex environment. The conceptual skills extend to visualizing the relationship of the individual business to the industry, the community, and the society as a whole.

Based on the review of literature, differences between unit level and district level managers' learning styles were speculated. Therefore, Learning Style Questionnaire was administered to unit and district level managers in selected
restaurant corporations.

Research Instrument

The questionnaire was composed of an alternate version of Kolb's Learning Style Inventory (see Figure 4) and 13 demographic items.

Figure 4 insert here

Marshall and Merritt (1985) developed the Learning Style Inventory -- Semantic Differential format (LSI-SD) by using the same word list comprising the original LSI. In order to provide more structure for responding, each word was contrasted with a word that represented the theoretically opposite learning style. Respondents used a 5-point scale to rate the consistency with which the opposing words characterized their popular learning style.

According to Marshall and Merritt (1985) the structure of the LSI-SD was consistent with the Kolb learning style model. The estimated reliabilities for individual scales ranged from 0.78 to 0.88; the two estimates for the bi-polar scales were 0.90 and 0.93 (Marshall & Merritt, 1986).
Thirteen demographic questions were designed for descriptive purposes and to study relationships between demographic variables and managers' learning styles. Demographic items included questions on sex, age, educational background, length of current employment, and the hours and topics of management development programs attended in current position, and previous foodservice related employment.

Pilot Test

Copies of the LSI-SD with demographic items were distributed to 6 local restaurant unit managers. Five of the 6 managers had completed education with a high school diploma and 1 had a college degree. The pilot test indicated that the LSI-SD could be completed within 10 to 15 minutes without any difficulty. Revisions to the demographic items were made.

Sample

The sample selection process of this study presented a challenge. Originally, the presidents of the nation's top 50 restaurant corporations reported by Restaurants & Institutions (Staff, 1987) were invited to have their
companies participate in the study. Sixteen companies responded and only one company agreed to have its unit and district level managers complete the Learning Style Questionnaire. Because of the limited response, 7 program directors at regional levels were personally contacted and invited to participate. Five of the 7 program directors agreed to have their unit and district level managers complete the questionnaire. A proportional random sample of unit and district managers was selected within each participating company. Ten percent of all unit managers or at least 20, and 25% of all district managers or at least 3 in each company were drawn as sample. A total of 162 unit managers and 56 district managers became the sample for the study.

Data Collection

Sufficient copies of the questionnaire were sent to participating companies. The national and regional offices of the companies distributed the questionnaires to unit and district level managers drawn as the sample. The unit and district level managers returned the completed questionnaires to the researcher directly or to the facilitators in their companies first and then to the researcher, depending upon the preference of the company. A
total of 118 (72.8%) completed questionnaires from unit
managers and 45 (80.4%) completed questionnaires from
district managers were usable for data analysis.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical analyses including frequencies,
means, percentages, and standard deviations were calculated
for all variables. The restaurant managers' learning styles
were determined by using the scoring procedures from the
LSI-SD. The relationships between selected demographic
variables and learning style scores were examined using
Pearson Correlation. The distribution of the learning
styles were determined using Crosstabs Analysis.

Results and Discussion

Demographic data indicated that 88% of the managers in
this study were male and 84% of them were under the age of
49 (see Table 1). Forty-four percent of the managers held a
high school diploma; and, 43% had baccalaureate degrees, 26%
in non-restaurant related fields and 17% in restaurant
related fields. On the average, they had 10 years of
restaurant management experience; they had been in their
current companies for 8 years; and they had held their
current positions for 4 years. Two thirds of the managers thought that they would not be promoted in the next year. Eighty-one percent of the managers had attended an average of 64 hours of management development programs provided by their company in their current position. Personnel management was the topic most often covered in the management development programs they attended.

Table 1 insert here

Demographic characteristics of unit and district level managers were not significantly different; however, some interesting tendencies were found. In this male dominated industry, the district level managers had an even higher male percentage. While 54% of unit level managers were under age of 30, 59% of district level managers were between age 31 and 39. District level managers tended to be more experienced, have held their current positions longer, be more likely to think that there is no chance to be promoted in the next year, and be more likely to attend management development programs for more hours. Unit level managers appeared to attend more management development programs that covered the content area of personnel management. Both
levels of managers had similar educational backgrounds.

Using demographic characteristics of the managers in this study, a composite picture could be drawn. Young male high school or college graduates were employed and trained by the company and worked their way up to their current positions. Those who did not get promoted probably left the company; therefore, managers in this study were those who succeeded and stayed on their jobs.

Computation of the learning style scores for the unit and district level managers revealed that 78% of the unit level managers and 76% of the district level managers fell in the converger quadrant (see Figure 5). There is no significant difference between unit level and district level managers' learning styles. The tendencies of those managers whose scores fell in other quadrants were not as strong as the tendencies of those whose scores fell in the convergent quadrant, since the majority of the scores were distributed in all the areas in the convergent quadrant and only around the center areas in the other three quadrants.

------------------------
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The findings were consistent with Kolb, Rubin, and McIntyre's (1971) management norms which indicated that managers, in general, tended to emphasize active experimentation over reflective observation. And, professions with a technical base consist primarily of people with the convergent learning style (Kolb, 1984). However, the findings did not confirm Berger's (1983) study which found that hospitality managers' learning styles fell in all four learning style quadrants quite evenly. Although unit level managers having convergent learning style seems appropriate, the district level managers' convergent learning style is a concern. The nature of district level managers' job makes human skills essential. Persons with a convergent learning style are relatively unemotional and prefer to deal with things rather than people.

The majority of the managers having one particular learning style may be a factor of the profession. Whether this means people's learning styles are shaped by the fields of work they choose or whether people select professions that fit their learning styles is not clear. Both factors are probably operating simultaneously -- people choose fields that are consistent with their learning styles and are further shaped to fit the learning norms of their fields as they work in them.

Professional career choices not only expose individuals
to a particular learning environment common to that profession; individuals are also committed to problems of that profession which require a particular adaptive orientation. In addition, they become members of a reference group of peers who share a professional mentality, a common set of values and beliefs about how they should behave professionally. This professional orientation shapes learning style through habits acquired in professional training and through the more immediate normative pressures involved in being a competent professional. When there is a mismatch between the field's learning norms and the individual's learning style, people will either leave the field or alter their learning styles.

If the majority of the district managers in the study worked their way up through the organization, the similarity of learning styles between unit level managers and district level managers can be explained. District level managers either developed the convergent learning style in early years on the jobs or had their existing learning styles reinforced in the organization. They have not been treated differently by the management development staff, and they have not changed or broadened their learning abilities.

The design of management development programs has a major impact on managers' learning effectiveness (Berger & Farber, 1986) and their information perceiving and
processing orientations (MacCarthy, 1981). The use of a variety of instructional methods and activities can accommodate all managers' learning styles and broaden all managers' learning abilities by practicing techniques that they do not use very often. It is especially important for district level managers to develop the abilities of being sensitive to others, to see situations from multiple viewpoints, and to observe situations patiently (MacCarthy, 1981).

The use of instructional activities such as laboratory and simulation which give participants hands-on experiences will benefit managers with different learning styles. Because managers with a convergent learning style learn best through hands-on experiences, this activity will make them feel good about themselves and help them learn the content effectively. For unit level managers whose learning styles fell into other quadrants, hands-on activities provide an opportunity for them to develop the abilities of thinking and doing which are vital to their success. The use of a variety of other instructional methods such as lecture, group discussion, and self-instruction which provide the opportunities to think, listen, share ideas, and discover would help all the managers with different learning styles in different ways. The assimilators, divergers, and accommodators will get a chance to learn through their
favorite learning methods; and the convergers will be exposed to activities they would not choose, and will be given opportunities to broaden their abilities in areas which are unfamiliar to them and may be essential when the scope and orientation of their jobs change.

District level managers need to be highly skilled with people (Powers, 1980). They need the abilities to watch, observe, and trust their sense/feeling judgments based on their own experience. District level managers need to be able to combine knowledge of company policies and personnel to make effective decisions. Organizations have the responsibility of developing district level managers' abilities in areas that facilitate the proper functioning of the operation.

Although the relationships between learning styles and instructional methods have not been absolutely defined, learning style theory and resulting learning style measurement can help educators/trainers realize the differences among learners and provide instructional methods based on learners' needs. To stimulate and encourage the management development staff in the hospitality industry to design and implement programs which use a variety of instructional methods to improve professional skills and learning abilities of managers is a challenge the hospitality industry encounters.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally Over About Over Generally (Most of half half half half (Most of the time) time time time time the time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation A - B - C - D - E .... Participation
Watching .......... A - B - C - D - E .... Acting
Emotional ...... A - B - C - D - E .... Rational
Feeling ............ A - B - C - D - E .... Thinking
Analytical .... A - B - C - D - E .... Emotional
Logical .......... A - B - C - D - E .... Sentimental

Figure 4. Sample Statements of Learning Style Inventory -- Semantic Differential Format
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Figure 5. Learning Styles of Unit and District Level Managers
Learning Styles Distribution of District Level Managers

Figure 5. (Continued)
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unit Level Managers</th>
<th>District Level Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate, Restaurant</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S., Restaurant</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S., Non-restaurant</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>9 Years</td>
<td>13 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Company</td>
<td>7 Years</td>
<td>10 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Position</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROMOTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Expected</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PARTICIPATION</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM LENGTH</td>
<td>48 Hours</td>
<td>100 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Management</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Management</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MANUSCRIPT II.

MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS:
THEORIES AND PRACTICE
The accelerating rate of change in the social, economic, and political environments of business activity requires managers that keep themselves updated on major changes. Managers need to understand the significance of these environmental changes and alter their methods and practices accordingly. Managers need development programs to fit them for better performance in the jobs they now hold, to prepare them for the changes and challenges that are sure to come in the future, and to help them add to their years of service to the company. In addition, organizations need development programs to provide a succession of managers for top-level positions, to keep managers at all levels aware of changes that profoundly affect the operations of the organization, and to provide for an orderly evolution of the way the organization operates in its changing environment (Black, 1979).

A number of educational theories emphasizing different stages of the educational process have been developed for adult learners with varied characteristics. Also, a variety of publications available to managers in the hospitality industry discuss the rules and processes of planning and conducting successful training programs. But little is
known about how much information program directors in the hospitality industry actually adapt and apply. Management development programs in the hospitality industry have rarely been studied and reported. The general characteristics of the currently used management development programs or how the programs are designed are unknown. The characteristics of program directors as a group are also unidentified.

To obtain this information, a questionnaire was designed to survey program directors in the field. All program directors were asked to answer the same set of questions twice -- once relating to development programs for unit level managers and the second time relating to development programs for district level managers. It was thought that variations between programs for unit level managers and district level managers would be found. Almost all the program directors gave identical responses for programs at both levels; hence answers about all programs were combined.

Exhibit I insert here
The responses of program directors are summarized in the following paragraphs. In an effort to relate theory to practice, appropriate theories for each category of the survey will be followed by what is actually practiced by program directors.

**Objective and content**

**Theories** Program analyses have shown that results are more satisfactory if content design of management development programs relates to a sound assessment of organizational and individual needs, is integrated within a long-term plan for human resource development, and is designed in terms of desired outcomes. Without knowing what managers need or want to learn, time, money, and valuable resources often are wasted. Misdirected emphasis and efforts often result in program offerings that no one is interested in attending, or offerings that make no significant difference in the practices of managers.

**Practice** When asked how management development program objectives were determined, all program directors indicated the use of company goals; 76% used needs assessment; and 57% used feedback from previous participants. Few companies used promotion policies to
determinate program objectives.

The content most commonly taught was personnel management, food and beverage management, decision making, financial management, and marketing. Topics related to computer or other technology were seldom or never taught by 70% of the companies responding.

------------------------
Exhibit II insert here
------------------------

**Instructional method**

**Theories** Instruction is the means by which content is delivered to an audience. The effectiveness of the program depends on the method used almost as much as the topic addressed (Verduin, Miller, & Greer, 1977). In a real sense, the instructional method is determined by the appropriate match among audience, instructor, content, and situation. There is no one best instructional method that works in every situation (Weston & Cranton, 1986). Programs are most effective when individual needs and styles are accommodated in a rich, flexible, multi-path environment (Meier, 1985).

**Practice** When selecting instructional methods, all the companies considered their program objectives and their
past experiences. The amount of time available was the third factor considered when selecting instructional methods. Characteristics of the participants influenced only 52% of the program directors when they made decisions about instructional methods. The most commonly used instructional methods were films/slides/videos, lectures, role plays, and seminar/group discussions. Case studies, simulations, and self instruction were sometimes used. Laboratories were seldom or never used by 61% of the program directors; and, computer assisted instruction (CAI) was seldom or never used by all the program directors.

---
Exhibit III insert here
---

**Evaluation method**

**Theories** Management development requires an investment of time and money which, like any other type of investment, must be justified on the basis of the return from that investment (Clegg, 1987). Therefore, a valid system of evaluating development programs is essential to any learning organization. Evaluation should be an integral part of a total development program and should be interwoven with the planning and implementation phases. Evaluation can
be used to provide information regarding program effects, both intentional and unintentional. Results can reduce uncertainty in the decision making process and improve effectiveness.

**Practice** The bases for selecting evaluation methods were the same as those used for selecting instructional methods. All companies evaluated the effectiveness of their programs on the participants' feedback at the end of the program and participants' job performance after returning to their operation units. There was almost no use of outside agents for evaluation purposes.

The majority of the program directors used some kind of participant evaluation. Observation, job performance, oral examination, and paper-and-pencil test were the most commonly used methods. The degree of using special projects varied considerably among companies.

----------------------------------

Exhibit IV insert here

----------------------------------

In addition to information about objective and content, instructional method, and evaluation, more specific information about management development programs was obtained.
Standardization

Seventy-one percent of the companies always or usually standardized their development programs. These training programs were usually designed by their training and development department. All program directors indicated that they seldom or never used the service of commercial management development companies or employed outside consultants to help design the programs.

Location

Most of the training programs took place in-house. The degree of using national training centers or regional offices varied. School/college campuses or professional/trade association facilities were seldom used by companies for their management development programs.

Length

The length of the management development programs offered by companies varied from less than one day to more than 10 days. No general tendency or preference was found.

Company support

All program directors indicated that some personnel were assigned to the management development programs. Seventy-six percent of the program directors were requested
to file regular reports related to their management development programs. Seventy three percent of the program directors reported always or usually getting a special budget for their programs. While 74% of the participants were paid to attend management development programs, only 30% of the companies tied the managers' promotions to their completion of the programs.

Participant selection

When asked who the management development program participants were, the majority of the program directors indicated that they always or usually were all the managers. Thirty-six percent of the directors stated that program participants were always or usually managers who showed promising potential. Only 16% of the participants were managers who showed training needs.

Program director

Each company had its unique job title for its management development program director. Some examples of these titles were: Director of Training, Vice President of Human Resources, Personnel Manager, Personnel Director, Human Resources Director, Director of Training and Development, etc. Thirteen of the fourteen program directors were male. The majority of them ranged in age
from 30 to 49 years old, entered the company and worked their way up through the organization, and held academic degrees. Only two program directors entered the family business.

Food for Thought

In the most general sense, the management development programs in this survey seem to be on the right track. Most of the companies supported management development programs with a specific budget and assigned personnel.

It was somewhat disappointing to find no differences between management development programs for unit and district level managers. Because the responsibilities of unit level and district level managers are often different in scope, the program objectives and content of the management development programs for each level might be selected with different emphases. Job descriptions for unit managers indicate a need for skills such as food and beverage management, supervision of personnel, and daily operation management. Job descriptions for district managers indicate a need for human skills. District managers are the liaison between unit managers and headquarter personnel. They are members of a team and need to build cooperative efforts within the team. Personnel
management, communication and employee motivation seem to be appropriate topics to be included in management development programs for district level managers; while food and beverage production management, basic supervision and operation management seem to be more appropriate for unit managers' development programs.

The lack of including computer and other technology in the program content is a concern. The importance of computer literacy in today's society and the computerization of hospitality operations can be documented. Efficient use of computers by managers will be inevitable.

The characteristics of participants are important factors to be considered when designing a program because each person learns differently and the participants learn more efficiently by using preferred learning methods. Although current management development programs do contain a variety of instructional methods, computer assisted instruction and laboratory exercises are areas that could be explored for those participants who prefer these learning methods.

Designing a sound management development program is very time consuming and requires professional expertise. Commercial development companies are usually staffed with experts in a variety of areas. Having a consultant conduct a workshop, seminar, or speak periodically can bring a new
perspective to in-house standardized programs and could have a positive effect on manager motivation. They could also be cost-effective activities when offered on a non-regular basis. Some use of outside experts could provide benefits beyond those already obtained from in-house programs.

The ultimate purpose of a management development program is to meet the needs of both manager and organization. The objectives of all the currently implemented development programs were determined by the company's goals, but few were determined by program participants' characteristics or training needs. Personnel promotion policies did not influence program objectives or credit participants for the completion of management development programs. It seems that the merit of building a career ladder was missing in these organizations. If the companies could assist individual managers to develop a career path, indicate the necessary skills needed to advance on the career ladder, and provide opportunities for learning the skills based on personal needs, the loyalty of the managers to companies would be developed beneficially and the high turnover rate in the industry could be reduced.
Summary

Results of the survey conducted with 14 program directors in the hospitality industry indicated that management development programs generally received monetary support from the companies, were designed by their own training and development departments, and frequently required all the unit/district managers' participation.

The objectives of the programs were set according to company goals. The instructional and evaluation methods were selected based on program objectives and past experiences. The most commonly taught topics included personnel management and food and beverage management. The most frequently used instructional methods were films/slides/videos, lectures, role plays, and seminar/group discussions. The most frequently used evaluation method was participants' job performance after completing the programs.

Suggestions made to restaurant corporations/program directors included providing management development programs with different emphases for unit and district managers, offering computer application courses, considering participant characteristics when designing programs, using the service of commercial management development companies or employing outside consultants, and integrating management development programs with manager career paths.
Exhibit I. The Questionnaire Design and Data Collection Process

Questionnaire Design

The first part of the questionnaire related to the characteristics of management development programs. Questions used a five point scale as shown below. Program directors were asked to indicate the frequency of happening for each situation listed on the questionnaire.

1 2 3 4 5
always usually sometimes seldom never

Characteristics of management development programs included: location, standardization, design, company support, participant, objective, instructional method, evaluation method, length, and content.

The second part of the questionnaire asked for information about program directors. Characteristics included: position, length of time in the position, career path, sex, and age.

Data Collection Process

The data collection process was a challenge. Originally, the presidents of the nation's top 50 restaurant corporations reported by Restaurant & Institutions (1987) were invited to have their company participate. Only 16 companies responded, 7 of these indicated that they did not wish to participate. The reasons for the low response rate can only be speculative. Perhaps the requests did not reach the management development program directors. Or, management development programs may be considered confidential. Also, it is speculated that practitioners in the field do not sense the importance of academic research. Because of the small sample size, 7 program directors at regional level were invited to participate in the study. Five of the seven directors completed the questionnaire. A total of 14 program directors became the sample of the study.
Exhibit II. Content Always or Usually Offered by Management Development Programs

- Personnel Management: 85%
- F & B Management: 85%
- Decision Making: 78%
- Financial Management: 74%
- Marketing: 41%
- Computer/Other Tech: 17%

Percentage of Companies
Exhibit III. Instructional Methods Always or Usually Used by Management Development Programs

- Film/Slide/Video: 78%
- Lecture: 74%
- Role Play: 74%
- Seminar/Group Discussion: 63%
- Case Study: 32%
- Simulation: 32%
- Self Instruction: 17%
- Laboratory: 9%
- CAI: 0%

Percentage of Companies
Exhibit IV. Participant Evaluation Methods Always or Usually Used by Management Development Programs

- Observation: 88%
- Job Performance: 78%
- Oral Examination: 67%
- Paper/Pencil Test: 67%
- Special Project: 26%
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Although a better understanding of how people learn has been discussed for years and numerous research studies on learning styles have been documented in journals of education, there have been very few empirical studies of learning styles in the foodservice industry. Studies pertaining specifically to the learning styles of restaurant managers are relatively non-existent in the current literature.

The present study was designed to (1) examine the learning styles of restaurant managers, (2) examine the relationship of restaurant managers' learning styles to related demographic variables, (3) examine certain aspects of current management development programs in selected restaurant corporations in the United States, (4) identify implications for restaurant management development programs, and (5) stimulate researchers in the foodservice area to engage in more detailed and larger scale studies dealing with learning styles.

Kolb's Experiential Learning Theory had been selected as the basis for the study because of its extensive theoretical development and empirical validation. Two research instruments were administered in the study, Learning Style Questionnaire (Appendix A) to unit and
district level restaurant managers and Program Analysis Questionnaire (Appendix B) to management development program directors. An alternative version of the Kolb's Learning Style Inventory, Learning Style Inventory -- Semantic Differential format developed by Marshall and Merritt (1985), was adopted in the Learning Style Questionnaire. The Program Analysis Questionnaire was developed to obtain information on current management development programs implemented in the foodservice industry. Both questionnaires included demographic items to identify characteristics of respondents.

The data were collected from 14 management development program directors, 118 unit level restaurant managers, and 45 district level restaurant managers. Unit level and district level managers were chosen because Training magazine (Staff, 1984) indicated that first line supervisors and middle managers in the organizations receive more training than any other employee. Those in top management positions were the most likely to receive training from outside the organization. Correspondence related to the data collection procedure is included in Appendix C.

Descriptive statistical analyses were calculated for all variables. Learning styles were determined by using the scoring procedures of the LSI-SD. The relationships between selected demographic variables and learning style scores
were examined using Pearson Correlation.

Thirteen of the 14 program directors were male. The majority of them ranged in age from 30 to 49 years old, entered the company and worked their way up through the organization, and held academic degrees. Eighty-eight percent of the managers were male. They had 10 years of foodservice management experience on the average. Eighty-one percent of the managers had attended an average of 64 hours of management development programs in their current positions provided by the companies.

Computation of the learning style scores for the unit and district level managers revealed that 78% of the unit level managers and 76% of the district level managers have convergent learning style. There was no significant difference between unit level managers' learning styles and district level managers' learning styles.

Results of the Program Analysis Questionnaire indicated that management development programs for unit and district level managers were almost identical. No significant difference was found. The objectives of the programs were set according to company goals. The most commonly taught topics included personnel management and food and beverage management. The most frequently used instructional methods were films/slides/videos, lectures, role plays, and seminars/group discussions.
Since the responsibilities of unit level and district level managers are often different in scope, managers at different levels need to have different knowledge and skills and develop different abilities. The management development programs of each level might be designed with different emphases in terms of objectives, content, and instructional methods.

The most commonly used instructional methods in current management development programs appear to match the learning preferences of assimilators, accommodators, and divergers. Assimilators enjoy the traditional classrooms; accommodators function by acting and testing experience; and divergers function through social interaction (MaCarthy, 1981). Convergers, the majority of the managers in this study, prefer to know how things work, have hands-on experiences, and enjoy solving problems. In order to provide an effective learning environment for the majority of the managers, instructional methods such as laboratory, simulation, case study, and special projects could be introduced into the management development programs.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based on this study, several areas concerning learning styles of hospitality management personnel need to be
further investigated. To begin with, in order to identify an industry norm, further study with larger samples is needed.

Second, further investigation which studies learning styles of hospitality personnel in different types of operations is recommended. Such designs would compare the learning style differences among hospitality personnel with different responsibilities in different environments.

Third, a longitudinal study which keeps track of the learning style changes of the participants from their student years to the later years of their career would be beneficial. Such a study would examine the factors that influence individuals' learning styles. Information might also shed light on the industry norm.

Fourth, further research could study the relationships between individual learning styles and instructional method preferences. Enhancement of individual learning might be an outcome.

Finally, a study which helps management development program staff in the hospitality industry develop more effective management development programs utilizing a variety of instructional methods based on participants' learning styles and preferences is recommended.
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APPENDIX A.

LEARNING STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE
LEARNING STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Following is a list of 40 word pairs. For each pair, decide which one of the two words is more characteristic of your learning style when compared to the other word. Then decide if the word describes what you generally prefer. If it is most of the time, then circle the extreme response, A or E, whichever is appropriate. If it is over half of the time but not most of the time, then circle the next response, B or D, whichever is appropriate. If you cannot decide between the two words, circle C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Most of the time)</td>
<td>Over Half The Time</td>
<td>About Half The Time</td>
<td>Over Half The Time</td>
<td>Generally (Most of the time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Premonition</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Watching</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Acting</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Perceptual</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Perform</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Operative</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watchful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Produce</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>A - B - C - D - E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGER CHARACTERISTICS

Instructions: Please place an X in the blank preceding the answer that best applies to you or fill in the blank with the information requested.

1. What is your sex?
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

2. What is your age?
   _____ Less than 30
   _____ 30-39
   _____ 40-49
   _____ 50-59
   _____ 60 or more years
3. What is the highest degree you have had?

- No formal degree
- High school diploma
- 2-year restaurant related associate degree
- B.S. degree, restaurant related major
- B.S. degree, non-restaurant related major
- Advanced degree, please specify

4. How many years of restaurant management experience have you had? ________ years

5. How many years have you been in this company? ________ years

6. How many years have you held your present position? ________ years

7. Do you think you will be promoted in the next year?

- Yes
- No

8. While you have been in your current position, have you attended any management development programs, workshops, or seminars provided by your company?

- Yes
- No (Please skip question #9-10)

9. How many hours of management development programs, workshops, or seminars have you attended while in your current position? ________ hours

10. What categories of topics have been covered in these programs, workshops, or seminars?

- Financial management
- Marketing management
- Personnel management
- Production management
- Others, please specify

11. Prior to your employment, have you worked in any other type of foodservice operation?

- Yes
- No (Please stop here)

12. Complete the following by indicating the numbers of years you have worked in each type of foodservice operation and numbers of hours of programs, workshops, or seminars you have attended provided by each employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of operation</th>
<th>Number of years employed</th>
<th>Hours of programs, workshops, seminars attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family style restaurant</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table service restaurant</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club/Bar</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel</td>
<td>________</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Others, please specify ________

13. What categories of topics have been covered in management development programs, workshops, or seminars provided by your previous employer(s)?

- Financial management
- Marketing management
- Personnel management
- Production management
- Others, please specify
APPENDIX B.

PROGRAM ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE
Instructions: This survey is to determine the nature and extent of management development activities in your organization for both unit managers (persons responsible for the successful operation of one restaurant unit) and district managers (persons responsible for the successful operation of several restaurant units in designated areas). Please read through the following statements carefully and assign a numerical value to each statement using the scale provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>always</th>
<th>usually</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>seldom</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please use the left hand-blank for unit managers and right hand blank for district managers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Development Program(s) for</th>
<th>Unit Managers</th>
<th>District Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The location of management development program(s) is/are
   a. national training centers.
   b. regional/district office(s).
   c. in-house.
   d. school/college campus.
   e. professional or trade associations.
   f. others (Please specify ____________________________ )

2. Management development program(s) is/are standardized for all managers.
   (If 5, please skip to Question #4)

3. The standardized management development program(s) was/were designed by
   a. T & D department.
   b. outside consultant.
   c. commercial management development company.
   d. others (Please specify ____________________________ )

4. The way company supports the management development program(s) is that
   a. specific budget is given to the program director.
   b. specific personnel are assigned to the program(s).
   c. regular reports are required from the program director.
   d. promotions are tied to the program completion.
   e. participants are paid to attend the programs.
   f. others (Please specify ____________________________ )

5. The participants in management development program(s) are
   a. all unit/district managers.
   b. unit/district managers who sign up voluntarily.
   c. unit/district managers who show promising potential.
   d. unit/district managers who show training needs.
   e. others (Please specify ____________________________ )
6. Information used to determine program objectives includes
   a. company goals.
   b. needs assessment.
   c. feedback from prior participants.
   d. promotion policy.
   e. others (Please specify ___________________________)

7. Information used to determine instruction/evaluation methods includes
   a. program objectives.
   b. characteristics of participants.
   c. past experiences.
   d. time available.
   e. others (Please specify ___________________________)

8. Instructional methods used include
   a. lecture.
   b. role play.
   c. seminar/group discussion.
   d. self instruction.
   e. case study.
   f. simulation.
   g. laboratory.
   h. computer-assisted instruction.
   i. films/slides/videos.
   j. others (Please specify ___________________________)

9. Participant evaluation methods used include
   a. observation.
   b. oral examination.
   c. paper-and-pencil test.
   d. special project.
   e. job performance.
   f. doing nothing.
   g. others (Please specify ___________________________)

10. Program evaluation methods used include
    a. end-of-the-program feedback from participants.
    b. outside evaluation agent.
    c. participant's job performance.
    d. others (Please specify ___________________________)

11. The length of the management development program(s) is/are
    a. less than one day.
    b. 1-3 days.
    c. 4-6 days.
    d. 7-9 days.
    e. more than 10 days.

12. The content areas of management development program(s) include
    a. personnel management.
    b. food and beverage management.
    c. financial management.
    d. decision making.
    e. marketing.
    f. computer or other technology.
    g. others (Please specify ___________________________)
PROGRAM DIRECTOR CHARACTERISTICS

Instructions: Please fill in the blank with the information requested OR place an X in the blank preceding the answer that best applies to you.

1. What are the job titles for the personnel responsible for management development program(s) in your company?


2. What is your position in the company?


3. How long have you been in this position?
   _____ Less than 1 year
   _____ 1-4 years
   _____ 5-9 years
   _____ 10 or more years (Please specify number of years _______)

4. What was your path to program management? Check all that apply.
   _____ Entered the family business
   _____ Worked way up through the organization
   _____ Had previous work experience in program development
   _____ Had an academic degree, please specify ____________________________
   _____ Had related training, please specify ________________________________
   _____ Others, please specify ________________________________

5. What is your sex?
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

6. What is your age?
   _____ Less than 30
   _____ 30-39
   _____ 40-49
   _____ 50-59
   _____ 60 or more years
APPENDIX C.

CORRESPONDENCE
June 24, 1988

Dear

Iowa State University is undertaking a research study of learning styles utilized by restaurant management personnel and of selected characteristics of current management development programs. We anticipate that information obtained concerning the more effective learning styles of unit and area restaurant managers will suggest appropriate procedures in conducting management development programs.

Because only 50 of the most successful restaurant organizations in the United States are being invited to participate, we need your approval and support. There are three ways in which you can help.

One is for either you or your staff officer for personnel matters to complete the blue Program Analysis Questionnaire which asks for information about your management development activities for unit and district (area) management personnel. A postage paid, addressed envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire.

Secondly, we would appreciate receiving the names of unit and district managers employed by your organization (i.e., not franchised unit personnel). Not more than 10 percent of the unit managers and 25 percent of the district managers will be randomly selected to complete the beige Learning Style Questionnaire (sample enclosed). After the sample is drawn, we will send sufficient copies for your office to distribute to those drawn, or if you prefer, we will mail directly to each manager if you will provide us the addresses of the managers selected.

The responses to both questionnaires will be confidential and remain anonymous. Group results only will be used for data analysis and reporting purposes.

Finally, we would appreciate receiving a copy of your organizational chart for the purpose of categorizing participating companies. Organizations with similar structure will be grouped together for comparative analyses.

For your participation, you will receive a copy of the research results. If you have questions, please contact either of us. We appreciate your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Cathy H.C. Hsu
Research Investigator

Thomas E. Walsh
Department head and
Research adviser
September 6, 1988

Dear

In late June, you received a package of material and a letter inviting your participation in an Iowa State University research study of management development programs and learning styles of management personnel in the restaurant industry. Many organizations have responded and are in the process of participating. We have not heard from you or anyone in your organization. Your participation is needed because only a limited number of restaurant organizations were chosen and contacted.

The information received will be anonymous and confidential for both the person responding and the organization for which he/she is employed. For your participation, you will receive a copy of the results for your use.

Enclosed is another package of the materials sent previously. We ask that you or your designated representative complete and return the blue Program Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ). Along with returning the PAQ, we would appreciate your sending a copy of your organizational chart showing position titles of top through unit managers (names are not needed) for use in classifying the participating organizations in various ways.

The final aspect of the study is to have a random sample of your unit managers and area/district managers complete a learning styles questionnaire. Depending upon the number of personnel, we would need from 10 to 15 percent of the unit managers and 20 to 30 percent of the area managers to participate. Again, all responses would be anonymous and confidential.

Their participation can be handled in one of two ways as you prefer. One is to provide us with a list of names and addresses so that we could correspond directly with those selected at random. The other is that we would provide you with sufficient questionnaires and the process for random selection (e.g., every 8th name on your list of managers beginning with the third name on your list). Postage-paid return envelopes would also be provided so that each manager could return his/her questionnaire directly. We would inform you as to the number returned.
We would appreciate receiving the responses by September 23. Please contact either of us if you have questions. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Cathy H.C. Hsu
Research Investigator

Thomas E. Walsh
Department head and
Research adviser
September 6, 1988

Dear

This is to acknowledge receipt of the completed Program Analysis Questionnaire as part of the Iowa State University research study of management development programs and learning styles. We appreciate your response.

We also asked your assistance in having a random sample of your unit managers and area/district managers complete a learning styles questionnaire. Depending on the number of personnel, we would need from 10 to 15 percent of the unit managers and 20 to 30 percent of the area managers to participate.

This participation can be handled in one of two ways as you prefer. One is to provide us with a list of names and addresses so that we could correspond directly with those selected at random. The other is that we would provide you with sufficient questionnaires and the process for random selection (e.g., every 8th name on your list of managers beginning with the third name on your list). Postage-paid return envelopes would also be provided so that each manager could return his/her questionnaire directly. We would inform you as to the number returned.

All responses would be anonymous and confidential. Neither the individual or his/her company would be identified in the analysis and reporting of the data.

Your cooperation and participation is extremely important to the completeness of this study. You will receive a copy of the results for your use.

We would appreciate receiving the responses by September 30. Please contact either of us if you have questions. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Cathy H.C. Hsu
Research Investigator

Thomas E. Walsh
Department head and Research adviser

P.S. If available, we would also appreciate receiving a copy of your organizational chart showing position titles of top through unit managers (names are not necessary). The charts will be used to classify the organizations in various ways. Thank you.
November 3, 1988

Dear Representative:

Thank you for filling in or agreeing to have someone in your organization fill in the blue Program Analysis Questionnaire. We look forward to receiving that questionnaire from you by November 14.

We also appreciate your approval and support in having your district/area and unit managers fill in the beige Learning Style Questionnaire. We particularly appreciate your support in distributing and collecting the questionnaires. We would suggest having the questionnaires returned to you by November 18. We have enclosed a sample cover letter that might be used by your office to expedite questionnaire responses.

Since companies differ in size, we are asking for completed questionnaires from the following number of managers:

- 25% of all District/Area Managers or at least 3 (if possible)
- 10% of all Unit Managers or at least 20

The responses to both questionnaires will be confidential and remain anonymous. Group results only will be used for data analysis and reporting purposes. For your participation, you will receive a copy of the research results.

We would appreciate receiving the responses by November 25. Please contact any of us if you have questions. Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Cathy Hsu  
Research Investigator

Thomas E. Walsh  
Department head and Research adviser

Frances M. Smith  
Associate professor and Research adviser
Dear [Name]:

The Department of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institution Management at Iowa State University is conducting a research project involving both unit and district/area managers. They need your help. Please take 15 minutes to fill in the attached questionnaire and return to my office by November 18.

The results are to be used to recommend future management development programs for managers like you. Since all persons are different, they need your response. If you have questions please feel free to contact me or call Dr. Thomas Walsh at Iowa State University, 515-294-1730.

The responses to the questionnaire will be confidential and remain anonymous. Only group results will be reported.

I look forward to receiving your questionnaire by November 18.