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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

There is a lack of thought applied to leading front line staff by leaders (i.e., managers and supervisors) in the hospitality areas of the gaming industry. This deficiency can result from several factors in the workplace. These factors may include lack of knowledge on the subject of leadership, insufficient time for planning leadership activities, and a misunderstanding of when or unwillingness to implement leadership theory and/or tactics. Existing leadership research in the hospitality industry tends to gravitate towards the assessment of leader traits and determination of a prevailing style or, utilizes such information to recommend a leadership model befitting the industry. This master’s thesis seeks to establish a ground up approach beginning with understanding how front line hospitality leaders acquired their leadership thoughts and produce subsequent actions. The hospitality driven activities and services within the gaming environment provides the setting for this research.

As jurisdictions seek to enhance tax revenues, the gaming industry has experienced and continues to experience robust growth throughout the country. In addition to offering the gambling experience, most gaming facilities offer a vast array of traditional hospitality based activities. The service and services typically include multiple tiered food and beverage options and typical full service hotel amenities including varied room types, valet, spa, and concierge; all under the umbrella of the hospitality profession.

Research Objectives

With the goal of understanding basic leadership acumen, this research study examined a cross section of hospitality professionals within the gaming industry that directly lead front line staff on a regular basis. The primary objectives of this study were to:
1. Examine front line leader’s knowledge about leadership concepts and theories.

2. Determine the acquisition of front line leader knowledge.

3. Understand knowledge implementation in daily work activities.

4. Examine if time constraints play a role in leading effectively.

**Significance of Study**

The hospitality industry is both a service and labor intensive proposition (Poulston, 2008). The effectiveness of the leader can impact shareholder value, customer satisfaction, and employee happiness. It is for these reasons that effective leadership is critical to the success of a hospitality business.

The existing body of research that examined leadership within the hospitality industry has been centered on who the leader is and not how the leader was developed. Dating back as far as 1977 with Nebel and Stearns using questionnaires for hotel and catering work and again with Keegan’s (1983) survey relating to appropriate styles, research has been conducted through the use of questionnaires for assessing both leader’s traits and follower’s perceptions. This thesis begins to address the gap that exists prior to an assessment of leadership traits and styles by understanding what the leader knows and how the leader, either through formal education or experiential learning, came to know it.

The results of this study will benefit several stakeholders of the hospitality industry. These include educators, students, professionals, and researchers. First, educators will benefit by understanding the importance of building a curricula that incorporates leadership theory and the thorough teaching of the practices and principles that surround such ideas. Secondly, learning leadership theories and concepts is of utmost importance to students. As front line leaders, the beginning years of a graduate’s career will be laden with both employee and guest
interactions. Understanding the implications of leading may correlate to industry retention rates of new graduates. Third, hospitality professionals working in the industry will potentially gain insights to development opportunities for front line leaders that do not have formal education or training that speaks to leadership concepts. Finally, this study may serve to create future comparisons either between hospitality leaders in the gaming industry or those in the hotel industry.

**Research Questions**

Appreciating the dilemma that front line leaders lack knowledge about leadership theory and concepts, the following research topics stemmed from the final research question: Are front line managers and supervisors aware of leadership theory and practices? These questions attempt to answer sub-problems: 1) front line leaders lack knowledge about leadership theory and concepts, 2) leaders may not have the opportunity to conceptually learn about leadership, and 3) leaders being unaware when to use leadership skills and being too busy doing manual tasks to effectively lead. These research questions arise from the sub-problems.

1. What do front line leaders know about leadership concepts and theories?
2. How do front line leaders acquire their knowledge?
3. How is the knowledge utilized in daily work activities and do time constraints play a role in leading effectively leading staff?
Assumptions and Delimitations

Assumptions

It is assumed participants are truthful and are who they say they are because they were contacted through their place of employ. Supervisors and managers lead their staff and shift without direct oversight from a superior that may supersede their authority. The operation and staff is large enough to expect a leader to have adequate knowledge of both technical and leadership aspects of the position. The properties are large enough to have a human resources department that includes a training and development function.

Delimitations

1. Population consists of hospitality leaders within the gaming industry but does not include casino supervisors or managers.
2. Respondents directly lead line staff and do not include the director level or higher that may step in to lead line staff for a short time or during periods of change.
3. Geographic constraints exist and limit respondents to the Eastern and Southwestern United States including Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Arizona.

Definition of Terms

Leader: A supervisor or manager that directly supervises, leads, or manages a shift or manages the department overall and works a shift.

Gaming industry: Labeled as a “lab” per se for the environment in which this study was administered; not necessarily viewed differently than the hospitality industry or a large full service hotel.
Leadership theory and concepts: Constitutes some level of familiarity with terms such as theories X and Y, transformational, transactional, servant, or situational.

Situations: Refers to interactions requiring the supervisor to exert some type of leadership thought, strategy, or technique.

Characteristics: In this case referring to terminology describing traits of a good leader.

Tasks: Work that a supervisor does on a routine basis that is outside the realm of providing leadership. This may include assignments such as inventory, scheduling, creating or reviewing reports, performance reviews, and filling in for line staff due to either staff shortages or providing breaks to employees.

Leading: Time applied solely to the thought and activity of leading people.

Company training: Education and development opportunities pertaining to company provided supervisor training.

Organization of Thesis

This thesis is organized in five chapters. The first chapter presented the dilemma, research questions, the objectives of the study, and why the thesis is to be considered significant. As this paper moves forward, a review of research will include the history of hospitality research as it pertains to leadership, the importance of leadership knowledge to the success of the leader and the roles that both formal education and company training play in imparting leadership knowledge on the hospitality leader. Chapter three will detail methodology, chapter four discusses analysis and results of the data, and finally, chapter five will conclude the thesis with ending thoughts and recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In an increasing fashion over the past three decades, many studies and articles have shaped the discussion on leadership within the hospitality profession. Most work has centered on general leadership theory and its’ application to the hospitality arena. A general overview of work will be reviewed in the following manner: 1) hospitality leadership works and how those efforts intertwine with general management theory, 2) formal education in teaching leadership, and 3) company training and its’ role in leadership development.

As a note, there is scant work on leadership in the gaming industry and this topic is of little use to this thesis. The gaming industry serves a hospitality lab for purposes of this study. Two examples are identified here prior to relevant literature review.

A study by Goussak and Weber (2010) was conducted applying the full range model as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and how the results impact gaming revenues. It concluded that leaders operated in a transactional mode and revenue growth was not a determining factor in the respondent’s perceptions. A study by Schaap (2006) studied a group of senior leaders (n=120) and related the groups leadership behavior and the ability to effectively implement strategic planning processes.

History of Hospitality Leadership Research

Several important works beginning in 1977 and continuing through 2010 find relevance for this discussion. Each represents a time period and shift in leadership philosophy and theory.

One of the earliest notable works on hospitality leadership was that of Nebel and Sterns. The authors of this 1977 article explored a large sampling (n=594) of hospitality professionals through the lens of Fiedler’s contingency theory (Campbell, 1968). Taking into
consideration positional power, employee independence, tasks, and group dynamics, the study suggested a task oriented style was appropriate based on the industry and the situations encountered. Pittaway, Carmouche, and Chell (1998) argued and noted there was a flaw in the theory, “It is evident that if the effectiveness of a leadership style is dependent on the situation it is unlikely that one will find a leadership style that can be applicable to an entire industry (p. 414).”

Leadership opinion questionnaires were utilized in combination with interviews in the Worsfold (1989) study of general managers (n=28). In exploring the personalities and traits of the leader respondents, the researcher noted those exhibiting good interpersonal skills and good directing skills will garner greater success in the hospitality industry. The author surmised consideration for the human element and setting structure were important to both the general manager role and effective leadership.

With a small lag to the general leadership trend of the time, Tracey and Hinkin (1994) applied both transactional and transformational leadership principles to the hospitality industry. A transactional approach is concerned with matter-of-fact exchanges in the work environment such as short-term goals and rewards, benefits for time served, standardized thinking, and the basic monetary transaction between the employee and employer for services performed. Transformational leadership is noted for creating vision, a sense of a greater cause, group and self actualization, utilization of emotion invoking communication skills, and being charismatic. Corporate staff (n=45) was asked to rate ownership (n=6) on the two styles and then comment on transformational characteristics. Those that rated higher in both transactional and transformational traits were considered to exhibit more transformational leadership than those rating lower. During the study period, change was occurring
throughout the industry and the authors concluded a transformational style was more appropriate during periods of change.

Brownell (2010) has asserted that it is again time to look for a new approach to leading in the hospitality industry. In her article in Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, Brownell suggests the future leadership theory should be rooted in servant style leadership. First presented by Greenleaf (1977), servant leaders are in service to others regardless of their position and whether it be providing internal or external service. Influence and power come from the service itself. Integrity, character, and personal values are all keys to determining one’s success as a servant leader (Giampetro-Meyer, Brown, Browne, & Kubasek, 1998; Linden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008). The author also tries to highlight the differences while suggesting a link between transformational and servant leadership styles. Parolini, Patterson, and Winston (2009) reported on a study that revealed strong statistical differences between transformational leaders and servant leaders in the following five dimensions; ethics, focus, motive and mission, development, and means of influence. Brownell cites Ehrhart’s (2004) work as an example that a transformational leader is focused on the needs and goals of an organization while the servant leader’s primary focus is on developing his or hers followers as an end to itself.

While this body of work illustrates the general evolution of hospitality leadership research, it also highlights that research is focused on the assessment of leaders and specific leadership models. Absent from the research is any understanding of what front line leaders actually know about leadership and how they came to know it. Blanch (1998) expressed concern over leadership concepts in hospitality management. In critiquing hospitality leadership studies, he noted research looks at traits of leaders but does not address the process
of leadership, have a clear definition of leadership, or have a framework by which to conduct research.

**Role of Formal Education in Teaching Leadership**

The role of formal higher education in developing future leaders is important to the overall success of the leader. It is particularly important to lower level front line leaders. Kay and Moncarz (2004) conducted a study that included lodging professionals (n=137) and graduates of Florida International University’s School of Hospitality and Tourism Management (n=55). This research studied the effectiveness of Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities (KSAs) on the respondent’s success and advancement in the hospitality industry. These competencies were grouped into four core areas including human resource management, financial management, marketing, and information technology. Previous research had concluded that human resources management KSAs were considered paramount to the success of leaders at all levels. This study recorded a shift and noted a bifurcation in managerial levels and the KSAs required being successful at those levels. Upper level executives were now reporting that financial acumen was most important to their advancement. Lower and mid-level managers considered human resources management and information technology to be most important for their success. The human resources competencies included what would be considered leadership traits and behaviors such as positive human relations, supervising, being a leader, building teams, and training and developing employees. All groups however, rated themselves most competent in human resource management KSAs, which is heavily weighted towards leadership abilities.

A study by Lee (2007) recognized the attributes of learning both formally and experientially. The author researched a population where the respondents both attended
college and worked in industry. It was found that students learned platform speaking skills, became civic-minded, improved writing skills, and learned to perform experiments in the formal setting. Interestingly however, in the work environment the respondents learned to adapt to change, learned about finance, and gained leadership skills.

In making a case for segregating leadership as a distinct discipline within the hospitality curricula, Hill and VanHoof (1997) designed an innovative leadership class that combined formal education and informal industry executive mentoring. Students were taught leadership theory and characteristics, human relations competencies, and leadership analysis.

Attaining leadership prior to graduating college is a trend and students see this as a resume enhancement. Additionally, a movement is afoot to create socially responsible leaders as well and two relevant studies speak to this point.

Dugan and Komives (2007) conducted a national study of 50,378 college students. Based on civic engagement movement, empowerment of social identity groups, and emergence of new leadership associations, the authors noted, “All trends converge in the form of an institutional and societal mandate that calls for institutions of higher education to purposefully develop socially responsible leaders (p. 5).” This challenge faces three problems: 1) the gap between theory and practice, 2) no clear picture of the development needs of college students, and 3) uncertainty regarding the influence of the college environment on leadership development outcomes. To increase leadership development of students, ten recommendations were offered.

1. Continually discuss socio-cultural issues
2. Get students involved in at least one organization
3. Get students involved in at least one leadership program
4. Create leadership programs across the organization
5. Focus on members, not just positional leaders
6. Discourage too much breadth of involvement
7. Develop mentoring relationships
8. Design distinct programs for different groups
9. Align students self perceptions of leadership with competence and confidence
10. Build bridges with K-12 educators

Earlier, Brownell (2008) was cited for her work and recommendation that servant leadership may be the new path forward for hospitality leadership. Part of her thought process was to suggest that servant leaders have a higher calling. A servant leader’s scope of concern extends beyond the organization into the social and physical environment. These individuals feel a profound responsibility to participate in and contribute to the larger society (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

This section has set forth some key findings. Namely that, 1) leadership is important to lower level supervisors and managers, 2) students learn leadership both formally and experientially, 3) hospitality curricula calls for leadership to be a standalone discipline, and 4) leadership development of college students extends to campus life and calls for faculty to be role models and mentors alike. Helping students develop the integrity and strength of character for leadership may be of the most challenging and important goals of higher education (King, 1997, p.87).

**Company Training and Leadership Development**

Training is widely recognized as an important activity for hospitality organizations (Tracey & Tews, 1995). It was therefore interesting to note that most research gravitates
towards assessing outcomes and calculating return on investment of training dollars. A study conducted by Conrade, Woods and Ninemier (1994) found less than ten percent of hospitality companies surveyed formally evaluated their training programs. Although one can look at a company’s financial success and status for answers, there is little research assessing whether or not training is considered successful.

Tracey and Tews (1995) research recognizes that trainees’ preparation for training, knowledge and skill acquisition during training and transfer of training to the workplace are important facets of the overall training process. Their study of twenty-one training and human resource professionals suggests there are two primary drivers for the success of this process; individual characteristics and the work environment itself. Individual characteristics include abilities, attitude, and motivation. Work environment influences can be attributed to job characteristics, social networks, and organizational systems. Regarding leadership training, the authors’ write,

“Many of the training programs designed and implemented by those we interviewed, particularly supervisory and managerial programs (e.g., leadership, strategic-action planning), require participants to synthesize and evaluate complex information. If trainees possess critical-reasoning, problem-solving, and decision-making abilities, learning will be relatively quick and efficient. Consequently, a trainer should account for individuals' abilities in the program design and implementation (p. 40).”

Hughes, Ginnett and Curphy (2009) note in many ways training for leadership has many parallels to the content and technique used in university-level topics of the same subject. They suggest that the programs are shorter in nature but tend to be more focused. Low level supervisor training focuses on developing skills such as training, monitoring, giving feedback, and conducting performance reviews. Mid-level managers will be schooled
in areas such as improvement of interpersonal, oral communication, and written communication while learning time management, planning, and goal setting techniques.

Conger (1996) in reviewing the general field of leadership development and training, offered this assessment, “Leadership programs can work well, if they use a multi-tiered approach. Effective training depends on the combined use of four different methods I call personal growth, skill building, feedback, and conceptual awareness (p. 56).”

In a study conducted by Lashly for the Hospitality Training foundation in 1999, it was reported that forty percent of employer organizations conducted no training in the previous twelve months. Most training taking place was to fulfill statutory requirements for food handling, health, and safety matters.

To understand the lack of training, this researcher conversed with human resources professional who noted while the programs are in place, financial pressures have reduced staffing levels so there are fewer people to attend, less time for people to be available for training, lack of replacements for those in training, and less dollars to spend on training activity.

The findings from this section include:

1. Training is widely accepted as important to the hospitality industry.
2. Many organizations to not formally assess the success of failures of training programs.
3. The individual and the environment play an important role in the training process.
4. Learning leadership in company training setting will be short, focused, and must be well planned.
5. Outside of statutory required training, financial pressures have impacted dollars available for training, time allotted for training, staff sizes that would allow training to actually occur and be fulfilling.

As a final note in the literature review, the population of this study consists of front line leaders and as such skills and behaviors would be of importance. Hughes, et al. (2009) suggest the following when comparing the two (p. 266).

“Leadership behaviors are somewhat different than leadership skills. A leadership behavior is concerned with a specific action. A leadership skill consists of three components, which include a well defined body of knowledge, a set of related behaviors, and clear criteria of competent performance. Thus, a leadership skill is knowing when to act, acting in a manner appropriate to the situation, and acting in such a way that it helps the leader accomplish team goals.”
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Chapter three explains the research process sequentially in six sections. The overview of the study again frames the dilemma and restates the research questions. The research approach and design outlines how the study was conducted and reviews the instrument development and conceptualization. The sampling section deals with population and methods and process for selecting the group. The data collection area discloses the method for acquiring data from the sample. Data analysis will present the process for sifting data collected from participants. The ethical and human study portion addresses IRB approval (Appendix 1), participant consent, anonymity and confidentiality, and potential risks to participants.

Overview of the Study

The objective of this study was to begin a journey that fundamentally understands what front line leaders know about leadership and how those leaders came to know it. This will assist in solving the dilemma which is; front line leaders in the hospitality industry lack the ability to effectively lead frontline employees. This led to three research questions:

1. What do front line leaders know about leadership concepts and theories?
2. How do front line leaders acquire their knowledge?
3. How is the knowledge utilized in daily work activities and do time constraints play a role in leading effectively leading staff?

Research Approach and Design

This descriptive study takes a qualitative, phenomenological approach. Since the researcher was looking to capture the characteristics associated with the population’s real life perceptions and experiences, this approach was most appropriate. The modified Van Kaam
method set forth by Moustakas (1994) adds validity to the informal, interactive process that uses open-ended questions and comments. Based on the researchers’ contacts in the casino industry, the hospitality environment of gaming entities was used to acquire the sample population (Table 1).

The research instrument was a set question guide and protocol (Appendix) that followed the same format for each participant. The protocol consisted of a series of questions including two administrative, six target, and five classification questions. The instrument had a combination of both structured and unstructured questions. Of the eight total non-classification questions, five were of the structured variety and three were considered unstructured. In order to separate participants experiences apart from their theoretical knowledge, questions regarding how and when leadership practices were utilized were placed before ‘what they know and how did they came to know it’ types of questions. The instrument was reviewed by two experts and the IRB. One expert was from academia with a doctoral degree and a track record of scholarly work while the other was from industry and holds a masters degree and leads a human resources department in a large casino hotel. Appropriate changes were made after feedback was received.

The final protocol was framed in the context of leadership knowledge, information acquisition, and implementation. 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?

The target interview length was twenty minutes. The shortest interview lasted ten minutes and twenty-four seconds and the longest lasted twenty-four minutes and fourteen seconds.

**Sampling Procedure**

A hybrid purposive, snowball method was used to attain participants. This method allows for the researcher to acquire a population with knowledge of the subject matter and use those demonstrating interest to further recommend other potential subjects (Groenwald, 2004). As stated earlier, participants included front line leaders from the hospitality environment of the gaming industry and were limited to traditional hospitality disciplines.
Casino operation leaders were excluded from the sampling. An initial objective of purposive sampling was to acquire both formally educated and non-formally educated leaders. Prior to the sampling being attained, it was realized in order to be true to the idea of the study, it was best to ‘let the chips fall where they may’ regarding educational background. This will allow for a realistic representation of the actual makeup of the leadership population. The population is a representation of a snowball method of acquiring front line leaders in the hospitality sector of the gaming industry. Considering the diversity of hospitality workforce, it did not seek to assess any particular groups based on race, religion, age, or gender makeup.

Prior to the beginning of each interview the investigator read a statement regarding research on human subjects and the interviewee was given the opportunity to refuse participation and made known that he or she could stop the interview and any time.

**Data Collection**

In order to acquire a more geographically diverse population, the method of communication for this study was telephonic. While traditional qualitative research has taken place through face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews have been frowned upon. Cachia and Millward (2011) demonstrated that this method can produce positive results for interpretive phenomenological analysis. In addition to numerous data, factors such as geographic diversity and ability to reschedule interview times with participants who work in a very fast paced, hectic environment are of utmost importance to researching in the hospitality arena.

Four initial contacts were made to industry professional in and out of human resources departments. This yielded a total of thirty-one potential participants at four different properties in three differing states and two unique regions of the United States. Of the thirty-
one potential participants, ten were deemed to not fit within the purpose of the study due to being employed as casino operations leaders. Verbal contact was made with the remaining twenty-one which resulted in thirteen utilizable interviews. Of the eight other respondents, two interviews were started and had to be stopped due to work situations occurring during the interview and the interviewees did not call back; and the remaining were unavailable during the scheduled interview session either due to a work related issue or did not answer the call.

The participants were coded with a participant number, title, contact number, state and corresponding region of country (i.e., Eastern or Southwestern), and department (i.e., food and beverage, hotel, facilities, or stewarding). Prior to each interview beginning, a participant interview form (Appendix 3) was initiated and labeled with the participant code number only. These notes were taken for reference during the analysis portion of the study. Each interview was digitally recorded and transcribed by a professional legal secretary. To ensure each response was recorded with the appropriate question, the transcriptionist utilized the participant interview template for recording data. Each interview transcript was proofed by both the transcriber and investigator.

Confidentiality and anonymity were protected in that there are no recordings of any name other than on the initial contact sheet which is protected by the investigator. There is no recorded linkage between the subject, company name, address or contact information. All analysis was completed in the aggregate and no response can be associated with the name of a subject. There was no incentive for participation and therefore no need for further contact with the investigator.
Data Analysis

The data obtained by the investigator was analyzed without the use of content analysis software. The sample size permitted the coding to take place with the use of Excel. The digitally recorded data was transcribed and categorized by question. Each subject was given a participant identification number. Coding was used to group data and this allowed for common themes to emerge. Content analysis is, “A systematic, replicable technique for compressing many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding” (Stemler, 2001) (p. 1). Weber, (1990) notes: "To make valid inferences from the text, it is important that the classification procedure be reliable in the sense of being consistent; different people should code the same text in the same way" (p. 12). Since the investigator is the sole coder, all inferences and interpretations of phraseology will be consistently applied.

This study looked at basic and fundamental behaviors of front line leaders. The goal of this research was to learn what leaders know, how each came to know it, and if the knowledge is utilized. The aim was not to create a competency model and therefore a basic method of categorization was utilized. The same categories developed by a team at Ohio State University for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, were utilized for classifying data in this study. The LBDQ method organizes all data into two categories called consideration and initiating structure (Appendix 3). Consideration deals with human elements such as friendship, trust, support, and relationships. Initiating structure refers to ensuring tasks and goals are being accomplished, standards are met, and poor work is scrutinized (Halpin, 1957). All responses were listed in a raw state on the first review. Responses were then combined for commonality and frequency of response was recorded on
the second assessment. Finally, the responses for the open ended questions were evaluated and categorized based on the two factors from the LBDQ.

Ethical and Human Issues

Much consideration has been afforded the subjects of this study.

1. The investigator has attained the appropriate credentials to conduct research on human subjects (Appendix 4).
2. This study poses no known risks to the subjects of this study. To the contrary, subjects may have their interests peaked to learn about leadership theory and research.
3. The IRB approved this study and exempted it from official review.
4. An opening statement was read to each participant advising of the rights of human subjects in research.
5. All information has been protected and kept confidential.
6. No compensation was provided for participation in this study.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Participant Profile

The population included thirteen hospitality leaders which consisted of seven managers and eight supervisors. Two geographical regions, Eastern US and Southwest US, were represented by three states, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Arizona. Females made up 31% of the population and 75% of females worked in the hotel division. Of the nine males in the study, all but two worked in food and beverage areas. The mean age for the group was 42.9 years with the oldest and youngest being 70 and 24 years of age, respectively. The respondent’s ethnic makeup included three Asians, eight Caucasians, and two Hispanics while the mean years of leadership experience for the total sample was 13.76. Five out of eight attended institutions of higher education with three of those having a degree associated with hospitality management. Thirty-eight percent attended some form of company training while twenty-three percent noted participation in leadership assessment via questionnaire at some point in their career (Table 2).

Research Question One

Research question one deals with knowledge. Two interview questions were asked of the participants to assess their knowledge of leadership concepts. The first was, “What situations most often require leadership?” The second asked the respondents to offer five characteristics of good leadership.

Thirty-seven responses were solicited from the participants for situations requiring leadership (Table 3). The consideration factor garnered 48% of the responses while initiating structure received 52% of the responses. Three responses equally received the highest
frequency of mentions with one being in the consideration category (motivating staff), and two being in the initiating structure category (service recovery and enforcing rules). Communicating was also prevalent with three responses divided between general communications and communicating upward. Additionally, dealing with employee personal problems and mediating employee disputes each received two mentions making a combined total of four responses for employee related issues. Three respondents noted being knowledgeable of leadership theory and concepts and expressed thoughts such as:

P # 30 “…employees sometimes bring their personal realm [problems] to work.”

P # 10 “…rules and regulations need to be followed,” and “…employees need to be accounted for.”

P # 13 “…keeping staff focused…on track and not letting them get flustered”, and “…give guidance and a little help.”

Those with secondary education used terms such as motivating, communicating, supporting, and service recovery when discussing situations requiring leadership. It should be noted that participant #30 struggled to offer a response while participant #9 did not respond in a logical manner to this question.

The second question to assess knowledge asked the participants to offer five characteristics of a good leader. Consideration responses made up 55% of total responses while initiating structure accounted for 45% (Table 4). In total, sixty-three responses were elicited which included one respondent only being able to offer four characteristics and one responding with six. It should be noted that several struggled and the researcher had to prompt for more answers. Over half of the consideration responses, 18 of 35, received multiple mentions while only thirty-nine percent, 11 of 28, of the initiating structure responses
obtained multiple responses. Being an effective communicator, a structure response, was mentioned most often with five, both fair and friendly were mentioned equally as a consideration factor with three responses each. Out of 63 total terms describing leader characteristics, 12 terms received multiple mentions while 34 were dissimilar, singular responses.

**Research Question Two**

The interview protocol posed three survey questions to gather data regarding the methods by which a respondent may have acquired knowledge about leadership. One question asked if the respondents were educated, either through college or company training, about leadership concepts and theories. A second question tested if the respondents were familiar with terminology surrounding leadership concepts. Finally, the third question explored the potential of participants gaining knowledge through the use of leadership assessment.

Three of the participants were educated about leadership through either college or company training. All three reported working at manager level positions. Two of the three have masters degrees and one of those is a degree in hospitality management. Participant #13, who holds a masters degree in hospitality management, commented that, “My leadership classes were through the school of business with the general student population and I did not have any hospitality related leadership classes.” Participant #10 learned of leadership from training he received throughout twenty years of service in the Coast Guard.

An array of leadership theories and concepts such as Theory X and Y, Transformational, Transactional, and Situational, were read to the group seeking familiarity. The same respondents that were educated about leadership responded positively to the
terminology. All were of the manager level and on a combined basis, average 15.66 years of leadership experience. This is compared to a mean of 13.76 years of leadership experience for the overall set of participants. One respondent, #4, who has an MBA, noted he may have been exposed to leadership concepts but would have to “Look back in my books…,” to see if that were the case or not.

A third question asked if respondents had ever participated in a leadership assessment via questionnaire. For the most part, the researcher had to describe what was meant by leadership assessment; there was little understanding of the tool. Only three responded yes to being assessed. This included two managers and one supervisor. One respondent was both educated with a masters degree and had company training focused on leadership. Another had higher education and no company training while the third had no higher education yet had participated in company training. This group’s leadership experience combined for a mean of 14.33 years.

**Research Question Three**

The third research question attempts to understand if front line leaders are afforded the ability to effectively utilize their leadership skills based on time and tasks; and, if they know when to deploy those skills. This was done thought the use of three questions. First, leaders were asked to describe how they used their leadership skills in everyday situations (Table 5). The responses were again categorized according to the two factors from the LBDQ research. Of the twenty-five responses, results for this question included four responses that had multiple mentions. These included leading by example and coaching which are consideration descriptors and, counseling for attendance and service recovery which are initiating structure terms. By far, leading by example was mentioned most often at 20%. Four out of five
leading by example comments came from participants indicating they had no secondary education.

In order to ascertain if leaders were given ample time to think about leading their teams and apply those thoughts, leaders were asked if they felt they had adequate time to lead effectively. Seven out of thirteen participants reported yes; three managers and four supervisors. While variables such as division, department, and education showed no significance on the results, years of leadership experience for those saying they did have enough time to effectively lead was 15% less than for those saying they did not have enough time to lead; 12.57 versus 15.16 respectively. The mean years for leadership experience of the total population were 13.76.

Another gauge for appraising a leader’s opportunity to effectively lead was to understand what percent of their day they attributed to leading versus doing manual tasks such as creating or reviewing reports, scheduling, staffing, or coordinating with other departments. Each respondent was asked to divide his or her time by percentage of time spent on leading and percentage consumed by manual tasks. While each readily understood the concept of manual tasks, the researcher had to explain in detail what was meant by time spent leading. The common description used by the researcher was, “A set period of time during the day that was spent reflecting on leading your staff based on the how you described leadership. A quiet time of peace and solitude to think about those you lead.” The responses ranged from zero to fifty percent for time spent leading. The mean for the total population was 15.95% of time spent on leading. However, while the mean for the total population was 15.95%, the mode was 10%. When three anomalies (30, 40, 50), all approximately twice that of the mean or
higher were removed, the average for the remaining ten respondents fell to 8.7% from 15.95%. The respondents identified as anomalies were:

P # 9. Identified himself as a quality assurance Asian chef overseeing multiple outlets commented, “I let them do their jobs…train them and trust them to do their jobs…give them 100% support.”

P # 11. Identified himself as a restaurant floor supervisor said, “I actually try to lead by example.”

P # 13. Identified himself as a multiple outlet restaurant manager that commented, “I see myself more as a motivator…more of a facilitator.”

Of the above three respondents noting large amounts of time to lead, two have degrees in hospitality management areas and the third is currently earning a degree in hospitality management. All of the anomalies were in food and beverage areas. All eight food and beverage respondents with the inclusion of the anomalies resulted in a mean time of 20.57% leading; when excluding the anomalies the time fell to 9.4%. This compares to the five hotel leaders time which averaged 8%. Those that responded yes to having enough time to effectively lead on the previous question had a mean time of 13% dedicated to leading when accounting for the anomalies. Those that reported they did not have enough time to effectively lead as noted on the previous question, had a mean time of 10.83% of their day dedicated to leading.

Summary

The results of the survey found that the sampling population was diverse. It included an even mix of two levels of management with each having a direct supervisory role. Ages of participants ranged from 24 to 70 years of age and consisted of 9 males and 4 females. The
ethnicity of the group included Asians, Caucasians, and Hispanics with leadership experience ranging from 1 year to 32 years. The eight food and beverage and five hotel professionals come from two regions of the country and three different states. Six out of thirteen participants have secondary education and three of those have a hospitality related degree. Five of thirteen respondents participated in some form of company training while three participants have had their leadership skills and/or style assessed through the use of a questionnaire.

The survey questions relating to current knowledge resulted in participants indicating 27 different behaviors and skills required of leaders with motivating staff, providing service recovery, and enforcing rules having high frequency. Good leader characteristics were described by 46 differing terms with being a good communicator as most mentioned followed by being fair and being friendly.

The second set of three questions focuses on knowledge acquisition. The three respondents confirming their knowledge about leadership theory and concepts were all manager level leaders. One was company trained and two held secondary education degrees. Two of the knowledgeable group responded positively to various leadership concepts when asked and one did not. Additionally, one other participant responded favorably to knowing leadership theory terminology. Although the majority of the group did not understand the meaning of leadership assessment, three reported having an assessment of their leadership style or skills at some point in their career.

Finally, a third set of questions investigated if leaders have the time to utilize their leadership skills effectively and understand when to deploy those skills. Participants indicated leading by example was the skill most utilized followed by coaching, counseling for
attendance, and service recovery. Eighty percent of the respondents that listed leading by example did not have higher education. Seven participants reported having enough time to effectively lead staff and six did not. Hotel leaders estimated that they spend approximately 8% of their work time thinking about leadership while food and beverage leaders reported spending 9.4% of their time doing the same (accounting for anomalies). Those indicating a favorable response to having enough time to lead effectively reported an average spent on leading of 13% while those saying they did not have enough time to effectively lead reported an average of 10.83% of their work time spent on leading.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Chapter five discusses findings and implications for the dilemma overall and the three sub-problems individually. Recommendations for both industry and future research are discussed as well as limitations of this study. In essence, this study sought to understand what front line leaders know about leadership theory and concepts, how they came to acquire the knowledge, and if the leader has the time and skills necessary to effectively utilize that knowledge.

The group consisted of leaders with and without higher education; with and without some type of company training; and few who had leadership assessment and many who had not. Some struggled to respond to provide logical thought to open ended questions and needed further prompting. With due consideration given to what could be perceived as potential shortcomings for the overall group, all responded by consistently mentioning leadership traits, skills, and behaviors commonly found in competency model research studies of students or educated leaders (Testa & Sipe, 2012). Whether through life experiences such as family, work, K-12 education, various media sources, community volunteer organizations, or perhaps through involvement with youth sports; something has shaped, formed, and given birth to basic leadership thoughts in non-educated, untrained leaders who openly state they are not familiar with leadership theory and concepts. With ten out of thirteen indicating they lack subject knowledge, as a group, they could be considered to have less than adequate knowledge to be in a leadership position.
Research Topic One

Research topic one centered on knowledge. The sampling population responded in both an interesting and telling fashion to a query about behaviors required by leaders. It is interesting that the responses fell within knowledge, skills, and competencies common to that of leaders. It is telling that the frequencies of those responses revolve around reactionary skills versus proactive or forward thinking skills. To illustrate this point, Table 3 points out that service recovery, enforcing rules, dealing with employee problems, mediating employee disputes, and accounting for employees were all multiple-mention reactionary responses. Forward thinking skills or behaviors such as motivating staff, coaching, and general communication were the only multi-mention proactive type responses. Reactionary multi-mention responses outpaced forward thinking proactive type responses by nearly two to one. This could be an indication that leaders who lack knowledge utilize more time and energy on the familiar, such as problems, versus the unfamiliar, such as leadership and all that it entails. It may also suggest that a larger quantity of problems surround leaders who lack leadership capabilities.

The participants, in listing characteristics of a good leader, cited more consideration or soft people type responses than structure or task type responses. The participants appear to value a leader that is fair, friendly, honest, and leads by example. They also appreciate a good communicator that is consistent; detail oriented, and can be trusted. The consideration or soft people type responses accounted for 55% of mentions versus 45% being structured or task type responses.
Research Topic Two

Research topic two sought to attain information about knowledge acquisition. The findings confirm that the respondents, overall, are not familiar with leadership concepts and/or theories. It can be inferred that most are being promoted to leadership positions without adequate leadership education or training. Only three respondents have a hospitality related degree. The 38% of the respondents who attended company training only did so after assuming a leadership position. Another vehicle in which a company can show it puts value on leadership is through the use of leadership assessment tools. These tools, in the case of this discussion, allow a leader to be given feedback, create a development plan, and reflect on his or her role as a leader. More importantly though, the use of such a tool stimulates conversation on the topic within the workplace and allows for leadership development. It is therefore important to highlight that one respondent understood what the tool was and after further explanation to each of the other respondents, only three participated in leadership assessment at some point in their careers. This suggests that senior leaders in the industry may not value leadership assessment as a tool for front line leaders. Twenty-three percent of respondents have hospitality related degrees and only one of those indicated knowledge of leadership theory. Further, only 38% indicated having completed some form of company training. Of the combined eight individuals with either education or company training, only two noted having leadership knowledge. In the absence of a well trained or educated leadership group, or as a supplement to training activities, a thoughtful leadership assessment program could be a tool to bolster leadership acumen amongst front line leaders.
Research Topic Three

The third research topic centers on utilization of leadership knowledge and skills. Three items were asked to gain understanding; 1) does the leader have enough time to effectively lead; 2) what percentage of time is spent thinking about leading; and 3) in what situations do you use your leadership skills.

Slightly less than half of the respondents claim not to have enough time to effectively lead. The average time spent on leadership was 8.7% of the respondent’s time. While three respondents indicated they had large amounts to time to lead, each oversaw multiple areas or was tasked with working with employees a majority of time. More telling however, is that three respondents noted they spent 0% of their time thinking about leadership theory or practice; meaning they did not do so at all. These results become visible when viewed through the responses of the next question; how do leaders use leadership skills? By more than two to one over any other response, the participants said leading by example is the most useful skill. This suggests a very time consuming behavior is necessary to lead. One can infer that the leaders feel it necessary to work side by side with staff in order to attain positive outcomes. Additionally, three out of four multiple mention behaviors were reactionary in nature. These included providing service recovery, counseling for attendance, and leading by example. These combined responses suggest leaders have little time to think about leading and therefore spend more time fixing problems rather than using leadership to implement a systematic approach to service delivery. Hence, in a reactionary fashion, front line leaders rely on working side by side with staff in order to ensure success. The leaders refer to this reactionary posture as leading by example.
Recommendations for Industry

The results suggest various opportunities for hospitality organizations to improve the effectiveness of front line leaders. In order to increase knowledge base of leaders and allow adequate time for implementation of that knowledge, the following should be considered:

1. Hire educated hospitality professionals with a vested interest in practicing successful hospitality leadership.
2. Prior to promoting from within, create a formal upward mobility program by which those interested in entering positions of leadership can be formally trained and educated on the theory, concept, and practical implications of leadership.
3. Create a culture of leadership that transcends the mid to senior leadership ranks and includes front line leadership positions.
4. Implement a formal leadership assessment plan that focuses on developing leaders and the monitoring of skills and behaviors that change and develop over time.
5. Provide formal mentoring opportunities with senior leaders in order to both teach leadership skills and behaviors and inspire success.
6. Provide adequate time for leaders to apply thought and consideration to the practice of leadership by having mid level managers assist front line leaders or by increasing leadership positions within the organization.

Recommendation for Future Research

This research could be used as a basis for various pursuits. There are opportunities to draw comparisons between the hospitality leadership sector and casino leadership sector of the gaming industry. Dissecting the concept of available time and its’ relationship to effectively leading in the hospitality environment would be beneficial. Exploration of the
phrase *leading by example*, would further the understanding of what uneducated and untrained leaders perceive to be the most useful tool in their leadership kit. Any further studies would be aided by a consortium type effect with partners from industry and academia. The information gained is of major use to industry but requires access to a sampling population. Academia can provide a scholarly method and report in an unbiased fashion. The overall effect of this partnership would be beneficial to shareholders, customers, employees, and institutions of higher education.

**Limitations**

Although the sampling is small, it is also diverse both demographically and geographically. However, is not generalizable to the U.S. as a whole based on the population consisting of only two regions and three states. The characteristics of hospitality functions within and outside of the gaming sector are similar, but may not be considered comparable by some. Questions over the pace of business, customer demands based on casino participation and how overall profit is derived may raise concerns.

**Conclusion**

This qualitative thesis sought to understand leadership acumen, knowledge acquisition, and the ability to use that knowledge to effectively lead. Perhaps two points may best summarize the suggestion that front line leaders lack knowledge, time, and ability to effectively lead.

1. Respondents are reactive versus proactive when dealing with leadership activities.

2. Respondents do not model the behaviors and skills they list as being characteristic of a good leader.
The lack of leadership thought being applied by front line leaders is putting hospitality organizations at risk. Companies may be allowing supervisor’s personalized perceptions leadership to guide the ship, so to speak. This freelancing leadership method may not be in alignment with the company vision or mission. Even leaders that were schooled and trained, attained their thoughts about leadership from somewhere other than their current place of employ. Allowing front line leaders of this caliber to control one’s destiny equates to the outsourcing of an important commodity; leadership.
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## TABLES

### Table 1: Front Line Leaders in the Hospitality Industry - Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Leadership Experience</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Geographic Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>Southwest US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Southwest US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Southwest US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Eastern US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Participant Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>7 54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>6 46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4 31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9 69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>8 62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>8 62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Higher Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8 62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hospitality Related Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5 38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8 62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Service recovery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee personal problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enforcing rules</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating employee disputes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accounting for employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communicating generally</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treating people well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Providing guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guest interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communicating upward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4  Characteristics of Good Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communicator</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Detail oriented</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead by Example</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decision maker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financially skilled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follow through</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good memory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hard worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-tasker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Presence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Problem solver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Results oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Service skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead by example</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Counseling for attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service Recovery</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and recognize</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Observe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing staff needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resolving union problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being fair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interview Sheet

Participant Code: _____________       Date: _________       Time: _________

Hello, my name is Greg and I’m doing research for my master’s degree 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 anytime.

What is your Title?

What staff/positions do you lead?

In everyday situations, how do you use your leadership skills?

What situations most often require leadership?

What are five characteristics of a good leader? List characteristics…

1.

2.

3.
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?

Gender: Male / Female   Age:____   Ethnicity:______________
Education: HS / BS / MS / None   Is degree in Hospitality Management?  Y / N
Title: Manager / Supervisor   Area: F&B / Hotel / Facilities
Years of experience leading people _____

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.
Appendix 3: LBDQ Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>He does personal favors for group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>He is easy to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>He finds time to listen to group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>He keeps to himself.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>He refuses to explain his actions. *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>He acts without consulting the group.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>He backs up the members in their actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>He treats all group members as his equals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>He is willing to make changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>He is friendly and approachable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>He gets group approval on important matters before going ahead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 5, 10, 15, 19, 25, 30, 33, 36, 37 and 40 are not scored on either dimension.

* These items are scored in reverse.
**Items in the Initiating Structure Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>He makes his attitudes clear to the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>He tries out his new ideas with the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>He rules with an iron hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>He criticizes poor work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>He assigns group members to particular tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>He schedules the work to be done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>He maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>He encourages the use of uniform procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>He makes sure that is part in the organization is understood by all group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>He lets group members know what is expected of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>He sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that Gregory Krawiec successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course “Protecting Human Research Participants”.

Date of completion: 08/22/2011

Certification Number: 729679