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ABSTRACT

Front-line leaders are critical to the success of hospitality organizations. Successful development of leaders is contingent upon higher education, industry, and hospitality management students working in partnership. A gap exists between the wants, needs, and desires of hospitality recruiters and what recruiters perceive academia is producing. However, industry has a responsibility to continue developing leadership skills of new leaders’ post-graduation. This study examined front-line leaders in full-service hotel environments. The purpose was to explore what front-line leaders know about leadership, understand how the knowledge was acquired, and if the knowledge was used effectively. This qualitative study takes a phenomenological approach and utilizes a propensity for participative decision-making (PPDM) scale to assess the use of leadership knowledge. Results from the study suggest front-line leaders form thoughts about leadership behaviors whether formally educated on the topic or not. College graduates were more likely to have PPDM and be familiar with leadership constructs. However, a gap still exists in the development of front-line leaders’ post-graduation. It is in the best interest of industry to invest in leadership development or unwittingly risk outsourcing leadership to newly hired but unknown front-line leaders.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The hospitality industry consists of an array of varied and complex businesses that are highly labor intensive (Poulston, 2008). Hospitality organizations are traditionally considered intangible service providers but are arguably involved in both service and manufacturing; i.e. manufacturing and remanufacturing food and room product respectively (Israeli, 2014). This service paradigm and manufacturing paradigm perspective within hospitality organizations underscores the importance of leaders, particularly front-line leaders, to the industry. The size and scope of an organization determines the resulting organizational design as represented by an organizational chart (Berger & Brownell, 2009). Regardless of organizational design, complex hospitality businesses require front-line leaders to successfully navigate daily operations in order to meet organizational goals and business plan objectives. Front-line hospitality leaders reside outside of an office overseeing and directly influencing operations through coaching, instructing technical skills, and communicating with line-level employees at a greater rate than more senior leaders within the organization (Kavanaugh & Ninemeier, 2012). In other words, front-line leaders continually influence decisions that impact internal and external customer interactions.

Considering the hospitality industry is complex and requires skilled front-line leaders to achieve an organization’s goals, great care should be given to selection, development, and nurturing of front-line leaders. Organizational performance and well-being
of human assets at all levels of the organization are improved through the use of structured training and development (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). Influencers in positions to impact selection and development of the next generation of leaders are called on to do so in a meaningful manner (Brownell, 2005). Aguinis and Kraiger (2009) note, “There is documented evidence that training [and development] activities have a positive impact on performance of individuals and teams” (p. 453).

Various methods are utilized to develop leaders and are delivered by means of formal higher education and company sponsored programs. Hospitality programs at institutions of higher education have taken on greater responsibility for formally developing industry leaders over the past two decades (Cheung, Law, & He, 2010). Evidence of this is demonstrated by recent emerging program names such as Georgetown Global Hospitality Leadership; Missouri State’s recent program name change to Hospitality Leadership; or longer standing Hospitality Leadership programs at institutions such as DePaul University and East Carolina University. The Cheung et al. (2010) study demonstrates that leadership is often listed as a competency in hospitality research. Hospitality educators have an opportunity to create a classroom leadership development learning environment through coursework, readings, and lectures (Arendt & Gregoire, 2005). An emerging leadership course design is a blended-experiential methodology that combines theory with practice, and is a method preferred by hospitality students (Maier & Thomas, 2013). Other academics such as Brownell (2010) take an egalitarian approach, and suggest institutions of higher education hospitality programs have a responsibility for leadership development noting servant leadership concepts may be a preferred path forward.
Likewise, many private sector hospitality organizations also utilize formal education to develop leaders. The extent and impact of company leadership development continues to be researched. A study by Elliott Leadership Institute (2003) in partnership with Johnson and Wales University found CEO’s leadership competencies were acquired by life experiences (34%); on-the-job learning (33%); and by mentorship (10%). Vice president level personnel indicated leadership skill and knowledge acquisition occurred through on-the-job learning (44%); life experience (13%); personal training classes (13%); and employee training classes (12%). Finally, middle managers reported leadership development was attributed to on-the-job learning and personal training; 38% and 22% respectively. Results from this study suggest that positions beyond front-line leaders are self-developing through life experiences and on-the-job learning. Leadership development resources are typically allocated to mid-level and senior level leaders through succession planning activities (Chung, Enz, & Lankau, 2003). This may indicate that less resources are being allocated to develop newly promoted front-line leaders or recently hired college graduates. Further, implications of this may indicate front-line leaders are developing managerial and leadership knowledge and skills through life experience and on-the-job learning at a greater rate than senior leaders. A gap in leadership development may exist during this formative timeframe for new front-line leaders. Leadership functions and leader impact on team effectiveness is improved when leaders are trained versus untrained (Santos, Caetano, & Tavares, 2015). Front-line hospitality leaders oversee managerial operations through decision making processes on a daily basis and are compensated to do so (Reich, 2000).
Leadership requires critical thinking which consists of constructs such as decision-making, strategic planning, and fostering an environment of creativity and risk taking (Chung et al., 2003). Numerous decisions are made by front-line leaders during the course of each day. Senior level leaders such as CEO’s, company officers, and vice presidents are responsible for long-term conceptual decisions dealing with steering the organization; mid-level leaders such as directors and administrative managers focus on short to mid-term forward looking decisions; and front-line operational managers and supervisors are responsive to the daily activities of customer service, employee relations, and for implementing and enforcing company standards (Kavanaugh & Ninemeier, 2012; Santos et al., 2015). Decision-making at the front-line level is of importance as are the methods used in such decision-making processes.

One method of decision making is participative decision-making (PDM). PDM occurs when leaders utilize thoughts and ideas of others within an organization to formulate plans and solutions in a strategic fashion to initiate a shared sense of decision making responsibility (Russ, 2013). PDM positively impacts organizations through enhanced productivity, flow of information, solving work related problems, and creating job enrichment (Miller & Mongue, 2016; Rodgers & Hunter, 1993). It has also been suggested PDM has a positive influence on job satisfaction (van der Westhuizen, Pacheco, & Webber, 2012). Rodgers & Hunter (1993), opined “The critical fact underlying the importance of participation in decision making is the fact that the employee is closer to the work than top management” (p. 9). Clark, Hartline, and Jones (2009) in a study about commitment to quality service, go further to suggest that a participatory leadership style is well suited for the
hospitality industry as a service worker, such as a front desk agent, is more cognizant of customer needs than a manager. Therefore, a front-line leader schooled and practiced in participative management techniques may be better equipped to create an environment that delivers higher quality service by employees with a greater sense of job satisfaction.

**Statement of the Problem**

Working in concert, hospitality institutions of higher education, hospitality organizations, and front-line leaders (FLL) are responsible for developing leadership talent. Conversely, these parties together or separately, may impede leadership growth and knowledge within an organization. Leadership development issues may arise when hospitality education programs lack focus on leadership curriculum or creating leadership opportunities for students; hospitality organizations fail to allocate time, money, and create formal development programs for newly promoted or recently hired FLL; or when a new or existing FLL chooses not to engage in personal development or does not fully comprehend the advantages of developing leadership acumen. The construct of whole-brain learning is analogous to this symbiotic relationship. Tesone's (2004) hospitality study suggests theory, practical experience, and personal reflection on the interaction between the theoretical concepts and application allows for deeper comprehension and evaluation of the learning process; in this case leadership.

Executives rely on FLL to execute plans, oversee daily operations, and achieve results through personnel (Cheung et al., 2010). Supervisors make many decisions regarding
daily operations during any given shift. Service standards, productivity measurements, service recovery issues, scheduling, adjusting variable labor, employee personal problems, non-service related guest issues, and other managerial tasks are but a part of the overall decision-making scope of FLL, which differs from middle and executive level focus (Kay & Moncarz, 2004; Kavanaugh & Ninemeier, 2012). In order to attain continuity in decision-making across divisions, departments, and day parts within the same departments, organizations rely on a mission statement, forward looking vision, and set of foundational values (Reich, 2000). A common mission, vision, and set of values of an organization assist in creating alignment in the decision-making process (Dickson, Ford, & Upchurch, 2006). Dickson et al., (2006) further suggest that failure to inculcate new leaders with a set of common guiding principles creates a leadership void and may cause FLL to free-lance decision making.

The above scenarios present a dilemma for hospitality organizations. The lack of front-line leader’s knowledge surrounding leadership theory and practice, emanating from either formal higher education or company development, may have an adverse effect on a leader’s ability to effectively lead front-line staff in accordance and in alignment with an organizations mission, vision, and values.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine front-line leaders’ knowledge of leadership theory and concepts, how knowledge was attained, and application of knowledge in a full-
service hotel setting. To achieve this purpose, a phenomenological qualitative approach similar to another study exploring hospitality FLL in full-service casino environments was utilized (Krawiec, 2012). This study went further to explore potential associations between front-line leaders’ leadership knowledge and implications relating to decision-making. In this case, utilizing a scale centered on the propensity for participative decision-making (PPDM) (Parnell & Bell, 1994).

**Significance of the Study**

The hospitality industry is a complex environment requiring leaders at all levels of the organization to manage revenues and expenses, develop and implement service systems, and sustain an atmosphere that promotes employee engagement and satisfaction (Poulston, 2008). Higher education hospitality programs and employers alike share responsibility for developing current and future industry leaders. Effective leaders are skilled and savvy in the art of leadership (Nahavandi, 2011). Therefore, examining how FLL acquire thoughts and knowledge on the construct of leadership and exploration of the leader’s ability to effectively utilize said knowledge is important to industry.

Considerable research has centered on managerial and leadership competency models in the hospitality industry (Cheung et al., 2010; Chung et al., 2003; Kay & Moncarz, 2004; Testa & Sipe, 2012). For decades, researchers have investigated leadership behaviors and traits (Fiedler, 1996). A gap exists in leadership research. Research has generally informed audiences on desirable traits, styles, and behaviors of ideal leaders and sought feedback regarding follower’s perceptions of leaders. There is a scarcity of hospitality research simply
focused on existing leader’s knowledge of leadership theory, how knowledge was attained, and if knowledge is effectively used in the workplace and impactful to the organization. This line of research can be compelling to hospitality organizations; both public institutions and private enterprises.

This study benefits hospitality entities by shining new light on the importance of front-line leader’s contributions and potentially spawn a reexamination of critical roles FLL play in advancing an organization’s goals. This can result in a realignment of resources or allocation of new resources allotted for front-line leadership development.

Students will glean insights to leadership self-development, acquiring opportunities to practice leadership, and the significance of decision-making. Leadership experiences are prized by hospitality recruiters (Kwok, Adams, & Feng, 2012).

The academic community will find usefulness with this study as well. As the study is a phenomenological qualitative study examining lived experiences of practicing front-line leaders, the study can be utilized to create classroom dialogue focused on participants anecdotal information and importance of leadership and decision-making. Additionally, future research on this topic will be meaningful to industry in theory and practical application. Finally, the what do FLL know about leadership and how was the knowledge attained construct, can be examined against many performance indicators in the industry; both qualitatively and quantitatively.
Research Topics

A central question developed in response to the management dilemma is, “Are front-line leaders in full-service hotels aware of leadership theory, practices, and resulting implications?” Therefore, this study sought to examine the following research topics:

1. Are FLL in the full-service hotel environments knowledgeable and/or familiar with leadership theories and practices?
2. How was leadership subject knowledge attained?
3. Are FLL with formal knowledge of leadership theory and practices more or less likely to have a propensity for participative decision making (PPDM)?

Definition of Terms

- **Competency**: “Performance of duties based on one’s ability to accomplish specific job-related tasks and assume the role of the position” (Tas, 1988, p. 41).
- **Competencies**: Skills, abilities, and attitudes necessary for success (Tas, 1988).
- **Critical thinking**: A general psychology definition is: “Critical thinking examines assumptions, discerns hidden values, evaluates evidence, and assesses conclusions” (Petruss, 2004, p. 461).
- **Decision**: A commitment to action through the use of resources (Mintzberg & Theoret, 1976).
• **Decision-making**: In hospitality, a situational process involving information gathering, analysis and assessment, and consideration of internal matters (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009).

• **Front-line leader**: A position of authority such as a supervisor or a manager that directly oversees line staff and is responsible for managing a period of time (Krawiec, 2012).

• **Full-service hotel**: A hotel consisting of services beyond rooms including but not limited to various full-service food and beverage offerings, spa, valet, bell, door, and concierge (Krawiec, 2012).

• **Knowledge**: Information, understanding, skill, or awareness about something that you get from experience or education (“Merriam-Webster Dictionary,” n.d.).

• **Leadership**: “A process of influencing an organized group toward accomplishing its goals… involving the leader, followers, and situation” (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2009, p. 4).

• **Leadership Effectiveness**: Effectiveness in this case refers to a leader’s ability to influence his or her subordinates (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

• **Manufacturing paradigm**: A sequential process focused on mass production and the efficiency of cost (Israeli, 2014).

• **Mission**: A statement of purpose illustrating an organization’s goals, business philosophies, and guidance for operational practices (Reich, 2000).

• **Participative decision-making (PDM)**: “…involving some degree of transfer of decision control and responsibility from a superior to his or her subordinates” (Parnell & Bell, 1994, p. 518).
- **Propensity for Participative Decision-Making:** “refers to the predisposition of a manager to employ PDM techniques within the organization” (Parnell & Bell, 1994, p. 518).

- **Service paradigm:** A simultaneous process centered on seller-customer interactions (Israeli, 2014).

- **Training:** “A systematic process through which human resources in the hospitality industry gain knowledge and develop skills by instruction and practical activities that result in improved performance” (Tanke, 2001, p. 167).

- **Vision:** As scholarly debate continues over a collective definition, *vision* for this study has been defined as a forward looking statement, as communicated by the organization’s leader, that is ambitious and positive while moving the organization towards strategic and measurable growth (Berger & Brownell, 2009; Hughes et al., 2009; Kantabutra & Avery, 2010).

**Dissertation Organization**

This dissertation is comprised of five chapters. The first chapter presented subject background, the management dilemma and resulting research topics, and significance of the study. Moving forward, chapter two presents a review of relevant literature centered on leadership and decision-making. Chapter three consists of an overview of the study along with methodology. Chapter four discusses analysis and results of data. Finally, chapter five concludes the dissertation with a summary of work and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Importance of Leadership

Is it art or science? Is it behavior or trait related? Or, maybe both? Does it emanate from a process? Or, is it inspirational in nature? The it is leadership, and the answers are the conundrum that continue to intrigue academic researchers from all industries and points on the globe. Based upon vast amounts of leadership centered research conducted for more than a century, it is rational to stipulate that leadership has been deemed important and has been “…the concern of some of the foremost thinkers in history” (Fiedler, 1996, p. 241). The phenomenon of leadership is not exclusive to any public or private industry sector, sports affiliation, or family, religious, or political constructs. Therefore, this review begins with an examination of approaches utilized over time to explore and theorize about the construct of leadership. The review then moves to more recent works relating leadership to the hospitality industry, before moving to leader development and finishing with the topic of decision making.

Historical Perspective

Trait Theory

Codified leadership research began to take shape prior to and early in the twentieth century (Gregoire & Arendt, 2004; Hernandez, Eberly, Avolio, & Johnson, 2011). Trait theory was the early area of study amongst theorists. Trait theory fixated on the potential differences in personality traits of leaders versus non-leaders (Gibb, 1947; Jenkins, 1947).
While numerous traits were researched, recognized, and narrowed to key themes such as intelligence, sociality, dependability, and interest in control during this era, most theorists could not muster conclusions that traits alone make the leader (Hernandez et al., 2011; Stogdill, 1948). Gibb (1947) noted that the search for a leader often starts with attributes of personality and those demonstrating such attributes or traits. In concluding the study focused on military leadership selection, Gibb found there is “no one leadership personality” (p. 283) and the leader is connected with group members and the context in which leadership is needed at the moment. Stogdill (1948) reviewed a wide array of studies focused on leadership traits of students’ in grade school through college. In collapsing the plethora of traits to manageable themes, Stogdill cited categories of capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, status, and situation as meaningful. Still, Stogdill states:

A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers. Thus, leadership must be conceived in terms of the interaction of variables which are in constant flux and change (p. 64).

However, trait theory continues to play a role today in corporate leadership assessments. Judge et al. (2002) acknowledge that leadership theories based upon traits are considered out of vogue. Indeed, leadership research moved from trait related analyses to behavioral and situational analyses in the evolution of leadership research (Hughes et al., 2009; Hernandez et al., 2011). Consider though, the Big Five Personality framework attempts at predicting leadership effectiveness. Judge et al. (2002) opine that updated meta-analyses, including their own study, has advanced trait theory via the five-factor model which revolves around neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness to assess leadership effectiveness.
Behavioral Theory

Two seminal studies ushered in the era of behavioral theories. The first, a series of studies by Ohio State University scholars began utilizing the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to examine leadership behaviors in two dimensions (Halpin, 1957). The first was consideration and suggested impacts included trust, respect, and interpersonal relationships. The second was initiating structure influencing tasks, performance, and group member relationships (Collett, 1959; Halpin, 1957). In the same vein but in a different fashion, Michigan State University scholars contributed to behavioral theory through a lens of effective group performance in four categories: leader support, interaction facilitation, goal emphasis, and work facilitation (Hughes et al., 2009). The behavioral line of research was primarily focused on task and people oriented leadership constructs with the goal of differentiating behaviors in supervisors that have high concern for people and supervisors that have high concern for work outcomes (Hernandez et al., 2011).

Contingency Theory

A new string of theories emerged suggesting leadership was a complex process and contingent on more than the leader him or herself and must consider the followers and situation as well (Arendt & Gregoire, 2005; Hernandez et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2009). Contingency refers to conditions that are planned but may change (Merriam-Webster Dictionary, n.d.). Notable works in this genre include Fiedler’s contingency model (Campbell, 1968), Hershey and Blanchard’s situational leadership model (Hersey &
Blanchard, 1982), and the path-goal thought conceived by Evans and later developed into a theory by House (Evans, 1970; House, 1996).

In 1968, Campbell reviewed the work of Fiedler’s contingency model and noted that positional power, structure of the task at hand, and the interpersonal relationship between the leader and members are the constructs most likely to influence a leader’s degree of effectiveness. Fiedler created the least preferred coworker (LPC) score to assess situational favorableness (Arendt & Gregoire, 2005; Campbell, 1968; Hughes et al., 2009). When positional power, task structure, and relationships were favorable, the least preferred worker (LPC) would be high and overall opportunity for leader effectiveness would be heightened (Hernandez et al., 2011). Conversely, Fiedler surmised that a task oriented leader would be more effective when the three situational constructs were unfavorable (Campbell, 1968; Hernandez et al., 2011). Campbell (1968) noted at the time that Fiedler believed leadership style changed minimally over time and therefore one could not be trained about various leadership styles. As Hernandez et al. (2011) opined, the effectiveness of certain styles, according to Fiedler, may be contingent on a favorable or unfavorable environment.

Another contingency based theory is the path-goal theory. The path-goal construct suggests that a leader’s effectiveness is founded in his or her ability to adapt styles contingent upon followers and situation (Hughes et al., 2009). These four styles are directive, supportive, participative, and achievement oriented. Each is established to motivate and satisfy varying follower characteristics, and to be utilized in an assortment of situational
settings (Hernandez et al., 2011; House, 1996; Hughes et al., 2009). House (1996) reiterates the original intent of his path-goal theory developed in 1971.

House (1996, p. 326) states:

> The essential notion underlying the path-goal theory is that individuals in positions of authority, superiors, will be effective to the extent that they complement the environment in which their subordinates work by providing the necessary cognitive clarifications to ensure that subordinates expect that they can attain work goals and they will experience intrinsic satisfaction and receive valent rewards as a result work goal attainment.

In concise terms, Hughes et al. (2009) posit that in order to effectively utilize path-goal theory, the leader should adopt a style that best suits an individual follower or work unit, clearly communicate the path, provide support for goal success, and reward in a manner that meets followers expectations for goal attainment.

**Situational Leadership**

> “The importance of a leader’s diagnostic ability cannot be overemphasized” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 149). The situational leadership theory is an advancement of the Ohio State University studies from the late 1950’s. It builds on two main constructs of the original work, initiating structure and consideration, and fashions new constructs of task behavior and relationship behavior, respectively (Hernandez et al., 2011; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Hughes et al., 2009). Hersey & Blanchard (1982) posit that leader’s awareness of both maturity [defined as the ability and willingness of people to take responsibility for their own
behavior (p.153)] of the follower and current situation be considered when choosing an effective style. Further, Hersey & Blanchard (1982) defined four styles of leadership, (1) delegating, (2) participating, (3) selling, and (4) telling, that counsel leaders on appropriate avenues to take based upon the maturity level, or ability and willingness, of the followers when confronting various situations. The Hersey and Blanchard situational leadership theory is practitioners based and review of literature indicates issues with validity and robustness. It is offered here as a scholarly, albeit limited, off-shoot of a larger work with a wide appeal for simplicity of application in the workplace.

**Transactional and Transformational**

Burns (1978) book, *Leadership*, demonstrates his original thoughts on the transactional leaders and transformative leaders. Burns suggests that transactional leaders using a form of exchange for work will fall short as the leader follower equation continues to grow; do X and receive Y while not doing X will result in not only not receiving Y, but potentially a coercive punishment as well. This technique, says Bass (1990), can lead to mediocrity overall but in the short-term can attain improved standards. Bass also observes that a leader (manager) may not always be in control of the reward mechanism and thus potentially fall short on his or her end of the exchange. Both Burns (1978) and Bass (1990) argue this form of leadership lacks depth of thought and purpose other than to understand what current rewards will motivate employees to accomplish work goals.
Transformational leadership on the other hand does not rely on external rewards systems but attempts to appeal to a higher calling as set forth by the leaders vision (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978). The followers must attain and retain a level of trust and respect for the leader to engage in a long-term transformational process (Hernandez et al., 2011). Hughes et al. (2009) suggest that transformational leaders are at the same time charismatic leaders and “…must project an image of success in order for followers to believe they possess superhuman qualities… and failure to do so will erode the leader’s authority” (p.632).

As Bass expanded Burn’s concepts he noted transformational leaders possess charisma, are inspirational, intellectually stimulate followers, and practice individualized consideration regarding followers needs. Bass (1990) further opined that transactional leaders work from a contingent reward system, practice management by exception responding only to system failure, and have a laissez faire approach to leading abdicating decision-making responsibilities.

**Servant Leadership**

Servant leadership is rooted in a leader-follower relationship (Arendt & Gregoire, 2005). Robert Greenleaf created the construct and coined the term in 1970 (Spears, 1996). The essence of servant leadership centers on the leader, having been of service and support to the followers, was now entrusted and revered by the followers and in turn, considered chosen to be the leader (Greenleaf, 1977). Hughes et al. (2009) share the critics view that servant leadership is soft and may lead to the unintended consequence of leaders not focusing on organizational goals in lieu of serving followers. Regardless, as Greenleaf penned his
thoughts on the idea of servant leadership in 1977, he saw his new path forward clearly as an emerging and warranted approach to leadership. Ten characteristics are associated with servant leadership. The characteristics include listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualism, foresight, stewardship, commitment to other’s growth, and building community (Spears, 1996). Two of Greenleaf’s seminal thoughts summarize his servant leadership approach (Greenleaf, 1977). The first,

A new moral principle is emerging, which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader (p.23).

The second, “Rather; they will freely respond only to individuals who are chosen as leaders because they are proven and trusted as servants (p.23-4). Ideas such as servant leadership continue to fill a need toward practical approaches to modern day leadership (Ingram, 2016).

**Hospitality Leadership Research**

Employees are assets of an organization and as such need to be protected and developed just as any other valuable asset (Berger & Brownell, 2009). Senior and mid-level hospitality leaders value human resource knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) above financial, information technology, and marketing KSA’s (Kay & Moncarz, 2004). Leadership is present in many competency centric research studies and models in and out of the realm of hospitality management (Testa & Sipe, 2012; Schultz, 2013). Various leadership theories,
styles, and approaches are at the disposal of leaders within the hospitality industry (Gregoire & Arendt, 2004; Hernandez et al., 2011). A selection of available theories, styles, and approaches that are considered well-suited for service sectors including the hospitality industry consist of transformational, servant, and participative (Brown & Arendt, 2010; Brownell, 2010; Worsfold, 1989).

**Transformational Leadership in Hospitality**

Berger and Brownell (2009) note, “Those who enter into a transformational relationship are inspired to work together because they believe that they will flourish both individually and within the context of their leader-follower relationship” (p.380). This can be considered relevant when viewed through the lens of transformational theory attributes such as articulating a clear and compelling vision, motivating employees to embrace a higher calling, and appealing to positive values and morals of the followers (Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978). Hospitality research has indicated transformational leadership can have a positive effect on constructs within hospitality organizations.

A study by Tracey & Hinkin (1996) sought to assess the impact of transformation leadership theory on a set of variables deemed important to leader-follower relationship within the hospitality industry. Researchers surveyed 291 low to mid-level front-line leaders from an array of departments in U.S. lodging operations. The goal of the study was to test perceptions of front-line leaders regarding their superiors across several areas. These included subordinate satisfaction with leader, leader effectiveness, openness of communication, mission clarity, and role clarity. Tracey & Hinkin (1996) developed a
transformational theory process model to assess areas and utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as developed by Bass & Avolio, 1989. The questionnaire centered on four dimensions of transformational leadership which include idealized influence (communicates important values and beliefs), inspirational motivation (demonstrates confidence in achieving goals), intellectual stimulation (values questioning assumptions), and individual consideration (treats team members as individuals) (Bass & Avolio, 1989).

Results of this study suggest a direct impact of transformational theory on subordinate satisfaction and leader effectiveness with indirect impact on mission clarity, role clarity, and openness of communication.

Brown and Arendt (2010) explored front desk employee perceptions of supervisor’s transformational leadership theory behaviors as well as supervisors’ perceptions of front desk employee performance. The work pursued linkage between leader transformational behaviors and employee performance. Researchers in this study surveyed hotel front office teams in a Midwest state and collected 118 supervisor and 91 employee questionnaires. Employee performance was assessed using 10 measures including (a) attitude toward guests, (b) care of equipment, (c) attitude towards supervisor, (d) attendance, (e) attitudes towards coworkers, (f) dependability, (g) quality of work, (h) job knowledge and skills, (i) judgement, and (j) initiative and motivation. The authors utilized a modified MLQ using the four dimensions of transformational leadership including idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. While no direct linkage was found between supervisor transformational leadership behaviors and employee performance, Brown and Arendt (2010) note that the idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership
reflects trust in the leader and opine that power and confidence, which scored the highest, are also part of the idealized influence dimension. This may reflect transformational leadership being on display in the workplace.

A study gaining insight to transformational leadership effects on foodservice employees’ attitudes towards food safety practices was completed by Lee, Almanza, Jang, Nelson, and Ghiselli in 2013. The researchers surveyed 235 line-staff food service workers across various restaurant types chosen at random in a Midwest state. Confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modelling were used on the conceptual model to ensure validity. While that study explored many intentions and behaviors (8 hypotheses in total) centered on food safety practices, most were not germane to this current work, which is focused on the impact of transformational leadership theory in hospitality management. Of importance to this topic however, was that Lee et al. (2013) tested if transformational leadership theory had a positive influence on organizational culture, attitudes towards food safety practices, and intentions to follow food safety practices. The research team found a significantly positive impact on organizational culture, but the research did not support a statistically worthy positive impact of transformational leadership theory behaviors on either attitudes or intentions. However, as Lee et al. (2013) opine, organizational culture did result in a significant positive impact on attitude’s and intentions. Researchers suggest and argue that transformational leadership behaviors having positively impacted organizational culture, by extension positively impacted the foodservice employees’ attitudes and behaviors regarding food safety practices.
Regarding a summarizing note on transformational leadership, Tracey and Hinkin (1994, p. 18) comment,

Transformational leadership is a way to advance the efficient use of human resources. As transformational leaders, hospitality managers must develop a strong sense of vision to clarify and communicate organizational objectives and create a working environment that fosters motivation, commitment, and continuous improvement.

Servant Leadership in Hospitality

The servant leadership construct as articulated by Greenleaf (1977) in his review of his seminal work of 1970 noted at the time that researchers and theorists continued to grapple with the idea. Truly, a review of current day and past literature find the construct of servant leadership referred to as an approach, belief, perspective, philosophy, or theory (Brownell, 2010; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Gregoire & Arendt, 2004; Ingram, 2016). Servant leadership, regardless of the label assigned, is a popular notion for practitioners and researchers alike. Servant leadership has gained interest in hospitality research streams for the past two decades as researchers try to apply theoretical frameworks and conceptual models to the construct (Koyuncu, Burke, Astakhova, Eren, and Cetin, 2014). The idea of servant leadership having roots in Christian orthodoxy may impede some researchers from taking interest. Further, Ingram (2016) suggests other leadership models can be observed whereas servant leadership revolves around core values and a belief structure intrinsic to the leader and may not be easy to assess and measure. This may account for the myriad of labels associated with the construct of servant leadership. Servant leadership has been studied across cultural lines to understand cross-cultural fit and equivalency (Han, Kakabadse, & Kakabadse, 2010; Sarayrah, 2004). A review of literature illustrated high interest in servant
leadership and therefore warrants attention. The servant leadership model translates closely to the Chinese language and culture and a study revealed three additional areas of servant leadership within the Chinese culture (Han et al., 2010).

In her paper, *Leadership in the service of hospitality*, Brownell (2010) suggests a gap exists post the transformational and situational leadership period and points to an emerging theory that seems to naturally fit a service sector such as hospitality management; servant leadership. Although recognizing a close relationship for comparisons and contrasts with leadership theories such as transformational and authentic leadership, the author suggests servant leadership as a new path forward. Servant leaders appeal to followers through a shared vision, common purpose and core values to accomplish goals (Hughes et al., 2009). Organizations need to allocate time, energy, and effort to create a mission, vision, and set of values for the servant leader to espouse to the followers (Kantabutra & Avery, 2010; Reich, 2000). These values are illustrated through the actions of servant leaders (Brownell, 2010; Spears, 1996). These behaviors, as noted by Brownell’s adaptation of Spear’s work include:

1. Listening intently to others combined with personal reflection on what is heard
2. Empathy: assuming the good intentions of colleagues
3. Awareness: understanding issues involving ethics and values
4. Persuasion, rather than relying on authority or coercion
5. Conceptualization: servant leaders dream great dreams and are also operationally skilled
6. Foresight: the ability to foresee the likely outcome of a situation

7. Stewardship: holding institutions in trust for the greater good of society

8. Commitment to the personal and professional growth of all employees

9. Building community within the organization

Servant leader’s behaviors stretch outside of the normal realm of the business enterprise taking on an inherent need to serve other key constituents as well (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears, 1996). These outside constituents include the local community, a globalized society at large, and the higher education system (Brownell, 2010). Brownell (2010) argues servant leadership can address ethical issues in leadership and reconnect the business premise with the larger community. The author concludes this theory may not be suited for all leadership scenarios, but suggests servant leadership is a viable path forward and posits that educators are the conduit through which future hospitality leaders can learn and hence operationalize the concept in industry (Brownell, 2010).

Servant leadership is also a theory gaining quite a bit of interest in other parts of the world; India, the Middle-East, and Asia (Ghosh & Khatri, n.d.; Han et al., 2010; Sarayrah, 2004). The search for a more intrinsic, altruistic, and meaningful linkage to a leadership theory may be driving researchers in settings of autocratic governance (Sarayrah, 2004; Koyuncu et al., 2014; Han et al., 2010). A review of literature suggests a particular interest in servant leadership within China.
In searching for an inherent connection to the Chinese culture, Han et al., (2010) noted studies linking the western construct of servant leadership to various ideologies with the Chinese culture. Within the research, servant leadership was suggested to have commonalities with Confucianism, Daoism, and Communism; all considered leadership constructs within the Chinese culture. Researcher’s servant leadership interests in this part of the world have examined leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviors (Wu, Tse, Fu, Kwan, & Liu, 2013); senior leadership and organizational performance (Huang, Li, Qiu, Yim, & Wan, 2016); trickle-down effects of servant leadership on frontline employee service behaviors (Ling, Lin, & Wu, 2016); and the cultural fit of servant leadership in the public sector (Han et al., 2010).

Servant leadership is considered to be similar to Chinese leadership constructs including three additional and related dimensions to western servant leadership including (1) being dutiful, (2), allegiance to state, party, and laws; and, (3) listening. An argument could be made that the three attributes are existing servant leadership behaviors (Greenleaf, 1977; Spears, 1996). Similarly, as is presented each could be considered dissimilar in context of traditional Chinese leadership dogma (Han et al., 2010).

Reviewed studies conducted in China suggest servant leaders impacted hospitality organizations in a healthy fashion. For example, senior leaders demonstrating servant leadership behaviors had an overall positive effect on service climate and were seen as more effective than transformational leaders which led to superior organizational performance (Huang et al., 2016). Servant leadership as a cultural approach was found to have a trickle-
down effect from senior leaders to middle managers and front-line leaders eventually making way to front-line employees’ service-oriented behaviors and improved quality service (Ling et al., 2016). For followers that are sensitive to treatment from others, servant leadership behaviors can be a positive motivator (Brownell, 2010; Wu et al., 2013). In the context of employee organizational citizenship behaviors, servant leadership behaviors was gleaned to foster high leader-member exchange leading to improved relationships in the workplace (Wu et al., 2013).

Research reveals servant leadership not only matters to the hospitality industry but is a well suited leadership theory for the industry (Brownell, 2010; Koyuncu et al., 2014). Servant leadership can have a positive impact on performance, employee satisfaction, and service quality (Ling et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2013). In an industry that is diverse, often situated in multicultural environments, and global in nature, servant leadership can transcend a variety of leadership theories (Han et al., 2010; Koyuncu et al., 2014; Sarayrah, 2004) and may be a very relevant path forward (Brownell, 2010).

**Participative Leadership in Hospitality**

Participative leadership can be considered another leadership approach or behavior well suited for the hospitality industry (Berger & Brownell, 2009; Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009). This behavior rests within the path-goal theory, which suggests differing leader behaviors, along with differing situations and follower reactions will improve follower
satisfaction and increase performance resulting in requisite rewards for the followers (Hughes et al., 2009).

Studies indicate participative leadership and decision-making may have positive results for the industry. While exploring strategic implementation and participative leaders and decision-making in foodservice operations, Ogbeide & Harrington (2011) found leaders in organizations utilizing high levels of participative leadership practices outperformed those doing the opposite. Researchers further suggested that regardless of the size of the organization, higher participative leadership equated to greater strategic implementation success and improved financial performance. Empowering leadership, a construct closely associated with participative leadership, positively impacts hotel leadership teams knowledge sharing and team efficacy which indirectly effects performance in a positive manner (Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006). Harrington & Ottenbacher (2009) opined complex situations require the input of a variety of constituents including peer leaders, front-line employees, and outside vendors when leaders are in search of solutions. In order to attain mutual understanding and resolutions during times of conflict, a participative approach may be the best option (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009).

In a fast paced, complex operating environment that relies heavily on human capital to attain results, a leader may find success in a leadership approach such as participative, which solicits input and relies on the recommendations from team members when making decisions (Hughes et al., 2009). Experienced leaders in environments that warrant such an
approach benefit from front-line staff with first-hand knowledge when making decisions and create a more satisfied and engaged employee population (Berger & Brownell, 2009).

**Role of Higher Education in Leadership Development**

Hospitality management programs play an important, yet evolving role in developing future hospitality leaders (Brownell, 2010; Moncarz & Kay, 2005). Research indicates various pedagogical approaches, a search for leadership curriculum best practices, and linkage to graduate success have gained attention (Brownell, 2006; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Hill & Vanhoof, 1997; Tesone, 2004). Faculty, students, graduates, and professionals agree leadership is important to complex hospitality environments (Arendt & Gregoire, 2005; Kwok et al., 2012; Kitterlin-Lynch, Williams, & Zheng, 2015). The use of leadership practices have been found to produce positive results on financial and quality performance measures (Huang et al., 2016; (Ling et al., 2016; Ogbeide & Harrington, 2011). It is important that academia develops graduates armed with the knowledge, skills and abilities in preparation for further development as new managers and leaders (Tas, 1988).

There are benefits to utilizing a hospitality management program to develop leaders, however, there are also gaps in industry expectations of the graduate product and what is actually being produced by academia (Cheung et al., 2010). Further, in a study by Moncarz and Kay (2005) of hotel leaders and self-perceived success based on formal education, researchers noted middle managers did not equate their own formal education as having a statistically positive impact on the competencies of being a leader, building a team, or motivating employees. Hotel managers in Hong Kong perceived leadership as the most
important competency ranking it first of eight while indicating colleges contribution to leadership preparedness was only worthy of five out of eight ranking (Cheung et al., 2010). To conquer the gaps of negative industry and graduate perceptions, researchers have and continue to explore paths forward.

During formative years of college, students are pliable and open to change allowing for an opportunity to introduce leadership constructs (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Servant leadership is befitting the hospitality industry (Brownell, 2010; Koyuncu et al., 2014). Some suggest based on evolving business practices and need for civility and citizenship awareness on campuses, a servant leadership approach should be incorporated into college leadership activities and programs (Brownell, 2010; Dugan & Komives, 2007).

Whole brain learning is a model of learning that encompasses knowledge or theory, experiential learning opportunities, and a state of reflection that when all combined, creates a deeper level of preparedness and self-awareness (Tesone, 2004). This type of learning model is similar to a blended-method learning model (Maier & Thomas, 2013). This experiential and participative learning model sets the stage for greater success as graduates enter leadership positions upon graduation, and Maier and Thomas (2013) noted the benefits of this teaching strategy include:

- Creative and critical thinking skills
- Practical skills for career development
- Integration of various course work elements
- Improved interpersonal skills
- Self-confidence

(Tesone, 2004) suggests her systems approach to whole brain learning with an education loop, an experience loop, and a reflective process resulting in a heightened state of self-awareness is a practitioner ready model and should be implemented in the following sequential steps.

1. Presentation: Leadership style preference
2. Practice Style: Preference surveys
3. Awareness: Identification of style preference
4. Practice: Practice from style preference
5. Awareness: Record observations via mentor
6. Contemplate: Identify style preference strengths and limitations
7. Self-awareness: Who was I before? Who am I now?

Examples of growth in hospitality management experiential learning models include Stockton University’s Seaview Country Club and Conference Center; Iowa State University’s food production laboratory and student operated restaurant; and The Kirkwood Hotel and Conference Center located at Kirkwood Community College.

Competency based education is a valuable teaching method in an applied and theoretical field such as hospitality management (Moncarz & Kay, 2005). Competencies can be considered closely associated skills and abilities necessary to be successful at a job function (Brownell, 2006; Moncarz & Kay, 2005; Tas, 1988). In demonstrating appreciation
for size, scope, and global reach of the hospitality industry, Brownell (2006) suggested that the “common” set of leadership competencies were insufficient and expressed the classroom taught competencies were foundational at best. Common competencies included clustered items centered on communication, human relations, and team dynamics. The author reasoned a higher level, more “distinctive” set of leadership competencies were required for graduates to be successful on a global stage. Distinctive competencies are sensitivity, initiative, decisiveness, and resilience; each must be developed over time and therefore cannot be assessed in classroom settings. Brownell (2006) opines these higher competencies must be assessed in the workplace over a period of time in practical conditions. In studying competencies for future hospitality leaders, Tas (1988) found thirty-six competencies of importance. Six were considered essential when scored 4.5 to 5.0 on a five-point scale and could be considered human resource related competencies. The seventh ranked competency at 4.48 and “of considerable importance” was possesses needed leadership qualities to achieve organizational objectives. Human resource professionals and educators together can accomplish developing leaders in a competency based environment by creating out-of-class leadership experiences, encouraging students to study abroad, adjusting curricula, and by creating executive-guest speaker experiences (Brownell, 2006; Tesone, 2004).

While methodologies for instruction of leadership in the academic environment have been reviewed with suggestions for new approaches, other studies, journal notes, and articles have shed further light on both the gap between industry and academia, and possible improvements to leadership developments. An avenue to understand industry’s expectation of graduates and to solicit feedback from industry regarding perceptions of student
preparedness is to communicate with hospitality recruiters through research (Kitterlin-Lynch et al., 2015; Kwok et al., 2012).

In a mixed methods study of recruiters and graduating seniors, Kwok et al. (2012) explored the likelihood of graduating seniors to receive job offers based on the Factors Influencing Hospitality Recruiters’ Hiring Decisions (FIHRHD) model (Kwok, Adams, & Price, 2011). The modified FIHRHD model in Kwok et al.’s (2012) research includes a leadership component labeled leadership/career preparedness along with relevant job experience, person-organization fit and person-job fit, professionalism, and interview behaviors. The authors suggest that leadership experience could be an influencer for hiring. Additionally, this research indicated that seniors receiving job offers demonstrated a better fit to the FIHRHD model than seniors that did not. A common theme to improve graduate hiring opportunities reinforced in this study was for hospitality programs to offer leadership opportunities through extra-curricular activities and for students to capitalize on those opportunities (Arendt & Gregoire, 2005; Dugan & Komives, 2007; Kitterlin-Lynch et al., 2015; Kwok et al., 2012).

In an insightful and germane research note, Kitterlin-Lynch et al. (2015) interviewed hospitality recruiters to gain perceptions of hospitality recruiters and hospitality faculty in order to identify alignment of program product output (program graduates) and recruiter satisfaction with graduates. Additional goals of this study were to identify gaps and opportunities for better alignment, improve student success upon graduation, and assist hospitality programs job placement percentages which effects marketing, enrollment, and
funding. Emergent themes from both recruiters and faculty boldly identify major gaps in the push and pull of industry expectations and faculty perception of industry needs and faculty’s ability to fulfill said needs (Kitterlin-Lynch et al., 2015). Recruiter’s themes noted graduates have deficiencies in presentation skills, communication skills, and lack practical industry experience prior to graduation. Observations regarding faculty interviews in response to recruiter themes indicated faculty could not embrace teaching soft skills due to lack of time to teach more relevant technical skills and all schools receive similar students from the admissions pipeline and therefore learner’s communication skills are the same and out of the hands of faculty. Recruiters recommendations for academia included having students practice and develop soft skills, embody professional behavior, simulate mock interviews, and create opportunities of internships.

A gap does exist between industry expectations of graduate skills and leadership abilities (Brownell, 2006; Cheung et al., 2010; Kwok et al., 2012). Kitterlin-Lynch et al. (2015) state, “The findings of this study indicate that hospitality graduates are entering today’s complex hospitality job market lacking qualities and traits perceived to be vital by hospitality industry recruiters” (Conclusion section, p. 312). However, much has been written regarding steps to close the gaps. Hill & Vanhoof (1997) recommend creating a singular class on leadership as opposed to marrying various course outcomes to accomplish leadership development in the college arena. Students participating in short, moderate, or long-term leadership roles within sports, clubs, and activities on campus report greater confidence in leadership ability than those without participation (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Further students with long-term leadership participation reported significantly higher leadership
confidence than students with short to moderate-term roles indicating confidence comes with experience (Dugan & Komives, 2007). Students may elicit examples of leadership through observing and reflecting on others leadership behaviors while faculty may consider creating leadership centric classroom settings influencing self-awareness through resume building, modeling the way, challenging the status quo, and creating a vision for leadership development (Arendt & Gregoire, 2005). In support of industry wants, needs, and desires from hospitality graduates, Kitterlin-Lynch et al. (2015) offer program adjustments and suggestions such as:

- Promoting soft skills
- Adjusting course activities and assessments
- Include professionalism and professional dress in grading schemes
- Create a professionalism and career development course
- Include soft skills development in human relations classes
- Promote industry trade show attendance
- Plan student-industry roundtable discussions

Developing the whole hospitality professional includes both knowledge and experience in preparation for entrance into industry (Barrows & Bosselman, 1999). Entrance into industry is an important distinction, and a reminder that industry must play their part in further developing the whole hospitality professional.
Role of Organization in Leadership Development

Leadership development can be viewed as a package of human resource activities working together to improve the leader and organization (Enz & Siguaw, 2000). Leadership development programs offered in industry often parallel coursework found in the college setting but delivered in shorter time periods (Hughes et al., 2009). Developing employees, whether college graduates or in-organization front-line employee promotions, demonstrates commitment to employee success and long-term investment in talent (Costen, Johanson, & Poisson, 2010). Development requirements differ by hierarchical structure for leaders. For example, front-line leaders development focuses on employee evaluation and feedback, coaching employees, how to train, and systems assessment, while middle manager development centers on planning, communication, interpersonal relationship skill building, and goal setting (Berger & Brownell, 2009; Hughes et al., 2009). Literature in the area of hospitality organization leadership development often emanates from a scholarly review of industry best practices (Costen et al., 2010; Enz & Siguaw, 2000; Enz & Siguaw, 2003; Hinkin & Tracey, 2010). The review of literature that follows lists hospitality organizations demonstrated practices as noted by the researchers, respectively. While themes emerged, it is important to allow each to be noted independently allowing the best practices to form the emerging pattern. This pattern will permit reflection by academics and practitioners for use in their respective areas.

Hinkin and Tracey (2010) conducted a review of hospitality organizations included in Fortunes top 100 companies to work for in search of differentiators from companies that did
not make the list. The author’s compared four hospitality organizations including Marriott, Starbucks, Kimpton Hotels, and Four Seasons, to make human resource centric comparisons against other service type companies on the list which were deemed hospitals and grocers. Reasons for inclusion on the list become evident with the author’s findings. Average annual hours spent on training and development in the hospitality set was 69 for hourly employees and 176 for salaried employees; more than both grocers and hospitals. Employee turnover assessments indicated hospitality companies, grocers, and hospitals all recorded voluntary turnover rates two-thirds less than respective industry averages. The hospitality set reported annual line staff wages of $30,545 while annual salaried employee wages were reported to be $76,464. Improvement is important for attaining high performance results but Hinkin & Tracey (2010, p. 38) note:

What we have not seen is substantial change in the way that people are managed. Individual firms stand out, but too many firms accept “industry realities” such as substantial turnover and “learn as you go” training. Whether it is recognized by managers or not, people are the greatest asset of virtually every organization. An uncompromising focus on this philosophy is arguably the most important factor that separates the top one hundred from the thousands of companies that did not make the list of best companies to work for.

Six human resource themes were found by Hinkin and Tracey (2010) after reviewing the hospitality, grocer, and hospital organizations that were included in the top 100 list.

- Culture of caring for employees and open communication
- Flexible scheduling to meet the needs of a changing workforce
- Innovative methods to attract, select, and retain a loyal and competent workforce
• Training programs that are viewed as an investment in people with emphasis on career tracks and promotion from within
• Performance management systems that are aligned with organizational objectives
• Compensation programs that reflect the values of the organization and link pay to performance

In a category labeled human resources best practice champions, Enz & Siguaw (2000) reviewed twenty-three forward looking hospitality companies/properties as designated by peers. The champion group evaluated eight nominees based on a self-developed set of five human resource categories. The authors noted five categories to be (1) Leader development, (2) Training and knowledge building, (3) Employee empowerment, (4) Employee recognition, and (5) Cost management. After sifting through rationale, strategies, and programs for which the eight champion companies/properties were nominated, Enz and Siguaw (2000) stated, “To develop their best practices, the champions expanded employee involvement and authority, boosted skill building and information sharing, and implemented cost containment strategies and performance-based rewards” (p. 48).

A selection of strategies deployed are listed below.

• Assessed core competencies needed by future leaders
• Created an executive training and development system
• Utilized annual ready assessments for succession planning, selection, and promotion
• Moved high-potential leaders into “stretch” assignments in preparation for promotion
• Created a mandatory sabbatical of ninety days for leaders attaining five years of tenure
• Developed upward mobility programs including cross-training, manager-on-duty assignments, and general manager assignments

In revisiting the original champions study (Enz & Siguaw, 2000), Enz and Siguaw completed a subsequent study in 2003 in an effort to learn what lived on from the original research. To accomplish this, the authors spoke with key human resource champion representatives. Learning organizations demonstrate the capacity to explore, experiment, and thus continually improve (Enz & Siguaw, 2003; Hughes et al., 2009). Five years past the original study, the authors noted (a) business results and financial acumen have become part of the leader competency, (b) development tracking plans led to promotions for more women and minorities into leadership positions, and (c) talent pools have grown and benefitted from annual ready assessment plans.

Front-line leaders are critical to the success of the organization (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009; Kavanaugh & Ninemeier, 2012). Hospitality enterprises are facing pressures of tight labor markets and needing to rely more on promotion from within to supplement the qualified pool of hospitality management graduates (Costen et al., 2010). Human resources best practice research indicates the what and how of leadership development is known to some hospitality organizations (Costen et al., 2010; Enz and Siguaw, 2000; Enz & Siguaw,
Hospitality operators savvy enough to capitalize on learning from best practices will positively impact various performance measures, and be able to attract and develop the best and brightest talent (Enz & Siguaw, 2003).

**Leadership and Decision Making**

Various definitions for decision-making are available for different disciplines such as psychology, marketing, and manufacturing. Decision-making in hospitality can be viewed as a situational process involving information gathering, analysis and assessment, and consideration of internal matters (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009). All levels of leadership are tasked with decision-making responsibilities, and front-line leaders particularly make numerous decisions that affect shareholder, guests, and employees daily (Kavanaugh & Ninemeier, 2012). Decision making processes tend to follow in the context of various leadership theories (Hughes et al., 2009). For example, a dictator would not be likely to utilize a participative decision-making process too often just as servant leader would be less likely to adopt an authoritarian decision-making approach on regular basis. A participative leadership approach is well suited for the hospitality industry (Brownell, 2010; Worsfold, 1989), and by extension a fitting decision-making process would be participative decision-making (PDM).
Participative Decision-Making

Research surrounding participative decision-making, while seemingly straightforward in theory, offers glimpses into a road often less traveled in the hospitality industry. The idea of participation can have different meanings to various cultures around the globe and in diverse hospitality environments in America (Parnell & Bell, 1994; Sagie & Aycen, 2003). A review of literature revealed comprehensive work centered on leadership styles including participative, however, a scarcity of work on PDM was found in the United States hospitality field (Ogbeide & Harrington, 2011). PDM research in the United States has been focused on manufacturing, and researchers are advancing literature from a psychological and management perspective (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009). Research did reveal global interests attempting to apply PDM in various cultures within hospitality settings and in general. Studies outside of the U.S. have sought to test PDM in association with employees’ feedback-seeking behaviors, job satisfaction, and innovation and performance (Li & Qian, 2016; Nagy & Babaita, 2017; Pacheco & Webber, 2016; Parnell & Crandall, 2003).

Researchers exploring PDM in association with employees’ feedback-seeking behaviors utilized 248 employee-supervisor dyads from two hotels in China as study participants (Li & Qian, 2016). The authors lens of the PDM consisted of two employees of different levels of the organization sharing input on control of one of the employee’s tasks and duties. Li & Qian (2016) introduced psychological ownership theory to further review the association of PDM and employees’ feedback-seeking behaviors on personal performance. Results of the work indicated PDM was positively linked to employee
feedback-seeking behaviors. Further, Li & Qian (2016) opined psychological ownership did mediate the relationship and as an employee develops ownership the need for seeking feedback becomes intrinsic and self-fulfilling. In other words, greater PDM results in increased job ownership whereby the employee inherently desires and seeks out feedback on personal performance.

A study of 135 employees in three and four star Romanian hotels examined relationships between PDM, orientation towards innovation, and hotel performance (Nagy & Babaita, 2017). The constructs included orientation towards innovation symbolized as perfecting service and services; PDM through the lens of involved decision-making in a group environment; and, hotel performance based on the following indicators: occupancy, profit margin, return on assets, total asset rotation, gross profit, and income per room. Nagy and Babaita (2017) concluded that managers seeking to improve or perfect service and services through innovation were more likely to seek employee opinions by utilizing PDM. Regarding hotel performance, study results germane to PDM were a mixed bag. The authors found positive effects of PDM on three of six variables including occupancy, total asset rotation, and profit margin with the latter receiving the greatest positive effect from PDM. Managers involving employees in the decision making process can have a positive effect on performance outcomes (Nagy & Babaita, 2017).

Culture must be considered and weighed when assessing the effects of PDM. For example, a study may be conducted in the context of a country or local province (Li & Qian, 2016). In such studies, awareness of measuring devices such as scales with latent cultural differences may be in order (Parnell & Crandall, 2003), or broad multi-country studies may
be clustered by likeness prior to analysis (Pacheco & Webber, 2016). In this manner, the 2008 European Values Survey (EVS) recorded 22,547 observations from workers in forty-eight countries and was utilized by Pacheco and Webber (2016) to explore the role of PDM on job satisfaction. The researchers attained perceptions of PDM from a 10-point scale measuring no freedom to great freedom. The authors concluded PDM had a substantial impact on job satisfaction to a greater extent than other job characteristics. Both men and women recognized increased job satisfaction from PDM, however, women appear to find greater job satisfaction when offered PDM opportunities.

**Propensity for Participative Decision-Making**

Participative decision-making research suggests PDM influences performance, efficiency, innovation, employee feedback-seeking behaviors, and strategic planning implementation in a positive way (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009; Li & Qian, 2016; Nagy & Babaita, 2017; Pacheco & Webber, 2016). Where PDM construct seeks to understand shared decision making and associated effects on various topics, the propensity for participative decision-making (PPDM) construct seeks to understand predictability of a manager to utilize PDM strategies and tactics in the workplace (Parnell & Bell, 1994).

The PPDM scale created by Parnell and Bell in 1994 was refined and modified in 2000 (Parnell & Crandall, 2001). Parnell and Bell (1994) hypothesized managers would be inclined to engage PDM if the manager perceives organizational effectiveness will be enhanced and personal power will not be diminished. Therefore, the researchers sought to
construct a model centered on two dimensions: organizational effectiveness and power. Parnell and Bell (1994) envisioned organizational effectiveness as improvement to quality and productivity. PDM has been associated with improved performance measures including quality and performance (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009; Li & Qian, 2016; Nagy & Babaita, 2017). The power dimension may be viewed as an inhibitor of PPDM as managers perceiving the distribution of power as a personal loss of power within the organization – notwithstanding the unknown gain of influence (Parnell & Bell, 1994). The first of two surveys were completed by 110 graduate students and tested 119 items on a six-point Likert scale. After validity testing and review, the 33 remaining items were distributed to 220 lower and middle level business managers. After further tests for validity and factor analysis, 10 items remained with seven associated with organizational effectiveness and 3 with power.

Organizational effectiveness (ORG) and power (PWR) subscales consists of:

**ORG1**: Many organizational problems disappear when everyone has a chance to participate in decision making.

**ORG2**: Participative decision making usually results in effective decisions.

**ORG3**: Group decisions are worth any extra time required.

**ORG4**: Participative decision making stimulates feelings of self-worth for subordinates.

**ORG5**: Participative decision making is an effective communication tool.

**ORG6**: When my boss allows me to participate in decisions I feel more important.

**ORG7**: Participative decision making promotes positive relationships at all levels of the organization.

**PWR1**: Participative decision making requires divulging too much confidential information.

**PWR2**: Participative decision making gives too much power to subordinates.
PWR3: Subordinates often cannot be trusted. (Parnell & Bell, 1994, p. 529).

The authors note manager’s PPDM is considered high when belief is that PDM is causing organizational effectiveness to increase and loss of power is perceived to be low. Conversely, manager’s PPDM is low when belief that PDM is causing organizational effectiveness to suffer the manager will lose power. Parnell & Bell (1994) concluded the PPDM scale was open for further development and association with other participative management constructs.

While not germane to this study, the PPDM scale was revisited and refined in 2000 (Parnell & Crandall, 2001). The researchers added two dimensions to the original two in a similar manner of research. Two new dimensions reflected emerging topics at the time. Recognizing an organization’s culture and employee commitment could influence managers PPDM, Parnell & Crandall (2001) included culture and commitment as additional dimensions. This resulted in a modified scale which included four dimensions; organizational effectiveness, power, culture, and commitment.

Summary of Literature Review

Leadership is important to organization success and front-line leaders play a pivotal role in leading front-line staff to accomplish goals. Research has revealed many leadership theories and approaches that are available for a leader to choose depending on the situation and followers. Leadership theories and approaches can be better suited for different types of business enterprises. A participative leadership style or approach is considered fitting for the
hospitality industry. Recognizing organizations hire college graduates and promote experienced line-staff members, both the organization and institutions of higher education are responsible for the education and development of hospitality leaders. Highly trained and developed leaders are linked to enhanced performance versus untrained and undeveloped leaders. Decision-making is a leadership competency that is worthy of such development and one such method of decision-making is participative decision-making. Research has linked participative decision-making to improvements in various human resource and quality performance measures. A model exists to assess a leader’s propensity for using participative decision-making and its’ affects in the workplace. Understanding if a managers PPDM is greater if he or she is formally or informally educated and developed as a leader would be meaningful to hospitality educators, industry, and individual leaders. It is also of interest to identify what front-line leaders know about leadership theory and practices, how knowledge was acquired, and if the knowledge is effectively utilized.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS

This chapter provides an overview of the study and describes research design, procedures for collecting data, and data analysis. This overview reiterates the purpose, dilemma, and research questions. The design and approach of the study was reviewed in this chapter. The population and sampling were discussed in detail. The development and conceptualization of the questionnaire and model was discussed. Procedures for data collection were described and in the last section, a brief review of data analysis was completed.

Overview of Study

The objective of this research was to further explore the construct of what front-line leaders in full service hotel environments know about leadership theory, and how FLL acquired the knowledge. Additionally, in order to assess if the knowledge is being utilized effectively, responses shed light on a leader’s propensity to use participative decision-making in the workplace. This led to three research topic questions.

1. Are FLL in the full-service hotel environments knowledgeable and/or familiar with leadership theories and practices?
2. How was leadership subject knowledge attained?
3. Are FLL with formal knowledge of leadership theory and practices more or less likely to have a propensity for participative decision making (PPDM)?
Research Design and Approach

An overarching research goal led to the decision to use a qualitative, phenomenological approach for this study, as this study is an extension of previous work exploring similar constructs centered on hospitality leaders in the casino industry (Krawiec, 2012). This type of study seeks to learn about lived experiences and perceptions of participants, which is appropriate in this exploratory mode (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). Due to the desire to create continuity and bridge the two studies, a decision was made to modify the existing questionnaire by attaching the PPDM scale.

Use of Human Subjects

The Application for Research on Human Subjects was submitted to the Iowa State University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board for approval. The instrument including the PPDM scale was submitted and accepted as an exempt study with regards to human subject protections (Appendix A). An opening statement was read to each participant advising he or she could stop at any time, all information was protected, and no compensation was provided for participation in this study.

Sample

The targeted population for this study was front-line leaders in full service hotels. Front-line leaders are considered leaders that directly oversee line-staff as part of duties on a regular basis. These positions would be labeled as department supervisors, assistant managers, or directors. A hybrid purposive, snowball method, similar to the original study was again deployed to target subjects with the desired management ranks resulting in
foundational industry knowledge. Snowballing implies the initial subject in turn leads to other knowledgeable and interested subjects. The snowball method has been acknowledged as having limitations but warranted when access to subjects was sparse (Cooper & Schindler, 2011; Groenewald, 2004). Being a phenomenological study, no attempt was made to acquire educated and developed or uneducated or undeveloped leaders. Education, either formally or informally, was not a precursor for participating. The study continued until important themes became repetitive indicating a saturation point was reached (Groenewald, 2004).

Instrument

An instrument (Appendix B) previously used (Krawiec, 2012) was modified to incorporate a PPDM scale developed by (Parnell and Bell (1994). The instrument consisted of six introductory statements of informed consent (Groenewald, 2004), a transitional question, two administrative questions, eight target questions, eight classification questions, and 10 statements associated with the PPDM scale. The question set protocol ensured each participant was asked the questions in the same order. Target questions included structured questions for order purposes and semi-structured questions allowing for response development. Participants were free to expound on answers and ask for clarification as needed. The investigator used prompts when necessary to assist participants in comprehending question content. In a semi-structured interview environment, a less formal relationship exists between the investigator and participant permitting greater clarity and elaboration to responses (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). The instrument was reviewed by four experts, and the IRB. The experts were from academia, one with a doctoral degree and one with a master’s degree, and from industry, a human resource vice president with a master’s
degree and a senior vice president of asset management with unknown credentials. No changes were made to the original instrument content (Appendix B). Again, the only addition was the PPDM scale. The key target questions pointing to research topics of leadership knowledge, knowledge acquisition, and utility are noted below.

In order to understand the participant’s basic understanding of leadership concepts, the following questions were asked.

1. What situations most often require leadership?
2. What are five characteristics of a good leader?

Regarding knowledge acquisition, the participants were queried in the following manner.

1. Were you ever formally taught about leadership theory and concepts through either college or company training?
2. If yes, are you familiar with terminology such as Theory X or Y, Servant, Transformational, Transactional, or Situational leadership concepts?
3. Have you ever had your leadership style assessed through the use of a questionnaire?

In order to assess the ability to utilize leadership skills, the participants were asked:

1. In everyday situations, how do you use your leadership skills?
2. Based solely on time and tasks, do you think you are able to lead your staff well?
3. What percentage of your day do you spend on accomplishing tasks versus time spent thinking about and practicing leadership?

(Krawiec, 2012, p. 16)

The PPDM subscales (Parnell & Bell, 1994) noted earlier were listed below target questions and prior to classification questions. PPDM scales utilize a 6-point Likert scale with 1 signifying least agreement and 6 signifying strongest agreement with the power dimension being reverse coded. Anticipated time to complete the interview was twenty-five minutes. The shortest interview was completed in 11 minutes and 18 seconds while the longest was recorded to be 57 minutes and 10 seconds.

**Data Collection**

Four industry contacts working at senior levels including owner, executive committee member, regional director and general manager were initially contacted and informed of this study. The study was to be completed with a sample population of front-line leaders from full-service hotels. One contact did not have full-service hotels in the portfolio at the time and one contact had recently added several full-service properties to the company portfolio but declined to participate. This left two contacts providing participation opportunities from full-service branded hotels across three states located in the Midwest and Southeast.

The contacts emailed several key leaders with the researcher’s contact information. Initial responses resulted in a first wave of respondents. Upon learning about the study purpose and length, the leaders informed other leaders and the snowball effect resulted in 25 potential participants after the second wave. Interviews were all scheduled via email in
advance and conducted over a three-week period. Prior to interviews, potential participants were all coded with a unique identifier number, property, title, phone number, and email address. All electronic files were secured individually with password protection. After each interview occurred, a second coding process took place reducing identifiers to participant code, position, department, hospitality sector, formal education, and regional location.

Contact was made with 20 of 25 potential participants. Prior to each interview a participant interview form was initiated with the participants coded identifier only (Appendix B). Interviews were conducted via the phone to improve the response rate as hospitality schedules and work situations vary throughout the day. Telephonic interviews are deemed acceptable and meaningful in producing quality data for phenomenological analysis (Cachia & Millward, 2011; Cooper & Schindler, 2011). Participants were read an opening statement regarding confidentiality, IRB approval, no foreseen harm, and instructions indicating the participant could refuse to answer any question or choose to bring the interview to a close at any time. All interviews were digitally recorded with permission and audio files were transferred to protected files directly after each interview using the unique participant identifier only. Handwritten notes were recorded on the interview form as a redundant measure. A graduate student with undergraduate research coding experience and employed as a medical scribe was retained to transcribe each interview. The transcriptionist utilized the digitally recorded interview verbatim responses as the basis for the data. The investigator’s field notes were not provided to the transcriptionist. The field notes were retained and utilized as a contextual reference tool by the investigator.
All analysis was created in the aggregate without linkage to personal identifiers. There were no incentives offered to participants. Participants were offered to email the researcher in the future if interested in study results and conclusions.

Data Analysis

Data were gathered using the question protocol form and digital recording (Appendix B). The data were transcribed and the qualitative nature of the study along with small sample size allowed for Microsoft Excel software to record, code and analyze data. Descriptive statistics were used for data distribution for classification questions and the PPDM scale. The open-ended target questions were coded and analyzed by a sole researcher. A single interpretation ensured consistency in coding and contextualizing key words, phrases, experiences, key words in context, and eventual emergent themes. A qualitative approach to analysis was followed for response content. Groenewald (2004, p. 49) suggests the following procedure for qualitative analysis.

1. Bracketing and phenomenological reduction.
2. Delineating units of meaning.
3. Clustering of units of meaning to form themes.
4. Summarizing each interview, validating it and where necessary modifying it.
5. Extracting general and unique themes from all the interviews and making a composite summary.

The above procedure was closely followed including bracketing to reduce biases, validating transcribed interviews via field notes, and allowing unique and natural themes to emerge.
All data were first recorded in a raw state within Excel tables and reviewed for commonalities in context with that stated purpose of the study and particular question. A second review of data permitted grouping of information while a third review permitted construction of interpretations based on patterns. The use of simple tables permitted research topic results to be sorted by classification questions such as having a college degree of receiving company training. Themes were then extracted and analyzed. The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Halpin, 1957) was used to set coding boundaries for the defining leadership target question. The LBDQ consists of two dimensions, consideration and initiating structure. A leader demonstrating consideration is associated with behaviors such as friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth of relationship. A leader focused on productivity would display behaviors associated with initiating structure including delineating the relationship between leader and follower, good communication skills, getting the job done, and being well organized.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Results are discussed by research topic and associated questions along with findings and emergent themes. Illustrative quotes from open ended questions are utilized to reinforce themes.

Demographics of Respondents

The target population for this study was FLL in full-service hotels. The sample consisted of twenty FLL from five full-service hotels located in the Midwest and one located in the Southeast. The demographic information was attained from the classification portion of the question protocol form and can be found in Table 1. Participants were closely split among disciplines as 11 or 55% worked in hotel departments and 9 or 45% worked in food and beverage departments. Gender was equally split 50% each for male and female participants. The minimum respondent age was 22 years old with the eldest respondent being 56 years old and the average age of respondents was 39 years of age. Regarding leadership experience, the average amount of leadership experience of all respondents was 11.8 years with the most being 31 years and the least being 2 years. The mean leadership experience for college graduate respondents was 9.4 years versus a mean of 17.4 years for non-college graduates. Fourteen of the sample had been conferred a college degree and six had not. Of the fourteen reporting to have a college degree, eight of the degrees were hospitality centric degrees; culinary or hospitality management. The respondents holding college credentials included 10 Associate of Applied Science degrees, 3 Bachelor of Science degrees, and 1 Master of Science degree. This participant profile information is included in Table 2.
Table 1  Front Line Leaders in the Hospitality Industry - Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Leadership Experience</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1DP</td>
<td>Executive Housekeeper</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2DP</td>
<td>Director of Sales</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3DP</td>
<td>Transportation Supervisor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4DP</td>
<td>Front Office Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5DP</td>
<td>Director of F &amp; B</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6DP</td>
<td>Executive Sous Chef</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>F &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7DP</td>
<td>Assist. Restaurant Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>F &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8DP</td>
<td>Restaurant Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>F &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9DP</td>
<td>Assist. General Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10DP</td>
<td>Executive Housekeeper</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11DP</td>
<td>Executive Chef</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>F &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12DP</td>
<td>Front Office Supervisor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13DP</td>
<td>Banquet Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14DP</td>
<td>Banquet Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15DP</td>
<td>Front Office Supervisor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16DP</td>
<td>Executive Housekeeper</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17DP</td>
<td>Front Office Supervisor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18DP</td>
<td>Pastry Chef</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>F &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19DP</td>
<td>Assist. Restaurant Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>F &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20DP</td>
<td>Operations Supervisor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>F &amp; B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2  Sample Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitality Related Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Type of degree as a percent of degree holders
Research Topic 1 Theme: Leadership Knowledge

Research topic one was designed to assess FLL in full-service hotels knowledge of theories or approaches to leadership. In order to assess this topic, respondents were asked to define leadership in their own words, what situations typically require utilization of their leadership skills, and if respondents were familiar with specific theories.

Participant’s response data to defining leadership were handled in two ways. First, open-ended responses were analyzed within the context of the LBDQ (Halpin, 1957) for key words in context, batched, and listed by frequency. Results are listed in Table 3. Results indicate that all subject’s definitions were peppered with leadership descriptors, regardless of having or not having a college degree. However, there were two participants that failed to articulate an answer to the question; one with and one without a college education. This could indicate FLL, even in the absence of formal leadership development, are prone to acquire and adopt leadership constructs from unknown sources through lived experiences.

Additionally, full verbatim comments were sorted by respondents with and without college degrees. The first emerging theme indicated a divergent view and description of leadership. Illustrative quotes are listed below. Comments represent respondents with college degrees.

Act in a supporting role of others to have them be the best that they can be and produce the best in accordance with services standards that are in place for the hotel brand. (Respondent with degree).
Getting things accomplished through other people. (Respondent with degree).

Blending of communication, relationships, and discipline in a sense that you have to communicate with people in order to lead them, have a good relationship with people in order to work alongside them, and drop the hammer when things go wrong. (Respondent with degree)

Comments representative of respondents without college degrees.

Being able to drive and control people into doing what it is that you want them to do. I suppose leadership doesn’t necessarily need to be business. (Respondent without degree).

That’s a hard question. I don’t know how to answer that. I don’t know how to answer it. (Respondent without degree).

Leadership is done by example with respect given until you can’t anymore. Nobody wants to follow someone who just sits in the office and yells at you. I’m a hands-on type of person. (Respondent without degree).

There appears to be clear differences based on various terminology and definitions utilized to describe leadership (Berger & Brownell, 2009; Hughes et al., 2009). The inconsistencies in the view of leadership by those with and without college degrees may be a result of learning processes and knowledge associated with the grit required to attain a college education.
Table 3  FLL Defined Leadership behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Frequency Total Sample n = 20</th>
<th>Frequency with degree n = 14</th>
<th>Frequency without degree n = 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead by example</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish tasks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting goals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create deadlines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two additional attempts to understand a FLL foundational leadership knowledge were to inquire as to familiarity with theories associated with leadership and to directly ask respondents to describe five characteristics of a good leader. Eight of twenty participants responded in the positive to the familiarity question. Of the eight, six were from the pool of subjects holding a college degree. Only two of six college graduates could recall leadership constructs with those being servant leadership and situational leadership, with another stating he could not remember the moment. The two non-degree holders responding positively could not recall concepts in the moment.

Finally, a verbatim list was generated from participants being offered time to free think and list five characteristics of a good leader. The results are found in Table 4. There are noticeable similarities with the LBDQ list regardless of whether or not a participant is educated or familiar with leadership theories or not. In conjunction with the LBDQ list generated from the same sample, a pattern may be emerging furthering the idea of unknown sources, in the absence of formal education on the topic, are shaping FLL understanding of leadership and shaping the FLL leadership style.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Communicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can take criticism</td>
<td>Detail oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Financially skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deals with conflict</td>
<td>Follow through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>Good memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally intelligent</td>
<td>Hard worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Multi-tasker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good attitude</td>
<td>Presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communicator</td>
<td>Problem solver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good listener</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard working</td>
<td>Results oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has vision</td>
<td>Service skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds people accountable</td>
<td>Time management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Topic 2 Theme: Knowledge Acquisition

The second research topic was created to attain data that shed light on how FLL leadership knowledge was acquired. Three items were used to assess this topic. The subjects were asked 1) Do you have a college degree? 2) Were you ever formally taught about leadership theory either through college or company training? and, 3) Have you ever had your leadership style assessed through the use of a questionnaire?

As referenced earlier in the sample profile and noted in Table 2, 70% of participants (14) were college graduates and 57% of graduates (8) were schooled in hospitality management related programs. This equates to 8 of 20, or 40% of participants, which is meaningful and encouraging to the hospitality industry. Overall, most graduates indicated receiving an AAS degree. An emergent theme appears to indicate college graduates are finding FLL success and employment in full-service hotels, and a sizable number of college educated FLL in full-service hotels are from hospitality related programs.

Regarding the inquiry centered on were you formally taught about leadership theory either through college or company training, 8 of 20 said yes to company training. Five of these indicated knowledge of leadership theory. All five also reported having college degrees. While this appears to be a positive result, more data from different questions would have aided in delineating from which direction the leadership knowledge emanated, college or company training. Additionally, results from all respondents indicated leadership
knowledge was not top of mind, and the inability of respondents to recall leadership theories or styles may suggest little further development after college of ineffective company training.

The final inquiry for how knowledge was acquired queried subjects about leadership style assessments. Only four of twenty responded favorably to having been required to complete a personal leadership assessment. The four respondents included three with college degrees. Two of the four also indicated familiarity with leadership theory and approaches. Two of the graduates held hospitality related degrees. The average length of leadership service of all participants was 11.8 years. The average length of leadership service for respondents indicating participation in an assessment was 16.25 years. Leadership assessments provide a discussion point about the importance of leadership both in the classroom and hotel. Given the low number of assessments reported and the high average experience in years, senior leaders and educators may be missing the mark on this low cost and high value technique. Further data and different questions would assist in determining the assessment provider, college or the company.

An overarching theme for research topic two suggests that college educated and company trained FLL, mostly one and the same, indicate having leadership knowledge but cannot recall leadership theory and practices. This finding may point to ineffective training or lack of continual focus by senior leaders on FLL leadership as an asset in the workplace.
Research Topic 3 Theme: Ability to Effectively Lead

Research topic three sought to link leadership knowledge with the outcome of effectively leading. Given the propose and design of this study, data were gathered utilizing two qualitative methods. First, three queries were made to subjects regarding how are leadership skills utilized each day and are participants able to effectively lead based on available time and required tasks. Lastly, each was asked to apply a percentage to the amount of time spent on actively leading or contemplating leading individuals and the team as a whole. Then, participants were asked to rate statements from the propensity for participative decision-making scale (PPDM). A participative leadership approach is considered a fit for the hospitality industry with participative decision-making being a cornerstone of the style (Miller & Mongue, 1986; van der Westhuizen et al., 2012). The PPDM model was considered an avenue to bridge knowledge and action to assess the outcome of effective leadership. PPDM scale predicts a leader’s propensity to utilize participative decision-making which has been demonstrated to positively impact various performance indicators (Harrington & Ottenbacher, 2009; Li & Qian, 2016; Nagy & Babaita, 2017).

Open ended questions elicited responses to assess if FLL are effective leaders. The use of illustrative quotes is appropriate again as it speaks to the lived experience of the FLL. Many general topics from the data rose out of the responses including coaching, disciplining, providing guidance, communicating, and motivating staff. There were three main themes that emerged from data including service recovery, employee conflict, and training. The prominent themes can be viewed in the context of respondents with a college degree versus
without. Interestingly, handling service recovery issues and training were associated with college degree holders while service recovery and employee conflict were associated with non-college degree holders. Representative comments and associated themes from college graduates include the following.

**Regarding service recovery...**

When things go wrong. Whether a system is down, a reservation’s been messed up, or we overbooked on a presidential suite, it requires a lot of service recovery or just back of the house recovery. There are things a guest may never see that we’re scrambling to fix before they even get here. For instance, our system went down recently and we didn’t know who was going to be here or who was leaving. We had to be really on top of which rooms were ready and which rooms were gone. (Respondent with degree).

**Regarding training...**

I do it generally all the time but especially at the front desk. You’re the kind of the face of the hotel, the main customer service department. Any time there’s an issue that one of my employees doesn’t necessarily feel comfortable with I’ll go up there and handle the issue and make sure they watch and listen to how I handle it so that they can learn if they have to come across that issue again in the future then they will feel a little more comfortable handling it. (Respondent with degree).

Sometimes if I see that my staff are not doing something correctly, I show them how to do it properly so that they feel confident in what they’re doing and will not ignore that they’re doing it wrong. I approach it in a professional and respectful manner. (Respondent with degree).

Responses of those without a college degree coupled with associated themes of service recovery and employee conflict.
Regarding service recovery...

I have a rule and I’m the only one who really has this set rule: if the employee (server usually) feels like they’re tip is in any way jeopardized for any reason, it becomes my problem and I go and deal with the customer. Any time they think “Oh I’m not going to get tipped because the food was bad” etc., that’s when they come and get me and I do service recovery. I like to chit-chat with people too. (Respondent without degree)

Regarding employee conflict…

Being in the restaurant industry tends to run with a lot of drama. There can be a lot of fights between servers or bartenders and it’s kind of our job to step in and settle things down and make sure they’re working as a team together. (Respondent without degree).

We have a lot of stuff come up each day to satisfy our employees. At the end of the day we have to figure out our problems. On the other side we have the housekeeper and we need to satisfy them too, right? (Respondent without degree).

A lack of leadership knowledge and service systems knowledge on behalf of non-college graduates may link employee issues and service recovery. Conversely, college degree holders were associated with service recovery and training which could indicate a logical approach to service improvement from recognizing service barriers and then conducting corrective training. These concepts would be learned in the college setting.

Participants were asked to estimate what percentage of time in a given work day is spent leading or thinking about leading individuals and teams. Responses ranged from 0% to 100% and varied significantly to the point where the data were inconsequential. Respondents struggled with grasping the concept of allocating time each day to critically think about leadership and its effect on performance.
The PPDM scale was trialed as a device for assessing leadership effectiveness in this qualitative study. The scale creators best describe its utility in the following way.

The first dimension, organizational effectiveness (ORG1-ORG7), encompasses seven items that consider one's beliefs concerning the relationship between PDM and the organizational variables of decision quality (ORG1 and ORG2), productivity (ORG3 and ORG4), self-efficacy of subordinates (ORG5), self-efficacy of superiors (ORG7), and communication effectiveness (ORG6).

The second dimension, power (PWR1-PWR3), measures the perceived relationship between PDM and the superior's power and control. PWR1 is concerned with the dissemination of confidential information that may accompany PDM. PWR2 assesses the transfer of power that may occur between superior and subordinate. PWR3 reflects the degree of trust that occurs between manager and subordinate (Parnell & Bell, 1994, p. 521).

The participants were read each of the ten items in order without relating each to their respective dimensions. The participants were informed that the ratings were 1 for least likely to agree and 6 for the strongest agreement. The power dimension was coded in the reverse and this was not noted to the participants. The results are listed in Table 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>PPDM Scale Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Effectiveness</td>
<td>Mean rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG 1</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG 2</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG 3</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG 4</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG 5</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG 6</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG 7</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWR 1</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWR 2</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWR 3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, the sample size limited statistical analysis. However, quality (ORG2) and self-efficacy of subordinates (ORG5), were perceived to be less impacted by PDM according to responses by subjects without a college degree. All mean ratings scored marginally higher by respondents with college degrees except for PWR1 which appears to be insignificant, 2.43 versus 2.33. In acknowledging the limitations of sample size, an anecdotal trend appears to continue here; nine of 10 item ratings slightly favor respondents with college degrees.
One last topic was explored within the study. Participants were asked to identify people that have greatly influenced their leadership thoughts and style. The respondents often moved to storytelling mode and enthusiastically shared who these influencers were. The participants listed parents, grandparents, spouses, siblings, friends, previous bosses, current bosses, coaches, professors, teachers, and religious figures.
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

Chapter five contains three sections. First, a summary of findings was discussed and guided by the three research topics. Recommendations for operationalizing findings are offered as are opportunities for furthering this line of research. Finally, the qualitative nature of the study presents limitations and these were noted.

Summary of Results

The literature provided underpinnings to support that leadership is important in general and particularly to complex businesses such as hospitality enterprises (Israeli, 2014; Kavanaugh & Ninemeier, 2012; Nahavandi, 2011). This study identifies a gap in the development of FLL in the hospitality industry. Recruiters have historically expressed displeasure with academia for not fully preparing graduates for industry (Kitterlin-Lynch et al., 2015; Kwok et al., 2012). Results indicate senior hospitality industry leaders are neglecting post graduate development responsibilities.

Research topic one results suggest a scant number of FLL actually have foundational leadership theory knowledge. This sample struggled to recollect any concepts even though 14 of 20 were college graduates and the sample averaged 11.8 years of leadership experience. A small group participated in company training and less had some type of personal leadership assessment completed. Research topic one also revealed that FLL have attained thoughts and insights into behaviors that would be consistent with researched leadership behaviors.
Research topic two focused on how FLL may have come to know about leadership theory and practice. Surprisingly, a full 14 of the 20 participants were college educated with 10 of those holding some form of hospitality management degree. Still, knowledge on the topic of leadership was lacking. Although some participants reported attending company training, none could recall content suggesting the training was not recent or that the training was not impactful or memorable.

In order to understand if having leadership knowledge equates to effective use of leadership skills, research topic three explored a manager’s propensity to utilize participative decision-making and queried subjects on use of leadership skills each day. The PPDM scale ratings noted that 9 out of 10 items scored higher, in other words better, for college graduates than for non-college graduates. Additionally, the interview data loosely suggested three main themes emerged from experiences of FLL daily routines. The three themes of service recovery, training, and employee conflict loosely intertwined in the context of college education. Respondents with college degrees were associated with service recovery and training while non-degree respondents associated with service recovery and employee conflict issues. A rational reason could the delta between education or no education as it relates to knowledge, team projects, and leadership experiences, that one attains from the college experience.

In sum, front-line leaders are not being developed post college during formative years as new leaders. This responsibility falls directly with the hiring organization. This study has suggested that in the absence of leadership development and professional training after
graduation, front-line leaders will acquire thoughts on leadership from some source unknown to the organization. Failure to inculcate new leaders with a succinct mission, vision, and core set of values exposes an organization to decreased performance. Further, in the absence of knowing who has influenced front-line leaders, a company is in essence outsourcing an important asset, leadership.

**Conclusion and Application**

In this case, the researcher is a long-term hospitality professional with lengthy executive experience in hospitality environments including casino and full-service hotels. Lived experiences have led to the identification of the FLL development gap and was the basis for this line of research. This important line of research, *what do you know, how do you know it, and is it effective* leadership concept, appears to be unique, therefore a scarcity of literature was found. Developing leaders in a continuous fashion from college through early formative FLL positions, can positively impact all key constituent groups including guests, employees, shareholders, and society as a whole. Hence, continued research will have a positive impact on key constituents and academia as well.

Developing leaders is a shared responsibility between institutions of higher education, industry employers, and graduates themselves. Review of literature supports this line of reasoning. The business of education is to develop leaders and be in a continual state of assessment and improvement. However, hospitality organizations are in the business of serving others and not experts in leadership development or education. Research on
recruiter’s desires has suggested what competencies are requisite for employment along with building out a resume of leadership experiences, community service and cultural experiences (Kitterlin-Lynch et al., 2015; Kwok et al., 2012). Review of literature also suggests that colleges and universities are revising curricula to meet demands for leadership development within the program of study (Hill & Vanhoof, 1997; Maier and Thomas, 2013).

As academia continues to improve graduate preparedness, industry must also recognize their role in the continuum of teaching and developing leaders. Companies are faced with centralized human resource assets spread across regions and therefore time, money, and mentoring available for leadership development of new recruits will continue to fade. Thus, the gap will remain.

Implications

First, educational institutions may consider being the driving force for post graduate success. Innovative initiatives can solidify a collaborative effort between institutions of higher education, industry employers, and graduates to bridge transition from college student to industry professional. As an extension of hospitality programs, employers could acquire expertise they lack by hiring a “coach” to mentor, advise, and counsel new hires periodically throughout the first several months of employment. This plausible and mutually beneficial plan may be worthy of further research as it is applicable and will close the gap between recruiters wants and needs, and potentially what colleges may never be able to provide, an experienced off the shelf leader that needs no further development. Institutions choosing to
innovate in such a manner will benefit by being a leader in the field, touting greater graduate success, and being a school of choice for recruitment.

Second, schools could engage and educate recruiters on both college and program outcomes designed for student success and program completion. This could then be linked to a natural hand-off point from the college to the company with a next step for manager and leader development within the company domain. There is substantial literature available to build a user manual per se for companies to utilize upon hiring a graduate (Testa & Sipe, 2012; Chung et al., 2003). This would accomplish setting realistic expectations for recruiters and by extension companies. Further, it would clearly communicate the company’s responsibilities in caring for the graduate during initial formative and developmental professional years.

Culture adjustments may be in order for educational institutions and companies alike. Kitterlin-Lynch et al. (2015) suggest faculty may be disinclined to adjust course outcomes or teaching strategies to meet the needs of industry. In the same manner, industry needs to accept their role in continuing to develop burgeoning leaders. Reframing a program mission and vision may go far to steer faculty towards being service providers and therefore being nimble becomes part of the culture including responsiveness to industry concerns.
Limitations and Future Studies

The study sample enlisted a wide array of full-service hotel front-line leader positions to attain varied lived experiences and data. However, the small sample size and restrictive geographic location does not allow for generalizations. Results are qualitative in nature leaving room for future study designs to scale this line of research. The *what do you know, how do you know it, and is it effective* leadership concept may be applied to investigations of other variables. In this case, the construct was used to explore effective leading through the lens of formal leadership education and participative leadership style and decision-making approach. Variables such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, intention to stay or leave, and across the board key business indicators may have relevance for future studies. A knowledgeable leader recognizes he or she has various leadership theories and approaches at his or her disposal. The savvy leader, like a master carpenter, knows which tool to retrieve from his or her leadership toolbox to skillfully complete the task at hand. The construct put forth in this study generates further discussion on how leaders can build the proverbial toolbox and better understand how to utilize the assembled tools.
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**APPENDIX B: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT PROTOCOL**

| **INTRODUCTION** | Hello, my name is Greg and I’m doing research for my PhD at Iowa State University. I appreciate your time today. I would like to make you aware of several items pertaining to this research:  
1. I want to talk for fifteen minutes or so about the topic of leadership.  
2. I do not foresee any risks to participants coming from this research.  
3. A benefit you may receive is that your interest in leadership theory may be peaked.  
4. I have a series of short questions to ask and after each question you or I may discuss the topic further if we wish.  
5. This conversation is confidential. I will not record your name; only your position title and several informational items such as age, gender, ethnicity, and level of educational background.  
6. Your participation is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or stop the interview at any time. |
| **TRANSITION** | Do you have any questions about the process before we get started? |
| **ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS** | How are you today?  
May I ask your official title?  
What staff/positions do you lead? |
| **TARGET QUESTIONS** | How would you define leadership?  
In everyday situations, how do you utilize leadership skills?  
What situations most often require leadership? |
What are five characteristics of a good leader? List characteristics…

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.  

What figures in your personal life would you say have significantly influenced your thoughts on leadership?

1.  
2.  
3.  
4.  
5.  

Based solely on time and tasks, do you think you are able to lead your staff well?

% Tasks: _____ % Leading: _____ = 100% (tasks = performing line work)

Were you ever formally taught about leadership theories and concepts either through college or company training?

College ____ Company Training ____ (how many training levels)

For example: Theory X or Y; Servant; Transformational; Transactional; Situational

Have you ever had your leadership style assessed through the use of a questionnaire?

Yes  No
Propensity for Participative Management Scale (1 = least agreement, 6 = strongest agreement)

Organizational effective subscale

**ORG1:** Many organizational problems disappear when everyone has a chance to participate in decision making.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**ORG2:** Participative decision making usually results in effective decisions.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**ORG3:** Group decisions are worth any extra time required.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**ORG4:** Participative decision making stimulates feelings of self-worth for subordinates.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**ORG5:** Participative decision making is an effective communication tool.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**ORG6:** When my boss allows me to participate in decisions I feel more important.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**ORG7:** Participative decision making promotes positive relationships at all levels of the organization.
1 2 3 4 5 6

Power and control subscale

**PWR1:** Participative decision making requires divulging too much confidential information.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**PWR2:** Participative decision making gives too much power to subordinates.
1 2 3 4 5 6

**PWR3:** Subordinates often cannot be trusted.
1 2 3 4 5 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>Gender: Male / Female</th>
<th>Age: ____</th>
<th>Ethnicity: ______________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education: HS / BS / MS / None</td>
<td>Is degree in Hospitality Management? Y / N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Manager / Supervisor</td>
<td>Area: F&amp;B / Hotel / Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of experience leading people ______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCLUDING QUESTION AND THOUGHTS</td>
<td>The survey is concluded. Do you have any questions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| THANK YOU AND DEBRIEFING         | Thank you very much for your time. I know your quite busy and have much to do.  
The reason for this research is to better comprehend the front-line leader’s understanding of leadership theories and concepts. Also, to inquire as to when that knowledge is used and under what circumstances the leadership concepts are put into practice.  
Your thoughts on the subject will help to strengthen leaders in the future. Thank you again. |