## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to fill an important gap in the literature by identify the leadership styles of managers and to find out the relationship between factors originating from demographic characteristics of managers of the four- and five-star accommodation establishments in the TRNC. Based on the findings, it may be possible for hotel managers in the TRNC to be supported by various training and development programs to equip themselves with the desired kind of leadership roles.

Researchers have stressed the importance of organisational leadership as being fundamental to the success of firms, even more so for industries are that global and dynamic. The hospitality industry is complex, dynamic, and global; as a result it becomes challenging for the firms of the industry to sustain their competitiveness on a continuous basis (Chathoth and Olsen, 2002).

Today’s leadership has become more complicated, primarily because of continuum restructuring, demographic changes of employees and rapid development of technology. These changes create some new challenges for the managers, who have to face frequent changes of the organisational structure and culture, as well as to provide emotional assistance to their employees during the times of changes (Hooijberg, Hunt and Dodge, 1997).

In examining the current state of the hospitality industry one discerns that the hospitality leaders of today must be different. There is no more autocratic ‘my way or the highway’ approach to obtaining productivity gains from today’s workforce. As Harold Leavitt (2003) notes...’authority...has never been enough to guarantee effective management, and it is certainly not enough to handle middle manager’s jobs today’. He goes on the state that due to the fast-changing, speeding world, managers must become equipped with many more skills and competencies than were required in the past. Managers now need imaginative, persuasive, visionary and inspirational skills-the skills many label leadership.

The ability to communicate persuasively is an essential skill in companies today. Gone are the days of dependency, when information was delivered top-down and there was little need to win over subordinates and colleagues with our ideas and opinions. We now live and work in a flatter, more interdependent society. It is still the world of uncertainty, though, in which most of us need to persuade others to cooperate with us in order to get our jobs done. If certainty existed, we would not persuasion, as all would be clear. In today’s environment, uncertainty is part of lives and we need to sell our ideas, points of view, products, services, policies and in a strange way, our own talents and reputations (Legget, Brian and Rosans, Josep, 2008).

Manager now need inspirational skills are that qualifies a leader as a figure, which inspires and motivates followers to appropriate behaviour. In the conditions when transformational change is being conducted in an organisation, the leader has the task of clear and continuous stimulating others to follow new idea. Today leaders must be visionary that can paint a portrait of what the organisation needs to become and than use their communication skills to motivate others to achieve the vision which play especially important roles during times of transition (Newstrom, 2007).

In today’s business environment human capital has become the most important asset of hospitality firms. The hospitality industry tends to be labour intensive and has increasingly harsh environmental demands imposed upon it, and suggestion have been made that leadership skills may help organisations to utilize the available human resources more effectively. As a result understanding and promoting effective ‘leadership’ may be of considerable importance in coping and dealing successfully with environmental pressures. Those organisations that actively consider leadership approaches and use them to help educate managers on the complexities of leading people may benefit (Erkutlu, 2008).

It could be argued that there is no universally accepted leadership style applicable to each situation. Managers should adapt their leadership style to the new requirements, both in the internal, and the external environment of the enterprise. Leaders have formal authorities where they may use these authorities to form work groups and to influence these groups for supporting the organisational strategy and goals. In managing organisations, leaders will practice certain actions or behaviour when interacting with employees from different backgrounds and this may lead to produce different types of leadership styles. The often repeated statement that the democratic leadership style is the best choice could be wrong because, in some conditions, it is necessary to apply the autocratic leadership style, if this step could assist the manager to accomplish the organisational goals (Raguz, 2007).

In addition, hospitality is a specific industry, with hotel management being quite complex, because of increased competitiveness and changes in tourism demand. Everyday practice of hotel enterprises confirms the thesis that complexity, dynamics, heterogeneity and uncertainty are the main characteristics of today’s environments. Two main factors of the organisational environment in the hospitality industry are competitors and guests. Competitiveness requires new hotel products, increasing the quality of the hotel quality and changes in the behaviour of employed staff. On the other hand, hotel guests have ever increasing demands, with the hotel management having to compete with the competition, in order to create a more attractive and creative service. Therefore, the leadership style should be adapted both to the individual hotel manager, as well as to the needs of the employees and hotel guests.

.

**CHAPTER 2**

**THE LEADERSHIP LITERATURE**

**2.1 Definitions of Leadership**

The Issue of leadership has been a matter of research for decades. Leadership is a concept which is often talked about, and which has generated a proliferation of literature, especially in the field of management and organizational science. There is no unanimity as to what *‘leadership’* means. Burns (1978) stated leadership to be one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth. And his definition of leadership is ‘acting-as well as caring, inspiring and persuading others to act- for certain shared goals that represent values- the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations- of them-selves and the people they represent’.

Different definitions of leadership have been identified through ages. According to Warren G. Bennis (1959) ‘leadership is function of knowing yourself, having a vision that is well communicated, building trust among colleagues and taking effective action to realize your own leadership potential’. An observation by Bennis (1959) is true today as when he made it many years ago:

‘Always, it seems, the concept of leadership eludes us or turns up in another to taunt as again with its slipperiness and complexity. So we have invented an endless proliferation of terms to deal with it...and still the concept is not sufficiently defined.’

Common in contemporary approaches is the definition adopted by Moorhead and Griffin (1989) who argued that leadership is both a *process* and *property*. Thus, as a process, it is generally accepted that leadership involves the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate people. As a property, leadership is a quality attributed to those who appear able to exert such influence successfully. This view was also supported by Jago (1982). The process of leadership is the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is the set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence.

Northouse (2007) had integrated various approaches and came up with the following definition, that leadership is the process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal. According to Kouzes and Posner (1995) leadership is the ability to mobilize people towards a shared vision, while encouraging individual development in the process. Komives, Lucas, and Mc Mohan’s (1998) definition is that leadership is the relational process of people together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common goal. However, according to Yukl (2002) leadership is involves a social influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person-or group-over other people-or groups- to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organisation. According to Bernard Bass (1990) leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perception and expectations of the members. According to Stogdill (1974) leadership is the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction. According to Robert J. House and others (1999) leadership is the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organisation. However, Bogardus (1991) definition of leadership is the interaction of specific personality traits of one person with those of the group, in such a way that the course of action of the many is changed by the one. According to Kotter (1990) leadership is about what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles. Leadership is about coping with change.

Researchers who differ in their conception of leadership select different phenomena to investigate and interpret the results in different ways. When leadership is defined in a very restrictive way by researchers, they are likely to take a narrower perspective on the processes to be studied, and it is less likely they will discover things unrelated or inconsistent with their initial assumptions about effective leadership.

**2.2 Leadership Vs Management**

There is continuing controversy about the difference between leadership and management. It is obvious that a person can be a leader without being a manager (e.g. an informal leader), and a person can be a manager without leading. Indeed, some people with the job title ‘manager’ do not have any subordinates (e.g. manager of financial accounts). Nobody has proposed that managing and leading are equivalent, but the degree of overlap is a point of sharp disagreement (Yukl, 2002). According to Pierce and Newstrom (2006) leadership is an important part of management, but it is not the whole story. The primary role of a leader is to influence others to voluntarily seek defined objectives (preferably with enthusiasm) (Newstrom, 2007).

Zaleznik (1977) began the trend of contrasting leadership and management by presenting an image of the leader as an artist, who uses creativity and intuition to navigate his/her way through chaos, whilst the manager is seen as a problem solver dependent on rationality and control. Since than the leadership literature has been littered with bold statements contrasting the two. Bennis and Nannus (1985), for example, suggest that managers ‘do things right’ whilst leaders do ‘the right thing’ and Bryman (1986, cited in Bolden, 2004) argues that the leader is the catalyst focussed on strategy whilst the manager is the operator/technician concerned with the ‘here-and-now of operational goal attainment’.

Central to most of these distinctions is an orientation towards change. This concept is well represented in the work of John Kotter (1990) who of the Harward Business School and one of the leading management and leadership theorists. According to Kotter (1990) management is about coping with complexity. Management focuses on details, order and consistency, it focuses on short-term results, it focuses on eliminating risks, and it focuses on efficiency and bottom line values. However, according to Kotter leadership is about coping with change. Leadership focuses on change and innovation, it focuses on the big picture, it focuses on strategies that take calculated risks, and it focuses on people’s values.

The distinction of leadership from management as represented by Kotter (1990) and his contemporaries clearly encourages a shift in emphasis from the relatively inflexible, bureaucratic processes classed as ‘management’ to the more dynamic and strategic processes classed as ‘leadership’, yet even he concludes that both are equally necessary for the effective running of an organisation:

‘Leadership is different from management, but not for the reason most people think. Leadership isn’t mystical and mysterious. It has nothing to do with having charisma or other exotic personality traits. It’s not the province of a chosen few. Nor is leadership necessarily better than management or a replacement two distinctive and complementary activities, and both are necessary for success in an increasingly complex and volatile business environment’ (Kotter, 1990, 103).

**2.3 Leadership Behaviour**

Much research has focused on identifying leadership behaviours. In this view, successful leadership depends more on appropriate behaviour, skills, and actions, and less on personal traits which will be discussed later in this chapter.

**2.3.1 Use of Power**

One of the major differences between the leader and the manager relates to their source of power and the level of compliance it engenders within followers. Power is the potential ability to influence the behaviour of others. Power represents the resources with which a leader effects changes in employee behaviour. Within organisations, there are typically five sources of power: legitimate, reward, coercive, expert, and referent. Sometimes power comes from a person’s position in the organisation, while other sources of power are based on personal characteristics (Daft, 2000).

The traditional manager’s power comes from the organisation. The manager’s position gives him/her the power to reward or punish subordinates in order to all forms of position power used by managers to change employee behaviour (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.1.1 Legitimate power** coming from to it is called a formal management position in an organisation and the authority granted to it. For example, once a person has been selected as a supervisor, most workers understand that they are obligated to follow his or her direction with respect to work activities. Subordinates accept this source of power as legitimate which is why they comply (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.1.2 Reward power** stems from the authority to bestow rewards on other people. Managers may have access to formal rewards, such as pay increases or promotions. They also have at their disposal such rewards as praise, attention, and recognition. Managers can use rewards to influence subordinates’ behaviour (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.1.3 Coercive power** is the opposite of reward power. It refers to the authority to punish or recommend punishment. Managers have coercive power when they have the right to fire or demote employees, criticize, or withdraw pay increases.

Different types of position power elicit different responses in followers. Legitimate power and reward power are most likely to generate follower compliance. Compliance means that workers will obey orders and carry out instructions, although they may personally disagree with them and may not be enthusiastic. Coercive power most often generates resistance. Resistance means that workers will deliberately try to avoid carrying out instruction or will attempt to obey orders.

In contrast to the external sources of position power, personal power most often comes from internal sources, such as person’s special knowledge or personality characteristics. Personal power is the tool of the leader. Subordinates follow a leader because of the respect, admiration, or caring they feel for the individual and his or her ideas. Personal power is becoming increasingly important as more businesses are run by teams of workers who are less tolerant of authoritarian management. Two types of personal power are expert power and referent power (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.1.4 Expert power** referred as power resulting from a leader’s special knowledge or skill regarding the tasks performed by followers. When the leader is true expert, subordinates go along with recommendations because of his or her superior knowledge. Leaders at supervisory levels often have experience in the production process that gains them promotion. At top management levels, however, leaders may lack expert power because subordinates know more about technical details than they do (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.1.5 Referent power** comes from leader personality characteristics that command subordinates’ identification, respect, and admiration so they wish to emulate the leader. When workers admire a supervisor because of the way she deals with them, the influence is based on referent power. Referent power depends on the leader’s personal characteristics rather than on a formal title or position and is most visible in the area of charismatic leadership (Daft, 2000), which will be discussed later in this chapter.

The follower reaction most often generated by expert power and referent power is commitment. Commitment means that workers will share the leader’s point of view and enthusiastically carry out instructions. Needles to say, commitment is preferred to compliance or resistance. It is particularly important when change is the desired outcome of a leader’s instructions, because change carries risk or uncertainty. Commitment assists the follower in overcoming fear of change (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.2 Skills**

The three broad types of skills leaders use are technical, human, and conceptual. Although these skills are interrelated in practice, they can be considered separately (Newstrom, 2007).

**2.3.2.1 Technical skill** refers to person’s knowledge of and ability in any type of process or technique. Examples are the skills learned by accountants, engineers, word processing operators, and tool makers. Technical skill is the distinguishing feature of job performance at the operating and professional levels but as employees are promoted to leadership responsibilities, their technical skills become proportionately less important. As managers, they increasingly depend on the technical skills of their subordinates; in many cases they have never practical skills that they supervise (Newstrom, 2007).

**2.3.2.2 Human skill** is the ability to work effectively with people and to build teamwork. It involves a wide range of behaviours such as energizing individuals, giving feedback, coaching, care-giving, demonstrating empathy and sensitivity, and showing compassion and support for people who need it.

**2.3.2.3 Conceptual skill** is the ability to think in terms of models, frameworks, and broad relationships such as long-range plans. It becomes increasingly important in higher managerial jobs. Conceptual skill deals with ideas, whereas human skill concerns people and technical skill involves things.

Analysis of leadership skills help explain why outstanding department heads sometimes make poor vice president. They may not be using the proper mixture of skills required for the higher-level job, particularly additional conceptual skill (Newstrom, 2007).

**2.3.3 Leadership Styles**

Leadership style is the combination of traits, skills, and behaviours managers use in interacting with employees. Note that behavioural theorists focus on the leaders’ behaviours. However, behaviours are based on traits and skills (Lussier, 2009).

Leadership style is a form of cross situational behavioural consistency. It refers to the manner in which a leader interacts with his or her subordinates. More specifically, dimensions of leadership style depict the way in which a leader attempts to influence the behaviour of subordinates; makes decisions regarding the direction of the group; and his or her balance between the goal attainment function and the maintenance function of the group (Fertman, 2000).

In this research we divided leadership styles into four groups: autocratic leadership, democratic leadership, laissez-faire leadership, and charismatic leadership.

**2.3.3.1 Autocratic Style**: The leader makes decisions, tells employees what to do, and closely supervises employees (Lussier, 2009). An autocratic leader is one who tends to centralize authority and rely on legitimate, reward, and coercive power to manage subordinates (Daft, 2000). Autocratic leaders do not consult with staff, nor allowed to give any input, and structured set of rewards and punishment to influence staff, do not trust staff and do not allow for employee input. Probably a Theory X manager who has no time for consideration of Maslow’s higher needs or Herzberg’s motivating factor. This style can be highly effective when quick decisions are critical, but only when the leader can be enforce those decisions. However, critics of the autocratic style maintain that these managers could be more objective, could motivate employees better, and could be more open to the idea of others (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.3.2 Democratic Style**: The leader encourages employees participation in decisions, works with employees to determine what to do, and does not closely supervise employees (similar to Theory Y behaviour) (Lussier, 2009). A democratic leader who delegates authority to others, encourages participation, and relies on expert and referent power to manage and influence subordinates (Daft, 2000).

**2.3.3.3 Laissez-faire Style**: The French term laissez faire can be translated as ‘leave it alone’, or more roughly, as ‘hands off’. The leader takes a leave-employees-alone approach, allowing them to make the decisions and decide what to do, and does not follow up (Kozak and Uca, 2008).

**2.3.3.4 Charismatic Style**: The leader inspires loyalty, enthusiasm, and high levels of performance. Charismatic leaders have an idealized goal or vision, have a strong personal commitment to that goal, communicate the goal to others, and display self-confidence. Followers in turn the leader’s beliefs, adopt these beliefs themselves, feel affection for the leader, obey the leader, and develop an emotional involvement with the goal-all of which contribute to higher levels of performance (Lussier, 2009). They create an atmosphere of change, and they may be obsessed by visionary ideas that excite, stimulate, and drive other people to work hard. Charismatic leaders have an emotional impact on subordinates. They stand for something, have a vision of the future, are able to communicate that vision to subordinates, and motivate them to realize it (Daft, 2000).

**2.4** **Situational Flexibility**

Successful leader requires behaviour that unites and stimulates followers toward defined objectives in specific situations. All three elements-leader, follower, and situation- are variables that affect one another in determining appropriate leadership behaviour. Leadership clearly is situational. In one situation, action A may be the best cluster of leadership acts, but in the next situation, action B will be best. Leadership is part of a complex system, so there is no simple way to answer the question, what makes a leader? Sometimes leaders must resist the temptation to be visible in a situation. Even though good leadership involves a set of behaviours, it should not be confused with mere activity when activity is not needed. Aggressiveness and constant interaction with others will not guarantee good leadership. At times the appropriate leadership action is to stay in the background keeping pressures off the group, to keep quiet so that others may talk, to be calm in times of uproar, to hesitate purposefully, and to delay decisions. At other times a leader must be more decisive, directive, and controlling. The key task for a leader is to recognize different situations and adapt to them on a conscious basis (Newstrom, 2007).

**2.5 Followership**

With few exceptions, leaders in organisations are also followers. They nearly always report to someone else, even the president of a public firm or non-profit organisation reports to a broad of directions. Leaders must be able to wear both hats, relating effectively both upward and downward. And just as leaders give something to their superiors and employees, they need validation from higher authority as much as they need support from followers (Newstrom, 2007).

In formal organisations of several levels, ability to follow (dynamic sub-ordinancy) is one of the first requirements foe good leadership. Skilful performance in current roles unlocks the door to future leadership opportunities. By contrast, many people fail in their jobs not as result of any skill deficiencies, but because they lack followership skills. These skills help employees support their current leader and be effective subordinates (Newstrom, 2007).

Followership behaviours include:

* Not competing with the leader to be in the limelight,
* Being loyal and supportive, a team player,
* Not being a ‘yes person’ who automatically agrees,
* Acting as a devil’s advocate by raising penetrating questions,
* Constructively confronting the leader’s ideas, values, and actions,
* Anticipating potential problems and preventing them.

Good followers, then need to succeed at their own jobs while helping their managers succeed at theirs. At the same time, effective subordinates can also prepare themselves for promotion by developing their conceptual and leadership skills. Similarly, good leaders should never forget what it is like in the trenches. Many effective leaders remind themselves of the importance of followership roles by periodically spending time visiting their stores, working a shift in a plant, and doing other things to remain in contact with first-level employees (Newstrom, 2007).

**2.6** **Theories of Leadership**

Whilst practitioners often see theory as separate from practice, within an applied field such as leadership the two are inextricably theories of leadership strongly influence current practice, education and policy and offer a useful framework for the selection and development of leaders (Bolden, 2004). As social psychologist Kurt Lewin once said, ‘There is nothing as practical as a good theory’ (Northouse, 2007).

Theories help shape the way we conceive the world by simplifying and summarising large quantities of data. Since the middle of the twentieth century, various theories and literature have been developed by many scholars with different standpoints. These theories can be classified as follows:

**2.6.1 The Trait Approach of Leadership**

The trait approach arose from the ‘Great Man’ theory as a way of identifying the key characteristics of successful leaders. It was believed that through this approach critical leadership traits could be isolated and that people with such traits could then be recruited, selected, and installed into leadership positions. This approach was common in the military and is still used as a set of criteria to select candidates for commissions (Bolden and others, 2003).

The term trait has been the source of considerable ambiguity and confusion in the literature, referring sometimes and variously to personality, temperaments, dispositions, and abilities, as well as to any enduring qualities of the individual, including physical and demographic attributes (Zaccaro, Kemp and Bader, 2003). This school of thought suggested that certain dispositional characteristics (i.e. stable personality attributes or traits) differentiated leaders from non-leaders. Thus, leadership researchers focused on identifying robust individual differences in personality traits that were thought to be associated with effective leadership. In two influential reviews (Day and Antonakis, 2009), traits such as intelligence and dominance were identified as being associated with leadership.

Stogdill (1948) reviewed 124 trait studies conducted from 1904 to 1948 and found that common traits included intelligence, alertness to the needs of others, understanding of the task, initiative and persistence and desire to accept responsibility and occupy a position of dominance. The review failed to support the basic premise of the trait approach that a person must possess a particular set of traits to successful leader. The importance of each trait depended on the situation and the research did not identify any traits that were necessary to ensure leadership in all situations.

In 1974, Stogdill reviewed 163 trait studies conducted from 1949 to 1970. Many of the same traits were again associated with leader effectiveness, however, some additional traits were also identified. Those traits were: adaptable, social alertness, ambitious and achievement oriented, assertive, cooperative, self-confident, willing to assume responsibility, decisive, dependable, dominant (power motivation), energic (high activity level), persistent, stress tolerant. Even though the results were stronger in the second review. Stogdill make it clear that there was still no evidence of universal leadership traits. Possession of some traits and skills increase the likelihood that a leader will be effective, but they do not guarantee effectiveness (Mothilal, 2010).

Mann (1959) conducted a similar study that examined more than 1,400 findings regarding personality and leadership in small groups, but he placed less emphasis on how situational factors influenced leadership. Although tentative in his conclusions, Mann suggested that personality traits could be used to distinguish leaders from non-leaders. His results identified leaders as strong in the following six traits: intelligence, masculinity, adjustment, dominance, extraversion, and conservatism.

In 1995, James Kouzes and Barry Posner interviewed 75,000 people to identify the top ten characteristics needed in a leader. Their list includes the following characteristics: Broad-minded, competent, dependable, fair-minded, forward-looking, honest, inspire, intelligent, supportive, straight forward. All of those characteristics are not personality traits. Many researchers say you do not have to be born with all of these traits.

Hundreds of trait studies were conducted during the 1930s and 1940s to discover these elusive qualities, but this massive research effort failed to find any traits that would guarantee leadership success. One reason for the failure was a lack of attention to intervening variables in the casual chain that could explain how traits could affect a delayed outcome such as group performance or leader advancement. The predominant research method was to look for a significant correlation between individual leader attributes and a creation of leader success, without examining any explanatory process. However, as evidence from better-designed research slowly accumulated over the years, researchers have made progress in discovering how leader attributes are related to leadership behaviour and effectiveness (Yukl, 2002).

**2.6.2 The Behaviour Approach of Leadership**

The next major shift in research into leadership dealt with examining the types of behaviours leaders exhibited, in an effort to assess what it is that leaders do be effective. This focus on a leader’s action is different from that of the trait approach, which centered on a person’s physical and personality characteristics. Researchers studying the behaviour approach, also referred to as the style approach, determined that leadership is compassed essentially of two kinds of behaviours: task behaviours and relationship behaviours (Northouse, 2007). The behaviour approach attempts to explain how these two types of behaviours interface in a manner that allows a leader to influence a group in order to reach a goal (Deppe, 2010).

Leader focus had moved to understanding the relationship between a leader’s actions and the follower’s satisfaction and productivity. Theorists began to consider behavioural concepts in their analysis of organisational leadership. For example, Chester Bernard was instrumental in including behavioural components (Bass, 1990). Bernard’s work emphasized the ways in which executives might develop their organisations into cooperative social systems by focusing on the integration of work efforts through communication of goals and attention to worker motivation (Stone and Petterson, 2005). Bernard whose work focused on the functions of the executive, was instrumental in including behavioural components in his analysis of organisational leadership, which claimed that leadership involves accomplishing goals with and through people (Stone and Peterson, 2005).

Conclusions on the effects of varying leadership climates were derived from experimental research conducted at the University of Iowa (Miner, 2005). This research served to establish Lewin’s reputation in the United States. In it the effects of authoritarian (German) and democratic (American) leadership climates were contrasted (Miner, 2005). With colleagues Lippitt and White, Lewin (1939) carried out studies relating to the effects of three different leadership styles on outcomes of boys' activity groups in Iowa. Three different styles were classified as democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire. It was found that in the group with an autocratic leader, there was more dissatisfaction and behaviours became either more aggressive or apathetic. In the group with a democratic leader, there was more co-operation and enjoyment, while those in the laissez-faire led group showed no particular dissatisfaction, though they were not particularly productive either.

During the 1940s and 1950s studies into leader behaviours were undertaken at the Universities of Ohio and Michigan, USA. At Ohio, researchers administrated questionnaires to subordinate personnel in military and industrial organisations with the aim of assessing their perceptions of leaders (Wood, 1994). Two different leadership styles used with employees are consideration and structure, also known as employee orientation, and task orientation. Considerate leaders are concerned about the human needs of their employees. They try to build teamwork, provide psychological support, and help employees with their personal problems. Structured, task-oriented leaders, on the other hand, believe that they get results by keeping people constantly busy, ignoring personal issues and emotions, and urging them to produce. Consideration and structure appear to be somewhat independent of each other, so they should not necessarily be viewed as opposite ends of continuum. A manager may have both orientations in varying degrees. The most successful managers are those who combine relatively high consideration and structure, giving somewhat more emphasis to consideration (Newstrom, 2007).

After the publication of the late Douglas McGregor’s classic book The Human Side of Enterprise in 1960, attention shifted to ‘behavioural theories’. McGregor was a teacher, researcher, and a consultant whose work was considered to be ‘on the cutting edge’ of managing people. He influenced all the behavioural theories, which emphasize focusing on human relationships, along with output and performance (Bolden and others, 2003).

According to McGregor (1960) the traditional organisation with its centralized decision-making, hierarchical pyramid, and external control of work is based on certain assumptions about human nature and human motivation. He dubbed these assumptions Theory X and Theory Y (Stone and Peterson, 2005).

Theory X managers take a fairly negative view of human nature, believing that the average person has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if possible. Leaders holding this view, believe that coercion and control is necessary to ensure that people work, and that workers have no desire for responsibility. Theory Y managers, on the other hand, believe that the expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest, and that the average human being, under proper conditions, learns not only to accept but to seek responsibility. Such leaders will endeavour to enhance their employees’ capacity to exercise a high level of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organisational problems. It can be seen that leaders holding different assumptions will demonstrate different approaches to leadership: Theory X leaders preferring an autocratic style and Theory Y leaders preferring a participative style (Bolden, 2004).

Another influential behavioural approach to leadership is the Managerial grid developed by Blake and Mouton (1964) for identifying manager’s own style. The grid is based on the leadership style dimensions of concern for task (production) and concern for employee (people) orientations of managers, which essentially mirrors the dimensions-consideration and structure- of Ohio and Michigan studies discussed above (Newstrom, 2007). Essentially, the grid is square divided into eighty-one smaller squares by means of a nine point scale on each of the vertical and horizontal axis. The vertical axis runs from 1 at origin to 9 and represents ‘concern for people’, whereas the horizontal axis represents ‘concern for production’ (Wood, 1994). It also establishes a uniform language and framework for communication about appropriate leadership styles. The 1,9 leaders are high in concern for people but so low in concern for production that output is typically low. They are ‘country-club leaders’. In sharp contrast, 9,1 leaders tend to be authoritarian bosses. A 1,1 leader does not place adequate emphasis on either dimension and would predictably fail. A more desirable balance of the two dimensions is from 5,5 to 9,9-with the latter assumed by Blake and Mouton to be the most effective style. The grid can help individuals identify not only their primary leadership style but also their backup style. The backup style is the one managers tend to use when their normal style does not get results. In general, managers tend to be more autocratic and concerned with production when their primary style is unsuccessful (Newstrom, 2007). It was proposed that 9,9 ‘team management’-a high concern for both employees and production- is the most effective type of leadership behaviour (Bolden, 2004).

Significantly, when the respective leaders were asked to change their styles, the effects for each leadership style remained similar. Lewin aimed to show that the democratic style achieved better results. The possibility of social and cultural influences undermines his finding to some extent, but the studies nevertheless suggested the benefits of a democratic style in an American context. They also showed that it is possible for leaders and managers to change their styles, and to be trained to improve their leadership and adopt appropriate management styles for their situation and context.

Nonetheless, leadership research found itself again in crisis because of contradictory findings relating behavioural ‘styles’ of leadership to relevant outcomes. That is, there was no consistent evidence of a universally preferred leadership style across tasks or situations. From these inconsistent findings, it was proposed that success of the leader’s behavioural style must be contingent on the situation. As result, leadership theory in the 1960s began to focus on leadership contingencies (Day and Antonakis, 2009).

**2.6.3 The Contingency Approach of Leadership**

Trait and behavioural models of leadership lack a concern with situational factors. Little attention was paid in behavioural studies to the contexts in which leadership roles were performed or to the contingent factors that influenced leadership behaviour. Following from behavioural theories, a concern with the contingencies of leadership actively began to exercise researchers from the 1960s onwards. The underlying theme of most of these approaches was that leadership is not necessarily or simply a matter of personal qualities, or of the style of the leader, but of the circumstances in which leadership is performed. This not only means that a given situation (physical and social environment, organisational culture) can determine leadership styles and strategies but admits of the possibility that leaders may be good and effective in one context but not another (Wood, 1994).

The leadership contingency theory movement is credited in large part to Fiedler (1967, 1971), who stated that leader-member relations, task structure, and the position power of the leader determine the effectiveness of the type of leadership exercised (Day and Antonakis, 2009). Fiedler proposed that there is no single best way to lead; instead the leaders’ style should be selected according to the situation. He distinguish between managers who are task or relationship oriented. Task oriented managers focus on the task-in-hand tend to do better in situations that have good leader-member relationships, structured tasks, and either weak or strong position power. They also do well when the task is unstructured but position power is strong, and at the other end of the spectrum when the leader member relations are moderate to poor and the task is unstructured. Such leaders tend to display amore directive leadership style. Relationship oriented managers do better in all other situations and exhibit a more participative style of leadership (Bolden, 2004).

Another well-known contingency approach, the situational leadership (or life-cycle) model developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, suggests that the most important factor affecting the selection of a leader’s style is the development (maturity) level of a subordinate (Hersey, Blanchard and Johnson 2001). They proposed a contingency/situational theory advocating a leader’s use of differing leadership behaviours dependent upon two interrelated maturity factors: (a) job maturity-relevant task and technical knowledge and skills, and (b) psychological maturity-the subordinate’s level of self-confidence and self-respect (Yukl, 2002). They argued that the development level of subordinates has the greatest impact on which leadership style is most appropriate. Thus as the skill and maturity level of followers increases, the leader will need to adapt his/her task relationship style from directing to coaching, supporting and delegating.

A similar model was proposed by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958, 1973) who presented a continuum leadership styles from autocratic to democratic (Bolden, 2004). They suggested the idea that leadership behaviour varies along a continuum and that as one moves away from the autocratic extreme the amount of subordinate participation and involvement in decision taking increases. They also suggested that the kind of leadership represented by the democratic extreme of the continuum will be rarely encountered in formal organisations (Bolden and others, 2003).

Robert House (1971) and others have further developed a path-goal view of leadership initially presented by Martin G. Evans, which is derived from the expectancy model of motivation. Path-goal leadership states that the leader’s job is to use structure, support, and rewards to create a work environment that helps employees reach the organisation’s goals. The two major roles involved are to create a goal orientation and to improve the path toward the goals so that they will be attained (Newstrom, 2007). Kerr and Jermier (1978) extended this line of research into the ‘substitutes-for-leadership’ theory by focusing on the conditions where leadership is unnecessary as a result of factors such as follower capabilities, clear organisational systems, and routinized procedures (Yukl, 2002, 216).

Other lines of research, presenting theories of leader decision-making model for selecting among various degrees of leadership style (autocratic to participative) was developed by V. H. Vroom and associates (e.g., Vroom and Jago, 1988; Vroom and Yetton, 1973). They recognized that problem-solving situations differ, so they developed a structured approach for managers to examine the nature of those differences and to respond appropriately (Newstrom, 2007).

Another influential situational leadership model is that proposed by John Adair (1973) who argued that the leader must balance the needs of task, team and individual as demonstrated in his famous tree-circle diagram. The Adair model is that the action-centred leader gets the job done through the work team and relationships with fellow managers and staff. The effective leader thus carries out the functions and behaviours depicted by the three circles, varying the level of attention paid to each according to the situation (Adair, 1973).

**2.6.4 The Transactional Approach of Leadership**

In the late 1970s, leadership theory research moved beyond focusing on various types of situational supervision as a way to incrementally improve organizational performance (Yukl, 2002). Research has shown that many leaders turned to a transactional leadership theory, the most prevalent method of leadership still observed in today’s organizations (Avolio, Walderman and Yammarino, 1991). Transactional leaders lead through specific incentives and motivate through an exchange of one thing for another (Bass, 1990). The underlying theory of this leadership method was that leaders exchange rewards for employees’ compliance, a concept based on bureaucratic authority and a leader’s legitimacy within an organization (Tracy and Hinkin, 1994).

Avolio, Waldman, and Yammarino (1991) suggest that transactional leadership focuses on ways to manage the status quo and maintain the day-to-day operations of a business, but does not focus on identifying the organization’s directional focus and how employees can work toward those goals, increasing their productivity in alignment with these goals, thus increasing organizational profitability. The idea of transactional leadership is nearsighted in that it does not take the entire situation, employee, or future of the organization into account when offering rewards.

Transactional leadership theory focuses on the specific interactions between leaders and followers (Burns, 1978). These transactions are a method by which an individual gains influence and sustains it over time. The process is based on reciprocity. Leaders not only influence followers but are under their influence as well. A leader earns influence by adjusting to the expectations of followers. Transactional interactions comprise the bulk of relationships between leaders and followers (Burns, 1978).

The underlying theory of this leadership method was that leaders exchange rewards for employees’ compliance, a concept based in bureaucratic authority and a leader’s legitimacy within an organization (Tracey and Hinkin, 1994). Examples of this reward exchange included the leader’s ability to fulfill promises of recognition, pay increases, and advancements for employees who perform well (Bass, 1990).

Bass (1990) identifies three components of transactional leadership: Contingent reward, management by exception, and laissez-faire, or non-leadership behavior. Contingent reward relates back to earlier work conducted by Burns (1978) where the leader assigns work and then rewards the follower for carrying out the assignment. Management by exception is when the leader monitors the followers, and then corrects him/her if necessary. Management by exception can be either passive or active. Management by exception-passive includes waiting passively for errors to occur and then taking corrective action. Management by exception-active may be necessary when safety is an issue. For example, a leader may need to supervise a group of workers. Laissez-faire leadership is virtually an avoidance of leadership behaviors are ignored and no transactions are carried out (Stewart, 2006).

Transactional leadership focuses on ways to maintain the status quo and manage the day-to-day operations of a business. It does not focus on identifying the organization’s goals and how employees can work toward and increase their productivity in alignment with these goals, thus increasing organizational profitability (Avolio, Waldman and Yammarino, 1991).

Transactional leaders approach followers with a goal of exchanging one thing for another (Burns, 1978). The concept of transactional leadership is narrow in that it does not take the entire situation, employee, or future of the organization in mind when offering rewards. And it focuses on control, not adaptation (Tracey and Hinkin, 1994).

The focus of effective leadership began to change. Leaders were no longer required to measure work and ensure that the most effective person did it in the most efficient manner-which did not always increase the organization’s productivity and profitability anyway. Leaders now needed active involvement from the followers to achieve the organization’s goals (Stone and Patterson, 2005). Douglas McGregor (1960), closely linked to the work of the behavioral theorists, provided a basis for a new emerging theory of leadership-transformational leadership.

**2.6.5 The Transformational Approach of Leadership**

Burns (1978) first introduced the concepts of transformational leadership in his descriptive research on political leaders, but this term is now used in organizational psychology as well. According to Burns, transformational leadership is ‘a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents’. Burns went on to also further define it by suggesting that ‘[Transforming leadership] occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality’. Burns draws upon the humanistic psychology movement in his writing upon ‘transforming leadership’ by proposing that the transforming leader shapes, alters, and elevates the motives, values and goals of followers achieving significant change in the process. He proposed that is a special power entailed in transforming leadership with leaders ‘armed with principles that may ultimately transform both leaders and followers into persons who jointly adhere to modal values and end-values’. Burns sees the power of transforming leadership as more noble and different from charismatic leadership, which he terms ‘heroic’ leadership, and executive or business leadership. Despite this it is surprising that most of the application of Burns’ work has been in these two types of leadership.

Burns (1978) touts Mahatma Gandhi as the best modern-day example of a transformational leader because he aroused and elevated the hope and demands of millions of his countryman whose lives were transformed in the process.

Another researcher, Bass (1985), suggested a transformational leadership theory that adds to the initial concepts of Burn’s (1978).The extent to which leader is transformational, is measured first, in terms of his influence on the followers. The followers of such leader feel trust, admiration, loyalty and respect to the leader and they will do more than they expected in the beginning. Bass (1985) identifies four components of transformational leadership as an idealized influence/charisma, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration and an intellectual stimulation. The leader transforms and motivates followers by charisma, intellectual arousal and individual consideration. In addition, this leader seeks for new working ways, while he tries to identify new opportunities versus threats and tries to get out of the status quo and alter the environment.

The theory originated with Burns (1978) was expanded by Bass and Avolio. As conceived by Burns (1978), the transformational leader asks followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the group, organization, or society; to consider their long-term needs to develop themselves, as opposed to their immediate needs; and to become more aware of what is really important. Through this interaction, followers are converted into leaders. According to Bass and Avolio (1994) ‘the goal of transformational leadership is to transform people and organizations in a literal sense to change them in mind and heart; enlarge vision, insight, and understanding; clarify purposes; make behavior congruent with beliefs, principles, or values; and bring about changes that are permanent, self-perpetuating, and momentum building’. According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leaders display behaviors associated with five transformational styles: Idealized behaviours (living one’s ideas), an inspirational motivation (inspiring others), an intellectual stimulation (stimulating others), an individualized consideration (coaching and development), and an idealized attributes (respect, trust, faith). Bass and Avolio (1994) conclude that transformational leadership is closer to the *ne plus ultra* that people have in mind when they describe their ideal leader and is more likely to provide a role model with whom subordinates want to identify.

**2.6.6 The Charismatic Approach of Leadership**

Increasing attention has been directed during the past several decades toward charismatic leadership (Choi, 2006). The terms transformational and charismatic are used interchangeably by many writers, but despite the similarities there also appear to be important distinctions (Yukl, 2002; Conger and Kanunga, 1987; Yamarino and Bass, 1988; Shamir and others, 1993; Gardner and Avoio, 1998).

The current theories of charismatic leadership were strongly influenced by the ideas of an early sociologist named Max Weber (Yukl, 2002). Charisma is a Greek word that means ‘divinely inspired gift’, such as the ability to perform miracles or predict future events. In its earliest usage in the Christian Bible , ‘charisma’ referred to special ‘gifts’ such as wisdom, knowledge, prophecy, healing and so on bestowed by God on special people (Boyett, 2006). Weber (1947) used the term to describe a form of influence based not on tradition or formal authority but rather on follower perceptions that the leader is endowed with exceptional qualities. According to Weber, charisma occurs when there is a social crisis, a leader emerges with a radical vision that offers a solution to the crisis, the leader attracts followers who believe in the vision, they experience some successes that make the vision appear attainable, and the followers come to perceive the leader as extraordinary (Yukl, 2002; Erarslan, 2004; Conger and Kanunga, 1987).

However, unlike Weber (1947), Conger and Kanunga do not consider an objective crisis to be necessary condition for charismatic leadership. Even in the absence of a genuine crisis, a leader may be able to create dissatisfaction with current conditions and simultaneously provide a vision of a more promising future. The leader may precipitate a crisis where none existed previously, setting the stage for demonstration of superior expertise in dealing with the problem in unconventional ways (Yukl, 2002). Conger and Kanunga (1987) proposed a theory of charismatic leadership based on the assumptions that charisma is an attributional phenomenon. Subsequently, a refined version of the theory was presented by Conger (1989) and by Conger and Kanunga (1998). According to the theory, follower attribution of charismatic qualities to a leader is jointly determined by the leader’s behaviour, skill, and aspects of the situation.

This approach, in effect, combines both notions of the transformational leader as well as earlier trait and great man theories. Researchers have taken different positions, but overall four major characteristics of charismatic leaders can be identified: (1) a dominant personality, desire to influence others and self confidence, (2) strong role model and behaviour and competence, (3) articulation of ideological goals with moral overtones, and (4) high expectation of followers and confidence that tey will meet these expectations (Northouse, 2007).

In the current usage, Bass (1997) strips the word of any divine dimensions. As used in his theory, charisma refers to a purely behavioural phenomenon. One does not have to have a ‘special’ or ‘divine’ gift to exhibit ‘idealized influence’ or ‘charisma’ (Boyett, 2006).

In 1977, House proposed a theory to explain charismatic leadership in terms of a set of testable propositions involving observable processes rather than folklore and mystique. The theory identifies how charismatic leaders behave, their traits and skills, and the conditions in which they are most likely to emerge. One limitation of the initial theory was ambiguity about the influence processes (Fiol, 1999).

After the publication in 1978 of an influential book by Burns entitled *Leadership* which in this Pulitzer prize winning treatise, Burns described charismatic political leadership as a form of transforming leadership which involves the pursuit of collective interests by leaders and followers for the achievement of real and intended social change. The concept of transforming leadership stimulated new ways of thinking about leadership in organizations and changed the direction of leadership research (Paul, and others, 2002).

Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) revised and extended the theory by incorporating new developments in thinking about human motivation and a more detailed description of the leader’s influence on followers. The following assumptions were made about human motivation: (1) Behaviour is expressive of a person’s feelings, values, and self-concept as well as being pragmatic and goal oriented, (2) a person’s self-concept is composed of hierarchy of social identities and values, (3) people are intrinsically motivated to enhance and defend their self-esteem and self-worth, and (4) people are intrinsically motivated to maintain consistency among the various components of their self-concept and between their self-concept and behaviour (Shamir, House and Arthur, 1993).

Shamir and others (1998) tested several hypotheses derived from an extended version of Shamir, House, and Arthur’s (1993) self-concept based theory. Shamir and others used three different samples of subordinates to assess leader behaviour, individual-level correlates, and unit-level correlates, respectively. They also examined the effects of charismatic behaviours and unit-level correlates on superiors’ assessments of leaders’ performance. The findin0gs provide only very partial support for the theory and indicate a need for greater sensitivity to the multiple constituencies of leaders in theories and studies of charismatic leadership in organisations (Shamir and others, 1998).

Despite the hype, confidence in this approach to leadership is rapidly declining. A number of high profile corporate scandals, plus the tendency of charismatic leaders to desert organisations after making their changes (often leaving even more significant challenges), has highlighted that this may not be sustainable way to lead. Because of the way in which charismatic leadership presents the leader as a saviour, it is now often referred to as ‘heroic leadership’. There is a resistance to this view of the leader within many industries and organisations are seeking alternatives that develop quieter, less individualistic leadership (Cited in Bolden, 2004 in Mintzberg, 1999).

**2.6.7 The Servant Approach of Leadership**

One leadership philosophy that has increasingly been interpreted and referred to in the literature has been that of Servant Leadership (Boyum, 2006). Like Burn’s early conceptions about transforming leadership, the emphasis is on the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership. The difference, however, is that the servant leader follows his/her path out of a desire to serve rather an out of a desire to lead (Bolden, 2004).

Robert Greenleaf who is founder of the Centre for Servant Leadership, formulated theory of servant leadership after he read Herman Hess’ Journey to the East. Greenleaf (1997) stated that the story greatly impressed him, but the idea laid dormant for over 11 years before he began to write essays expanding on various ideas related to the blossoming theory of servant leadership. These assays touched on various aspects related to power, manipulation, hope, responsibility, strength, and so forth (Wallace, 2007).

A conceptual framework that is helpful for understanding servant leadership is found in the ‘Ten Characteristics of the Servant Leader’ described by Larry Spears (1998). Spears distils Greenleaf’s (1977/2002) instrumental means into ten characteristics: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community (Spears, 1998). Rather servant leadership is an ethical perspective on leadership that identifies key moral behaviours that leaders must continuously demonstrate in order to make progress on Greenleaf’s (1977/2002) ‘best test’. The ‘best test’, which gives us the ethical ends for action, combined with Spear’s distillation of traits that identified the means, create a powerful framework for a review of the literature that furthers the conceptual framework for servant leadership (Greenleaf, [21.08.2011]).

The concept of servant leadership was discussed by Greenleaf through example, and grounded in his understanding of philosophy and practice, but falls short of a formal definition. Greenleaf’s initial premise was as follows:

‘The servant –leader is servant first...It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. He or she is sharply different from the person who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions. For such it will be a later choice to serve-after leadership is established. The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature. The difference manifest itself in the care taken by the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people’s highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, will they not be further deprived?’ (Bolden and others, 2003).

**CHAPTER 3**

**LEADERSHIP STUDIES IN HOSPITALITY**

The issue of leadership has been a matter of research for decades. The concept of leadership is directly related to mainstream management of the literature through it has implementation in the accommodation sub-sector of tourism industry as it is an industry requiring human relations. However, leadership as a research topic has been somewhat neglected within the tourism industry, hence few studies exist with a special focus on the tourism and hospitality industries.

When the management process is studied either in the mainstream area of management literature or in the special literature relating to tourism and hospitality, it is observed that use of certain leadership styles are widespread in certain time periods, such as autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, and charismatic. Therefore it can be said that studies about leadership are mostly conducted in order to identify the characteristic behaviours of leaders. It has been noted that the studies in later periods also mostly focused on the factors affecting leadership behaviours (Kozak and Uca, 2008).

In this context, it is seen that environmental factors (Tracey and Hinkin, 1994), cultural factors, organisational factors, characteristics of the sector, and characteristics of the managers are influential in the creation of the leadership style (Kozak and Uca, 2008).

Within the context of the behavioural approach, the first study conducted on the accommodation sub-sector is the investigation by Fleishman, Harris and Burt (1955) (Cited by Kozak and Uca, 2008 in Fleishman, Harris and Burt, 1955). In this study, it was concluded that absence, ceasing work and job-related complaints occur less frequently in the organisations where there is a high relationship between managerial effectiveness and satisfaction of subordinates ( Akoğlan, 1997). Another study in this field was conducted by White (1973) in order to find out which leadership styles are more preferred by employees who working at hotels and catering in the UK. And results were support that more consultative leadership approaches would be welcomed by employees.

According to the outcomes of a study conducted by Maviş (1985) who tested Likert’s system approach model on five-star accommodation establishments was found that System 1 (strictly authoritarian) leadership behaviours were dominant in public accommodation establishments whereas System 3 (counselling) leadership behaviours were effective in private accommodation establishments. The results of another study conducted by Taner (1993) determined that System 3 (counselling) style is valid in five-star accommodation establishments in Turkey. According to the results of a study conducted by Akoğlan (1997) on the managerial perceptions of female managers in the accommodation sub-sector, it was found that female managers attach same importance to being human oriented as being task oriented.

In 1989, Shortt conducted a research to find out Mintzbergian analysis work activities of hotel managers in Northern Ireland. Mintzberg’s (1973) *The Nature of Managerial Work* identified 10 managerial roles, one of which is leadership, which Mintzberg defined as, ‘...responsible for the motivation and activation of subordinates; responsible for staffing, training and associate duties’ (Mintzberg, 1973). According to outcomes of Shortt’s study that leadership was third most important dimension (Cited by Boyne, 2010 in Shortt, 1989). In the same year Worsfold (1989) aimed to link leadership style with managerial effectiveness on hotel general managers of a major UK hotel group. He found that balance between consideration and initiating structure, and suggests autocratic style with consultative overtones (Worsfold, 1989).

Under the topic of hierarchy of leadership behaviours there were two research papers. One of them was conducted by Cichy and Schmidgall (1996) to develop hierarchy of leadership traits and behaviours on financial executives of US lodging firms. The findings support that leadership ranked least important at the line or hourly employee level (Cited by Boyne, 2010 in Cichy and Schmidgall, 1996). In 2009, Avcı and Topaloğlu studied to investigates whether the perception of the leadership behaviour differs based on the hierarchical level of junior and middle level managers and employees of hotels in Muğla. The results indicate that there are five leadership behaviour which are employee caring, vision articulating, relationship building, risk taking, and operations monitoring (Avcı and Topaloğlu, 2009).

Another research paper was examined by El Masry and others (2004) to investigate differences and similarities between Egyptian and foreign hotel general managers. They found that there was not difference in leadership effectiveness and Egyptian general managers are more relationship-oriented while foreign general managers are more task-oriented (El Masry and others, 2004).

Arendt and Gregorie had two studies on collage students in US (2005, 2008). In 2005 they tried to measure type and frequency of leadership behaviour. And they found out that hospitality students report that they perform leadership behaviours at collage and at work. But, in 2008 they aimed to compare leadership practices between students who reflected on and changed their actions with those who did not. Findings indicate that students who reported reflecting on their actions in classroom and work settings had significantly higher leadership scores in certain leadership practices (Cited by Boyne, 2010 in Arendt and Gregorie, 2005).

According to the outcomes of Nicolaides’s study (2006) which conducted to investigate and analyze the distinction between leadership and management in South African hotels, recommends the conceptual merging of leadership and management in hotels and suggest a role-based catalogue of leader behaviours for successful leadership in the hospitality industry.

Within the context of behavioural approach Kozak and Uca (2008) had an empirical study. It was conducted in order to analyze the effects of organisational, individual, environmental and employee related factors on managers’ leadership styles of accommodation establishments in Turkish town of Alanya. Among these factors significant relationship were observed between the organisational factors, environmental factors, factors originating from characteristics of managers and the leadership styles of managers. On the other hand, no significant relationship was found between the factors originating from employee’s characteristics and the leadership styles of managers (Uca and Kozak, 2008).

Within the studies utilising behavioural-focused leadership theories, there is not coherent structure or any patterns of similarity between or across these studies with which to develop any meaningful conclusions regarding the aggregated findings (Boyne, 2010).

Literature review into the context of transformational leadership has become the most frequent theoretical focus for published leadership-related hospitality articles in recent years; according to Boyne (2010) this theoretical approach accounts for around 40 percent of all hospitality leadership studies utilising core leadership theory during the 1990s and 2000s. Within the context of transformational approach three studies conducted by Tracey and Hinkin to examine casual models relating transformational leadership with workplace roles and communication issues. In 1994, they sought to examine the impact of both transformational and transactional leadership on other individuals and on organisational outcomes of top-level management in a USA hotel company. They suggest that transformational leadership influences perceptions of leadership effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction and clarifies organisational direction and mission. In the same year, they applied to focus on executive managers into large hotel-management organisation. In this study, transformational leadership was measures in term of attributed charisma, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration, idealized influence, and inspirational leadership. Transactional leadership was measured in terms of the use of contingent rewards, active and passive management by exception, and laissez-faire leadership. And they found that more effective leaders were more transformational but less effective leaders were more transactional and transformational leaders can adapt to change and lead proactively. They suggest that major changes in the environment of the hospitality business required leaders who were able to examine their organisation holistically, use vision to recognize what changes were required and manage those changes to fit with organisation’s environment (Tracey and Hinkin, 1994). In 1996, another research was conducted by Tracey and Hinkin on lower and middle level managers in lodging companies in USA. They found that transformational leadership has a direct impact on perceptions of subordinate satisfaction with the leader and leader effectiveness, as well as an indirect effect on these variables through its impact on openness of communication, mission clarity, and role clarity (Tracey and Hinkin, 1996).

In 2004 Whitelaw and Morda had an empirical study which sought to explore and quantity the differences in gender-based perceptions of leadership styles and outcomes in the hospitality industry employees in Australia. They found that males place greater emphasis on ‘confronting’ and ‘sporting’ leadership styles than females. And females placed greater emphasis on leadership styles built upon clear and concise communication and a greater focus on personal consideration for the team members than males (Whitelaw and Morda, 2004).

Gill and others (2006) measured the impact of transformational leadership on job stress and the impact of on burnout on customer-contact service employees in restaurants and hotels in Canada. And findings support that degree of perceived burnout related to degree of perceived stress; and degree of stress related to leadership style (Gill and others, 2006).

During 2008, another study conducted by Erkutlu within the context of transformational leadership approach. This paper was purpose that to examine the influence of leadership behaviours on both organisational and leader effectiveness of managers and non-managerial employees in hotels in Turkey. The findings support the suggestion in the literature that transformational leadership behaviours stimulate organisational commitment and job satisfaction in hospitality industry (Erkutlu, 2008).

Bass and his colleagues initiated the empirical investigation of transformational and transactional leadership two decades ago. They proposed that transformational leadership is comprised of four dimensions, that transactional leadership is composed of three dimensions, and that an additional category of non-leadership exists (laissez-faire leadership). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) has been developed to assess these dimensions and much has been learned about the positive effects of transformational leadership. However, far less attention has been paid to transactional leadership and non-leadership. The current study examined the theoretical and empirical properties of each MLQ transactional leadership and non-leadership measure. Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) conducted the theoretical paper by using a hospitality sample of managerial and non-managerial employees in hotels. They looked at the four measures together, then examined the measures separately and subjected them to a number of additional analyses that varied depending on the issues of concern. Based on their findings, they offer recommendations about scale refinement and the need for new theory concerning the four transactional leadership and non-leadership dimensions of the MLQ (Hinkin and Schreisheim, 2008).

During 2005 by Al-Ababneh and Lockwood had conducted a research to set out to explore the link between the style of leadership adopted by managers and the job satisfaction of their subordinates in Jordan. The findings indicated significant differences in job satisfaction based on the employees’ demographic characteristics. It was also found that the most prevalent style was democratic but that once again style varied according to the managers’ demographic profile. While it is not possible from the data to claim a direct relationship between leadership style and job satisfaction, but neither is the data able to refute that assertion (Al-Ababneh and Lockwood, 2005).

Another research paper was examined by Patiar and Mia (2009) to find out relationship between hotel departments’ financial and non-financial performance and transformational leadership style’s of department managers in hotels in Australia. They found that transformational leadership style was positively associated with the non-financial performance which in turn was positively associated with the financial performance (increasing customer satisfaction) of the departments (Patiar and Mia, 2009).

To shed further light on the development and current use of transformational leadership theory in hospitality studies an analysis of the rationales for employing transformational leadership theory in the identified hospitality studies has been undertaken. The results of this analysis suggest that the diversity of findings owes much to the diversity of reasons for using transformational leadership (Boyne, 2010).

Considering the three studies which utilised contingency theories of leadership: Nebel and Stears (1977) found that a task-oriented management style would be the most effective in the North American hospitality industry; and Testa’s 2002 and 2004 papers found some significant differences (on consideration/initiating structure, trust and satisfaction) between culturally congruent (same nationality) and incongruent (different nationality) (Testa, 2007).

Within the context of LMX theory by Çalışkan (2009) conducted a research which main subject of the paper was to investigate the leadership styles and LMX quality in tourism service industry in which customer satisfaction has a crucial importance. In this research model the impact of paternalistic leadership (sub-components: benevolent, authoritarian and moral) on LMX was approved (Çalışkan, 2009).

In 2007 Raguz analyzed the dominant leadership style in the hospitality industry in Dubrovnik-Neretva. The findings demonstrate that the hotel managers in Dubrovnik-Neretva prefer the consultative leadership style, because they trust their subordinates, but not completely. They are ready to delegate the decision-making to the middle and lower management, accept the ideas of their subordinates, use the rewards as a fundamental means of reward and delegate the controlling to lower levels of hierarchy (Raguz, 2007).

Wu and others (2006) used both the theories, situational leadership by Hersey and Blanchard and organisational commitment. They aimed to analysing the cognition and relationship between managers’ leadership styles and employees’ organisational commitment in the operation unit of international tourist hotels in Taiwan. The results of this study indicate that a ‘delegating’ leadership style has the highest frequency of occurrences. It is followed by ‘selling’ and ‘participating’ styles. ‘Telling’ leadership has the lowest frequency of occurrences. It was also indicate that employees of different ages, lengths of services, major subjects, top level leadership styles, and the location of the hotels will show significantly different organisational commitments. The more managers belong to the selling, participating, delegating leadership styles, the more organisational commitment the employees have. In general, the ‘participating’ leadership attracts the most employee commitment, while the ‘telling’ leadership obtains the least (Wu and others, 2006).

Another research by Pimapunsri (2008) conducted to examine the relationships among learning organisation, leadership style, and subordinates’ demographic variables such as age and gender from hotels in Bankok, Thailand. The results demonstrated that demographic variables, such as gender and age show significant differences in learning organisation and subordinates’ perception of managers’ leadership styles.

The findings of Testa’s (2001) research shows that the way employees perceive a hotel’s leadership affects a number of important organisational outcomes including a leader’s effectiveness, employees’ attitudes, and ultimately, employees performance (Testa, 2001).

In conclusion, the findings from the identified leadership-focussed hospitality studies cannot be aggregated to provide a holistic understanding of leadership in the hospitality sectors.

**CHAPTER 4**

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The research aimed to determine leadership styles of managers working in accommodation establishments and to find out the demographic factors influencing those styles at four- and five-star accommodation establishments in TRNC.

**4.1 Research Questions**

The specific research questions of the study are as follows:

1. What kind of leadership styles are adopted by the managers of four- and five-star accommodation establishments?
2. How do leadership styles differ in relation to managers’ nationality?
3. How do leadership styles differ in relation to managers’ gender?
4. How do leadership styles differ in relation to managers’ management level?
5. How do leadership styles differ in relation to managers’ work experience?
6. How do leadership styles differ in relation to managers’ education level?

The leadership styles were considered as the independent variable, and demographic factors were considered as the dependent variables and the relation between them were tried to in investigating. The effects of managers’ demographic characteristics such as gender, nationality, management level, job experience, education level on the leadership styles were studied. Table 4.1 illustrates the variables of the study.

**Table 4.1** **Variables of the study.**

**4.2 Sample Selection**

The sample of this study consisted of the senior managers and chiefs working in four- and five-star accommodation establishments operating in the North Cyprus. When considering the advance service quality and organisational structure of the four- and five-star hotels in comparison to the other types and classes, it was thought that it would be more appropriate to construct a sampling frame among those hotels.

The hotel industry was selected because the hotels in the North Cyprus consist of heterogeneous employees and because hotels provide many opportunities for managers and employees to interact. According to Clark, Hartline, and Jones (2009) ‘the level of close interaction creates an environment level of close interaction creates an environment where employees job actions are likely to be affected by their manager2s leadership style’.

According the data of the North Cyprus Hoteliers Association-KTOB and the Ministry of Tourism, there were 6 four- and 13 five-star (totally 19) accommodation establishments in existence during the implementation period of the study (July-September 2011). As sample of the study chosen, all hotels in the North Cyprus were not covered two of the hotels. One of the hotel which Noah’s Ark Hotel was outside the scope of research because it was not data in the KTOB list in May. At the same time Grand Tulip Hotel were excluded from the sample because this hotel not registered into the hotel list by Ministry of Tourism.

**Table 4.2** **Accommodation establishments by categories-in alphabet order**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Name of Establishment** | **Category** | | Acapulco Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Cratos Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Cyprus Jasmine Courte Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Deniz Kızı Royal Hotel | \*\*\*\* | | Dome Hotel | \*\*\*\* | | Kaya Artemis Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Kyrenia Oscar Club | \*\*\*\* | | L. A. Holiday Centre | \*\*\*\* | | Malpas Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Mercure Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Merit Cristal Cove Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Merit Lefkoşa Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Olive Tree Dedeman | \*\*\*\* | | Pia Bella Hotel | \*\*\*\* | | Rocks Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Salamis Bay Conti Resort Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Savoy Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | The Colony Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | | Vuni Palace Hotel | \*\*\*\*\* | |

**4.3 Data Collection Instruments and Procedures**

The field study was conducted at the beginning of July 2011 and ended in the middle of September of 2011. Before conducting the field study, the 19 accommodation establishments were contacted by phone and the human resource managers were asked about the number of managers they employed. From this information it was determined that there were approximately 160 senior, middle, and first-line managers.

Questionnaires were delivered by the researcher during the visits to the accommodation establishments. During this period, the most of the support was obtained from the human resources department of the hotels. Of the total 160 questionnaires delivered, 120 were returned. One hotel refused to take part in the study. Despite all the efforts of the researcher to convince the hotel to be part of the study, the researcher was told that the hotel has the policy of not taking part in such studies because they don’t have time. The response rate for the study was 75%.

Quantitative research methods were employed to carry out the study. An adapted version of the Kozak and Uca’ (2008) questionnaire was used as the study instrument. In 2008 by Kozak and Uca were conducted an empirical study in order to determine the factors affecting the leadership styles of managers in accommodation establishments in the Turkish town of Alanya. Through the field study 227 managers were surveyed. The effects of organisational, individual, environmental and employee related factors on managers’ leadership styles are discussed within the framework of empirical data analysis. Among these factors significant relationships were observed between the organisational factors, environmental factors, factors originating from characteristics of managers and the leadership styles of managers. On the other hand, no significant relationships were found between the factors originating from employees’ characteristics and the leadership styles of managers (Uca and Kozak, 2008).

The questionnaires were used as the data collection tool. The questionnaire was divided into two main parts. The first part of the questionnaire aimed at revealing the demographic factors of the study respondents and consisted of 5 questions. The second part of the questionnaire aimed at identifying the leadership styles of the study respondents. It included 28 items formed on a five point Likert type scale (1 for ‘Strongly Disagree’, 2 for ‘Disagree’, 3 for ‘Neutral’, 4 for ‘Agree’, 5 for ‘Strongly Gree’) hence can be regarded as an ordinal scale. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated to determine the reliability of the scale. The reliability of the scale was found to be .835 that considered high (Büyüköztürk, 2007). Each style was examined by seven questions that items describe aspects of leadership behaviour. Such as:

Response on items: 3, 11, 12, 15, 17, 21, 26 (Autocratic Leader)

Response on items: 1, 2, 8, 13, 19, 23, 24 (Democratic Leader)

Response on items: 4, 6, 7, 14, 22, 27, 28 (Laissez-faire Leader)

Response on items: 5, 9, 10, 16, 18, 20, 25 (Charismatic Leader)

Statistical analysis had been conducted on a personal computer by using Microsoft Excel 2007, Microsoft Office 2007, and SPSS 18 version (Statistical Package for the Social Science). The statistical procedures for quantitative research include descriptive statistics, ANOVA analysis and mean of variables.

**CHAPTER 5**

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**5.1 An Overview of the Participants in the Study**

Frequency was used for looking at detailed research include formation on demographic data. The distribution of the 120 participants in relevance to their demographic profile is presented in Table 5.1.

In Table 5.1, it can be seen that 65.8 percent of participants were male and 34.2 percent participants represent female. It shows that male participants were contain greater number than female participants. The nationality of respondents were represent of 50.8 percent Turkey, 47.5 percent TRNC and 1.7 percent other. The TRNC and Turkey participants were represent almost the same rate. In the level of education, 59.1 percent of participants had university degree, 30 percent of participants had high school degree. Although primary school graduates constituted 2.5 percent, managers with master/doctorate level were 6.7 percent. However, the number of participants marking other option at 1.7 percent constitutes a very low part of sample. In terms of the level of the work experience, 40 percent of participants had 6-10 years of job experience ranked in the highest and the number of managers with job experience lower than 1 year ranked in the lowest with 1.7 percent. The largest number of managers participating in the study, that is 59.1 percent of respondents were employed at senior management level, and followed by 35 percent at intermediate management level and 4.2 percent employed at lower management level and 1.7 percent employed at other levels.

**Table 5.1** **Demographic profile of respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | n | % |
| **Gender** |  |  |
| Female | 41 | 34,2 |
| Male | 79 | 65,8 |
| **Nationality** |  |  |
| TRNC | 57 | 47,5 |
| Turkey | 61 | 50,8 |
| Other | 2 | 1,7 |
| **Education Level** |  |  |
| Primary Education | 3 | 2,5 |
| High School | 36 | 30 |
| University | 71 | 59,1 |
| Master/Doctorate | 8 | 6,7 |
| Other | 2 | 1,7 |
| **Work Experience** |  |  |
| Less than one year | 2 | 1,7 |
| 1-5 years | 24 | 20 |
| 6-10 years | 48 | 40 |
| 11-15 years | 15 | 12,5 |
| 16 years or more | 31 | 25,8 |
| **Management Level** |  |  |
| Senior Management | 71 | 59,1 |
| Intermediate Management | 42 | 35 |
| Lower Management | 5 | 4,2 |
| Other | 2 | 1,7 |
| Total | 120 | 100 |

**5.2 Leadership Style of Managers**

Mean response for each style were calculated and are shown in Table 5.2.1. It shows that the mean responses for the four leadership style were perceived to be significantly different from each other. Charismatic leadership style in which mean score 3,8143 was perceived significantly more often compared to the other three leadership styles. The leadership style with the second highest mean response (mean=3,7655) was the democratic style, and followed by laissez-faire style with mean score of 3,6976. The lowest mean was belong to autocratic style with mean score of 3,356.

According to findings, managers who working at accommodation establishments in the TRNC are using ‘Charismatic’ leadership style in which behaviour includes the leader acting as a role model for followers, displaying a sense of power and confidence, and making bold, unconventional decisions, develop and communicate an emotionally captivating vision, foster the acceptance of shared goals, and motivate the followers for the achievement of common aspirations (Conger, Kanunga, 1987; Shamir, House, and Arthur, 1993). This set of behaviours is reflected leadership concept such as transformational (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).

**Table 5.2 Classification of Managers in Terms of Leadership Styles**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean |  | Std. Deviation |
| Variables | Statistic | Statistic | Std. Error | Statistic |
| **Charismatic** | **120** | **3,8143** | **0,5521** | **0,60485** |
| Democratic | 120 | 3,7655 | 0,5251 | 0,57526 |
| Laissez-Faire | 120 | 3,6976 | 0,5089 | 0,55751 |
| Autocratic | 120 | 3,356 | 0,5362 | 0,58741 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 120 |  |  |  |

The general view from the range of research sources available is not consistent with our findings as the hospitality managers are authoritarian, dictatorial, and heavy handed, and hold a unitary view of managerial and leadership relationships i.e. they see themselves as the principle source of authority (Wood, 1994). However the outcome obtained is consistent with Neal, Finlay, and Tansey (2005) who found that Lebanon is characterized by a relatively low level of traditional authority and a very high level of charismatic authority. Hotel organisations can view leadership development as a source of competitive advantage. Since the industry tends to be labour intensive and has increasingly harsh environmental demands imposed upon it, leadership skills may help organisations to utilize the available human resources more effectively and may help to increase performance. The research of Tracey and Hinkin (1994) who reported that hospitality business required leaders who were able to examine holistically their organisation, use vision to recognize what changes were required and manage those changes to fit the organization’s environment.

Wang, Jen, and Tang Mei-Ling (2010) research results show that the business management environment has become severe in recent years and that organisational development strategies often need transforming. Thus, a business is more eager than ever for those who have the transformational leadership being able to change organisational strategy and culture and being able to enable the organisation to be more adaptable to external environment requirements. It is certain that a business also expect these that have the charismatic leadership and the visionary leadership of being self-confident and competent for expressing visions. Furthermore, subordinates will be inspired with more potential by such leadership and make more mental and physical efforts for organisations. Therefore, an organisation can start from adjusting the leadership style if wanting to promote the organisation a performance (Wang, Chich-Jen, and Mei-Ling, 2010).

As with all industries, hospitality organisations have a number of crisis situations. Hotel and catering organisations are transitional communities particularly in respect of the relation between products, services and customers. The transitional nature of customers places strains on product and service delivery, particularly as demand is erratic and uneven (Wood, 1994). The conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty are typical of crisis situations and charismatic leadership has traditionally has being associated with crisis (Burns, 1978). Although early theorists have suggested crises to constitute a prerequisite for charismatic leadership (Weber, 1947), recent scholars generally agree that even though crisis situations may promote such leadership they are not required for its occurrence (Shamir, House and Arthur, 1993).

In addition, social crises have long been thought to be a precursor of charismatic leadership (Weber, 1947; Parsons, 1951). In Parson’s words, ‘any situations where an established institutional order has to a considerable extent become disorganized, where established routines, expectations, and symbols are broken up or under attach is a favourable situation of such a charismatic movement. This creates widespread psychological insecurity which in turn is susceptible of reintegration to a charismatic movement. This creates widespread psychological insecurity which in turn is susceptible of reintegration to a charismatic movement’. The basic argument is that in periods of crises and stress, people feel anxious and frustrated about the uncertain future. In these situations, people develop a high need for direction and certainty and will eagerly accept a leader who displays self-confidence and provides a clear vision of the future. Thus, evidence suggest that individuals placed in challenging situations experience greater need for charismatic leadership (Mayo, Postar 2005).

A probable explanation for this outcome may be that positional characteristics of managers, increase in educational level, and total work experience can shape their charismatic behaviour. The largest number of managers participating in the study were employed as senior management level, the level of education was high as 59.1 % of managers have university degree, and in terms of work experience 40 % of participants had 6-10 years of job experience. Some theorists have suggested charismatic behaviour to occur more frequently at higher hierarchical echelons (Rainey, Watson, 1996; Shamir, Howell, 1999 cited in Walter, Bruch, 2009).

Walter and Bruch (2009) suggest contextual factors will influence charismatic leadership both directly and indirectly. First context features may shape the job characteristics, demands, and constraints that leaders face, setting boundary conditions for the feasibility of charismatic leadership and directly influencing the likelihood that leaders engage in such behaviour. Exemplifying this relation, leaders located at higher hierarchical levels or in decentralized, organic organisations have been suggested to enjoy higher discretion, enabling them to engage in bold, unconventional actions and to formulate visionary goals and thereby promoting their charismatic leadership (Shamir, Howell, 1999).

A One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. It is a technique used to compare means of two or more samples using the F (variance) distribution. As shown on Table 5.3, there is no statistically significant difference between gender and leadership styles. However, it has been approved by different researchers that gender differences have impact on leadership styles (Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Melero, 2004; Eagly and Carly, 2003; Van Engen and Willemsen, 2000). For example, Eagly and Johnson (1990) results revealed that females are more democratic as compare to males.

**Table 5.3** **One-Way** **ANOVA differences of Gender and Leadership Styles**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sum of | Df | Mean | F | Sig. |
|  |  | Squares |  | Square |  |  |
| Charismatic | Between Groups | 0,499 | 1 | 0,499 | 1,369 | 0,244 |
|  | Within Groups | 43,035 | 118 | 0,365 |  |  |
|  | Total | 43,535 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Democratic | Between Groups | 0,057 | 1 | 0,057 | 0,171 | 0,68 |
|  | Within Groups | 39,322 | 118 | 0,333 |  |  |
|  | Total | 39,379 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Autocratic | Between Groups | 1,324 | 1 | 1,324 | 3,931 | 0,50 |
|  | Within Groups | 39,737 | 118 | 0,337 |  |  |
|  | Total | 41,061 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Laissez-faire | Between Groups | 0,165 | 1 | 0,165 | 0,530 | 0,468 |
|  | Within Groups | 36,822 | 118 | 0,312 |  |  |
|  | Total | 36,987 | 119 |  |  |  |

As shown on Table 5.4, the one-way ANOVA results indicate that at a 0.05 a significance level, management level is not statistically significantly related to leadership behaviour. This indicates that management level has no influence on leadership behaviour of the 4- and 5-star hotel managers. This outcome is inconsistent with Kozak and Uca (2008) who reported that there is a meaningful relationship between leadership styles managers adapt and the management level.

**Table 5.4** **One-Way ANOVA differences of Management Level and Leadership Style**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sum of | Df | Mean | F | Sig. |
|  |  | Squares |  | Square |  |  |
| Charismatic | Between Groups | 1,146 | 3 | 0,382 | 1,045 | 0,375 |
|  | Within Groups | 42,389 | 116 | 0,365 |  |  |
|  | Total | 43,535 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Democratic | Between Groups | 1,556 | 3 | 0,519 | 1,591 | 0,195 |
|  | Within Groups | 37,823 | 116 | 0,326 |  |  |
|  | Within Groups | 39,379 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Autocratic | Between Groups | 0,429 | 3 | 0,143 | 0,408 | 0,748 |
|  | Within Groups | 40,633 | 116 | 0,35 |  |  |
|  | Total | 41,061 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Laissez-faire | Between Groups | 0,719 | 3 | 0,24 | 0,767 | 0,515 |
|  | Within Groups | 36,268 | 116 | 0,313 |  |  |
|  | Total | 36,987 | 116 |  |  |  |

It can be depicted from Table 5.5, one-way ANOVA results indicate that at a 0.05 significance level, job experience is not statistically significantly related to leadership behaviour. This indicates that job experience has no influence on leadership behaviour of the 4- and 5-star hotel managers in North Cyprus. However, it contradicts the findings of the previous study by Ali and Ali (2010) who argued that increase in total job experience at current position found their leader’s behaviour more visionary because vision is central for achieving unity of effort.

**Table 5.5** **One-Way ANOVA differences of Job Experience and Leadership Style**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sum of | Df | Mean | F | Sig. |
|  |  | Squares |  | Square |  |  |
| Charismatic | Between Groups | 0,42 | 4 | 0,105 | 0,28 | 0,89 |
|  | Within Groups | 43,115 | 115 | 0,375 |  |  |
|  | Total | 43,535 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Democratic | Between Groups | 0,667 | 4 | 0,167 | 0,495 | 0,739 |
|  | Within Groups | 38,713 | 115 | 0,387 |  |  |
|  | Total | 39,379 | 119 |  |  |  |
|  | Between Groups | 2,266 | 4 | 0,567 | 1,679 | 0,160 |
|  | Within Groups | 38,795 | 115 | 0,337 |  |  |
|  | Total | 41,061 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Laissez-faire | Between Groups | 0,606 | 4 | 0,152 | 0,479 | 0,751 |
|  | Within Groups | 36,381 | 115 | 0,316 |  |  |
|  | Total | 36,987 | 119 |  |  |  |

As shown on Table 5.6, the one-way ANOVA results indicate that at a 0.05 significance level, education level is not statistically significantly related to leadership behaviour. This indicates that education level has no influence on leadership behaviour of the 4- and 5 star hotel managers.

**Table 5.6** **One-Way ANOVA differences of Education Level and Leadership Styles**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of  Squares | Df | Mean  Square | F | Sig. |
| Charismatic Between Groups | 0,488 | 4 | 0,122 | 0,326 | 0,860 |
| Within Groups | 43,047 | 115 | 0,374 |  |  |
| Total | 43,535 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Democratic Between Groups | 0,573 | 4 | 0,143 | 0,424 | 0,491 |
| Within Groups | 38,807 | 115 | 0,337 |  |  |
| Total | 39,379 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Autocratic Between Groups | 0,716 | 4 | 0,179 | 0,510 | 0,728 |
| Within Groups | 40,345 | 115 | 0,351 |  |  |
| Total | 41,061 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Laissez-  faire Between Groups | 0,708 | 4 | 0,177 | 0,561 | 0,692 |
| Within Groups | 36,279 | 115 | 0,315 |  |  |
| Total | 36,987 | 119 |  |  |  |

As shown in Table 5.7, the one-way ANOVA results indicate that at a 0.05 significance level, nationality is statistically significantly related to laissez-faire leadership style (0,009). The data gathered from the analysis demonstrates that nationality has influence on laissez-faire leadership behaviour of the 4- and 5-star hotel managers.

**Table 5.7** **One-Way ANOVA differences of Nationality and Leadership Styles**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sum of | Df | Mean | F | Sig. |
|  |  | Squares |  | Square |  |  |
| Charismatic | Between Groups | 0,577 | 2 | 0,288 | 0,785 | 0,458 |
|  | Within Groups | 42,958 | 117 | 0,367 |  |  |
|  | Total | 43,535 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Democratic | Between Groups | 1,148 | 2 | 0,574 | 1,757 | 0,177 |
|  | Within Groups | 38,231 | 117 | 0,327 |  |  |
|  | Within Groups | 39,379 | 119 |  |  |  |
| Autocratic | Between Groups | 1,573 | 2 | 0,786 | 2,33 | 0,102 |
|  | Within Groups | 39,488 | 117 | 0,338 |  |  |
|  | Total | 41,061 | 119 |  |  |  |
| **Laissez-faire** | **Between Groups** | **2,848** | **2** | **1,424** | **4,881** | **0,009** |
|  | **Within Groups** | **34,139** | **117** | **0,292** |  |  |
|  | **Total** | **36,987** | **119** |  |  |  |

As Table 5.7 indicates that managers from the TRNC indicate a mean score of 3.8446 with managers from Turkey indicating a mean score of 3.5808. This means that TRNC managers are more laissez-faire in their leadership style when compared to managers from Turkey.

**Table 5.8** **Mean analysis of Nationality with Leadership Styles**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Nationality |  | Laissez-faire | Charismatic | Democratic | Autocratic |
| TRNC | Mean | 3,8446 | 3,8145 | **3,8521** | 3,4762 |
|  | N | 57 | 57 | 57 | 57 |
|  | Std. Deviation | .51173 | .59331 | .54195 | .55086 |
| Turkey | Mean | 3,5808 | **3,8314** | 3,7002 | 3,2459 |
|  | N | 61 | 61 | 61 | 61 |
|  | Std. Deviation | .56597 | .60862 | .59345 | .61175 |
| Other | Mean | 3,0714 | 3,2857 | 3,2857 | 3,2857 |
|  | N | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Std. Deviation | .50508 | 1,01015 | .80812 | .20203 |
| Total | Mean | 3,6976 | 3,8143 | 3,7655 | 3,356 |
|  | N | 120 | 120 | 120 | 120 |
|  | Std. Deviation | .55751 | .60485 | .57526 | .58741 |

Laissez-faire leaders abdicate their responsibility and avoid making decisions (Bass, 1990). Subordinates working under this kind of supervisor basically are left to their own devices to execute their job responsibilities (Ardichvili and Kuchinke, 2002). According to the literature laissez-faire leadership is not a commonly observed style in the hospitality industry. This indicates that managers prefer to allow their employees to take on a greater amount of responsibility and prefer to empower them. A probable explanation for this is that in the hospitality industry employees are in a situation where they are faced with unpredictable situations or circumstances, for instance, a difficult guest, an unexpected problem with a room, etc. and is expected to solve the problem instantly. Therefore, the decision may have to be made without conferring upon the manager. It can be said that hotels are successful companies when their managers have a ‘can do’ approach and are prepared to take risks. Especially in high season period of hotels which in that time occupancy rate high, and customer do not wait, and decisions should be taken without a getting an idea from managers. Delaying taking a decision is the same as not making a decision. Furthermore, a basis for action includes experiment with new ideas.

The literature suggests range of opinions from the more cynical one that sees empowerment as a management control/manipulation tool, to the Human Resource Management view that it is essential for achievement of maximum organisational potential. For example Goldsmith (1997) suggest that ‘it is predominantly about encouraging front-line staff to solve customer problems on the spot, without constant resource to management approval’. Whereas Bowen and Lawler (1992) cited in Lashley (1997) take the view that it is about ‘management strategies for sharing decision-making power’. Work by Hales and Klides (1998) carried out in a sample of five star hotels suggest that ‘the overwhelming impression to be gained from the literature is that empowerment entails some additional employee choice at the margins of their jobs, rather that any substantial increase in employee voice’.

Leadership exists in all societies and is essential to the functioning of organisations within societies. However, the attributes that are seen as characteristic for leaders may vary across cultures (Den Hartog and others, 1999). Here, borrowing from House, culture refers to set of ‘share motives, values, believes, identities interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives and are transmitted across age generations’.

Turkish (in Turkey) culture has long been described as being high on collectivism and power distance (Hofstede, 1994). Finding of the GLOBE-Global Leadership and Organisational Behavioural Effectiveness which was constitutes one of the more ambitious and influential cross-cultural leadership studies, revealed two predominant characteristics of Turkey to be in-group collectivism and power distance among 62 countries. According to the inter-country societal culture rankings of the GLOBE study Turkey is higher in terms of in-group collectivism (4th), and power distance (10th) (House and others, 2004).

Turkey scores were high on Power Distance dimension which means that the following characterises the Turkish style: Dependent, hierarchical, superiors often inaccessible and the ideal boss is a father figure. Power is centralized and managers rely on their bosses on rules. Employees expect to be told what to do. Control is expected and attitude towards managers is formal. Communication is indirect and the information flow is selective. The same structure can be observed in the family unit where the father is a kind of patriarch to whom others submit (Hofstede, 1994). These assumptions are more consistent with an autocratic leadership style which is not reflected in the results of this study.

According to Hofstede (1994), Turkey is a collectivistic society. This means that the ‘we’ is important people belong to in groups (families, clans, or organisations) who look after each other in exchange for loyalty. Communication is indirect and the harmony of the group has to be maintained, open conflicts are avoided. The relationship has a morale base and this always has priority over task fulfilment. Time must be invested initially to establish a relationship of trust. Nepotism may be found more often. Feedback is always indirect also in the business environment (Hofstede, 1994).

As mentioned above, in the collectivist societies, emphasize is on unity and group fidelity, and superiors rely on fidelity of staff, reliability and coordinated group relationship with others. Thus this study indicates that the use of laizzes-faire leadership is consistent with the basic assumptions underlying “collectivism” in that managers obviously have trust and belief in their staff. Moreover, one of the reasons of the result could be influence of Islam. It is generally assumed that Islam’s influence on workplace behaviour may elevate concern for in-group relationship above personal concerns. Both employees and employers have moral obligations to develop relationships that lead to increased team and organisational solidarity (Yahchouchi, 2009). Therefore, Islam community is supposed to be more collectivistic. Collectivistic cultural values foster conformity in group, section, or unit behaviour. Harmony within groups is more valued in collectivistic cultures; members are more likely to engage in behaviours that ensure harmony and refrain from behaviours that threaten harmony. Consequently, we can easily assume that both TRNC and Turkeys national culture can promotes laissez-faire leadership style.

Another probable explanation of this result might be the nepotism. Cyprus is such a tight-knit society that nepotism or shades of nepotism are endemic in every part of public or private sector. In collectivist societies, supervisors rely on fidelity of staff, reliability and coordinated group relationship with others and for this purpose they prefer to select staff among their friends and relatives.

Nepotism is related to society’s passing from traditional to modern conditions. The more traditional society is, the more likely it also is that nepotism plays an important role in organisations; and the more modern it is, the larger the probability that nepotism is a negligible factor in organisations (Krag, nd). Some researchers believe that nepotism is dominant in smaller firms in underdeveloped countries (Araslı and Tümer, 2008). It can be said that there are nepotism tendencies in family companies because they think that rising generation will carry out the institution’s vision and they will have advantages of knowing the institution more than anyone else (Özler and others, 2007). It is believed that appointing family members to managerial positions will stabilize the company and prevent conflict of interest between ownership and management. Nepotism by allowing next generations to take over the firm may prevent isolation of individuals from family system (Asunakutlu and Avcı, 2010). Miller and Le Breten-Miller (2006) mentioned positive effects of choosing a family member as a top executive for reason that it may induce higher motivation. However, Araslı and others (2006) made a study on 257 full-time hotel employees in North Cyprus. They find that nepotism has a significant negative effect on human resource management, job satisfaction, quitting intention, and negative rumors. Moreover, Araslı and Tümer (2008) carried out a study with 576 bank employees in North Cyprus and found that nepotism create job stress in the workplace and this increases dissatisfaction of the staff about their organisations. Having regarded nepotism as a natural, psychological and also normative (not ethical) behaviour the main purpose here should be not to prevent nepotism but manage it effectively and ethically.

Although Turkish Cypriot culture has effects of motherland Turkey such as both of country’ language, and religion are same, Turkish Cypriots have cultural differences from Turkish people. The Turkish Cypriot and Turkish people cultural differences generally refer to the difference between their ‘way of life’. The culture of people living in Cyprus is not limited with the Turkish one. For years we have been affected from several cultures, from Ottoman, Greek, British, we have been affected from all and resulting point is mixture. As such, a distinct culture is constructed and this culture is different from the culture of Turkish people. As wrote above, historical background of the island and the cultural interaction of different civilisation for defining the origins of the particular culture seen in Cyprus. In this representation, rather than defining culture to have a homogeneous essence unaffected from any outside effects the uniqueness of culture itself is perceived to be resulted from its amorphous character. Cypriot culture is mainly represented as a patchwork of Greek, English, and Turkish cultural elements. Accordingly it is believed that some particular characteristics were gained with the past experience. In other words, especially past cohabitation with Greek Cypriots and fact that Cyprus was a colony of British Empire are pointed out as the reasons behind the unique position of the Turkish Cypriots culture. The significance of these two societies, are the fact that they signify the connection of Turkish Cypriots with the ‘West’ and the ‘European’ (Greek side connected with Europe since 2004). Here the Europe is defined with its hegemonic connotation: civilised, modern, and culturally superior as opposed to the non-European.

Civil wars in 1953, 1963 and war in 1974 had a considerable impact on management and leadership. It could be argued that after 1974 Cyprus was divided into two parts and this situation developed in response to uncertainty of future.

With regard to leadership, national culture is usually conceptualized and investigated as a set of independent variables and as having an influence on the leadership styles and leader behaviour of its members. Hundreds of studies have shown that a country’s culture helps to explain leadership styles (Babaita and others, 2010; Taleghani and others, 2010; Giritli and others, 2007; Duson, 2003; Kim and Hancer, nd) and so many studies have significantly advanced our understanding of leadership phenomena as consequences of national culture.

In the world, there are countries that have characteristics of laissez-faire style of leadership. Such as, Japanese leaders compared with leaders of other societies have less power of control because they are expected to have warm and good relationships with their followers and followers are allowed to decide due to their own attitude and decisions, to an extent. Fidelity of the inferior to the superior in Japanese moral framework is a virtue. In return, the superior should allow inferior to express this fidelity and it is expected that leader rely on his followers to remove his weak points.

In 2002, Ardichvilli and Kuchinke conducted research that developed by Bass and Avalio and Hofstede’s model of culture, found that two less efficient leadership styles were laissez-faire and management by exception, have received significantly higher scores in the four former USSR countries-Russia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan-, when compared to the US and Germany. However, most of the American managers believed that the role of the manager is to help solve problems, meaning he can help staff detect the ways for solving problems by their own. Not he just answers all their questions. The reason is giving solution to all problems causes staff lose their own motivation for innovation and creativity, and finally their productivity decreases (Taleghani and others, 2010).

Laissez-faire style which means hands-off approach, then managers of the hotel take this relaxed style of coordinating their business. In hospitality industry because of workforce culture is diversified that in the study 61% from Turkey and 57% from TRNC. And according to North Cyprus Hoteliers Association statistical research in 2011, 28% of workers at accommodation establishments are the Turkish Cypriots. Managers must learn to use cultural diversity as an advantage, rather than as disadvantage, to the organisation such as decision making and creative problem solving. Employees can connect with colleagues who share similar interests and backgrounds. In those forms employee support each other, personal and professional growth and enhance their individual and collective ability to contribute to the company.

The reasons for this effect may be several. The individualised consideration behaviours that the principle model to subordinates may well be repeated in staff interactions with each other thus promoting a greater sense of collegiality. If staff cared by their principle, they may well show the same concern towards other staff members. Further the laissez-faire leadership behaviours of principals including avoiding decision making and absent when needed can have the effect of encouraging staff to look to collegial work groups as a substitute for leadership.

The success of company could due to the use of laissez-faire culture. Culture is important because it can affect many people and things to do with the business. If the culture of the business is not clear, it can affect presence and punctuality. This means that if company has a firm and unfriendly culture it could result in their staff not coming to work because of a poor working atmosphere. Also they might not like work, they either coming late or take a day of work. This could result in the business losing out on work and have less time to call for a replacement. The results of Pizam’s (1993) study related with characteristics of cultural structure in hotel sector are associated with cultural structure that hotel leaders want to develop. Wood (1994) argued that numerous hotel managers accept that empowerment of employee is the one of the most important tasks of themselves but in practice, they believe that it is not as easy as they accepted. In other words they don’t behave as they believe empowerment is the one of their most important tasks in another study, Testa (2001) mentioned that it is necessary for leaders of hotel organisations to behave to the needs and expectations of their employees as external customers, but it was mentioned that there are huge differences between leaders and employees in the perceptions of the leadership.

**CHAPTER 6**

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

As can be observed from the research findings, managers in accommodation establishments in TRNC focused on Charismatic leadership styles. Weber (1947) defines charismatic leadership as “resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him”. The charm of such people made their followers go behind these leaders without questioning them. These result can be considered as indicators of the suggestion that hotel managers today demonstrating the beneficial consequences of charismatic leadership behaviour. Such behaviour includes the leader acting as role model for followers, displaying a sense of power and confidence, and making bold, unconventional decisions. Furthermore, charismatic leaders develop and communicate an emotionally captivating vision, foster the acceptance of shared goals, and motivate followers for the achievement of common aspirations (Conger and Kanunga, 1987; Shamir, Hause and Arthur, 1993). Also the findings obtained are import as they show that the result as a leader behaviours identified for accommodation industry managers’ are still valid. As can be remembered, the managers’ preferences have been in this direction in the studies of Boyett (2006), Daft (2000), Congar and Kanunga (1987), Shamir and others (1993) providing that charismatic leadership behaviours are effective.

The analysis of regarding the factors due to characteristics of managers and leadership styles; it was observed that there is a meaningful relationship between laissez-faire leadership style and nationality of manager. On the other hand, no significant relationship were found between gender, management level, education level, and job experience of managers. It means that nationality of managers reinforces laissez-faire leadership style. It is believed that the long term work experience and higher education level of the manager participants affected the selection of these management models. Particularly the high rate of managers adopting laissez-faire leadership style can be regarded as an indicator that managers of four- and five-star accommodation enterprises are now beginning to gain leadership qualification.

In this study, it was observed that there is not a meaningful relationship between managers’ demographic characteristics – gender, management level, education level, and job experience- and leadership styles managers adopt. These findings are inconsistent with previous studies (e. g. Kozak and Uca, 2008; Eagly and Johnson, 1990). This result is important since these factors are not effective in the creation of leadership styles. According to Kozak and Uca (2008) regarding the factors due to characteristics of mangers and leadership styles; it was observed that there is a meaningful relationship between leadership styles managers adopt and the management level, educational background, experience and variables of relationship with subordinates. Such a relationship has also been reflected in the work of Szilagyi and Wallance (1990) stating that past experience and educational level oblige managers to adopt a specific leadership style and a manager educated and with experience of a certain approach state that this style is the only behavioural attitude that can be implemented to subordinates in every situation. Al-Ababneh and Lockwood (2005) found that managers showed different leadership style based on their demographic profiles (age, gender, education), tenure and organisational position. This study showed that males, older managers, degree holders, experienced managers, and middle managers had a higher preference toward democratic leadership styles than other styles.

Since no relationship was found between gender variables and leadership styles by Kozak and Uca (2008). However, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that female and male leaders did not differ in interpersonally oriented style and task oriented style. In two other types of studies, labrotory and assessment studies, men were found to be more task oriented and women more interpersonally oriented. Also, women tended to adopt a more democratic or participative style and a less autocratic style than men in all three types of studies (Eagly and Johnson, 1990).

According to findings laissez-faire leadership style were found to share a statistically significant with nationality of accommodation establishment managers. Bass (1990) conceptualised that this kind of style occur when there is an absence or avoidance of leadership. Laissez-faire leaders abdicate their responsibility and avoid making decisions (Bass, 1990). Subordinates working under this kind of supervisor basically are left to their own devices to execute their job responsibilities.

Managers who from TRNC’s mean score (mean=3,8446) was higher than Turkey managers’ mean score (mean=3,5808). It means that TRNC managers used mere laissez-faire leadership style than Turkey managers.

According to the literature laissez-faire leadership is not a commonly observed style in the hospitality industry. This indicates that managers prefer to allow their employees to take a greater amount of responsibility and prefer to empower them. The term empowerment is transferring power and responsibility to employees so that, so within specified limits, they will be able to provide the best possible customer service at their own direction. Reason of this might be that hotel industry is very much related with people oriented and industry of intangible products. It is a service industry where the work environment, employees behaviour must be in a continuously change and innovation especially faced with unpredictable situation. This mostly because the needs, the expectations of clients. For instance, a difficult guest, an unexpected problem with a room, etc. is expected to solve the problem as soon as possible. Therefore, employee must decide and solve problem without conferring upon the manager. Moreover, Theory Y managers believe that the average human being under proper conditions learns only not to accept but to seek responsibility. Such leaders will endeavour to enhance their employees’ capacity to exercise a high level of imagination, and creativity in the solution of organisational problems (Bolden, 2004).

One limitation in this study was the period of research carried out as high season period of tourism in North Cyprus, with high stress levels for managers. In that time the most of the hotels were fully occupied and the managers were very busy. Therefore, if we have been conducted study on the low season period such as February, we would have more survey to turn back.

Another limitation was that the sample of the managers was examined in a spectrum of four leadership styles. If the spectrum of leadership styles was drawn from a wider range, it is possible that the results would be different. Furthermore, it can also be of interest to study managerial styles from the perspective of co-workers (subordinates, peers), as they are in a unique position to provide valuable behavioural assessments for two reasons. On one side, colleagues are often influenced by the consequences of the focal person’s action. On the other hand, they can observe this behaviour over time and in a variety of situations.

In this climate of change, leadership is viewed by many as the key to organisational success. Today’s leaders need to become more adaptable, making sense of uncertainty and managing change. Leaders of the future need to be able to adapt their style to the situation and context, ensuring the results needed are achieved. The qualities of self - awareness, empathy, and trust are coming to the fore. In addition to coping with environmental challenges, the personalities and behaviours of leaders will determine their degree of achievement. As expectations rise, leaders in the future will increasingly have to win the right to lead others.

Nowadays most of the employees are well educated, exposed to the new era of modernization, and not to mention with the digital age, the knowledge and expectation of the employees were vast. In order, not to frustrate the employees further, a manager should have charismatic qualities in leading the subordinates or employees. By having a charismatic leaders or managers the employees will feel that they are special, accepted or established in the organization, empowered, able to respect the leader as being extraordinary, and tangible in the workplace. In short, having these qualities will indirectly motivate the employees to spend more hours working and keep up contributing to the organization improvement and achievement.

Findings suggest that managers should be adopt a laissez-faire leadership style in order to manage effectively according to their nationality. Therefore, the results of the study can assist hotel managers in developing their managing style with attention to a differences in national culture. Hotels can help their leaders manage culturally different groups more effectively by providing training on the differential effects of various leadership styles. On the other hand, one may consider selecting managers based on how strongly their leadership styles predominantly held among the hotel employees.

In the future studies, first of all other variables such as national culture of managers/employees, possible impacts or effects of nepotism on multiple organisational dimensions, employee empowerment or involvement, and impacts of transformational/charismatic leadership on organisational and leadership effectiveness may be used in order to examine the probable relationships. Secondly, future research with larger sample size elsewhere would be productive to provide a support for the generalization of the present findings.

This study is necessary and useful for that reason: the study provides some managerial implications the owners, managers, employees in the North Cyprus where the tourism and hospitality constitutes on essential part of the economy.
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**APPENDIX 1**

**RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE**

Sayın Yönetici,

Bu anket, **‘KKTC sınırlarında faaliyet gösteren 4 ve 5 yıldızlı konaklama işletmeleri yöneticilerinin liderlik stillerinin belirlenmesi ve bu özellikleri etkileyen faktörlerin ortaya konulmasını’** belirlemeye yönelik bir yüksek lisans tez çalışması için bilgi toplama aracı olarak hazırlanmıştır.

İki bölümden oluşan anketin birinci bölümünde; otel yöneticilerinin demografik özelliklerinin belirlenmesine yönelik 5 çoktan seçmeli soru bulunmaktadır.

İkinci bölümde ise, liderlik özelliklerinin belirlenmesine etki eden faktör özelliklerini saptamak amacıyla hazırlanmış 28 soru bulunmaktadır.

Sizlerin vereceği cevaplar, yalnızca akademik amaçlar için kullanılacağından isim belirtmenize gerek yoktur.

Doğru ve içten cevaplarınız, bu çalışmanın geçerliliğini sağlamanın yanı sıra, elde edilecek sonuçlar gerek otel yöneticileri gerekse araştırmacılar için bir veri kaynağı oluşturacaktır. Gösterdiğiniz ilgiden dolayı şimdiden teşekkür eder, saygılarımızı sunarız.

Özlem YAMAK Doç. Dr. Şerife Zihni EYÜPOĞLU

Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi

Turizm ve Otel İşletmeciliği Dekan Yardımcısı ve İşletme Bölüm Başkanı

Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Bölüm Başkanı

Tel: 0533 844 99 48 Tel: 0392 223 6464 (278)

E-mail: [cyprus392@windowslive.com](mailto:cyprus392@windowslive.com) E-mail: [serifeeyupoglu@neu.edu.tr](mailto:serifeeyupoglu@neu.edu.tr)

1. **BÖLÜM: Demografik Özellikleri Belirlemeye Yönelik Sorular**

1. Cinsiyetiniz:

1. Kadın
2. Erkek
3. Uyruğunuz:
4. KKTC
5. TC
6. Diğer…….
7. İşletmede çalışmakta olduğunuz yönetim düzeyi aşağıdakilerden hangisidir?
8. Üst düzey yönetim
9. Orta düzey yönetim
10. Alt düzey yönetim
11. Diğer (belirtiniz)……
12. İş deneyiminiz aşağıdaki aralıklardan hangisine girmektedir?
13. 1 yıldan az
14. 1-5 yıl
15. 6-10 yıl
16. 11-15 yıl
17. 16 yıl ve üstü
18. Eğitim durumunuz aşağıdaki seçeneklerden hangisine uymaktadır?
19. İlköğretim
20. Lise
21. Üniversite
22. Master/Doktora
23. Diğer (belirtiniz)…..

**2. BÖLÜM: Liderlik Stillerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Sorular**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Yönerge**: Sayın Yönetici, seçeneklerden en uygun olanına (X) işareti koyarak cevabınızı belirtiniz. | **Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum** | **Katılmıyorum** | **Fikrim Yok** | **Katılıyorum** | **Kesinlikle Katılıyorum** |
| 1. İşle ilgili kararlarda daha önce yapılmış uygulamaları dikkate alırım. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astlarımın gelişimini sağlamak benim için en önemli sorumluluktur. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astları yönlendirme konusunda en iyi olduğum alan düzen ve organizasyondur. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. İyi iş arkadaşlarından oluşan bir grupla çalışmak beni tatmin eder. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astlarla ve diğer çalışanlarla yakın iletişim kurarak kendimi en iyi şekilde geliştirebileceğime inanırım. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. İyi organize olmaları durumunda astlarımın tatmin olacaklarını düşünüyorum. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Sorumluluğumda çalışan astları kararlarında özgür bırakırım. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Faaliyetlerimden ve bu faaliyetlerin sonuçlarından en çok astlarıma karşı sorumlu olduğumu düşünüyorum. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Kişisel deneyimlerimden öğrenerek kendimi en iyi şekilde geliştirmeye çalışırım. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Sorumluluğumda çalışan astlar beni güvenilir bulurlar. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. İşle ilgili kararlarımda kendi yargılarım ön plandadır. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Bireysel düşünerek astlarımı en iyi şekilde yönlendirebilirim. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astlarımla ortak bir vizyonu paylaşmak benim için önemlidir. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astlarımın yaptıkları işte özgür olmalarını sağlarım. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. İş dışındaki davranışlarım ve yaptıklarım astlarımı ilgilendirir. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum | Katılmıyorum | Fikrim Yok | Katılıyorum | Kesinlikle Katılıyorum |
| 1. Kendilerine örnek bir yöneticiyle çalışan astların yaptıkları işten tatmin olacaklarını düşünüyorum. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. İşletme kural ve politikalarına bağlı kalarak kendimi en iyi şekilde geliştirebileceğime inanıyorum. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astlarım görevleriyle ilgili davranışlarında beni kendilerine örnek alırlar. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. İşle ilgili karar alırken astların fikir ve düşüncelerini mutlaka dikkate alırım. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Yaptığım işin sonucunu öngörebilirsem işimde daha başarılı olabilirim. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Yaptığım işle ilgili sadece üst düzey yönetime karşı sorumluyumdur. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. İşle ilgili konularda kararı tamamen astlara bırakırım. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astları yönlendirmede takım çalışmasının önemli olduğunu düşünüyorum. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Bireysel gelişimimde tercih ettiğim yol, paylaşılabilir bir vizyon geliştirmektir. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Sorumluluğumda çalışan astlarıma göre ben, iyi bir takım oyuncusuyumdur. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Yaptıklarımdan dolayı sadece kendi inanç ve değerlerime karşı sorumlu olduğumu düşünüyorum. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Faaliyetlerimde özgür olmak beni geliştirir. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Astlarımın dostça bir iş ortamında motive olacaklarını düşünüyorum. |  |  |  |  |  |
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