IDENTIFICATION AND COMPARISON OF MANAGEMENT SKILLS REQUIRED FOR SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT IN INDEPENDENTLY OPERATED COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICES

BY

WILLIAM EMMETT RYAN III

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1981

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1984

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1992

IDENTIFICATION AND COMPARISON OF MANAGEMENT SKILLS REQUIRED FOR SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT IN INDEPENDENTLY OPERATED COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICES

Thesis Approved:

Robert E. Nolan
Thesis Advisor

Melvin D. Miller

Ray L. Sanders

Blake B. Rowney

Thomas C. Collins
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The help and guidance offered by my committee during the conceptualization and development of this project was invaluable. To my committee I wish to express my gratitude and appreciation for their assistance. A special thanks is extended to Dr. Melvin Miller, my committee chairman, for his time and guidance throughout my degree program as well as this project. The questions he did not answer provided more insight for me than I realized. To Dr. Robert Nolan, I offer many thanks for your encouragement, insight, and willingness to explore a multitude of different options during the development of this project. The support you gave while guiding me through this process was deeply appreciated. To Dr. Ray Sanders, sincere gratitude is extended for his insight and support. He always asked me to think one step beyond where I was and then look back. To Dr. Baker Bokorney, a very special thanks is extended for his expert advice and counsel. Dr. "B" has been a colleague, friend, and mentor for many years.

To the NACUFS National Board of Directors, sincere appreciation is extended for the national support and funding for this project. The assistance and support which was offered by many of my NACUFS colleagues throughout the country was appreciated. I was never turned down when I asked for advice. Sincere gratitude is extended to my colleagues at Oklahoma State University. Their patience and support throughout this project and my degree program provided me the encouragement to continue.

Special thanks to my parents, Bill and Pat Ryan, for the support

and love they have shown through the years. The values they taught me have provided an excellent background upon which to build my life.

Finally, words cannot express the sincere gratitude, love and appreciation I feel toward my wife, Rita. Her love and support throughout this project and my degree program have kept me going. The value of her patience, understanding, support, and guidance is too great to be measured. To my children, Jennifer, Sarah, Will, and Daniel, thank you for trying to understand why daddy was studying so much. Now it is time do the things that you want to do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Success in the service industries belongs to employees and managers who share the excitement of working with people and who insure that the smallest details of service are performed well, often with no indication of success other than a customer's smile. The delivery of good service results in satisfaction for the manager and the employee (Heskett, 1986). In order to provide this service a group of people cooperate with each other and help the other reach goals. The manager is the leader of the team and has enormous impact on success or failure (Sweeney, 1978).

The manager is that person in charge of an organization or one of its sub-units who is vested with formal authority over that unit or group of units. From this authority comes status which leads to revised interpersonal relations and access to information, thus in turn enabling the manager to make decisions and mold strategies (Mintzberg, 1989). This process leads to managerial roles which are integrated and should be left intact in order to form the complete person. Mintzberg (1989) identified the three managerial roles as interpersonal, informational, and decisional. Interpersonal roles include being a figurehead, a leader and a liaison. Informational roles involve monitoring the environment, being a disseminator, and acting as a spokesman.

Decisional roles rely on entrepreneurship, being a disturbance handler, a resource allocator, and acting as a negotiator.

People are one of the most under utilized resources in business, and human resources are often over looked or ignored (Sweeney, 1978). One of the primary reasons for the manager to be in place is to support the individuals working with him, and to promote the team concept.

> The polished manager therefore does not complain that people are not following the rules or are changing their minds while the program is underway. He does not expect that Nature is going to hold the Universe constant, while he goes about making up his plans and pursuing his projections...Even through a person can give a logical explanation, he will never be a genius at action until he acquires an unerring intuitive sensitivity about things. Only then will he be able to reach into a mass of conflicting data and opinions and pull out the right thing to do and do it at the right time (Siu, 1980, p. 3 & 7).

Management, or getting things done through others, is a complex, integrated, interactive task. Managerial techniques which work at one level of an organization may not be the same at other levels. The seasoned manager is circumspect regarding the application of uniform managerial procedures across all parts of the same institution (Siu, 1980).

Management in the food service segment of the hospitality industry utilizes the same principles as the balance of the business world. Planning, organization, coordinating, and controlling are necessary for the continued successful operation of food service facilities, but efforts in these areas may not be observable in day to day operations. Major managerial activities may be grouped in clusters rather than continuous functions and the manager's daily activities implement the plans, goals, and organizational efforts determined at a prior time (Ferguson & Berger, 1984).

These activities may be part of a food service manager's job, but it is often difficult to determine what they actually do. Information designed to help managers on a daily basis should be developed in order to help them perform their daily work more effectively, develop training methodology, and to further define what they do (Ferguson & Berger, 1984). The supervisors of these managers carry the traits of their unit management experience with them as they progress through the organization. Research needs to clearly identify what management skills are required in single and multi-unit management positions in order to improve training programs to benefit educators and hospitality industry (Umbreit & Smith, 1990).

The first level of multi-unit management is one of the hardest jobs in the hospitality industry to define. Individuals most often promoted into this position usually have had the highest unit volume and largest profit in their respective unit (Managing the Managers, 1983). This criteria for promotion may or may not identify a good multi-unit manager, but is essential to maintain credibility. "Gaining acceptance and winning the respect of former peers is difficult for any newly-promoted person, whether he works in a factory or in an executive suite" (Managing the Mangers, 1983, p. 164).

The majority (82%) of individuals in the fast service industry who are promoted into multi-unit management positions come from within the organization itself (Umbreit, 1989). Turnover in multi-unit management positions averages 10% to 15% per year with 44% of that amount attributed to a lack of human resource management skills and 25% related to job stress. Umbreit also indicated that 35% of the fast service industry executives he surveyed reported difficulty in finding competent

individuals to fill multi-unit management positions.

The transition from single to multi-unit management has often been difficult, calling for new skills and a revised management style. Single unit management emphasizes technical skills such as structure, doing, expertise, and influencing. Conversely, multi-unit management emphasizes business skills such as human relations, motivation, support, communication, and training and development (Umbreit & Smith, 1990). Successful multi-unit managers indicated they placed a high priority on the development of their managers, recruiting, training and other human resource management skills. Multi-unit managers found that the management techniques they used with hourly employees do not work as well with the managers they now supervise (Umbreit, 1989). Role confusion in the multi-unit management position often resulted from failure to define job expectations, unstructured job responsibilities, conflicting management styles, lack of training, and little feedback (Frazier, 1981). The different management skills required in single and multi-unit management often cause problems for individuals making the transition between these positions.

Statement of the Problem

The problem this study addressed was: multi-unit managers are inadequately prepared for successfully meeting the requirements of the multi-unit management position.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to identify and compare the management skills required in single unit management and the management

skills required in multi-unit management in college and university food services. The specific research questions for the study were:

1. What are the skills required to be a single unit manager in the college and university food service industry?

2. What are the skills required to be a multi-unit manager in the college and university food service industry?

3. How do the single unit management skills compare to those skills required for multi-unit management in the college and university food service industry?

Assumptions

The following assumptions were accepted in order to conduct the study:

1. The responses to the questions were the honest and accurate reflection of current situations in college and university food services rather than ideologies perceived by the respondents.

2. The National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS) voting delegates presented a true representation of the population.

Limitations

The following conditions describe the limitations imposed on this study:

1. Implications of this study may not be applicable to college and university food service operations which are not members of the National Association of College and University Food Services, or those operations run by an outside contractor. Membership in NACUFS is voluntary.

Identification of colleges and universities operating their own food services who are not members of NACUFS would have been a difficult task and was beyond the scope of this study.

2. Participants in the study were those individuals listed by The National Association of College and University Food Services as the voting delegate. These individuals may not always be a director of food services, but do have similar responsibilities.

Definition of Terms

The following terms and definitions were used for this study:

NACUFS: The National Association of College and University Food Services. This is a volunteer professional organization for colleges and universities who operate their own food service departments. These departments may also be described as dining services and residential life operations.

Food Service Director: The administrator who is primarily responsible for the operation of the college or university's food service department. Other related titles would include, department head, dining services director, director, or administrator (Bennett, 1989).

Contractor: An outside company, publicly or privately held, that contracts its services, usually management, to other entities, usually colleges and universities (Bennett, 1989).

Food Services: "The industry whose business it is to provide food in a ready to eat state in a service environment" (Bennett, 1989, p. 20).

Customer: The primary recipient of college and university food

services, including students, faculty, and staff (Bennett, 1989).

Food Service Facility: A stand alone facility which operates as one entity. This facility may have one or more serving areas, themes, or supervisory levels.

Single Unit Manager: The individual with overall responsibility for the operation of one food service facility.

Multi-Unit Manager: The individual with responsibility for the direct supervision of more than one single unit manager. This position is also identified as a manager of managers.

Population and Methodology

The population of interest for this study was the institutional members of The National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS). Schools are members of NACUFS with individual participation under the school's membership. Food Service directors are those individuals normally identified as the voting delegate by NACUFS and who are primarily responsible for single and multi-unit food service managers.

A census of the population was conducted utilizing survey instrumentation which was developed from previous research in the fast service segment of the hospitality industry. The instrument utilized in this study was juried by a panel of experts and pilot tested prior to the collection of data. The appropriate statistical analyses were performed to most accurately describe the data.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I introduced the study, presented the problem, purpose and

research questions, assumptions, limitations, definitions of terms, population and methodology, and organization of the study. Chapter II includes a review of the literature related to single and multi-unit food service management. Chapter III identifies the methodology used in this study. The Chapter IV describes the findings of this study. Chapter V contains a summary, conclusions, implications and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The hospitality industry is wide in scope. Many programs, concepts and themes constitute this industry. The review of literature was divided into thirteen major areas in order to provide background material for this study. The areas selected to provide insight for this study were: the managerial nature, leadership, human resources, job design and labor trends, food services, colleges and universities, industry projections, food service management, single unit management, multi-unit management, related research, job analysis, and a summary.

Based on the complex nature of management in the food service industry these concepts should be considered together. Separation of the issues removes the ability to consider each as a building block for the total concept.

The Managerial Nature

What is the manager's job composed of? Mintzberg (1989, p. 10, 11, 12 & 14) identifies folklore and fact regarding the management position:

1. Folklore: The manager is a reflective, systematic planner. The evidence on the issue is overwhelming, but not a shred of it supports this statement.
   Fact: Study after study has shown that managers work at an unrelenting pace, that their activities are

characterized by brevity, variety, and discontinuity, and that they are strongly oriented to action and dislike reflective activities.

2. Folklore: The effective manager has no regular duties to perform.
   Fact: In addition to handling exceptions, managerial work involves performing a number of regular duties, including ritual and ceremony, negotiations, and processing of soft information that links the organization with its environment.
3. Folklore: The senior manager needs aggregated information, which a formal management information system best provides.
   Fact: Managers strongly favor the oral media--namely, telephone calls and meetings. The evidence comes from every single study of managerial work.
4. Folklore: Management is, or at least is quickly becoming, a science and a profession.
   Fact: The manager's programs--to schedule time, process information, make decisions, and so on--remain locked deep inside their brains.

The motivation to manage may come from a variety of sources. Miner (1974, p. 6 & 7) indicated most of the sources of motivation are internal and include:

1. Favorable attitude toward those in positions of authority, such as superiors.
2. Desire to engage in competition, especially with peers.
3. Desire to assert oneself and take charge.
4. Desire to exercise power and authority over others, particularly subordinates.
5. Desire to behave in a distinctive and different way, which involves standing out from the crowd.
6. Sense of responsibility in carrying out the numerous routine duties associated with managerial work.

The managerial job is different in many applications. With this difference there is still a core concept or definition which can be applied to all situations.

> The manager, then, plans, organizes, motivates, directs, and controls. These are the broad aspects of the work. He adds foresight, order, purpose, integration of effort, and effectiveness to the contributions of others. That is the best use of the word "manage." That is the work of the manager (Strong, 1965, p. 5).

The manager is a folkhero in American society, so we look to him for

leadership and at the same time are concerned about his ability to lead us (Mintzberg, 1980).

One of the reasons for this admiration/questioning relationship may be that the basic tenants of the management nature are the same, but a difference is found in how the management function is performed. Mintzberg (1980) indicated that management jobs are basically similar. Differences that do exist can usually be described in common roles or characteristics. Much of the managers' work is challenging and non-programmed, the manager is a specialist and a generalist, and the managers' power is derived from access to information. In addition, specificity is the managers prime occupational hazard, managerial work is not based in science, and work is complex which often results in the development of a performance loop of fragmented activities.

Managers have many resources to work with including their environment, personnel skills, education, general knowledge, and the employees they supervise. Peters and Waterman (1982) indicated that treating people as the natural resource may be the key to it all. Schools of management and education tend to train managers in a rational approach which looks for the facts and makes detailed, justifiable decisions. This type of education does not promote the love of customer and staff, which if cultivated, allows personal satisfaction and company loyalty to grow.

Based on the critical nature of the relationship of employees to organization, a conceptual shift from personnel activities to human relations is occurring in the work place. This change from the paperwork to the people approach is allowing organizations to enhance productivity without increasing costs. "A critical determinant in the

operating efficiency of any organization is the extent to which efficient use is made of its human resources" (Osgood, 1981, p. 189).

Managers have learned to be more sensitive toward the people they manage, thus increasing the sensitivity and productivity of those under them (Strauch, 1984). The holistic approach to training, communication, and other management functions looks at the entire activity instead of isolated pieces. Clear and honest direction allows the employee to approach the task creatively, rather than being at the mercy of the taskgiver, usually resulting in improved performance. A lack of clear direction may let the employee feel out of control, apathetic or dissatisfied with the system resulting in lowered productivity and morale (Weitzel, 1987).

If different skills or outcomes are needed for the implementation of different strategies; matching a manager's skills to tasks will yield higher performance. Disadvantages to this can be found in a lack of strategic flexibility, poor management development, motivational problems, and a lack of managerial discretion (Gupta, 1986). The management structure of the organization should be able to accommodate the positive and negative aspects of management maturation in order to develop and be successful.

Managers should be problem givers. People do what you expect them to, and a staff that can not answer questions, face challenges and solve problems will not be productive (Brown, 1986). Delegation is one of the most effective methods to build confidence and productivity in employees in addition to optimizing the use of the manager's time (Starr, 1984).

Delegation completes the assigned work effectively, improves the mangers overall level of effectiveness, and promotes the development of

subordinates through job inducement (Rees, 1988). "Delegating means letting others become the experts and hence the best" (Firnstahl, 1986, p. 14). There is a downside to delegation. Managers tend to over use competent employees resulting in increased resentment from the employee, and a lack of other trained resources (Vinton, 1987). In addition, when organizations delegate little authority to subordinates there tends to be a trend to centralized authority which limits the size and scope of what can be accomplished and effectively managed (Emery, 1980).

The manager is continually challenged to be more effective. This effectiveness is significantly influenced by their insight into their own work. Managers are challenged to find systematic ways to share information, deal with superficiality, to step back and monitor the big picture, and to gain control of their own life by turning obligations into advantages (Mintzberg, 1989).

Leadership

Leadership is a complex task involving self understanding and a sensitivity of those who are led. The intent of leadership is to develop a atmosphere where others can maximize their contributions, gain a sense of accomplishment, and receive the appropriate recognition for improved performance (Osborne, 1984). The leader is in a self development process, as well as developing others. One school of contemporary thought holds that no one can motivate another, but that each individual must be motivated from within. The reality is that individuals will give extra effort for a cause, personal advancement, or a leader (Davidson, 1986).

The problem to be solved is finding individual achievers who can

transcend their field to become managerial leaders (Walker, 1986). Identifying those individuals is easier within an organization than from the outside. Cohen and Neilson (1988) conclude that top management, and maybe all managers, benefit from informal rather than formal procedures to identify top performers. Organizations which do not place a high priority on developing organizational leadership may be more successful based on the fact that without the prioritization of organizational leadership, individual development becomes embedded into the manager's every day routine.

Walker (1980) identified managerial leaders to be innovative, lead in niche markets, build on their strengths and compete on value not price. They focus organizational efforts on developing and motivating others, pay attention to fundamentals, think of the customers constantly, maintain a strong sense of value, are willing to experiment, and are risk takers. Kouzes and Posner (1991) identified the leadership traits which people admire as honesty, competency, forward vision, and an inspirational quotient. Putting these four factors together offers insight into the foundation of leadership from the constituent's perspective and dramatically improves the leaders credibility. They also indicate that actions speak louder than words, and that a leader should know their constituents, stand up for their beliefs, speak with passion, lead by example, and avoid conquering himself. The one concept that stands out is that successful leaders place a high priority on the development of others.

Cichy, Sciarini, Cook & Patton (1991) indicated vision, continual learning, and perseverance to be the key components of managerial leadership.

> A hospitality professional must remain knowledgeable of industry changes and have an understanding of the business. The leader must also be a people person with management skills that will motivate people to want to succeed. The future leader must have vision, the ability to draw up a plan of action to set the direction, and the ability not only to communicate, but to listen. The leader should be adaptable and willing to compromise and change (Cichy, Sciarini, Cook & Patton, 1991, p. 9).

Hospitality organizations should attempt to develop programs which allow for the development and molding of their behaviors while providing the mentoring to enforce them.

The management styles used to implement leadership can be different based on the circumstances at the time. Bradford and Cohen (1984) identified three scenarios for managerial leadership activities. The heroic response is based in the manager providing all the answers and as problems occur he is the one who will respond and coordinate. The managers-as-technician has usually been promoted from within, has all the answers and derives pleasure from solving problems. The manager-as-conductor emphasizes getting different individuals or areas to work together, is oriented toward goal setting, and tries to prevent conflicts. The concept of situational leadership fits well in the modern workplace, yet most managers do not see the importance of the relationship between these behaviors and their impact on the environment (Harris, 1987).

Synergy is what makes it possible for the members of a group to produce work better than an individual working alone could produce. "The key to group synergy and precision execution lies in the manager's ability to lead a group to produce decisions which have both quality and acceptance" (Morrison, 1988, p. 90).

Human Resources

> One of corporate America's most self-destructive habits is neglecting its human resources. The vast majority of companies focus their planning efforts on inanimate resources--raw materials, capital and energy--paying little, if any, strategic attention to the people who actually make the business run. (Planning Ahead, 1984, p. 25).

Changes in the work force have forced organizations to look at themselves to determine how they will handle future employees. In the coming years the basic issue facing human resources management is whether to respond to the coming workforce changes by viewing employees as expendable resources, or valuable assets (Redwood, 1990). In order to work together, institutions will need to allow management to work with labor in order to overcome their traditional adversarial relationship. This will necessitate the assumption of new ways of thinking for both (Waagen, 1982).

Some workplace changes have occurred as rapidly as work force changes. "Rising levels of uncertainty and change in today's business management have increased the difficulty and importance of managing human resource effectively" (Hooper, 1987, p. 49). Institutional efforts to change in order to improve employee performance are essential. The more opportunities for employee feedback and information sharing among all levels of management the better (McEvoy, Buller & Roghaar, 1988). It is estimated that spans of control will continue to widen in the future. The demands on managers to cover their tasks, be familiar with the operations, and communicate may be such that some of the work can not get done at all (McClenahen, 1989). Increased spans of control necessitates improved team building, and increased synergy.

Job Design and Labor Trends

The structure of the manager's job should be considered when looking at the institutional as well as the global picture. Jobs are normally compared against arbitrary standards which are difficult to qualify and translate into meaningful criteria in today's organizations. Often these jobs fail to reflect the elements which are of strategic importance to the organization (Emig, 1986).

In addition to the job design, individual work performance needs to be distinguished from the specific factors determining job behavior. What people want from work may not match what motivates them to work (Cooper, 1974). This has been shown in the Japanese style of management where the managers roll up their sleeves, leave their offices, and work with the employees. Japanese managers work closely with the employees to solve problems, improve quality and productivity, and listen to the ideas and comments the employees offer (O'Toole, 1981).

Management in the United States has been considered an elite part of the work force, often separate from the rest of the organization. Organizations are revising that concept and integrating the management function closer to the employees. Managers can be considered employees because they often assume the role of employees, take orders in addition to giving them, are compensated, and can be reprimanded or fired (Roomkin, 1989). He also indicated that policies and practices regarding middle management are in a state of significant change which is following economic and social trends. The relationship of the management position to the organization, society, and the economy is evolving rapidly. Technology has upgraded the work required in most

jobs, the service sector has been the fastest growing segment of the workplace, and the way in which work is organized all will require new job skills from the workforce (Bernstein, 1988).

A growing number of adults, including managers, educated and trained to work in one economic and social structure, are either unemployable or being left to founder as the workplace changes (Wright, 1983). These changes will continue to have an impact on the work force for years to come. "The greying of America" trend is expected to peak over the next decade, and by 2030, one in three adults will be 55 years of age or older" (Ananth & DeMillo, 1991, p. 25). The number of 16-24 year old employees will continue to decline over the next 20 years. Food service employers will need to change their procedures in order to satisfy their labor and management needs. The shortage of youth also means a shortage of individuals in the educational process of management development. Management retention will become more difficult based on a reduction in the layers of management as companies react to economic changes. Managers who are ready to move up become trapped when the positions they would have held no longer exist (Changing Workforce, (1989).

Food Services

To answer the question, What is Food Service?, one only has to look at the words; providing food, with service, to a customer. The style, location, manner, or environment may be different within industry segments as well as between them; however, similarities exist in every aspect of institutional and commercial food service programs and what ever lines existed between the two are fading fast (Watkins, 1987).

Quality standards for food are important and can lead to the success or failure of an operation, but the pursuit of quality should not stop with the food. All elements of quality such as establishing standards, service tracking measurements, and initiating corrective action should be integrated into the institutions planning and control systems (Shetty, 1987). The service issue has rapidly moved to the forefront of consideration. Customers of today value courtesy rather than speed, are tired of being abused, and want value for their time and money (Bernstein, 1990).

The Marriott corporation has identified that more than eight million customers contacts occur with their employees each day. In order to meet the quality and service demands for that many contacts they have indicated that an organization should have systems for teaching employees how to operate the system and deliver the product, include employees in growth opportunities, let the managers set the work climate, and encourage communication (Marriott, 1983). In the 1990's service will separate the successful food service operators from the unsuccessful ones. Service standards are customer driven, and should be provided as a tangible consistent product (Hale, 1990).

Peters and Waterman (1982) identify service to be an obsession for organizations who cherish the relationship between company and customer. Maintaining customer loyalty has been important in an organization but has become especially critical in service industries where many organizations are providing the same products.

Colleges and Universities

Higher education has been considered an ideal workplace for many

years, but pressures from external as well as internal sources are increasing tension, forcing restructuring and retrenchment, and affecting the quality and productivity of the institution (Austin, 1983). These changes are not all negative or positive.

> Many feel that higher education, as an American institution, is in a state of transition. Reasonably, all the component parts of the system are undergoing a change. Moreover, as institutions develop and change, most interact with their environments. Higher education is a dynamic entity. It is evident that the environment in which colleges and universities operate is vastly different from that in which it evolved (Bennett, 1989, p. 7).

Colleges and universities have become complex organizations which are strong and flexible when inniatives originate from inside, but largely immovable when criticized from the outside (Greenleaf, 1977).

According to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1987), colonial colleges were primarily concerned with the intellectual, religious and moral development of students. Following the civil war the purpose of higher education broadened to include education to enlighten citizenship, vocational training, and increased student service activities. Institutional diversity has been one of the major assets of higher education. The traditional purposes of higher education; the creation, preservation, and transmission of knowledge; the management of student development; and service to society have continued despite institutional diversity.

Over 3000 colleges served approximately 13 million students in the United States. More than half of all high school graduates enrolled in higher education, but less than half of the traditional aged students 18-24 years old are enrolled full time on a residential campus (National Association of Student Personnel Administrations, 1987). Junior and

community colleges have experienced rapid growth as a result of this trend.

University structure is often described as a system of informal communication among professional scholars in which expertise, rather than position was the source of power. The majority of the power for professional staff is found in their role as information brokers (Austin, 1983). Middle management, those individuals to whom first line managers and supervisors report, has often been caught up in the system and is the focus point of problems from above and below. Austin (1983) characterizes the work environment of the university middle manager as full of role complexity and tensions, having a limited opportunity structure, seen as a position of low status or esteem on campus, and received poor compensation. She identified the decision making opportunities available to middle managers as having low power to develop policy, but high authority to implement it. Middle managers often regarded as experts by those off campus, but are overlooked by others on campus.

A segment of higher education which has received the direct impact of the changes in the higher education system is food services. Colleges have not thought they needed to listen to what their customers, the students, want. Successful institutions have been those who were responsive to the needs of their clientele (Collison, 1989). College and university food services have been caught in the middle of rising expectations and falling resources while trying to meet the demands of a rapidly changing environment (Hayes, 1991).

> Dining service departments are directed by higher standards. The areas of service (the dining atmosphere, the management's responsiveness to the clientele, the employee's

> courtesy, the speed of service, the customer flow, the availability of food and beverages, and the overall dining experience and presentation) that affect the customer and attempt to meet their needs may well be the most important concepts for dining service departments to address in order to remain a viable part of higher education. (Bennett, 1989, p. 2).

Higher education like other institutions such as banks and hospitals has needed to continue to evaluate it's mission. The institutional changes needed to accommodate an evolving society should be happening at a quicker pace. Higher education administration will need to become more aware of what they are doing and why if they wish to continue to be effective managers and educators (Hodgkinson, 1981).

Industry Projections

The hospitality industry is comprised of many diverse fields. All revolve around the concept of service and meeting the needs of the customers. Restaurants and Institutions (1991) reported the definition of food service to be changing from food eaten in a food service establishment to any food prepared away from home. Food service sales were projected to be $256 billion in 1991, up 1.5 percent from 1991.

The college and university segment of the industry was projected to account for sales of $7.651 billion, or approximately three percent of the total projected food service sales (Restaurants and Institutions, 1991). Among the top 100 self operated college and university food service operations the average expenditures in 1990 for food was $4.8 million which served over 3.4 million meals according to Food Service Director (1991).

A majority (63.3%) of independent college food service operations plan to incorporate more diversified self service programs compared to

51.5 percent by college contractors (Food Service Director, 1991). Colleges and universities have succeeded in the past with traditional meal plans, but have found the diverse backgrounds of the students on campus are bringing demands for different concepts such as take out, catering, cash operations, and declining balance systems (Restaurants and Institutions, 1991).

According to the Outlook '91-'92 report, published in Food Service Director (1991), 20.2 percent of colleges and universities have expected food costs to rise by more than 10 percent, 44.7 percent believe that labor shortages will intensify, 91.4 percent indicated capitol funds to be tighter, 98.2 percent have foreseen a rise in labor costs, and 37.5 percent felt a decrease in customer counts will occur. While the total enrollment in higher education has increased, enrollment in traditional institutions has declined while enrollment in Junior Colleges has increased (Food Service Director, 1991).

In college and university food services there are two choices regarding the management and operation of food services, operate it independently, or contract the services out. Carlino (1990) reported approximately 43 percent of the annual sales in college and university food services have been generated by contract companies while 57 percent were generated by self operated institutions. The major objective of contract companies is profit which is then taken from the institution, and most likely the state. Conversely the major objective of self operation is service, and as a side benefit, any excess revenue stays at the institution (Dollar, 1991).

Stumph (1982, p. 7) identified the different characteristics of self operation and contracting as:

Self-operation provides:
- Opportunity for overall direction and shifts in emphasis.
- Opportunity to earn a substantial return.
- Opportunity to create additional units to your overall empire. This can be an advantage and add to institutional flexibility. It can also be a burden on institutional resources.
- Opportunity to demonstrate management ability.

A contractor provides:
- Professional management.
- A predictable return.
- Freedom from day to day problems and pitfalls.
- Cash flow rather than inventory investment.
- Escape from accounting, personnel and management burden.

Self operation allows the university food service the opportunity to give its' customers the personal touch. Many universities which independently operate their own food services belong to The National Association of College and University Food Services. NACUFS forms a coalition of members on common issues, provides assistance to members on a wide variety of topics through membership expertise, provides professional standards of operation, and is a volunteer association of networks according to On Campus Hospitality (1991), and Shuster, Boss, Schechter & Cohen (1991).

NACUFS is a professional organization which had 741 members in 1990-91 (NACUFS Annual Report, 1991). Institutional membership is the only membership segment where organizational voting rights are allowed. The institutional member, the school, is allowed one voting delegate. This person is usually the director of food service and would have final responsibility for single and multi-unit managers. NACUFS membership is described, with institutional membership segmented based on total annual food service revenue, in the NACUFS Annual Report (1991, p. 8) as follows:

MEMBERSHIP TYPE	%	NUMBER
Sustaining	21	(152)
Institutional (see below for breakdown into categories)	66	(486)
Student	3	(22)
Affiliate	2	(13)
Retired	3	(19)
Associate	3	(20)
Individual	4	(29)
		741

INSTITUTIONAL BY CATEGORY	%	NUMBER
Up to 1,000,000	31	(152)
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	30	(146)
$3,000,001 to $4,000,000	7	(34)
$4,000,001 to $5,000,000	8	(37)
$5,000,001 to $6,000,000	5	(25)
$6,000,001 to $7,000,000	3	(13)
Over $7,000,001	16	(79)
		486

Seventy two percent of voting delegates were men and twenty eight percent were women. Six percent of the institutional memberships were contract operators (Schuster, Boss, Schechter & Cohen, 1991).

Food Service Management

> Getting the job done is just the beginning of management. The larger obligations is to develop employees... What leadership is all about (is) stimulating growth in other people to get the best out of them...because we can't change people directly; it's not possible. The only person we can change is ourselves (Gullickson, 1987, p. 116).

The hospitality industry has been noted for rapid rise, and fall, in the management ranks. "Relatively young employees quickly assume a large degree of responsibility in the hospitality industry" (Pickworth, 1982, p. 31). The unit manager has been the corner stone upon which the food service industry was built. The manager usually has worked, 60-70 hours per week, not been given the skills or freedom to do their job and make decisions, and lacks the tools of leadership. Weinstein (1989) estimated that every time a unit manager resigned it cost the

organization $25,000 to recruit and retrain a replacement. In addition, he indicated that ineffective unit management can hurt the bottom line of a million dollar operation by $50,000 to $75,000 a year.

Fifty two percent of food service managers reported their jobs to be very stressful in a recent survey by Restaurant Business. It was estimated that turnover at the employee level is 300 percent, and 50 percent or more at the managerial level. Most managers left not because they wanted another job, but because they wanted out of the food service industry (Lang, 1991).

> Management personnel are plentiful, yet there is a general shortage of effective, professionally trained mangers in the area of foodservice, and in particular, institutional foodservice...Managing in these times is growing ever more complex, especially within higher educational institutions. The diversity of students' values and interests have a true ripple effect throughout the university community. Academic institutions are trying to meet the demands of a very wide array of students and their expectations. To meet these challenges and maintain financial responsibility may very well require new and more flexible management practices over the traditional ones (Bennett, 1989, p. 6 & 7).

The food service business is a people business and institutions should remember to treat the individuals who work for them with the same respect as the customers (Lang, 1991). There can not be a double standard in the work place. Upper level management gives lip service to increased productivity, and middle management expects little from their employees as reflected in their management styles. Some manage by way of a dictatorship, others manage by negotiation which undermines the supervisory position (Townshend, 1990). Successful managers understand that individuals are responsible for the outcome of their job. "Simply put, accepting responsibility is understanding the authority delegated and using it as intended" (Knippen & Green, 1990, p. 6).

Single Unit Management

> Historically food service has been viewed as culinary arts, a trade. It [sic] has been regarded by other professionals as a trade, rather than as management...In the past 30 years food service management has emerged from its early beginnings and become an accepted profession (Warner, 1991, p. 43).

The food service unit manager is in a unique position. He does not have a job with clear boundaries, defined authorities, or responsibilities, but is in the middle of a system of relationships which must be organized to accomplish his objectives (Hale & Nightingale, 1986). Despite these ambiguities, a core of skills were necessary for success at the single unit management level.

Hale and Nightingale (1986) and Warner (1991) identified these core skills as maintaining organizational standards; understanding, developing and implementing cost control systems and procedures; monitoring customers satisfaction; knowledge of menu planning; and purchasing. In addition, the unit manager should have the ability to communicate with a variety of different audiences, be able to implement training programs to develop the staff, take action to solve problems, and have a knowledge of safety and sanitation procedures. Warner (1991) utilized research conducted in the recreational segment of the hospitality industry to break these core skills down into knowledge and skill competencies for single unit management. While he associated them with the recreational segment of the hospitality industry, the skills transcend all areas of food service and provide a base of knowledge and skill to operate from. See Appendix A for the complete list of skills.

College and University administrators often have a problem with time management. As a campus administrator, the manager needs to

determine what tasks are essential to the job, and spend the appropriate amount of time on those priority issues (Born, 1979). A study conducted by Sultemeier, Gregories, Spears and Downey (1989) identified the managerial functions of college and university food service managers. At the director or assistant director level; maintaining standards of quality, holding informational meetings, communicating, taking charge in a crisis, influencing subordinates and reviewing operating reports were the important management functions. Unit managers reported that maintaining standards of quality, influencing subordinates, training, and correcting personnel problems were the key managerial functions at their level. Other managers within the unit who reported to the unit manager identified maintaining standards of quality and training as the important functions at their level. The key function at all levels was maintaining quality standards. Influencing subordinates and training was rated second, especially at the unit level.

Duke and Sneed (1989) indicated that job characteristics were found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction in college and university food service employees. This relationship was found in managerial as well as non-managerial employees. Dealing with others and feedback were the strongest predictors of satisfaction. Efforts to alter job satisfaction should begin with the employees perception of job characteristics according to the authors. Once these perceptions have been identified, training programs, job enhancement or other programs can be instituted to increase job satisfaction.

The manager of a single unit operation is likely to feel that communication between management levels is mostly downward, that the timing and criteria for promotion is biased, and that they do not get

the support they need to solve their problems (McFillen, Riegel & Enz, 1986). These issues, in addition to other problems which single unit managers face, often forced managers to try and protect themselves. One way to gain protection is to try and advance to a managerial level that allows them to delegate the bulk of ongoing problems to others (Krone, Tabacchi & Farber, 1989). This solution continues the cycle of poor communication and lack of support.

Utilizing this solution to the problems of single unit management is a double standard because most managers in an organization occupy the dual position of having subordinates who report to them and supervisors they report to. "Being both masters and servants of power, they should be able to understand the perspective of the two groups of people who play the most important roles in their professional lives" (Bartolome & Laurent, 1986, p. 70). The total time spent in single unit management is important when considering upward movement in management. The amount of time an individual has spent in a particular restaurant or organization is not as significant predictor of success in higher level management as is the amount of time that individual has been a manager (McEnrue, 1988).

Multi-Unit Management

Every manager at one time or another has had the desire to play superman. This was done to show subordinates how smart the manager is and how much work they can accomplish. Quickly answering employees questions, assuming their work, solving their problems all lead to upward delegation which results in the manager being over worked and appear weak in the eyes of subordinates (McConkey, 1987). Failing to

make the transition from doer to delegator has been a common mistake in multi-unit management. The developing multi-unit manager needs to stop being the star performer which got him the job, and begin to make winners out of others (McGarvey, 1989).

Teams of managers often make decisions which affect the entire organization. A team effort yields better decisions, protects the organization from arbitrary careless actions and strengthens the team members commitment to organizational goals (Kizilos & Heinisch, 1986). The teamwork concept can suffer if incumbents lack a clear idea of behavioral expectations. Even if these expectations are known, the role of the incumbent may change as others move in and out of positions (Buckham, 1987). Overcoming these obstacles requires cooperation, communication, and trust.

The manager of managers has often taken advantage of his position and abuses the power of that position. Too often the multi-unit manager puts his needs in front of the needs of his subordinates and the institution. Sampson (1965) indicated the power struggle for those who manage other managers to be made up if five interrelated struggles. A multi-unit manager struggles against the system, his peers, his boss, his subordinates, and himself. Understanding these relationships and their interaction will help the manager of managers to gain security and success. The multi-unit manager has often found that his technical competencies do not match his interpersonal competencies. If his supervisor can not help him develop his interpersonal skills then the power struggle is compounded (Sampson, 1965). In the fast service segment of the hospitality industry the irony has been that the easiest part of the multi-unit managers job was also the most difficult, never

let anyone or anything interfere with the bottom line (Lefever, 1989). This general attitude may prevent the reduction of power struggles and limit team building and cooperation.

"The importance of examining the impact of hierarchical level and function on managerial training needs is highlighted by the literature on managerial roles, behaviors, and required knowledges, abilities, and skills" (Ford & Noe, 1987, p. 41). Top, middle, and lower level management perform different leadership and management functions with technical skills becoming less important than monitoring, administrative, and leadership skills as an individual moves up the ladder. When related to Mintzberg's (1980) management roles it has been found that external roles were more important in higher levels of management, leader roles were more important at lower levels, and basic supervisory skills were important at all levels (Ford & Noe, 1987). Multi-unit managers in college and university food services fall in the middle level management category. They are usually just above the unit manager and just below the assistant director or director depending on the structure of the institution.

Related Research

Research in the fast service segment of the hospitality industry (Umbreit,1989) has shown that organizations fail to clearly define responsibilities for multi-unit managers and that half of those managers surveyed indicated they received no training for the position when promoted, nor an evaluation of their performance once in the job. In order to try and define the role of the food service multi-unit manager, Umbreit (1989) studied job descriptions from a variety of companies. He

found that multi-unit managers were responsible for policy implementation, sales, promotions, facility appearance and maintenance, financial control, and human resources management. In order to clarify these functions Umbreit (1989) polled a panel of industry experts, vice presidents of 300 randomly selected chain operators, and asked them to evaluate and categorize multi-unit management job functions. The result of this was the identification of five multi-unit manager job aspects.

> Job aspects of the multi-unit manager:
> Dimension 1 - Financial Management
> Maintains profitability of units by monitoring performance, preparing budgets, developing forecasts, authorizing expenditures, controlling costs, and reviewing results with unit managers.
> Dimension 2 - Restaurant Operations
> Enforces consistent company standards, systems, and procedures; evaluates product quality; implements new systems; oversees the delivery of positive customer services supervises new-product introductions; and monitors unit-management activities.
> Dimension 3 - Marketing and Promotions Management
> Implements marketing and sales-promotion plans, prepares units for promotional programs, and encourages collection of information on customers and the competitive market.
> Dimension 4 - Facilities and Safety Management
> Supervises the overall condition of unit facilities to ensure operational acceptability and competitive readiness and establishes safety-management programs.
> Dimension 5 - Human-Resources Management
> Supervises effective orientation, training, and management of employees; teachers unit managers how to manage people; provides quality feedback; and develops promotable managers (Umbreit, 1989, p. 54).

The same vice presidents reported that their multi-unit management positions were filled from within the organization 82 percent of the time and 35 percent of the vice presidents indicated it was difficult to fill the position with competent individuals.

Staffing from within has advantages such as quickly filling vacancies, eliminating employee surpluses, using the opportunity to

correct individual performance problems, and having the ability to renew the organizational vitality (Heneman, Schwab, Fossum, & Dyer, 1980). These authors indicated additional advantages to be the familiarity of the candidates with the organization, increased motivation to stay with the organization for advancement, and increased satisfaction after advancement. The down side of internal staffing was stagnation due to excessive inbreeding and the lack of new blood in the organization.

Multi-unit managers were surveyed to determine their perspectives related to the characteristics of their job based on the job aspects identified by the vice presidents. Umbreit (1989) found that multi-unit managers spent the following percentage of time on each job aspect:

Restaurant operations	32.7%
Human resource management	23.3
Financial management	22.3
Facilities and safety	10.6
Marketing and promotions	9.6
Other	1.5
	100.0

Multi-unit managers identified the job aspects which required an increasing amount of time as:

Human resources	43.8%
Restaurant operations	23.1
Financial management	18.1
Marketing and promotions	10.6
Other	2.5
Facilities and safety	1.9
	100.0

The aspects in which the multi-unit managers felt the most need for additional training in relation to the scope of their jobs were:

Human resource management	41.9%
Marketing and promotions	36.9
Financial management	11.9
Facilities and safety	3.7
Other	4.4
Restaurant operations	1.2
	100.0

The training topics most needed by the multi-unit managers within the top two job aspects were identified as:

> Human Resource Training Needs
> - Motivating and managing managers
> - Team building and performance orientation
> - Recruiting, hiring and training managers
> - Evaluating manager performance and handling terminations
> - Reading management behaviors and developing appropriate training strategies
> - Developing communication skills including effective public speaking

> Marketing and Promotion Training Needs
> - Implementing local store promotional programs
> - Determining the effectiveness of promotional programs
> - Identifying the appropriate products to promote
> - Developing economic profiles of market areas and assessing competition (Umbreit, 1991, p. 3 & 4).

Smith and Smith (1989) indicated the multi-unit management position was the link pin position in the food service industry which holds the organization together. In addition, a skills shift occurred when an individual moved from single to multi-unit management.

> New multi-unit managers often discover that the motivational techniques they used successfully with hourly employees in the units are not successful with unit managers, who are likely to be older and more motivated than hourly workers... a common problem among new multi-unit managers was the tendency to over-control and not permit unit managers to make their own decisions...multi-unit managers have to learn to work through their unit mangers to achieve results, and they must learn to step back and allow their mangers to make mistakes so the management team can learn and grow from these experiences. (Umbreit, 1989, p. 58).

The carry over of the technical skills required to manage a single unit were vital to success in the multi-unit position, but additional management skills were necessary also. Seven areas of management skill shifts were identified as part of a successful transition between management levels:

1. A shift from technical trainer to manager developer.
2. A shift from receiver of information to communicator of information.

3. A shift from a structured to an unstructured work environment.
4. A shift from "doer" to delegator.
5. A shift in influencing and motivating techniques.
6. A shift to new business knowledge and skills.
7. A shift from a supportive, one boss environment to a more political and peer interdependent environment (Smith & Smith, 1989, p. 4 & 5).

A secondary finding to this research into multi-unit management was that individual corporate strategies may orient multi-unit managers to place a different amount of emphasis on the various job aspects of their position. In addition, multi-unit managers may have a different perspective of their contributions to unit effectiveness based on the type of organization they are in (Umbreit, 1989a). This indicated there may be different multi-unit management skills required between organizations within the same segment of the hospitality industry as well as between the industry segments.

Job Analysis

An institution is often viewed as a pattern of roles. The coordination of these roles is accomplished through job analysis. Prior to making any decisions regarding these roles, the jobs in question must be defined and the behaviors necessary to perform the job identified (Casico, 1982). A comprehensive job analysis can provide the soundest basis for validation of the personnel process, according to Veres, Lahey and Buckly (1987), and Midkiff (1989).

Job analysis is a process by which a job, or closely related set of jobs, is dissected into its component parts, and each of those parts studied in order to provide information to form a total picture of the nature of the work required in that job (Gael, 1983). Job analysis may

also be a way to analyze reality. To support this, Levine (1983) argued that in our society adults spend a major part of their life while they are awake at work, and that a persons job may strongly impact an individual's personal self concept and how he viewed the world.

No one job analysis process is generally accepted as the best for all situations, according to Bemis, Belenky and Soder (1983) and Field and Gatewood (1987). A task or skill analysis inventory is one method to gather information to be used in job analysis. Individual supervisors can effectively respond to a questionnaire regarding job skills needed by their subordinates if they are knowledgeable about the job being studied (Field & Greenwood, 1987). The manager or supervisor has been the prime source of job facts according to Bemis et.all (1983). This individual has the responsibility to oversee and coordinate the subordinate's responsibilities, and can provide valuable information as part of the job analysis process.

Summary

The difficulty in arriving at a single definition of management has been based on the diversity of specific functions and levels within and between organizations. Continued research is necessary to further define what is taking place on an every day basis in order to clarify the picture of the management process. A study of the management skills required for single and multi-unit management in college and university food service may provide information which can be combined with existing research in order to further define what is occurring in hospitality management.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to identify and compare the management skills required in single unit management and the management skills required in multi-unit management in college and university food services. This chapter was developed to identify and explain the methodology used to accomplish the purpose of the study. The methodology was divided into six major areas in order to provide the appropriate insight for the study. The specific areas addressed were: research design, population, instrumentation, pilot study, data collection, and analysis of data.

Research Design

This study utilized descriptive research techniques and a survey to collect the data.

> Descriptive statistics are methods used to derive from these raw data certain indices that characterize or summarize the entire set of data. These descriptive statistics transform larger groups of numbers into more manageable form (Huck, Cormier & Bounds, 1974, p. 19).

According to Isaac and Michael (1981) descriptive research is used to:

> describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately... it does not necessarily seek or explain relationships, test hypotheses, make predictions, or get at meanings and implications (p. 46).

In addition, Isaac and Michael identified the survey to be the most widely used technique in education and the behavioral sciences for the collection of data in descriptive research. They indicated the following regarding surveys:

> They are a means of gathering information that describes the nature and extent of a specified set of data ranging from physical counts and frequencies to attitudes and opinions. This information, in turn, can be used to answer questions that have been raised, to solve problems that have been posed or observed, to assess needs and set goals, to determine whether or not specific objectives have been met, to establish baselines against which future comparisons can be made, to analyze trends across time, and generally, to describe what exists, in what amount, and in what context (p. 128).

Population

The population for the study was the voting delegates of the National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS). A census of the population was conducted in the study. NACUFS is a volunteer professional association which represents independently operated college and university food services. The voting delegate is the individual in the food service operation who would normally have responsibility for single and multi-unit managers. These individuals were selected to be surveyed based on their familiarity with the skills needed for each level of management. As of September 13, 1991 five hundred twelve (512) voting delegates were identified by the NACUFS national office. Cross checking the mailing labels against the directory identified one (1) duplicate name. The duplicate was removed from the list prior to the study. The population, and sample, for this study then consisted of five hundred eleven NACUFS voting delegates (N=511).

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was developed for this study based on prior research in another segment of the hospitality industry. The primary research to date has been conducted by Umbreit (1989), of Washington State University. His work has focused on identification of the skills required for a person to be successful as a multi-unit manager in the fast service segment of the hospitality industry.

Umbreit's research began by attempting to formulate a definition of the multi-unit management job based on the functions which individuals in those positions perform. From this he developed a profile of the skills and personal characteristics required for multi-unit management in order to deliver appropriate recruitment and training strategies (Umbreit, 1989). This study utilized information gained from Umbreit's research and attempted to identify and compare the job skills required for single and multi-unit management in a different segment of the hospitality industry, college and university food services.

The five job aspects developed by Umbreit, Financial Management, Restaurant (Food Service) Operations, Marketing and Promotions Management, Facilities and Safety Management, and Human Resources Management were carried over to this study. The instrument which he used to further define the job aspects (Appendix B) was modified by this researcher for use in this study. The modifications included the rewording of management skill descriptors to match nomenclature used in the college and university food service industry. In addition, a second likert scale was added to identify management skill importance for single unit managers. The rating scale for each management skill

descriptor was based on that management skill's importance related to the single or multi-unit management position with 1 = no importance, 2 = minor importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4 = major importance, and 5 = critical importance. To compensate for an order effect, the likert scales for single and multi-unit management skill ratings were reversed on two hundred thirty one (231) of the four hundred sixty one (461) questionnaires mailed in the full study. The order of the response foils was based on whether the single or multi-unit management skill rating scale appeared first or second on the questionnaire. The single unit rating scale appeared first for order = 1 and the multi-unit rating scale appeared first for order = 2.

Umbreit's number of units supervised and weighted performance dimensions were not utilized in this instrument. Management skill descriptors which asked for a rating on more than one management skill were reduced to ask for a rating on a single skill. Redundant descriptors were removed during the revision.

The questionnaire was reformatted to fit vertically on a page. Once formatted, each page was reduced, placed sideways on legal paper in consecutive order, stapled in the middle, and folded to form a book. The introductory cover letter from the NACUFS National President and the Executive director was on the exterior of the questionnaire. The respondents refolded the questionnaire once to return it in the postage paid envelope. Appendix D contains a copy of the instrument used in the current research, and the accompanying cover letter.

Following development, the instrument was juried for clarity and scope by a panel of experts in the field of college and university food services and a statistician familiar with research in the behavioral

sciences. These experts included Randy Shelton, Director of Student Union Food Services at Wichita State University; Shirleta Benfield, Past NACUFS President and Director of Food Services at The University of New Orleans; Judy Quisenberry, Manager of Business and Administrative Services, Eddie Denman, Assistant Director, and Donna Gilleland, Purchasing Coordinator, all three with The Department of Residential Life at Oklahoma State University; Peggy Smith, Associate Director of Student Housing for Food Services at The University of Kansas; and Dr. Laura Barnes, Assistant Professor of Applied Behavioral Studies at Oklahoma State University. A pilot study was then conducted to further refine the instrument.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted during the fall of 1991 in order to refine the questionnaire and analysis of data procedures prior to the implementation of the research. Isaac and Michael (1981) identified the advantages of conducting a pilot study as: providing the researcher with unforeseen ideas approaches and clues, reducing the number of treatment errors, potentially saving the researchers time and money on a project that will yield nothing, getting feedback from research subjects and others which lead to improvements, and permitting preliminary testing of the hypothesis.

The subjects for the pilot study were randomly selected from the NACUFS voting delegates (n=30). Once selected, each voting delegate was contacted by phone to determine their willingness to participate in the pilot study. If the voting delegate indicated no desire to participate another name was randomly chosen and contacted until thirty people

agreed to participate. Two voting delegates indicated an unwillingness to participate in the pilot study. Replacements were randomly selected from the population and contacted. Both replacements agreed to participate.

A copy of the instrument was mailed to each subject accompanied by a cover letter (Appendix C). This letter indicated the purpose of their selection, emphasized the importance of their response, asked for input on the format, clarity, and scope of the questionnaire, and thanked them for their participation. In addition, the letter indicated support from the NACUFS Board of Directors for this research.

Each pilot study non-respondent was contacted by phone and mailed a personalized letter requesting they complete and return the instrument (Appendix E), a second questionnaire, and another return envelope . A total of twenty one (21) questionnaires were returned. Subsequent to the non-respondent follow up a second set of voting delegates was chosen to replace the non-respondents from the first segment of the pilot study.

Twenty (20) additional voting delegates were randomly selected which raised the total pilot study sample to fifty (n=50). Non-respondents from the second set of pilot study participants were also contacted by phone and mailed a personalized letter (Appendix E), a second questionnaire, and another return envelope. Eight weeks were allowed for responses to be returned from the first and second mailings and the respective non-respondent follow ups.

A total of twenty four (24) responses were received from the first set of participants, a return rate of eighty (80) percent, and thirteen (13) responses were received from the second set of participants, a

return rate of sixty five (65) percent. Thirty seven of fifty questionnaires were received, none were rejected, for a total return rate of seventy four (74) percent.

Data from the pilot study responses was entered on a personal computer utilizing the statistical analysis program SYSTAT (Wilkinson, 1989). Reliability analysis, Cronbach's Alpha, was run on the performance dimension data collected in the pilot study utilizing the Oklahoma State University mainframe computer utilizing the SPSS statistical analysis package (SPSS, 1990). "Reliability refers to the accuracy (consistency and stability) of measurement by a test" (Isaac & Michael, 1981, p. 125). The instrument is reliable if it measures the same trait consistently in repeated measurements (Huck et.all, 1974). Reliability analysis was necessary based on the modification of an existing instrument to fit the purpose of the current research.

Reliability analyses were conducted separately for each of the five performance dimensions. Single and multi-unit management skill ratings were analyzed within each performance dimension. Table I indicates the results of these analyses. Management skill descriptors in each of the five performance dimensions were not modified based on the coefficient alpha's related to the pilot study.

Pilot study respondents indicated the original placement of the turnover percentage question had a negative connotation and led to an assumption of manager turnover which biased responses to the subsequent hiring practice questions. Respondent comments from the pilot study led to a change in question sequence. The sequencing adjustment moved questions regarding single and multi-unit manager turnover from the beginning, to the end of a string of questions regarding hiring

practices for single and multi-unit managers in Part I of the instrument.

Data Collection

Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1972) indicated pre-study planning may increase the percentage of returns. The researcher should utilize a questionnaire which deals with a significant topic for the population or sample, and the instrument should be constructed and presented in a manner which reflects quality and logical arrangement. In addition, the questionnaire should take as little time as possible to complete, be accompanied by a signed cover letter of explanation, and should clearly indicate that all responses are confidential.

Prior to the study several steps were taken in order to enhance response rates. At the NACUFS National Conference held in Denver during July 1991 the National Board of Directors gave national support and partial funding to this study. During the conference a presentation was made to the membership at each regional meeting. This presentation outlined the title and purpose of the study, how the study would be conducted, and potential benefits for the membership which may result from this research. The title and subject of the study was repeated several times in order to familiarize the membership with the terminology. An article (Ryan, 1991) was published in the NACUFS News Wave in August to reinforce information presented at the National Conference and to inform members not able to attend the conference. The questionnaire was constructed in a manner which continued to show national support for this study. The cover letter (Appendix D) was written on NACUFS stationary and signed by the National President and

TABLE I

PILOT STUDY RELIABILITY OF MANAGEMENT SKILL RATINGS WITHIN EACH PERFORMANCE DIMENSION

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Management	Multi-Unit Management
Financial Management	.9449	.8792
Food Service Operations	.8891	.8850
Marketing and Promotions	.8334	.8122
Facilities and Safety Management	.8680	.8217
Human Resources Management	.9119	.9210

N=37

the Executive Director of the association. Ivory paper was used for the instrument based on its' neutral tone and professional appearance.

The instrument and postage paid return envelope were mailed to the voting delegates in a NACUFS envelope. Postage for the NACUFS envelope consisted of an individually affixed souvenir stamp which pictured a wood duck. Postal service metering was considered to be less personal than an individually affixed stamp. These pre-study steps were taken to inform the NACUFS membership about the study, to personalize the process, and enhance response rates.

Voting delegates utilized in the pilot study were not included in the full research study. The questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix D) were mailed to the balance of the voting delegates for the institutional members of NACUFS (n=461). The subjects were asked to complete the instrument and return it to the researcher utilizing a self addressed, postage paid envelope. This process was coordinated through Central Mailing Services at Oklahoma State University.

Each questionnaire was coded for subject identification in order to avoid duplication of follow up correspondence. The coding also identified the order of the response foils for single and multi-unit management skill descriptors. The questionnaire also indicated all responses would be kept confidential.

Voting delegates whom had not responded to the first mailing were identified by matching the code numbers on returned questionnaires to a master mailing list. Each voting delegate who had not responded was mailed a personalized follow up letter (Appendix E) approximately four weeks following the initial mailing. This second mailing requested the voting delegate complete and return the instrument. The letter was

folded and wrapped around a second questionnaire and return envelope so the voting delegate's name was visible when the envelope was opened. The second questionnaire matched the first one which the voting delegate received with regard to the order of single and multi-unit management skill response foils. Questionnaires were coded to identify the second mailing. Eight weeks were allowed for responses to be returned from the original mailing and second mailing.

Twenty (20) voting delegates who had not responded to either mailing were randomly selected for a follow up telephone interview. This interview consisted of orally asking the non-respondents the questions on the instrument. The purpose of this type of non-respondent follow up interview was to determine if differences in responses existed between the subjects who returned the instrument and those who did not.

Analysis of Data

Data collected in the full study was entered on a personal computer utilizing the statistical analysis program SYSTAT (Wilkinson, 1989). Reliability analysis, Cronbach's Alpha, was run on the performance dimension data collected in the full study on the Oklahoma State University mainframe computer utilizing the SPSS statistical analysis package (SPSS, 1990). Reliability analyses were conducted separately for each of the five performance dimensions and single and multi-unit management skill ratings were analyzed within each dimension.

Correlated t tests were run on the performance dimension data collected in the full research study utilizing the statistical analysis program SYSTAT (Wilkinson, 1989) to determine the degree of difference between the level of importance for the management skills required of

single unit managers and the level of importance for the management skills required of multi-unit managers.

A correlated t test can be utilized with one independent variable, at two levels only, within subjects, and the n's must be equal (Linton & Gallo, 1975).

> The correlated samples t test, ... is also referred to as the matched t test, the correlated t test, and the paired t test. This t test is appropriate for ... situations in which each of the data observations in the first group is logically tied to one of the scores in the second group. The research situation in which a single group of subjects is measured twice, for example, measured under two different treatment conditions or before and after a common experience. Each score in the first group is logically tied to a specific score in the second group because it is obtained from the same person. Researchers use the t test most often to compare the means of two groups. If the two sample means are far enough apart, the t test will yield a significant difference, thus permitting the researcher to conclude that the populations probably do not have the same mean (Huck et al., 1974, p. 50, 52).

A strength of association measure, eta squared, was calculated for each of the performance dimensions in which the correlated t test which compared single and multi-unit management skill importance was significant. Statistical tests may indicate the relationship between two variables was significant at a selected probability level in a randomly drawn sample, but it may be difficult to make reasonable inferences regarding the meaning of the discovered relationships if strength of association measures were not calculated (Linton & Gallo, 1975).

The strength of association measure utilized in this study indicated what percentage of the variance between the management skill importance ratings was accounted for by the factors involved in the research.

One of the most useful features of strength-of-association measures is that they can serve as a guideline to indicate to you how well you understand the phenomenon you are studying. Unfortunately, as yet there are no hard and fast rules to tell you how strong a relationship you need before you can begin to feel happy about your results. A good dose of common sense is probably the best guideline. One limitation on most strength-of-association measures, however, is that the strength-of-association measure you obtain holds only for the particular situation in which it was discovered. The use of strength-of-association measures should encourage an approach to research that moves from the simple to the more complex and provides clear feed-back on the success of each step. Both of these trends would be welcome additions to research strategies in the behavioral sciences. Judging from the present state of the art in the behavioral sciences, any time you can account for more than 10% of the variance, you are doing better than the vast majority of studies (Linton & Gallo, 1975, p. 331, 332).

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to identify and compare the management skills required in single unit management and the management skills required in multi-unit management in college and university food services. This chapter was developed to present the findings of the research. The findings were divided into six major areas in order to provide the appropriate insight for the study. The specific areas addressed were: response rate, respondent demographics, instrument reliability, research question number one, research question number two, and research question number three.

Response Rate

Four hundred sixty one (461) questionnaires were mailed to voting delegates for the institutional members of NACUFS. Voting delegates utilized in the pilot study were not included in the full research study. Responses were collected from 273 (59%) voting delegates, with 182 questionnaires (39%) returned after the first mailing, and 61 questionnaires (13%) returned after a second mailing. Twenty, approximately ten percent, of the voting delegates who had not responded to either mailing were randomly selected for a telephone survey of non-respondents.

Table II shows the means of the sum of the management skill rating scores and their respective standard deviations for single and multi-unit management skills by performance dimension for responses received prior to a second mailing. Table III shows the means of the sum of the management skill rating scores and their respective standard deviations for single and multi-unit management skills by performance dimension for responses received from a second mailing, and Table IV identifies the means of the sum of the management skill rating scores and their respective standard deviations for single and multi-unit management by performance dimension for responses received from a non-respondent follow up conducted by telephone. Means represented in Table II, Table III and Table IV follow a consistent pattern with regard to ranking among the performance dimensions and are similar when compared across the time periods when responses were received. Standard deviations were larger for responses received from the non-respondent follow up, but did not follow a consistent pattern of differences when the performance dimensions were compared across the time periods when responses were received.

Ten questionnaires were not usable. Of the ten unusable questionnaires one was from a hospital, five were from a schools which had converted to contract food service, one was from a very small school, one had not applicable written on the questionnaire, and one respondent indicated it would take too much time to complete the questionnaire. A total of two hundred sixty three 263 (57%) questionnaires were usable.

TABLE II

PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM THE FIRST MAILING

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Management		Multi-Unit Management	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	33.55	8.62	43.86	8.71
Food Service Operations	38.55	6.54	37.50	7.71
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.50	6.13	30.57	4.67
Facilities and Safety Management	33.80	6.12	38.00	5.55
Human Resources Management	64.15	6.77	65.79	5.70

N = 182

TABLE III

PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM THE SECOND MAILING

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Management		Multi-Unit Management	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	37.65	9.10	45.78	9.30
Food Service Operations	39.85	5.47	38.21	4.41
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.55	6.06	30.00	5.38
Facilities and Safety Management	33.20	7.19	34.07	4.20
Human Resources Management	62.90	9.72	63.64	6.16

N = 61

TABLE IV

PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONSES RECEIVED FROM A NON-RESPONDENT FOLLOW UP

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Management		Multi-Unit Management	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	39.40	9.19	45.57	11.31
Food Service Operations	39.75	8.55	37.14	7.36
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.95	6.65	30.93	7.68
Facilities and Safety Management	34.10	7.91	36.14	8.26
Human Resources Management	63.30	14.06	62.71	12.16

N = 20

Respondent Demographics

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are shown in table V. The respondents were comprised of 58 (22.1%) schools with revenue under $1,000,000 per year, 77 (29.3%) with revenue between $1,000,001 and $3,000,000, 29 (11.0%) with revenue of $3,000,001 to $4,000,000, 18 (6.8%) with revenue of $4,000,001 to $5,000,000, 13 (4.9%) with revenue between $5,000,001 and $6,000,000, 9 (3.4%) with revenue between $6,000,001 and $7,000,000, and 50 (19.0%) with revenue over $7,000,001. Nine (3.4%) respondents did answer this question.

For school enrollment the respondents reported as follows: 34 (12.9%) enrolled 1 to 2,400 students, 53 (20.2) enrolled 2,500 to 4,999 students, 30 (11.4%) enrolled 5,000 to 9,999 students, 28 (10.6%) enrolled 10,000 to 14,999 students, 33 (12.5%) enrolled 15,000 to 19,999 students 20 (7.6%) enrolled 20,000 to 24,999 students, 10 (3.8%) enrolled 25,000 to 29,999 students, 52 (19.8%) enrolled more than 30,000 students. Three (1.1%) respondents did not answer this question.

The number of meals served per day at each institution were identified by the respondents as: 69 (26.2%) schools serving 1 to 1,999 meals per day, 51 (19.4%) schools serving 2,000 to 3,999 meals, 41 (15.6%) schools serving 4,000 to 5,999 meals, 25 (9.5%) schools serving 6,000 to 7,499 meals, 11 (4.2%) schools serving 8,000 to 9,999 meals, 15 (5.7%) schools serving 10,000 to 11,999 meals, 13 (4.9%) schools serving 12,000 to 13,999 meals, and 28 (10.6%) schools serving more than 14,000 meals per day. Ten (3.8%) respondents did not answer this question.

Respondents identified the number of separate food service facilities at their institutions as follows: 34 (12.9%) with 1

TABLE V

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF THE RESPONDENTS

Characteristic		Frequency	Percent
Membership Classification Revenue	Mailings		
Up to $1,000,000	2	58	22.1
$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	4	77	29.3
$3,000,001 to $4,000,000	5	29	11.0
$4,000,001 to $5,000,000	6	18	6.8
$5,000,000 to $6,000,000	7	13	4.9
$6,000,000 to $7,000,000	8	9	3.4
Over $7,000,001	10	50	19.0
Did not respond		9	3.4
School Enrollment			
1 - 2499		34	12.9
2,500 - 4,999		53	20.2
5,000 - 9,999		30	11.4
10,000 - 14,999		28	10.6
15,000 - 19,999		33	12.5
20,000 - 24,999		20	7.6
25,000 - 29,999		10	3.8
30,000 or more		52	19.8
Did not respond		3	1.1
Meals Served Per Day			
0 - 1999		69	26.2
2,000 - 3,999		51	19.4
4,000 - 5,999		41	15.6
6,000 - 7,999		25	9.5
8,000 - 9,999		11	4.2
10,000 - 11,999		15	5.7
12,000 - 13,999		13	4.9
14,000 or more		28	10.6
Did not respond		10	3.8

TABLE V (Continued)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Number of Separate Food Service Facilities		
1	34	12.9
2	53	20.2
3	30	11.4
4	28	10.6
5	33	12.5
6	20	7.6
7	10	3.8
8 or more	52	19.8
Did not respond	3	1.1
Number of Single Unit Managers		
1	53	20.2
2	49	18.6
3	38	14.4
4	25	9.5
5	26	9.9
6	23	8.7
7	12	4.6
8 or more	34	12.9
Did not respond	3	1.1
Source for Hiring Single Unit Managers		
Promotion from within	109	41.4
Outside the organization, within the industry	125	47.5
Outside the industry	1	.4
Recent graduates of educational programs	6	2.3
Other	13	4.9
Did not respond	9	3.4
Difficulty Hiring Single Unit Managers		
None	50	19.0
Minor	73	27.8
Moderate	100	38.0
Major	24	9.1
Critical	5	1.9
Did not respond	11	4.2

TABLE V (Continued)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Reason for Turnover of Single Unit Managers		
Lack of technical knowledge	8	3.0
Lack of human relations skills	19	7.2
Position too demanding	30	11.4
Position not well defined	1	.4
No individual award satisfaction	13	4.9
Promotion	93	35.4
Other	81	30.8
Did not respond	18	6.8
Single Unit Manager Turnover Percentage		
0	167	63.5
2 - 9	3	1.1
10 - 19	24	9.1
20 - 29	34	12.9
30 - 39	11	4.2
40 - 49	5	1.9
50 - 59	12	4.6
60 or more	5	1.9
Did not respond	2	.8
Number of Multi-Unit Managers		
0	127	48.3
1	61	23.2
2	46	17.5
3	14	5.3
4	7	2.7
5	3	1.1
6	2	.8
7 or more	3	1.1
Multi-Unit Management Span of Control Or Single Unit Mangers Supervised		
2	48	18.3
3	35	13.3
4	12	4.6
5	17	6.5
6	10	3.8
7	3	1.1
8 or more	9	3.4
Did not respond	129	49.0

TABLE V (Continued)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Source for Hiring Multi Unit Managers		
Promotion from within	70	26.7
Outside the organization, within the industry	61	23.2
Outside the industry	2	.8
Recent graduates educational programs	1	.4
Other	2	.8
Did not respond	127	48.2
Difficulty Hiring Multi-Unit-Managers		
None	28	10.6
Minor	38	14.4
Moderate	48	18.3
Major	17	6.5
Critical	5	1.9
Did not respond	127	48.3
Reason for Turnover of Multi-Unit Managers		
Lack of technical knowledge	4	1.5
Lack of human relations skills	9	3.4
Position too demanding	11	4.2
Position not well defined	2	.8
No individual award satisfaction	9	3.4
Promotion	60	22.8
Other	35	13.3
Did not respond	133	50.6
Multi-Unit Manager Turnover Percentage		
0	111	42.2
2 - 9	3	1.1
10 - 19	1	.4
20 - 29	4	1.5
30 - 39	3	1.1
40 - 49	1	.4
50 - 59	6	2.3
60 or more	6	2.3
Did not respond	128	48.7

N = 263
Respondents who indicated no multi-unit managers were currently on staff did not respond to questions regarding multi-unit manager demographics.

facility, 53 (20.2%) with 2 facilities, 30 (11.4%) with 3 facilities, 28 (10.6%) with 4 facilities, 33 (12.5%) with 5 facilities, 20 (7.6%) with 6 facilities, 10 (3.8%) with 7 facilities, and 52 (19.8%) having 8 or more food service facilities. Three (1.1%) respondents did not respond.

The number of single unit managers at each institution were reported as: 53 (20.2%) schools with 1 single unit manager, 49 (18.6%) with 2 managers, 38 (14.4%) with 3 managers, 25 (9.5%) with 4 managers, 26 (9.9%) with 5 managers, 23 (8.7%) with 6 managers, 12 (4.6%) with 7 managers, and 34 (12.9%) institutions with 8 or more single unit managers. Three (1,1%) respondents did not answer this question.

Sources for the hiring of single unit managers reported in the study were: 109 (41.4%) schools promoted individuals into the single unit management position from within the organization, 125 (47.5%) schools hired from outside the organization, but within the food service industry, 1 (.4%) school hired from outside the food service industry, 6 (2.3%) schools hired recent graduates of higher education or other certification programs, 13 (4.9%) schools indicated other sources were utilized to hire single unit managers. Other sources included a combination of all the sources listed, 4 responses; through the personnel office, 1 response; state employment lists, exams or civil service procedures, 4 responses; seasonal positions, 1 response; local community, 1 response; none hired in twelve years, 1 response; and food service contract companies, 1 response. Nine (3.4%) respondents did not answer this question.

Respondents indicated the degree of difficulty in hiring single unit managers was: 50 (19.0%) with no difficulty, 73 (27.8%) had minor difficulty, 100 (38.0%) had moderate difficulty, 24 (9.1%) had major

difficulty, and 5 (1.9%) had critical difficulty hiring single unit managers. Eleven (4.2%) of the respondents did not answer this question.

The principle reason for turnover in the single unit management position was reported by the respondents as: 8 (3.0%) schools reported the reason for single unit manager turnover to be a lack of technical knowledge, 19 (7.2%) identified a lack of human relations skills, 30 (11.4%) identified the position as too demanding, 1 (.4%) identified the position as not being well defined, 13 (4.9%) identified individuals in the position as not allowing sufficient award satisfaction, 93 (35.4%) identified promotion, and 81 (30.8%) identified other reasons for turnover in the single unit manager position. Other reasons included retirement, 31 responses; no turnover, 26 responses; low pay, 6 responses; lack of commitment, 1 response; left for reasons not job related, 2 responses; promotion to outside agency, 2 responses; moving out of area, 4 responses; lack of promotion capability, 1 response; seasonal position, 1 response; family reasons, 3 responses; must leave in 3 years, 1 response; changed from contract to self operated, 3 responses; and not applicable, 2 responses. Eighteen (6.8%) of the respondents did not answer this question.

The turnover percentages reported for single unit managers in the study were: 167 (63.5%) schools reporting no turnover, 3 (1.1%) reporting a 2 to 19 percent rate, 24 (9.1%) reporting a 10 to 19 percent rate, 34 (12.9%) reporting a 20 to 29 percent rate, 11 (4.2%) reporting a 30 to 39 percent rate, 5 (1.9%) reporting a 40 to 49 percent rate, 12 (4.6%) reporting a 50 to 59 percent rate, and 5 (1.9%) reporting a turnover rate of 60 percent or higher for single unit managers. Two

(.8%) respondents did not answer this question.

The number of multi-unit managers at each institution was reported as follows: 127 (48.3%) schools with no multi-unit managers, 61 (23.2%) schools with 1 manager, 46 (17.5%) schools with 2 managers, 14 (5.3%) schools with 3 managers, 7 (2.7%) schools with 4 managers, 3 (1.1%) schools with 5 managers, 2 (.8%) schools with 6 managers, and 3 (1.1%) schools with 7 or more multi-unit managers.

Demographic questions regarding multi-unit manager characteristics were not answered by the one hundred twenty seven (127) respondents who indicated they did not employ any multi-unit managers. The span of control, or number of single unit managers directly supervised by a multi-unit manager was reported as follows: multi-unit managers at 48 (18.3%) schools supervised 2 single unit managers, at 35 (13.3%) schools supervised 3, at 12 (4.6%) schools supervised 4, at 17 (6.5%) supervised 5, at 10 (3.8%) schools supervised 6, at 3 (1.1%) schools supervised 7, at 9 (3.4%) schools supervised 8 or more single unit managers. Two (1.0%) respondents with multi-unit managers or staff did not answer this question.

Sources for hiring multi-unit managers reported in the study were: 70 (26.7%) schools promoted individuals into the multi-unit management position from within the organization, 61 (23.2%) schools hired from outside the organization, but within the food service industry, 2 (.8%) schools hired from outside the food service industry, 1 (.4%) school hired recent graduates of higher education or other certification programs, 2 (.8%) schools indicated other sources were utilized to hire multi-unit managers. Other sources included the personnel office, 1 response; and the state employment roster, response.

Respondents indicated the degree of difficulty in hiring multi-unit managers was: 28 (10.6%) with no difficulty, 38 (14.4%) had minor difficulty, 48 (18.3%) had moderate difficulty, 17 (6.5%) had major difficulty, and 5 (1.9%) had critical difficulty hiring multi-unit managers.

The principle reason for turnover in the multi-unit management position was reported by the respondents as: 4 (1.5%) schools reported the reason for multi-unit manager turnover as a lack of technical knowledge, 9 (3.4%) identified a lack of human relation skills, 11 (4.2%) identified the position as too demanding, 2 (.8%) identified the position as not being well defined, 9 (3.4) identified individuals in the position as not allowing sufficient award satisfaction, 60 (22.8%) identified promotion, and 35 (13.3%) identified other reasons for turnover in the multi-unit manager position. Other reasons included no turnover, 13 responses; retirement, 12 responses; change of contractor, 1 response; not applicable, 1 response; leave the organization, 1 response; leave town, 1 response; higher management thinks food service is a necessary evil, 1 response; and 5 left blank. Six (2.3%) respondents with multi-unit managers on staff did not answer these questions.

The turnover percentages reported for multi-unit managers were: 111 (42.2%) schools reporting no turnover, 3 (1.1%) reporting a 2 to 9 percent rate, 1 (.4%) reporting a 10 to 19 percent rate, 4 (1.5%) reporting a 20 to 29 percent rate, 3 (1.1%) reporting a 30 to 39 percent rate, 1 (.4%) reporting a 40 to 49 percent rate, 6 (2.3%) reporting a 50 to 59 percent rate and 6 (2.3%) reporting a turnover rate of 60 percent or higher for multi-unit managers. One (.4%) respondent with multi-unit

managers on staff did not answer this question.

Instrument Reliability

Reliability analysis, Cronbach's Alpha, was run on the performance dimension data collected in the full study utilizing the Oklahoma State University mainframe computer and the SPSS statistical analysis package (SPSS, 1990). Reliability analysis was necessary based on the modification of an existing instrument to fit the purpose of the current research.

Reliability analyses were conducted separately for each of the five performance dimensions. Single and multi-unit management skill ratings were analyzed within each performance dimension. Table VI shows the results of these analyses compared to the results of reliability analyses conducted in the pilot study.

Research Question Number One

What are the skills required to be a single unit manager in the college and university food service industry?

Five performance dimensions: Financial Management with eleven (11) management skills, Food Service Operations with nine (9) management skills, Marketing and Promotions Management with eight (8) management skills, Facilities and Safety Management with nine (9) management skills, and Human Resources Management with fifteen (15) management skills were utilized to answer this research question. The rating scale for each skill was based on that management skills' importance related to the single unit management position with 1 = no importance, 2 = minor importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4 = major importance, and

TABLE VI

RELIABILITY OF MANAGEMENT SKILL RATINGS
WITHIN EACH PERFORMANCE DIMENSION

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Management		Multi-Unit Management	
	Pilot Study	Full Study	Pilot Study	Full Study
Financial Management	.9449	.9148	.8792	.9076
Food Service Operations	.8891	.9249	.8850	.9124
Marketing and Promotions Management	.8334	.8489	.8122	.8683
Facilities and Safety Management	.8680	.8342	.8217	.8310
Human Resources Management	.9119	.9310	.9210	.9217

N = 20 for the pilot study
N = 263 for the full study

5 = critical importance. Order was related to whether the single or multi-unit rating scale appeared first or second on the questionnaire. The single unit rating scale appeared first for order = 1 and the multi-unit rating scale appeared first for order = 2.

Respondents with Single and Multi-Unit Managers

Table VII shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers currently on staff. Table VIII shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers currently on staff by order.

The mean scores and standard deviations for the performance dimensions represented in Tables VII and VIII show minimal statistical differences. Order of the response foils had no apparent effect on how the single unit management skills were rated among those respondents who currently employ single and multi-unit managers.

Since there were an unequal number of management skill descriptors within each performance dimension further clarification of responses was necessary. Table IX shows a comparison of the means and their respective standard deviations for the individual management skill descriptor importance ratings. Management skill descriptors were listed by their respective performance dimension. Table IX was illustrated to accommodate the needs of the diverse college and university food service management systems represented in the population.

TABLE VII

SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS

Performance Dimension	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	37.39	8.63
Food Service Operations	40.54	4.83
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.45	5.14
Facilities and Safety Management	34.46	5.19
Human Resources Management	64.39	7.94

N=136

TABLE VIII

SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS BY ORDER

Performance Dimension	Order = 1		Order = 2	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	36.50	9.07	38.33	8.10
Food Service Operations	39.46	5.79	41.68	3.22
Marketing and Promotions Management	26.94	4.79	27.98	5.47
Facilities and Safety Management	33.51	5.17	35.45	5.07
Human Resources Management	63.53	7.47	65.30	8.37
	N = 70		N = 66	

TABLE IX

INDIVIDUAL SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS
FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT
MANAGERS CURRENTLY ON STAFF

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Financial Management		
Preparing financial plans	3.13	1.03
Establishing financial goals	3.17	1.06
Authorizing expenditures within policy limits	3.35	1.08
Managing competitive bidding/ purchasing processes	2.49	1.25
Monitoring compliance with purchasing controls	3.24	1.18
Assisting in the development of financial forecasts	3.20	1.11
Monitoring financial performance	3.77	1.03
Recognizing cost variances and causes	4.05	.76
Developing financial corrective action plans	3.70	1.06
Evaluating financial results related to budgets	3.57	1.06
Developing plans to correct financial deficiencies	3.74	.87
Food Service Operations		
Enforcing quality and service standards	4.78	.55
Developing operational plans	4.02	.81
Implementing operational plans	4.57	.63
Monitoring effective labor scheduling techniques	4.55	.71
Assuring quality customer experiences	4.35	.63
Identifying operational problems or issues	4.50	.67
Developing solutions to operational problems or issues	4.39	.72
Implementing corrective action for operational problems	4.52	.70
Enforcing organizational policies and procedures	4.36	.80

TABLE IX (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Marketing And Promotions Management		
Supervising the execution of organizational marketing and promotional plans	3.37	1.02
Developing in-house advertising programs and promotional materials	3.17	1.09
Implementing marketing concepts and promotional programs	3.59	1.08
Developing an awareness of customer preferences	4.46	.71
Assessing competitor operations including marketing and advertising campaigns	3.00	.97
Assisting in the development of university or community relations programs	2.97	.95
Gathering consumer research information	2.90	1.03
Supervising new product introduction	3.99	.88
Facilities and Safety Management		
Approving low-cost improvements to facilities	3.14	1.18
Recommending more costly improvements to facilities	3.14	1.00
Supervising preventive maintenance programs	3.85	.99
Supervising inside or outside contractors performing maintenance and improvements	2.98	1.24
Ensuring facilities are in compliance with health codes	4.65	.68
Monitoring security and safety procedures	4.58	.69
Recognizing facility safety issues	4.48	.71
Conducting cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	2.93	1.10
Ensuring employees are in compliance with health codes	4.70	.61

TABLE IX (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Human Resources Management		
Analyzing personnel needs and developing manpower plans	3.96	.86
Training and development of employees	4.40	.72
Supervising the implementation of in-unit training and development programs	4.22	.85
Preparing employees for promotion	3.98	.91
Effectively managing employee relation issues	4.20	.81
Conducting formal performance evaluations	4.35	.76
Minimizing employee turnover	4.17	.88
Coaching and motivating employees	4.52	.66
Taking disciplinary action when necessary	4.28	.70
Ensuring personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	4.30	.79
Monitoring compliance with company personnel policies and practices	4.28	.91
Modeling effective supervisory behavior	4.41	.78
Maintaining a favorable working environment	4.46	.73
Serving as a resource to the employees	4.39	.72
Providing constructive feedback when appropriate	4.44	.67

N = 136

Respondents With Only Single Unit Managers

Table X shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptor rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for single unit managers in institutions with only single unit managers currently on staff. Table XI identifies the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptor rating scores and their respective standard deviations for single unit managers in institutions with only single unit managers currently on staff by order.

The mean scores and standard deviations for the performance dimensions represented in Tables X and XI show minimal statistical differences. Order of the response foils had no apparent effect on how the single unit management skills were rated among those respondents who currently employ only single unit managers.

Since there were an unequal number of management skill descriptors within each performance dimension a further clarification of responses was necessary. Table XII shows a comparison of the means and their respective standard deviations for the individual management skill descriptor ratings. Management skill descriptors were listed by their respective performance dimension. Table XII was illustrated to accommodate the needs of the diverse college and university food service operations represented in the population.

TABLE X

SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

Performance Dimension	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	39.02	9.34
Food Service Operations	38.92	5.82
Marketing and Promotions Management	26.54	6.38
Facilities and Safety Management	33.00	6.29
Human Resources Management	61.55	10.08

N=121

TABLE XI

SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS BY ORDER

Performance Dimension	Order = 1		Order = 2	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	37.33	10.31	40.42	8.27
Food Service Operations	38.51	6.39	39.26	5.33
Marketing and Promotions Management	26.24	7.64	26.79	5.15
Facilities and Safety Management	32.82	7.44	33.17	5.19
Human Resources Management	60.71	11.57	62.24	8.68
	N = 55		N = 66	

TABLE XII

INDIVIDUAL SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS
FOR RESPONDENTS WITH ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS
CURRENTLY ON STAFF

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Financial Management		
Preparing financial plans	3.22	1.16
Establishing financial goals	3.30	1.04
Authorizing expenditures within policy limits	3.53	1.16
Managing competitive bidding/ purchasing processes	3.03	1.40
Monitoring compliance with purchasing controls	3.60	1.16
Assisting in the development of financial forecasts	3.30	1.06
Monitoring financial performance	3.90	1.04
Recognizing cost variances and causes	4.01	.91
Developing financial corrective action plans	3.70	1.11
Evaluating financial results related to budgets	3.66	1.08
Developing plans to correct financial deficiencies	3.79	1.13
Food Service Operations		
Enforcing quality and service standards	4.62	.69
Developing operational plans	3.97	.90
Implementing operational plans	4.36	.82
Monitoring effective labor scheduling techniques	4.27	.91
Assuring quality customer experiences	4.64	.72
Identifying operational problems or issues	4.34	.69
Developing solutions to operational problems or issues	4.14	.80
Implementing corrective action for operational problems	4.27	.84
Enforcing organizational policies and procedures	4.31	.86

TABLE XII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Marketing And Promotions Management		
Supervising the execution of organizational marketing and promotional plans	3.23	1.03
Developing in-house advertising programs and promotional materials	2.99	1.10
Implementing marketing concepts and promotional programs	3.37	1.21
Developing an awareness of customer preferences	4.25	.86
Assessing competitor operations including marketing and advertising campaigns	3.05	1.08
Assisting in the development of university or community relations programs	3.12	1.13
Gathering consumer research information	2.93	1.12
Supervising new product introduction	3.60	1.04
Facilities and Safety Management		
Approving low-cost improvements to facilities	3.15	1.11
Recommending more costly improvements to facilities	3.17	1.05
Supervising preventive maintenance programs	3.73	1.05
Supervising inside or outside contractors performing maintenance and improvements	2.79	1.27
Ensuring facilities are in compliance with health codes	4.46	.83
Monitoring security and safety procedures	4.22	.89
Recognizing facility safety issues	4.21	.94
Conducting cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	2.81	1.16
Ensuring employees are in compliance with health codes	4.49	.85

TABLE XII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Human Resources Management		
Analyzing personnel needs and developing manpower plans	3.75	1.00
Training and development of employees	4.29	.82
Supervising the implementation of in-unit training and development programs	3.96	.93
Preparing employees for promotion	3.55	.99
Effectively managing employee relation issues	4.05	.97
Conducting formal performance evaluations	4.05	.97
Minimizing employee turnover	4.00	1.04
Coaching and motivating employees	4.23	.90
Taking disciplinary action when necessary	4.22	.82
Ensuring personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	4.10	.93
Monitoring compliance with company personnel policies and practices	4.00	94
Modeling effective supervisory behavior	4.35	.90
Maintaining a favorable working environment	4.43	.76
Serving as a resource to the employees	4.23	.83
Providing constructive feedback when appropriate	4.34	.75

N = 121

Selection of a Comparative Sample of Single Unit Managers From Institutions With Single and Multi-Unit Managers

To compare the management skills required for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers against management skills for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only a random sample of 121 of the 136 respondents from those institutions which employ both levels of managers was selected. One hundred twenty one (121) of the 129 respondents with only single unit managers were randomly selected so the order of the response foils was matched for order one and order two among both groups of respondents. Respondents with single and multi-unit managers included only 66 respondents of order = 2 which necessitated randomly selecting the same number of respondents from a pool of 72 possible respondents which currently employed single unit managers only and had order = 2.

Table XIII compares the mean individual management skill descriptor rating scores by performance dimension for institutions with single and multi-unit managers on staff (N = 136) and the randomly drawn sample from the same group (N = 121). Table XIV compares the means of the sum of the individual single unit management descriptor skill rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for institutions with single and multi-unit managers (N = 136) and the randomly drawn sample from the same group (N = 121). Minimal statistical differences exist between the two groups which indicated a representative sample was drawn from the original respondents.

TABLE XIII
MEAN INDIVIDUAL SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS
RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS
AND RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ONLY

Performance Dimension	Original Respondents	Random Sample
Financial Management	3.40	3.43
Food Service Operations	4.50	4.55
Marketing and Promotions Management	3.43	3.44
Facilities and Safety Management	3.83	3.85
Human Resources Management	4.29	4.32
	N = 136	N = 121

TABLE XIV
SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR
RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED
TO A RANDOMLY SELECTED SAMPLE OF THE SAME RESPONDENTS

Performance Dimension	Original Respondents		Randomly Selected	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	37.39	8.63	39.02	9.34
Food Service Operations	40.54	4.83	38.92	5.82
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.45	5.14	26.53	6.38
Facilities and Safety Management	34.46	5.19	33.00	6.28
Human Resources Management	64.39	7.94	61.55	10.08
	N = 136		N = 121	

Comparison of Respondents With Single and Multi-Unit Managers to Respondents With Single Unit Managers Only

Table XV shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptor rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for the randomly selected sample of respondents which indicated single and multi-unit managers were currently on staff, and respondents which indicated only single unit managers were currently on staff. Mean single unit management performance dimension ratings were higher in institutions with single unit managers only for the Financial Management performance dimension. Mean single unit management performance dimension ratings were higher in institutions with single and multi-unit managers for the Food Service Operations, Marketing and Promotions, Facilities and Safety, and Human Resources Management.

Table XVI shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptor rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension and order equal to one for the randomly selected sample of respondents which indicated single and multi-unit managers were on staff and respondents which indicated only single unit managers on staff. Table XVII shows the same information for order equals two. The mean scores and standard deviations represented in Tables XVI and XVII compared to Table XV show minimal statistical differences. Order of the response foils had no apparent effect on how single unit management skill importance was rated among the 121 respondents randomly selected from institutions which currently employed

TABLE XV

SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED TO RESPONDENTS WITH ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

Performance Dimension	Single And Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	37.70	8.70	39.02	9.34
Food Service Operations	40.98	3.79	38.92	5.82
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.55	5.18	26.54	6.38
Facilities and Safety Management	34.66	5.13	33.00	6.29
Human Resources Management	64.84	7.85	61.55	10.08

N = 121

TABLE XVI

SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED TO RESPONDENTS WITH ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS BY ORDER = 1

Performance Dimension	Single And Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	36.95	9.39	37.33	10.31
Food Service Operations	40.15	4.25	38.51	6.39
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.04	4.79	26.24	7.64
Facilities and Safety Management	33.71	5.09	32.82	7.44
Human Resources Management	64.29	7.22	60.71	11.57

N = 121

TABLE XVII

SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED TO RESPONDENTS WITH ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS BY ORDER = 2

Performance Dimension	Single And Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	38.33	8.10	40.42	8.27
Food Service Operations	41.68	3.22	39.26	5.33
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.98	5.47	26.79	5.15
Facilities and Safety Management	35.45	5.07	33.17	5.19
Human Resources Management	65.30	8.37	62.24	8.68

N = 121

single and multi-unit managers and institutions which currently employed only single unit managers.

Since there were an unequal number of management skill descriptors within each performance dimension a further clarification of responses was necessary. Table XVIII shows a comparison of the means and their respective standard deviations for the individual management skill descriptor ratings for the randomly selected sample of institutions which currently employ single and multi-unit managers and institutions which currently employ only single unit managers. Management skills were listed by their respective performance dimension. Table XVII was illustrated to accommodate needs of the diverse college and university food service management systems represented in the population.

Table XIX shows a comparison of the means for the individual single unit management skill ratings within each performance dimension and their respective ranking. Financial Management skill means were 3.43 for respondents with single and multi-unit managers and 3.55 for respondents with single unit managers only. Management skill means for Food Service Operations were 4.55 for respondents with both levels of management and 4.32 for respondents with single unit managers only. Marketing and Promotions Management skill means were 3.44 for respondents with single and multi-unit managers and 3.32 for respondents with single unit managers only. Management skill means for Facilities and Safety Management were 3.85 for institutions with both levels of management and 3.67 for institutions with single unit managers only. Human Resources Management skill means were 4.32 for respondents with single and multi-unit managers and 4.10 for respondents with single unit managers only.

TABLE XVIII

INDIVIDUAL SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED TO RESPONDENTS WITH ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ON STAFF

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single and Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Financial Management				
Preparing financial plans	3.15	1.04	3.22	1.16
Establishing financial goals	3.21	1.05	3.30	1.04
Authorizing expenditures within policy limits	3.36	1.06	3.53	1.16
Managing competitive bidding/purchasing processes	2.53	1.29	3.03	1.40
Monitoring compliance with purchasing controls	3.27	1.18	3.60	1.16
Assisting in the development of financial forecasts	3.29	1.11	3.30	1.06
Monitoring financial performance	3.80	1.02	3.90	1.04
Recognizing cost variances and causes	4.03	.98	4.01	.91
Developing financial corrective action plans	3.74	1.07	3.70	1.11
Evaluating financial results related to budgets	3.60	1.08	3.66	1.08
Developing plans to correct financial deficiencies	3.79	1.10	3.79	1.13

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single and Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Food Service Operations				
Enforcing quality and service standards	4.79	.46	4.62	.69
Developing operational plans	4.09	.79	3.97	.90
Implementing operational plans	4.64	.53	4.36	.82
Monitoring effective labor scheduling techniques	4.60	.60	4.27	.91
Assuring quality customer experiences	4.82	.45	4.64	.72
Identifying operational problems or issues	4.54	.61	4.34	.69
Developing solutions to operational problems or issues	4.45	.65	4.14	.80
Implementing corrective action for operational problems	4.59	.56	4.27	.84
Enforcing organizational policies and procedures	4.48	.68	4.31	.86

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single and Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Marketing And Promotions Management				
Supervising the execution of organizational marketing and promotional plans	3.40	1.03	3.23	1.03
Developing in-house advertising programs and promotional materials	3.19	1.05	2.99	1.10
Implementing marketing concepts and promotional programs	3.60	1.06	3.37	1.21
Developing an awareness of customer preferences	4.46	.72	4.25	.86
Assessing competitor operations including marketing and advertising campaigns	3.02	.96	3.05	1.08
Assisting in the development of university or community relations programs	2.95	.95	3.12	1.13
Gathering consumer research information	2.92	1.03	2.93	1.12
Supervising new product introduction	4.02	.88	3.60	1.04

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single and Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Facilities and Safety Management				
Approving low-cost improvements to facilities	3.15	1.20	3.15	1.11
Recommending more costly improvements to facilities	3.17	1.01	3.17	1.05
Supervising preventive maintenance programs programs	3.89	.99	3.73	1.05
Supervising inside or outside contractors performing maintenance and improvements	3.00	1.26	2.79	1.27
Ensuring facilities are in compliance with health codes	4.68	.66	4.46	.83
Monitoring security and safety procedures	4.60	.69	4.22	.89
Recognizing facility safety issues	4.54	.68	4.21	.94
Conducting cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	2.92	1.09	2.81	1.16
Ensuring employees are in compliance with health codes	4.71	.61	4.49	.85

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single and Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Human Resources Management				
Analyzing personnel needs/ developing manpower plans	3.94	.88	3.75	1.00
Training and development of employees	4.42	.72	4.29	.82
Supervising the implementation of in-unit training and development programs	4.25	.83	3.96	.93
Preparing employees for promotion	3.99	.94	3.55	.99
Effectively managing employee relations issues	4.24	.81	4.05	.97
Conducting formal performance evaluations	4.39	.77	4.05	.97
Minimizing employee turnover	4.21	.88	4.00	1.04
Coaching and motivating employees	4.55	.65	4.23	.90
Taking disciplinary action when necessary	4.47	.70	4.22	.82
Ensuring personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	4.36	.76	4.10	.93
Monitoring compliance with company personnel policies and practices	4.16	.85	4.00	.94
Modeling effective supervisory behavior	4.46	.73	4.35	.80
Maintaining a favorable working environment	4.51	.67	4.43	.73
Serving as a resource to the employees	4.41	.74	4.23	.83
Providing feedback when appropriate	4.50	.67	4.34	.75

N = 121

TABLE XIX

MEAN INDIVIDUAL SINGLE UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS FOR RANDOMLY SELECTED RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED TO RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ONLY

Performance Dimension	Single And Multi-Unit Managers		Single Unit Managers Only	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Financial Management	3.43	5	3.55	4
Food Service Operations	4.55	1	4.32	1
Marketing and Promotions Management	3.44	4	3.32	5
Facilities and Safety Management	3.85	3	3.67	3
Human Resources Management	4.32	2	4.10	2

N=121

Performance Dimension Comparisons

Financial Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between the skills required for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ only single unit mangers. Table XX shows a mean skill rating of 37.70 for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers, and a mean skill rating of 39.02 for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only which reflected 1.32 difference. The standard deviation for single unit manager skill ratings was lower in institutions with single and multi-unit managers (8.70) than for institutions with single unit managers only (9.34).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Financial Management skill rating of single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only. The t value was not statistically significant ($t = 1.16$, $df = 120$, $p > .05$), indicating that the mean Financial Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers did not differ significantly from the mean Financial Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. The strength of association measure, eta squared, was not calculated for this comparison based on a lack of statistical significance.

Food Service Operations skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between the skills required for single unit management in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers

TABLE XX

CORRELATED t TEST FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Institutions with Single and Multi-Unit Managers	37.70	8.70	1.16
Institutions with Single Unit Managers Only	39.02	9.34	
Difference Score	1.32	12.47	

standard error of the mean for the differences = 1.133
df = 120, p = .248

and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. Table XXI shows a mean skill rating of 40.98 for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit management and a mean skill rating of 38.92 for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only which reflected a 2.06 difference. The standard deviation for single unit manager skill ratings was lower in in institutions with single and multi-unit managers (3.79) than for institutions with single unit managers only (5.82).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Food Service Operations management skill rating of single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit management and single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 3.31$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$), indicating that the mean Food Service Operations skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers was significantly greater that the mean Food Service Operations skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .0836. In this study 8.36% of the variance between the mean Food Service Operations skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only was accounted for by factors associated with the two single unit management positions.

Marketing and Promotions Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between the skills required for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit

TABLE XXI

CORRELATED t TEST FOR FOOD SERVICE OPERATIONS SKILL OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Institutions with Single and Multi-Unit Managers	40.98	3.79	3.31*
Institutions with Single Unit Managers Only	38.92	5.82	
Difference Score	2.06	6.87	

standard error of the mean of the differences = 0.624
df = 120, * p = .001

managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. Table XXII shows a mean skill rating of 27.55 for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers and a mean skill rating of 26.54 for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only which reflects a 1.01 difference. The standard deviation for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers (5.18) was lower than for institutions with single unit managers only (6.38).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill rating of single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only. The t value was not statistically significant ($t = 1.44$, $df = 120$, $p > .05$), indicating that the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers did not differ significantly from the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. The strength of association measure, eta squared, was not calculated for this comparison based on a lack of statistical significance.

Facilities and Safety Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between the skills required for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. Table XXIII shows a mean skill rating of 34.66 for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers and a mean skill rating of 33.00 for single unit managers in institutions with

TABLE XXII

CORRELATED t TEST FOR MARKETING AND PROMOTIONS MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Institutions with Single and Multi-Unit Managers	27.55	5.18	1.44
Institutions with Single Unit Managers Only	26.54	6.38	
Difference Score	1.01	7.75	

standard error of the mean of the differences = 0.704
df = 120, p = .152

TABLE XXIII

CORRELATED t TEST FOR FACILITIES AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Institutions with Single and Multi-Unit Managers	34.66	5.13	2.30*
Institutions with Single Unit Managers Only	33.00	6.29	
Difference Score	1.66	7.91	

standard error of the mean of the differences = 0.719
df = 120, * p = .023

single unit managers only which reflects a 1.66 difference. The standard deviation for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit management (5.13) was lower than institutions with single unit managers only (6.29).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating of single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 2.30$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating, that the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers was significantly greater than the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .0422. In this study 4.22% of the variance between the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only was accounted for by factors associated with the two single unit management positions.

Human Resources Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers in institutions which employed single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. Table XXIV shows a mean skill rating of 64.84 for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers and a mean skill

TABLE XXIV

CORRELATED t TEST FOR HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Institutions with Single and Multi-Unit Managers	64.84	7.85	2.73*
Institutions with Single Unit Managers Only	61.55	10.08	
Difference Score	3.29	13.28	

standard error of the mean of the differences = 1.208
df = 120, * p = .007

rating of 61.55 for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only which reflects a 3.29 difference. The standard deviation for single unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit management was lower than institutions with single unit managers only.

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Human Resources Management skill rating of single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 2.73$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Human Resources Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers was significantly greater than the mean Human Resource Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .058. In this study 5.85% of the variance between the mean Human Resources Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers and single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only was accounted for by factors associated with the two single unit management positions.

Research Question Number Two

What are the skills required to be a multi-unit manager in the college and university food service industry?

Five performance dimensions, Financial Management with eleven (11)

management skills, Food Service Operations with nine (9) management skills, Marketing and Promotions Management with eight (8) management skills, Facilities and Safety Management with nine (9) management skills, and Resources Management with fifteen (15) management skills were utilized to answer this research question. The rating scale for each skill is based on that management skill's importance related to the multi-unit management position with 1 = no importance, 2 = minor importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4 = major importance, and 5 = critical importance. Order is related to whether the single or multi-unit rating scale appeared first or second on the questionnaire. The single unit rating scale appeared first for order = 1 and the multi-unit rating scale appeared first for order = 2.

Respondents with Single and Multi-Unit Managers

Table XXV shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptor rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for multi-unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers currently on staff. Table XXVI shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptor rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for multi-unit managers in institutions with single and multi-unit managers currently on staff by order.

The mean scores and standard deviations represented in tables XXV and XXVI show minimal statistical differences. Order of the response foils had no apparent effect on how the multi-unit management skills were rated among respondents which currently employ single and multi-

TABLE XXV

MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS

Performance Dimension	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	45.88	7.71
Food Service Operations	38.35	5.81
Marketing and Promotions Management	30.51	6.00
Facilities and Safety Management	35.68	5.98
Human Resources Management	64.12	8.32

N=136

TABLE XXVI

MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS BY ORDER

Performance Dimension	Order = 1		Order = 2	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	45.16	8.16	46.64	7.18
Food Service Operations	38.33	5.68	38.36	5.99
Marketing and Promotions Management	30.33	5.57	30.71	6.47
Facilities and Safety Management	35.90	5.62	35.44	6.36
Human Resources Management	64.60	7.11	63.61	9.47
	N = 70		N = 66	

unit managers.

Since there were an unequal number of management skill descriptors within each performance dimension further clarification of responses is necessary. Table XXVII shows a comparison of the means and their respective standard deviations for the individual management skill descriptor ratings. Management skill descriptors were listed by their respective performance dimension. Table XXVII was illustrated to accommodate the needs of the diverse college and university food service systems represented in the population.

Selection of a Comparative Sample of Multi-Unit Managers from Institutions with Single and Multi-Unit Managers

To compare the management skills required for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers against the management skills required for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only a random sample of 121 of the 136 respondents from those institutions which employed both levels of management was selected. One hundred twenty one (121) of the 129 respondents with only single unit managers were randomly selected so the order of the response foils were matched for order one and order two among both groups of respondents. Respondents with single and multi-unit managers included only 66 respondents of order = 2 which necessitated randomly selecting the same number of respondents from a pool of 72 possible respondents which currently employed single unit managers only and had order = 2.

Table XXVII compares the means of the sum of the individual

TABLE XXVII

INDIVIDUAL MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS
FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT
MANAGERS CURRENTLY ON STAFF

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Financial Management		
Preparing financial plans	4.15	.99
Establishing financial goals	4.18	.94
Authorizing expenditures within policy limits	4.06	.96
Managing competitive bidding/ purchasing processes	3.59	1.30
Monitoring compliance with purchasing controls	3.85	1.04
Assisting in the development of financial forecasts	4.13	.99
Monitoring financial performance	4.34	1.03
Recognizing cost variances and causes	4.44	.76
Developing financial corrective action plans	4.35	.90
Evaluating financial results related to budgets	4.26	.87
Developing plans to correct financial deficiencies	4.42	.83
Food Service Operations		
Enforcing quality and service standards	4.43	.80
Developing operational plans	4.21	.79
Implementing operational plans	4.03	.90
Monitoring effective labor scheduling techniques	4.08	.91
Assuring quality customer experiences	4.35	.89
Identifying operational problems or issues	4.35	.73
Developing solutions to operational problems or issues	4.39	.67
Implementing corrective action for operational problems	4.14	.92
Enforcing organizational policies and procedures	4.36	.80

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Marketing And Promotions Management		
Supervising the execution of organizational marketing and promotional plans	3.88	1.03
Developing in-house advertising programs and promotional materials	3.74	1.08
Implementing marketing concepts and promotional programs	3.69	1.02
Developing an awareness of customer preferences	4.27	.80
Assessing competitor operations including marketing and advertising campaigns	3.76	1.11
Assisting in the development of university or community relations programs	3.88	1.07
Gathering consumer research information	3.52	1.12
Supervising new product introduction	3.78	.96
Facilities and Safety Management		
Approving low-cost improvements to facilities	3.75	1.04
Recommending more costly improvements to facilities	4.12	1.00
Supervising preventive maintenance programs	3.60	1.00
Supervising inside or outside contractors performing maintenance and improvements	3.40	1.34
Ensuring facilities are in compliance with health codes	4.34	.75
Monitoring security and safety procedures	4.18	.84
Recognizing facility safety issues	4.29	.78
Conducting cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	3.69	1.22
Ensuring employees are in compliance with health codes	4.21	.96

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Mean	Standard Deviation
Human Resources Management		
Analyzing personnel needs and developing manpower plans	4.32	.77
Training and development of employees	4.16	.79
Supervising the implementation of in-unit training and development programs	3.99	.84
Preparing employees for promotion	4.02	.80
Effectively managing employee relation issues	4.34	.75
Conducting formal performance evaluations	4.29	.81
Minimizing employee turnover	4.14	.85
Coaching and motivating employees	4.32	.75
Taking disciplinary action when necessary	4.28	.84
Ensuring personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	4.40	.75
Monitoring compliance with company personnel policies and practices	4.27	.87
Modeling effective supervisory behavior	4.49	.77
Maintaining a favorable working environment	4.38	.75
Serving as a resource to the employees	4.30	.75
Providing constructive feedback when appropriate	4.44	.70

N = 121

TABLE XXVIII

MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED TO A RANDOMLY SELECTED SAMPLE OF THE SAME RESPONDENTS

Performance Dimension	Original Respondents		Randomly Selected	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	45.88	7.71	46.07	7.57
Food Service Operations	38.35	5.81	38.70	5.33
Marketing and Promotions Management	30.51	6.00	30.62	6.12
Facilities and Safety Management	35.68	5.98	35.97	5.89
Human Resources Management	64.12	8.32	64.60	8.35
	N = 136		N = 121	

multi-unit management skill descriptor rating scores and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for institutions with single and multi-unit managers on staff (N = 136) and the randomly drawn sample from the same group (N = 121). Table XXIX compares the mean individual multi-unit management skill descriptor rating scores for institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers (N = 136) and the randomly drawn sample from the same group (N = 121). Minimal statistical differences exist between the two groups indicating a representative sample was selected from the original respondents.

Respondents who originally indicated single and multi-unit managers were currently on staff identified management skill level of importance for the multi-unit management position. The mean rating for the individual management skill descriptors in the Financial Management performance dimension was 4.17 indicating it was of major importance for multi-unit managers to posses Financial Management skills. The individual management skill descriptor mean rating in the Food Service Operations performance dimension was 4.26 indicating a major importance for these management skills. The mean individual rating for the skill descriptors in the Marketing and Promotions performance dimension was 3.81 indicating a moderate importance for these multi-unit management skills. The individual management skill descriptor mean rating in Marketing and Promotions Management was 3.96 indicating a moderate importance for these management skills. The mean rating for the individual management skill descriptors in Human Resources Management was 4.27 indicating a major importance for these multi-unit management skills.

TABLE XXIX

MEAN INDIVIDUAL MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS FOR RESPONDENTS WITH SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS COMPARED TO A RANDOMLY SELECTED SAMPLE OF THE SAME RESPONDENTS

Performance Dimension	Original Respondents		Randomly Selected	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Financial Management	4.17	3	4.19	3
Food Service Operations	4.26	2	4.30	2
Marketing and Promotions Management	3.81	5	3.83	5
Facilities and Safety Management	3.96	4	4.00	4
Human Resources Management	4.27	1	4.31	1
	N = 136		N = 121	

Research Question Number Three

How do single unit management skills compare to those skills required for multi-unit management in the college and university food service industry?

Five performance dimensions, Financial Management with eleven (11) management skills, Food Service Operations with nine (9) management skills, Marketing and Promotions Management with eight (8) management skills, Facilities and Safety Management with nine (9) management skills, and Human Resources Management with fifteen (15) management skills were utilized to answer this research question. The rating scale for each skill is based on that management skills importance related to the management position of reference with 1 = no importance, 2 = minor importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4 = major importance, and 5 = critical importance.

Comparison of Respondents Which Employ Single and Multi-Unit Mangers

Table XXX shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptors and their respective standard deviations for single and multi-unit managers for institutions which employ both levels of management. Mean single unit management performance dimension skill ratings were higher in the Food Service Operations and Human Resources Management; however, in Human Resources Management the difference between the two groups of managers was only .27. Mean multi-unit performance dimension skill ratings were higher in the Financial Management, Marketing and Promotions Management, and Facilities and

TABLE XXX

COMPARISON OF SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS FOR INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Managers		Multi-Unit Managers	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	37.39	8.63	45.88	7.71
Food Service Operations	40.54	4.83	38.35	5.81
Marketing and Promotions Management	27.45	5.14	30.51	6.00
Facilities and Safety Management	34.46	5.19	35.68	5.98
Human Resources Management	64.39	7.94	64.12	8.32

N = 136

Safety Management.

Since there were an unequal number of management skill descriptors within each performance dimension a further clarification of responses was necessary. Table XXXI shows a comparison of the means and their respective standard deviations for the individual management skill descriptor ratings for single and multi-unit management in institutions which employ both levels of management. Management skills were listed by their respective performance dimension. Table XXXI was illustrated to accommodate the needs of the diverse college and university food service systems represented in the population.

Table XXXII shows a comparison of the means for the individual single and multi-unit management skill ratings within each performance dimension and their respective ranking. Financial Management skill means were 3.40 for single unit managers and 4.17 for multi-unit managers. Management skill means for Food Service Operations were 4.50 for single unit managers and 4.26 for multi-unit managers. Marketing and Promotion Management skill means were 3.43 for single unit managers and 3.81 for multi-unit managers. Management skill means for Facilities and Safety Management were 3.83 for single unit managers and 3.96 for multi-unit managers. Human Resource Management skill means were 4.29 for single unit managers and 4.27 for multi-unit managers. Financial Management was the only set of performance dimension skills which showed a difference in the degree of skill importance between the two levels of management.

TABLE XXXI

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS FOR INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers		Multi-Unit Managers	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Financial Management				
Preparing financial plans	3.13	1.03	4.15	1.00
Establishing financial goals	3.17	1.06	4.18	.94
Authorizing expenditures within limits limits	3.35	1.08	4.06	.96
Managing competitive bidding/purchasing processes	2.49	1.25	3.59	1.30
Monitoring compliance with purchasing controls	3.24	1.18	3.85	1.04
Assisting in the development of financial forecasts	3.20	1.11	4.13	.99
Monitoring financial performance	3.77	1.03	4.34	.78
Recognizing cost variances and causes	4.05	.76	4.44	.76
Developing financial corrective action plans	3.70	1.06	4.35	.90
Evaluating financial results related to budgets	3.57	1.06	4.26	.87
Developing plans to correct financial deficiencies	3.74	.87	4.42	.83

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Single Unit Managers Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Multi-Unit Managers Standard Deviation
Food Service Operations				
Enforcing quality and service standards	4.78	.55	4.43	.80
Developing operational plans	4.02	.81	4.21	.79
Implementing operational plans	4.57	.63	4.03	.90
Monitoring effective labor scheduling techniques	4.55	.71	4.08	.91
Assuring quality customer experiences	4.77	.63	4.35	.89
Identifying operational problems or issues	4.50	.67	4.35	.73
Developing solutions to operational problems or issues	4.39	.72	4.39	.67
Implementing corrective action for operational problems	4.52	.70	4.14	.92
Enforcing organizational policies and procedures	4.36	.80	4.36	.80

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Single Unit Managers Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Multi-Unit Managers Standard Deviation
Marketing And Promotions Management				
Supervising the execution of organizational marketing and promotional plans	3.37	1.02	3.88	1.03
Developing in-house advertising programs and promotional materials	3.17	1.09	3.74	1.08
Implementing marketing concepts and promotional programs	3.59	1.08	3.69	1.02
Developing an awareness of customer preferences	4.46	.71	4.27	.80
Assessing competitor operations including marketing and advertising campaigns	3.00	.97	3.76	1.11
Assisting in the development of university or community relations programs	2.97	.95	3.88	1.07
Gathering consumer research information	2.90	1.03	3.52	1.12
Supervising new product introduction	3.99	.88	3.78	.96

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Single Unit Managers Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Multi-Unit Managers Standard Deviation
Facilities and Safety Management				
Approving low-cost improvements to facilities	3.14	1.18	3.75	1.04
Recommending more costly improvements to facilities	3.14	1.00	4.12	1.00
Supervising preventive maintenance programs	3.85	.99	3.60	1.00
Supervising inside or outside contractors performing maintenance and improvements	2.98	1.24	3.40	1.34
Ensuring facilities are in compliance with health codes	4.65	.68	4.34	.75
Monitoring security and safety procedures	4.58	.69	4.18	.84
Recognizing facility safety issues	4.48	.71	4.29	.78
Conducting cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	2.93	1.10	3.69	1.22
Ensuring employees are in compliance with health codes	4.70	.61	4.21	.96

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Performance Dimension Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Standard Deviation
Human Resources Management				
Analyzing personnel needs/ develop manpower plans	3.96	.86	4.32	.77
Training and development of employees	4.40	.72	4.16	.80
Supervising the implementation of in-unit training and development programs	4.22	.85	3.99	.84
Preparing employees for promotion	3.48	.91	4.02	.80
Effectively managing employee relation issues	4.20	.81	4.34	.75
Conducting formal performance evaluations	4.35	.76	4.29	.81
Minimizing employee turnover	4.17	.88	4.14	.85
Coaching and motivating employees	4.52	.66	4.32	.75
Taking disciplinary action when necessary	4.28	.70	4.28	.84
Ensuring personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	4.30	.79	4.40	.75
Monitoring compliance with company personnel policies and practices	4.28	.91	4.27	.87
Modeling effective supervisory behavior	4.41	.78	4.49	.77
Maintaining a favorable working environment	4.46	.73	4.38	.75
Serving as a resource to the employees	4.39	.72	4.30	.75
Providing feedback when appropriate	4.44	.67	4.44	.70

N = 136

TABLE XXXII

MEAN INDIVIDUAL SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS FOR INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Managers Mean	Rank	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Rank
Financial Management	3.40	5	4.17	3
Food Service Operations	4.50	1	4.26	2
Marketing and Promotions Management	3.43	4	3.81	5
Facilities and Safety Management	3.83	3	3.96	4
Human Resources Management	4.29	2	4.27	1

N=136

Performance Dimension Comparisons

Financial management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management. Table XXXIII shows a mean skill rating of 37.39 for single unit managers and 45.88 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 8.49 difference. The standard deviation for multi-unit manager skill ratings (7.71) was lower than for the single unit manager skill ratings (8.63).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Financial Management skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 11.65$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Financial Management skill rating for multi-unit managers was significantly greater than the mean Financial Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .5013. In this study 50.13% of the variance between the mean Financial Management skill ratings for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

Food Service Operations skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management. Table XXXIV shows a mean skill rating of 40.54 for single unit managers and 38.35 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 2.19 difference. The standard deviation for single unit manager skill

TABLE XXXIII

CORRELATED T TEST FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WITH BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	37.39	8.63	11.65*
Multi-Unit Managers	45.88	7.71	
Difference Score	8.49	8.50	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .729
df = 120, * p = .000

TABLE XXXIV

CORRELATED T TEST FOR FOOD SERVICE OPERATIONS SKILLS OF SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WITH BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	40.54	4.83	4.78*
Multi-Unit Managers	38.35	5.81	
Difference Score	2.19	5.35	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .458
df = 120, * p = .000

ratings (4.83) was lower than for the multi-unit manager skill ratings (5.81).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Food Service Operations skills ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 4.78$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Food Service Operations skill rating for single unit managers was significantly greater than the mean Food Service Operations skill rating for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .1447. In this study 14.47% of the variance between the mean Food Service Operations skill ratings for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

Marketing and Promotions Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management. Table XXXV shows a mean skill rating of 27.45 for single unit managers and 30.51 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 3.06 difference. The standard deviation for single unit manager skill rating (5.14) was lower than the multi-unit manager skill rating (6.00).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 6.97$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill rating for multi-unit managers was significantly greater than the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill rating for single unit

TABLE XXXV

CORRELATED T TEST FOR MARKETING AND PROMOTIONS MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WITH BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	27.45	5.14	6.97*
Multi-Unit Managers	30.51	6.00	
Difference Score	3.06	5.13	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .440
df = 120, * p = .000

managers in institutions which employ both levels of management.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .2646. In this study 26.46% of the variance between the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill ratings for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

Facilities and Safety Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management. Table XXXVI shows a mean skill rating of 34.46 for single unit managers and 35.68 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 1.22 difference. The standard deviation for single unit manager skills (5.19) was lower than for multi-unit manager skills (5.98).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 2.88$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating for multi-unit managers was significantly greater than the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .0578. In this study 5.78% of the variance between the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill ratings for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

TABLE XXXVI

CORRELATED T TEST FOR FACILITIES AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WITH BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	34.46	5.19	2.88*
Multi-Unit Managers	35.68	5.98	
Difference Score	1.22	4.94	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .424
df = 120, * p = .005

Human Resources Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management. Table XXXVII shows a mean skill rating of 64.39 for single unit managers and 64.12 for multi-unit managers which reflects a .27 difference. The standard deviation for single unit manager skill ratings (7.94) was lower than for multi-unit manager skill ratings (8.32).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Human Resources Management skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was not statistically significant ($t = .49$, $df = 120$, $p > .05$) indicating that the mean Human Resources Management skill rating for single unit managers did not differ significantly from the mean Human Resources Management skill rating for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management. The strength of association measure, eta squared, was not calculated for this comparison based on a lack of statistical significance.

Comparison of Respondents Which Employ Single Unit Managers Only To Multi-Unit Managers

Table XXXVIII shows the means of the sum of the individual management skill descriptor ratings and their respective standard deviations by performance dimension for respondents which indicated only single unit managers currently on staff and multi-unit managers from the randomly selected respondents with both levels of management. The randomly selected multi-unit managers were from the same respondents

TABLE XXXVII

CORRELATED T TEST FOR HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WITH BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	64.39	7.94	.49
Multi-Unit Managers	64.12	8.32	
Difference Score	.27	6.50	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .557
df = 120, p = .626

TABLE XXXVIII

COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE DIMENSION SKILL RATINGS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS RANDOMLY SELECTED FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Managers		Multi-Unit Managers	
	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation	Mean of Sum Scores	Standard Deviation
Financial Management	39.02	9.34	46.07	7.57
Food Service Operations	38.92	5.82	38.70	5.33
Marketing and Promotions Management	26.54	6.38	30.62	6.12
Facilities and Safety Management	33.00	6.29	35.97	5.89
Human Resources Management	61.55	10.08	64.60	8.35

N = 121

selected for the single unit manager comparison described earlier. Randomly selected multi-unit manager (N = 121) characteristics were compared to the original respondents (N = 136) in Table XXVIII.

Mean single unit management performance dimension skill ratings were higher Food Service Operations, but by a small margin (.22). Multi-unit management mean performance dimension skill ratings were higher for Financial Management, Marketing and Promotions, Facilities and Safety, and Human Resources Management.

Since there were an unequal number of management skill descriptors within each performance dimension a further clarification of responses is necessary. Table XXXIX shows a comparison of the means for the individual single and multi-unit management skill ratings and their respective standard deviations for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only and the randomly selected multi-unit managers. Management skills were listed by their respective performance dimension. Table XXXIX was illustrated to accommodate the needs of the diverse college and university food service systems represented in the population.

Table XL shows a comparison of the means for the individual single and multi-unit management skill ratings within each performance dimension. Financial Management skill means were 3.55 for single unit managers and 4.19 for multi-unit managers. Management skill means for Food Service Operations were 4.32 for single unit managers and 4.30 for multi-unit managers. Marketing and Promotions Management skill means were 3.32 for single unit managers and 3.83 for multi-unit managers. Management skill means for Facilities and Safety Management were 3.67 for single unit managers and 4.00 for multi-unit managers. Human

TABLE XXXIX

COMPARISON OF INDIVIDUAL MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS FOR SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS RANDOMLY SELECTED FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Performance Dimension/ Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers		Multi-Unit Managers	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Financial Management				
Preparing financial plans	3.22	1.16	4.14	1.03
Establishing financial goals	3.30	1.04	4.20	.94
Authorizing expenditures within policy limits	3.53	1.16	4.10	.94
Managing competitive bidding/purchasing processes	3.03	1.40	3.64	1.30
Monitoring compliance with purchasing controls	3.60	1.16	3.90	1.01
Assisting in the development of financial forecasts	3.30	1.06	4.14	.99
Monitoring financial performance	3.90	1.04	4.46	.74
Recognizing cost variances and causes	4.01	.91	4.41	.77
Developing financial corrective action plans	3.70	1.11	4.37	.88
Evaluating financial results related to budgets	3.66	1.08	4.27	.88
Developing plans to correct financial deficiencies	3.79	1.13	4.45	.82

TABLE XXXIX (Continued)

Performance Dimension/ Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Single Unit Managers Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Multi-Unit Managers Standard Deviation
Food Service Operations				
Enforcing quality and service standards	4.62	.69	4.45	.74
Developing operational plans	3.97	.90	4.25	.76
Implementing operational plans	4.36	.82	4.06	.89
Monitoring effective labor scheduling techniques	4.27	.91	4.12	.85
Assuring quality customer experiences	4.64	.72	4.39	.80
Identifying operational problems or issues	4.34	.69	4.41	.68
Developing solutions to operational problems or issues	4.14	.80	4.43	.63
Implementing corrective action for operational problems	4.27	.84	4.27	.85
Enforcing organizational policies and procedures	4.31	.86	4.20	.75

TABLE XXXIX (Continued)

Performance Dimension/ Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Single Unit Managers Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Multi-Unit Managers Standard Deviation
Marketing And Promotions Management				
Supervising the execution of organizational marketing and promotional plans	3.23	1.03	3.88	1.02
Developing in-house advertising programs and promotional materials	2.99	1.10	3.77	1.06
Implementing marketing concepts and promotional programs	3.37	1.21	3.71	1.00
Developing an awareness of customer preferences	4.25	.86	4.29	.82
Assessing competitor operations including marketing and advertising campaigns	3.05	1.08	3.77	1.10
Assisting in the development of university or community relations programs	3.12	1.13	3.86	1.10
Gathering consumer research information	2.93	1.12	3.55	1.14
Supervising new product introduction	3.60	1.04	3.80	.97

TABLE XXXIX (Continued)

Performance Dimension/ Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Single Unit Managers Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Multi-Unit Managers Standard Deviation
Facilities and Safety Management				
Approving low-cost improvements to facilities	3.15	1.11	3.78	1.03
Recommending more costly improvements to facilities	3.17	1.05	4.15	.98
Supervising preventive maintenance programs	3.73	1.05	3.64	1.00
Supervising inside or outside contractors performing maintenance and improvements	2.79	1.27	3.43	1.34
Ensuring facilities are in compliance with health codes	4.46	.83	4.46	.75
Monitoring security and safety procedures	4.22	.89	4.22	.86
Recognizing facility safety issues	4.21	.94	4.32	.78
Conducting cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	2.81	1.16	3.76	1.17
Ensuring employees are in compliance with health codes	4.49	.85	4.22	.97

TABLE XXXIX (Continued)

Performance Dimension/ Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers Mean	Single Unit Managers Standard Deviation	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Multi-Unit Managers Standard Deviation
Human Resources Management				
Analyzing personnel needs needs and developing manpower plans	3.75	1.00	4.31	.76
Training and development of employees	4.29	.82	4.16	.81
Supervising the implementation of in-unit training training and development programs	3.96	.93	3.98	.85
Preparing employees for promotion	3.55	.99	4.06	.82
Effectively managing employee relation issues	4.05	.97	4.41	.74
Conducting formal performance evaluations	4.05	.97	4.34	.81
Minimizing employee turnover	4.00	1.04	4.17	.86
Coaching and motivating employees	4.23	.90	4.37	.73
Taking disciplinary action when necessary	4.22	.82	4.31	.80
Ensuring personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	4.10	.93	4.44	.73
Monitoring compliance with company personnel policies and practices	4.00	.94	4.33	.82
Modeling effective supervisory behavior	4.35	.80	4.51	.71

TABLE XXXIX (Continued)

Performance Dimension/ Management Skill Descriptor	Single Unit Managers		Multi-Unit Managers	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Human Resources Management (Continued)				
Maintaining a favorable working environment	4.43	.70	4.42	.70
Serving as a resource to the employees	4.23	.83	4.32	.76
Providing constructive feedback when appropriate	4.34	.75	4.47	.70

N = 121

TABLE XL

MEAN INDIVIDUAL MANAGEMENT SKILL DESCRIPTOR RATINGS FOR SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY ONLY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS RANDOMLY SELECTED FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Performance Dimension	Single Unit Managers Mean	Rank	Multi-Unit Managers Mean	Rank
Financial Management	3.55	4	4.19	3
Food Service Operations	4.32	1	4.30	2
Marketing and Promotions Management	3.32	5	3.83	5
Facilities and Safety Management	3.67	3	4.00	4
Human Resources Management	4.10	2	4.31	1

N=121

Resources Management skill means were 4.10 for single unit managers and 4.31 for multi-unit managers. Financial Management and Facilities and Safety Management were the only set of performance dimension skills which showed a difference in the degree of skill importance required between the two levels of management.

Performance Dimension Comparisons

Financial Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only and institutions which employ both levels of management. Table XLI shows a mean skill rating of 39.02 for single unit managers and 46.07 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 7.05 difference. The standard deviation for multi-unit manager skill ratings (7.57) was lower than for single unit manager skill ratings (9.34).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Financial Management skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 6.30$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Financial Management skill rating for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was significantly greater than the mean Financial Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .2485. In this study 24.85% of the variance between the mean Financial Management skill ratings for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only and multi-unit managers in institutions

TABLE XLI

CORRELATED t TEST FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ONLY AND RANDOMLY SELECTED MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	39.02	9.34	6.34*
Multi-Unit Managers	46.07	7.57	
Difference Score	7.05	12.32	

standard error of the mean of the differences = 1.12
df = 120, * p = .000

which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

Food Service Operations skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only and institutions which employed both levels of management. Table XLII shows a mean skill rating of 38.92 for single unit managers and 38.70 for multi-unit managers which reflects a .22 difference. The standard deviation for multi-unit manager skill ratings (5.33) was lower than for single unit manager skill ratings (5.82).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Food Service Operations skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was not statistically significant ($t = .32$, $df = 120$, $p > .05$) indicating that the mean Food Service Operations skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only did not differ significantly from the mean Food Service Operations skill rating for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management. The strength of association measure, eta squared, was not calculated for this comparison based on a lack of statistical significance.

Marketing and Promotions Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only and institutions which employed both levels of management. Table XLIII shows a mean skill rating of 26.54 for single unit managers and 30.62 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 4.08 difference. The standard deviation for multi-unit manager skill ratings (6.12) was lower than for

TABLE XLII

CORRELATED t TEST FOR FOOD SERVICE OPERATIONS SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ONLY AND RANDOMLY SELECTED MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	38.92	5.82	.32
Multi-Unit Managers	38.70	5.33	
Difference Score	.22	7.45	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .677
df = 120, p = .752

TABLE XLIII

CORRELATED t TEST FOR MARKETING AND PROMOTIONS MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ONLY AND RANDOMLY SELECTED MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	26.54	6.38	5.04*
Multi-Unit Managers	30.62	6.12	
Difference Score	4.08	8.91	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .810
df = 120, * p = .000

single unit manager skill ratings (6.38).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 5.04$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill rating for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was significantly greater than the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .1747. In this study 17.47% of the variance between the mean Marketing and Promotions Management skill ratings for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

Facilities and Safety Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only and institutions which employed both levels of management. Table XLIV shows a mean skill rating of 33.00 for single unit managers and 35.97 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 2.97 difference. The standard deviation for multi-unit manager skill ratings (5.89) was lower than for single unit manager skill ratings (6.29).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill ratings for single and multi-unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 3.95$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating

TABLE XLIV

CORRELATED t TEST FOR FACILITIES AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ONLY AND RANDOMLY SELECTED MULTI-UNIT MANAGERS FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	33.00	6.29	3.95*
Multi-Unit Managers	35.97	5.89	
Difference Score	2.97	8.25	

standard error of the mean of the differences = .750
df = 120, * p = .000

for multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was significantly greater than the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was .1151. In this study 11.51% of the variance between the mean Facilities and Safety Management skill ratings for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

Human Resources Management skills were analyzed to determine if a difference existed between skills required for single unit managers in institutions with single unit managers only and institutions which employed both levels of management. Table XLV shows a mean skill rating of 61.55 for single unit managers and 64.60 for multi-unit managers which reflects a 3.05 difference. The standard deviation for multi-unit manager skill ratings (8.35) was lower than for single unit manager skill ratings (10.08).

A correlated t test was performed comparing the mean Human Resources Management skill ratings for single and multi unit managers. The t value was statistically significant ($t = 2.50$, $df = 120$, $p < .05$) indicating that the mean Human Resources Management skill rating for multi-unit managers in institutions with both levels of management was significantly greater than the mean Human Resources Management skill rating for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only.

Eta squared, a strength of association measure, for the t value was

TABLE XLV

CORRELATED t TEST FOR HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SKILLS OF SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS IN INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY SINGLE UNIT MANAGERS ONLY AND RANDOMLY SELECTED MULTI-UNIT MANGERS FROM INSTITUTIONS WHICH EMPLOY BOTH LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Single Unit Managers	61.55	10.08	2.50*
Multi-Unit Managers	64.60	8.35	
Difference Score	3.05	13.40	

standard error of the mean of the differences = 1.218
df = 120, * p = .014

.0495. In this study 4.95% of the variance between the mean Human Resources Management skill ratings for single unit managers in institutions which employ single unit managers only and multi-unit managers in institutions which employ both levels of management was accounted for by factors associated with the two management positions.

Multi-Unit Management Transition Problems

Performance dimensions were rated by the respondents to identify the dimension which multi-unit managers experience the greatest problems with when making the transition from single unit management to multi-unit management. Only those respondents with single and multi-unit managers currently on staff responded to this question.

Table XLVI shows the frequency, percentage, and ranking associated with the responses for each of the five performance dimensions. Financial Management skills were rated by 53 (20.2%) of the respondents as the skills for which single unit managers experienced the most problems with when making the transition to a multi-unit management position. This was followed in decreasing order by Human Resources Management skills 44 (16.7%), Marketing and Promotions Management skills 21 (8.0%), Food Service Operations skills 12 (4.6%), and Facilities and Safety Management skills 3 (1.1%).

TABLE XLVI

PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSITION FROM SINGLE TO MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT POSITIONS

Performance Dimension	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Financial Management	53	20.2	1
Food Service Operations	12	4.6	4
Marketing and Promotions Management	21	8.0	3
Facilities and Safety Management	3	1.1	5
Human Resources Management	44	16.7	2
Missing Responses	3	1.1	-

N=136

Discussion of Findings

Different skills were required for single and multi-unit management in the college and university food service industry. Food Service Operations performance dimension skills were more important for single unit managers. Financial Management, Marketing and Promotions Management, and Facilities and Safety Management were more important for multi-unit managers. No difference for the Human Relations Management performance dimension skills were identified between single and multi-unit managers.

Financial Management and Human Resources Management respectively were identified as the two performance dimensions which caused the greatest transitional problems for recently promoted multi-unit managers. Different human relations skills may be required for single unit management than were required for multi-unit management which the instrument utilized in this study did not address. Single unit managers may have been inadequately trained to meet the challenges of the different human relations skills required for the multi-unit management position.

This difficulty was in contrast to the findings of Umbreit (1989). He found Human Resource Management, followed by Marketing and Promotions Management and Financial Management respectively, posed the greatest problems for single unit managers making the transition to the multi-unit management position in the fast service segment of the hospitality industry.

No formal statistical analyses were conducted to compare the individual management skill descriptors; however, a review of the data

suggested differences in the individual management skills required between single and multi-unit management may exist. The skills required for single unit management focused on the daily activities associated with the operation of the food service facility, while the skills required for multi-unit management focused on organizational, administrative, and planning skills.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to identify and compare the management skills required in single unit management and the management skills required in multi-unit management in college and university food services. This chapter was developed to present the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the research in order to provide the appropriate insight for the study.

There were three research questions for this study. The research questions were:

1. What are the skills required to be a single unit manager in the college and university food service industry?
2. What are the skills required to be a multi-unit manager in the college and university food service industry?
3. How do the single unit management skills compare to those skills required for multi-unit management in the college and university food service industry?

The subjects of the study were institutional members of The National Association of College and University Food Services (NACUFS). Schools are institutional members of NACUFS with individual participation under the school's membership. Food Service directors are those individuals normally identified as the voting delegate by NACUFS and who are primarily responsible for single and multi-unit managers.

A census of the population (511) was conducted in the study. Fifty (50) voting delegates were utilized for the pilot study and not included in the full study. Four hundred sixty one (461) questionnaires were mailed to the voting delegates of which two hundred sixty three (263) were returned in a usable condition for a response rate of fifty seven (57) percent.

Survey instrumentation was developed from previous research in the fast service segment of the hospitality industry to match the specific requirements of this study. The questionnaire was divided into two major sections: institutional demographics, and management skill performance dimensions. The management skill performance dimensions included five separate dimensions: Financial Management with eleven (11) management skills, Food Service Operations with nine (9) management skills, Marketing and Promotions Management with eight (8) management skills, Facilities and Safety Management with nine (9) management skills, and Human Resources Management with fifteen (15) management skills. A rating scale was used for each skill descriptor to determine that management skills' importance related to the single and/or multi-unit management position with 1 = no importance, 2 = minor importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4 = major importance, 5 = critical importance.

The literature review was comprised of thirteen major sections: The Managerial Nature, Leadership, Human Resources, Job Design and Labor Trends, Food Services, Colleges and Universities, Industry Projections, Food Service Management, Single Unit Management, Multi-Unit Management, Related Research, Job Analysis, and a Summary.

Summary of the Findings

Based upon the information gained as a result of the study, including the demographics, the following findings were identified:

1. Minimal differences exist between the skills required to be a single unit manager in institutions which employ single and multi-unit managers and the skills required to be a single unit manager in institutions which employ single unit managers only in college and university food services.

2. The management skill performance dimensions rated to be of major importance for single unit managers in college and university food service were Food Service Operations and Human Resources Management.

3. The management skill performance dimensions rated to be of major importance for multi-unit managers in college and university food service were Human Resources Management, Food Service Operations, and Financial Management.

4. Differences do exist between the skills required to be a single unit manager and those skills required to be a multi-unit manager in college and university food services as follows:

   A. Financial Management, Marketing and Promotions Management, and Facilities and Safety Management performance dimension skills were more important for multi-unit managers than for single unit managers.

   B. The Food Service Operations performance dimension was more important for single unit managers than for multi-unit managers.

5. No difference in the level of importance was discovered for the Human Resource Management performance dimension skills required between

single and multi-unit managers in college and university food services.

6. The Financial Management performance dimension, followed in importance by Human Resource Management performance dimension, posed the greatest problems for single unit managers making the transition to the multi-unit management position in college and university food services.

7. Individuals in college and university food services promoted from single to multi-unit management positions were not properly trained to meet the requirements of the higher level positions.

8. Moderate difficulty was reported when institutions attempted to hire qualified individuals for single and multi-unit management positions.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were drawn:

1. It is inappropriate to believe that successful single unit managers can be as successful in the multi-unit management position without further specialized training.

2. Many of the college and university food service management training programs are inadequately designed to meet the needs of both single and multi-unit managers.

3. Inservice training for many college and university food services has not adequately met the needs for professional development in order to advance from single to multi-unit management.

4. The success of training programs for single and multi-unit managers could be enhanced by including a greater emphasis on practical experience, internships, mentor programs, and field based experiences.

Recommendations

This study has provided and compared information regarding the skills required to be a single unit manager and the skills required to be a multi-unit manager in the college and university food service industry which was previously unavailable. The information presented in this study should be useful to administrators of college and university food service departments in making decisions regarding hiring, training, promotion and organizational structure. The information presented in the study provides a number of implications for further research studies.

The following recommendations for practice are offered:

1. Establish a national NACUFS educational program which would provide training in the skills identified in this study as critical to the success of single and multi-unit managers. This program would be precursor to the Leadership and the Professional Development Institutes.

2. Training programs should be developed to provide a focus on the the skill requirements common to both the single and multi-unit management positions.

3. Develop training programs which focus on the different skills required for both the single and multi-unit management positions in order to enhance the management skills of the individuals promoted into both positions.

4. Establish a mentor program which assists the professional development process of those individuals who wish to advance to the next level of management in the college and university food service industry.

The following recommendations are offered for further study:

1. Perceptions of single and multi-unit managers in college and university food services with regard to the management skills relevant to the positions they hold should be examined and compared to the results of this study.

2. Management skills required for the next highest level of management above first level multi-unit management in the college and university food service industry should be identified and compared to the results of this and related studies.

3. This study should be replicated among food service contract companies employed in the college and university food service segment of the hospitality industry.

4. A study should be conducted which compares the single and multi-unit management skills required for success in the college and university food services against the skills required for success in the fast service segment of the hospitality industry.

REFERENCES

Ananth, M. & DeMicco, F. J. (1991). Strategies for tomorrow's hospitality workforce. FIU Hospitality Review, 9(1), 25-37.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C. & Razavieh, A. (1972). Introduction to research in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Austin, A. E. (1983). Colleges and universities as workplaces: Analysis and review of the literature. Washington D.C.: Annual meeting of the association for the study of higher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 554).

Bartolome, F. & Laurent, A. (1986). The manager: Master and servant of power. Harvard Business Review, 86(6), 77-81.

Bemis, S. E., Belenky A. H. & Soder, D. A. (1983). Job analysis: An effective management tool. Washington D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs.

Bennett, S. A. (1989). Current level of training programs: Implications for independent dining services in higher education (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 07A.

Bernstein, A. (1988). Where the jobs are is where the skills aren't. Business Week, 3070, 104-5, 108.

Bernstein, C. (1990). Empower employees; Motivate customers. Nations Restaurant News, 24(26), 27.

Born, W. M. (1979). Time management for the harried campus administrator. Educational Record, 60(3), 227-233.

Bradford, D. L. & Cohen A. R. (1984). Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance in contemporary organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Brown, W. S. (1986). The mistakes most managers make. Executive Female, 9(5), 40-41, 43.

Buckham, R. H. (1987). Applying role analysis in the workplace. Personnel, 64(2), 63-65.

Carlino, B. (1990). ARA services, brainy and brawny and on the march. Nations Restaurant News, 24(50), 48.

Casico, W. F. (1982). Applied psychology in personnel management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Reston, A division of Prentice Hall.

Changing Workforce (Cover Story) (1989). Restaurant Business, 89 (6), 39-143.

Cichy, R. F., Sciarini, M. P., Cook, C. L. & Patton, M. (1991). Leadership in the lodging and non-commercial food service industries. FIU Hospitality Review, 9(1), 1-10.

Cohen, H. & Neilsen, E. H. (1988). Finding and developing tomorrow's top mangers. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Quarterly, 29(1), 34-41.

Collison, M. K. (1989, September 20). In buyer's market, colleges turn to posh dorms and fast food to lure students. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 37, 39-40.

Cooper, R. (1974). Job motivation and job design. London: Institute of Personnel Management.

Davidson, J. P. (1986). Successful staff motivation hinges on enthusiastic delegators. Data Management, 24(6), 17-19.

Dollar, F. W. (1991). Privatization-panecea or illusion. NACUFS News Wave, 24, 5.

Duke, K. M. & Sneed, J. (1989). A research model for relating job characteristics to job satisfaction of university food service employees. Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 89(8), 1087-1091.

Emig, M. F. (1986). Job evaluation: The next generation. Personnel Journal, 65(11), 52-55.

Emery, R. A. (1980). The managerial skill of delegating or "Don't Work Late, Delegate". (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 189 734).

Feild, H. S. & Gatewood R. D. (1987). Matching talent with the task. Personnel Administrator, 32(4), 113-114, 116-117, 119-120, 122, 124-126.

Ferguson D. H. & Berger F. (1984). Restaurant managers: What do they really do? Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 25(1), 26-38.

Firnstahl, T. W. (1986). Letting go. Harvard Business Review, 86(5), 14-16, 18.

Food Service Director (1991). How college food service is performing. Food Service Director, 4(2), 57, 59.

Ford, J. K. & Noe, R. A. (1987). Self-assessed training needs: The effects of attitudes toward training, managerial level and function. Personnel Psychology, 40(1), 39-53.

Frazier, D. (1981, October 26). Employee attitudes. Nations Restaurant News, p. 16.

Gael, S. (1983). Job Analysis: A guide to assessing work activities. San Fransisco: Joey-Bass.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership. Ramsey, N.J. Paulist Press.

Gullickson, B. R. (1987). America's future depends on food service training. Restaurants and Institutions, 97(2), 116.

Gupta, A. K. (1986). Matching mangers to strategies: Point and counterpoint. Human Resource Management, 25(2), 215-234.

Hale C. & Nightingale M. (1986). What are unit managers supposed to do? A contingent methodology for investigating managerial role requirements. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 5(1), 3-11.

Hale, W. (1990). Service as a product. Restaurant Business, 90(5), 132-133, 136.

Harris, T. E. (1987). Leading and managing: a study of style and perception. Salt Lake City, UT: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Competitive Papers Division, Organizational Communication. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 227).

Hayes, J. (1991). State fiscal woes bruise campus feeding. Nations Restaurant News, 25(1), 110.

Heneman, H. G., Schwab, D.P., Fossum, J.A. & Dyer, L.D. (1980). Personnel/human resource management. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.

Hesket, J. L. (1986). Managing in the service economy. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (1981). Administrative development. In A. W. Chickering (Ed.), The Modern American College (pp. 721-729). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Hooper, J. A. (1987). Shoring up the weakest link. Personnel Administrator, 32(4), 49-55, 134.

Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H. & Bounds, W. G. (1974). Reading statistics and research. New York: Harper & Row.

Isaac, S. & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego, CA: EdiTS.

Kizilos, T. & Heinisch, R. P. (1986). How a management team selects managers. Harvard Business Review, 86(5), 6-8, 12.

Knippen, J. T. & Green, T. B. (1990). Knowing how and when to accept responsibility. Supervisory Management, 35(10), 6-7.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1991). The credibility factor: What people expect of leaders. NACUFS News Wave, 24, 1-5.

Krone, C., Tabacchi, M. & Farber, B. (1989). Manager burnout. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Quarterly, 30(3), 58-63.

Lang, J. M. (1991). Career burnout. Restaurant Business, 90(4), 131-133, 136-138, 140, 142, 144, 146, 148.

Lefever, M. M. (1989). Multi-unit management: Working your way up the corporate ladder. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Quarterly. 30(1), 60-67.

Levine, E. L. (1983). Everything you always wanted to know about job analysis. Tampa, FL: Mariner.

Linton, M. & Galo, P. S. (1975). The practical statistician: Simplified handbook of statistics. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Managing the managers (1983). Restaurants and Institutions, 93(10), 159-66.

Marriot, J. W. (1983). The Marriot secret: Put your staff first. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 764).

McClenahen, J. S. (1989). Managing more people in the '90's. Industry Week, 238(6), 30-31, 34-35, 38.

McConkey, D. D. (1987). Whose job are you working on? Business Quarterly, 51(4), 39-42.

McEnrue, M. P. (1988). Length of experience and the performance of managers in the establishing phase of their careers. Academy of Management Journal, 31(1), 175-185.

McEvoy, G. M., Buller, P. F. & Rogharr, S. P. (1988). A jury of one's peers. Personnel Administrator, 33(5), 94-96, 98, 101.

McFillen, J. M., Riegel, C. D. & Enz, C. A. (1986). Why restaurant managers quit (and how to keep them). The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Quarterly, 27(3), 36-43.

McGarvey, R. (1989). Taking charge, how to make the switch from member to leader of the band. Executive Female, 11(6), 46-48, 72.

Midkiff, K. R. (1989). Determining job dimensions: An alternative approach (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 2099.

Miner, J. B. (1974). The human constraint: The coming shortage of managerial talent. Washington D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs.

Mintzberg, H. (1980). The Nature of Managerial Work. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Mintzberg, H. (1989). Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations. New York: The Free Press.

Morrison, J. H. (1988). Profiling the new HR management style. Personnel Administrator, 33(6), 88-90,92.

NACUFS Annual Report (1991). 1990-91 Annual Report. East Lansing, MI: The National Association of College and University Food Services.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (1987). A perspective on student affairs: A statement issued on the 50th anniversary of the student personnel point of view. Iowa City, IA: The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 390).

On Campus Hospitality (1991). The pros and cons of contracting out your college or university food service operations. On Campus Hospitality, 13(2), 9, 22-23.

Osborne, W. L. (1984). Who's in charge here: The what and how of leadership. Houston, TX: Annual convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 433).

Osgood W. R. (1981). Basics of successful business management. New York: Anacom.

O'Toole J. (1981). How management hinders productivity. Industry Week, 210(3), 54-55, 57-58.

Outlook '91-'92 (1991). Labor and economy worry operations most. Food Service Director, 4(1), 53-55.

Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Pickworth, J. R. (1982). Managerial jobs in chain organizations. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 22(4), 30-33.

Planning Ahead (Cover Story) (1984). Training, 21(11), 24-25, 28-32.

Redwood, A. (1990). Human resource management in the 1990's. Business Horizons, 33(1), 74-80.

Rees, R. (1988) Delegation: A fundamental management process. Education Canada, 28(2), 26-32.

Restaurants and Institutions (1991). 1991 Forecast, The year of restructuring. Restaurants and Institutions, 101(1), 32,33, 68.

Roomkin, M. J. (1989). Managers as employers. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, B. (1991). Single and multi-unit management skills: Is there a difference in college and university food services? NACUFS News Wave, 24, 28.

Sampson, R. C. (1965). Managing the managers. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schuster, K., Boss, D., Schechter, M. & Cohen, M. (1991). 1991 presidents forum. Food Management, 26(2), 114-117, 122-123, 124, 126, 128, 130-132, 134, 136, 140-141, 144, 148-150, 152, 154.

Shetty, Y. K. (1987). Guidelines for managing in service businesses. Supervisory Management, 32(2), 38-42.

Siu, R. G. H. (1980). The Master Manager. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Smith, D. & Smith, D. J. (1989). A study of opinions and practices of successful multi-unit fast service restaurant managers. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference on Strategic Issues in the Fast Service Industry, Washington State University, Pullman, WA.

SPSS (1990). SPSS Reference guide [Computer program]. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

Starr, L. (1984). Top ten time tips. Performance and Instruction Journal, 23(3), 5.

Strauch, R. (1984). Training the whole person. Training and Development Journal, 38(11), 82, 84, 86.

Strong, E. P. (1965). The Management of Business: An Introduction. New York: Harper & Row.

Sultemeier, P. M., Gregorie, M. B., Spears, M. C. & Downey, R. (1989). Managerial functions of college and university food service managers. Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 89(7) 924-928.

Sweeney, N. R. (1978). Managing people: Techniques for food/service operators. New York: Chain Store.

Townshend, T. M. (1990). Let employees carry the ball. Personnel Journal, 69(10), 30, 32, 34, 36.

Umbreit, W. T. (1989). Multi-unit management, Managing at a distance. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 30(1), 52-59.

Umbreit, W. T. (1989a). Evaluating multi-unit manager's effectiveness: How district managers contribute to organizational success. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference on Strategic Issues in the Fast Service Industry, Washington State University, Pullman, WA.

Umbreit, W. T. (1991). Understanding the role and contributions of multi-unit managers in the fast service segment. Unpublished manuscript.

Umbreit, W. T. & Smith, D. I. (1990, August). A study of opinions and practices of successful multi-unit fast service restaurant managers. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education Conference, Washington D.C.

Veres, J. G., Lahey, M. A. & Buckly, R. (1987). A practical rationale for using multi-method job analyses. Public Personnel Management, 16(2), 153-157.

Vinton, D. (1987). Delegation for employee development. Training and Development Journal, 41(1), 65-67.

Waggen, C. L. (1982). Theory Z: Panecea or Placebo? Huntsville, AL. Communication program, The University of Alabama in Huntsville. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 219 835).

Walker, R. G. (1986). Wellsprings of managerial leadership. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly. 27(1), 14-16.

Warner, M. (1991). Competencies of a recreational food service manager. FIU Hospitality Review, 9(1), 39-50.

Watkins, S. M. (1987). Give everyone a vested interest in food service. The School Administrator, 44(5), 10-12.

Weinstein, J. (1989). The toughest job in food service. Restaurants and Institutions, 99(8), 42-45, 50, 58.

Weitzel, W. (1987). How to improve performance through successful appraisals. Personnel, 64(10), 18-23.

Wilkinson, L. (1989). SYSTAT: The system for statistics [Computer program]. Eavanston, IL.

Wright, J. E. (1983). Retraining the adult workforce. Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research, 7(2), 21-24.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

MANAGERIAL COMPETENCIES

MANAGERIAL COMPETENCIES

Knowledge competencies

1. knowledge of the principles of financial planning
2. understanding of the concepts and techniques of goal setting
3. knowledge of the basic fundamentals of accounting
4. understanding of the principles of cost accounting
5. knowledge of food service sanitation practices
6. understanding of food service equipment layout and design
7. understanding of governmental organizational structures at the city, county, and state levels
8. knowledge of event planning procedures for a concessions operation
9. understanding of catering management
10. understanding of off premises catering operations
11. knowledge of labor law and trade union practices
12. knowledge of menu planning, purchase specifications, and buying procedures for food and beverage operations
13. knowledge of novelty and souvenir manufacture and distribution
14. knowledge of personal computer operation
15. knowledge of the basic principles of personnel management
16. knowledge of job and task analysis for employee development and training use
17. knowledge of interviewing and hiring procedures
18. knowledge of business law
19. understanding of marketing and public relations concepts
20. understanding of the basic fundamentals of employee training and development
21. knowledge of performance evaluation methods and procedures
22. knowledge of the principles of leadership and motivational theories
23. knowledge of the theory of management style
24. understanding of the principles of interpersonal skills management
25. knowledge of time management
26. knowledge of food and beverage cost control systems and procedures
27. knowledge of novelty and souvenir cost control procedures
28. knowledge of food service preparation techniques (culinary arts)
29. understanding of the principles and use of break-even analysis
30. knowledge of cost control systems for concessions and vending operations

Skill Competencies

31. ability to establish operating goals for a concessions operation
32. skilled at financial planning
33. skilled at the practice of food service sanitation
34. skilled at the management of concessions food and beverage operations
35. skilled at the management of vending services
36. skilled at event planning
37. skilled at kitchen management
38. skilled at the management of catering operations

39. skilled at dining room management
40. skilled at program/novelty/souvenir management
41. skilled at the techniques of purchasing
42. skilled at the operation of a personal computer
43. ability to utilize spreadsheets (such as Lotus 1-2-3) on a personal computer
44. ability to develop and implement training programs for hourly and supervisory personnel
45. ability to develop and implement a public relations program
46. skilled at performance evaluation of subordinate personnel
47. skilled at the use of interpersonal management techniques.
48. ability to develop and implement cost control systems for food and beverage operations
49. ability to develop and implement cost control systems for concessions and vending operations
50. ability to develop and implement cost control systems for program, novelty and souvenir operations
51. skilled at the use of break-even analysis and profit volume charting
52. ability to develop and implement a sales and marketing program for catering operations
53. skilled at labor negotiations
54. ability to prepare and present effective oral and written presentations to groups
55. skilled at food service equipment layout and design preparation
56. ability to articulate ideas, principles, and policies both orally and in writing
57. ability to communicate effectively with clients, subordinates, and public agencies
58. ability to work effectively with groups
59. ability to use a PC for planning, forecasting, and cost control purposes
60. ability to take action to solve problems, overcome obstacles, and achieve goals

(Warner, 1991, pp. 49 & 50).

APPENDIX B

UMBREIT'S INSTRUMENT

PART I

How Important are Each of the Performance Dimensions of a Multi-Unit Fast Food Manager's Job?

Instructions:

1. Review the description of the five job performance dimensions below.

2. Distribute 50 points across all 5 dimensions in a manner which reflects the relative weight you believe each dimension should have in determining the effectiveness of a typical manager's performance. For example, if you believe each performance dimension should be given equal weight, you would assign 10 points to each dimension.

3. Assign each category at least 1 point. Do not use fractions of a point. Check to see your total = 50 points.

4. If you believe an important dimension is left out, write it in the blank space provided and add 10 points to the total for distribution.

Weighting (Points Assigned) 50 Total — Dimensions of a Multi-Unit Fast Food Manager's Performance

_____ 1. Finance Management: Maintains profitability of units by monitoring performance, preparing budgets, developing forecasts, authorizing expenditures, controlling costs, and reviewing results with unit managers.

_____ 2. Restaurant Operations: Enforces company standards and systems and procedures consistently, evaluates product quality, implements new systems, oversees the delivery of positive customer-service, supervises new product introductions, and monitors unit management activities.

_____ 3. Marketing and Promotions Management: Implements marketing and sales promotions plans, prepares units for promotional programs, and encourages collection of information on customers and the competitive market.

_____ 4. Facilities and Safety Management: Supervises the overall condition of unit facilities to ensure operational acceptability and competitive readiness and establishes safety management programs.

_____ 5. Human Resource Management: Supervises effective employment orientation, training and management of employees, and teaches unit managers how to manage people. Provides quality feedback and develops promotable managers.

_____ 6. Other Dimension: _____

_____

_____

PART II

Determining the Importance of Task Activities Comprising the Job of a Multi-Unit Fast Food Manager

Instructions:

1. Review the task activities listed under each major job dimension below and on the left-hand side check (√) the appropriate box indicating if the activity is the responsibility of a Regional Manager (second level), District Manager (first multi-unit level) or Unit Manager.

2. Review the task activities listed under each major job dimension below and on the right-hand side, circle a number from 1 to 5 to indicate the task's level of importance to the position of Multi-unit Fast Food Manager. (1 = no importance, 5 = of critical importance)

Level of Responsibility (number of units supervised)				Level of Importance to Multi-Unit Manager's Job				
REGIONAL (25 to 50 units)	DISTRICT (4-7 units)	UNIT (1 unit)	Dimension #1--Financial Management	No Importance	Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Of Critical Importance
☐	☐	☐	(1) prepares business plans and establishes district goals	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(2) authorizes expenditures within policy limits	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(3) manages competitive bidding process	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(4) monitors compliance with purchasing controls	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(5) assists unit management in developing financial and sales forecasts	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(6) monitors financial performance and assists unit management in the development of corrective action plans	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(7) coaches unit management in recognizing cost variances, identifying causes and developing corrective plans	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(8) evaluates and reviews financial results and assures responsibility for districts long-term profitability	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(9) develops financial improvement systems including identification and plans for correcting deficiencies	1	2	3	4	5

PART II (continued)

Level of Responsibility				Level of Importance to Multi-Unit Manager's Job				
REGIONAL (25 to 50 units)	DISTRICT (4-7 units)	UNIT (1 unit)		No Importance	Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Of Critical Importance
			Dimension #2--Restaurant Operations					
☐	☐	☐	(1) enforces QSC standards	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(2) supervises the development and implementation of unit operational plans	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(3) monitors the effective use of labor scheduling techniques	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(4) ensures quality customer experience	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(5) assures unit management and employee knowledge of recipes and production procedures	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(6) coaches unit management in recognizing and solving operational issues	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(7) supervises the gathering of operational data for review and analysis	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(8) implements company policies and procedures	1	2	3	4	5
			Dimension #3--Marketing and Promotions Management					
☐	☐	☐	(1) supervises execution of corporate marketing and promotional plans	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(2) monitors in-store advertising programs and promotional materials	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(3) develops management's awareness of customer preferences	1	2	3	4	5

PART II (continued)

Level of Responsibility				Level of Importance to Multi-Unit Manager's Job				
REGIONAL (25 to 50 units)	DISTRICT (4-7 units)	UNIT (1 unit)		No Importance	Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Of Critical Importance
			Dimension #3 (continued)					
☐	☐	☐	(4) trains unit management in the assessment of competitor operations, including marketing and advertising campaigns	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(5) assists unit management in developing community relations programs	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(6) supervises the gathering of consumer research information	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(7) recommends and supervises implementation of local store marketing concepts and programs	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(8) supervises new product introductions	1	2	3	4	5
			Dimension #4--Facilities and Safety Management					
☐	☐	☐	(1) approves low-cost improvements to facilities and recommends more costly improvements to facilities	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(2) supervises preventive maintenance programs	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(3) supervises outside contractors performing routine maintenance and improvements	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(4) ensures restaurants are in compliance with health codes	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(5) monitors security and safety procedures	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(6) coaches unit management in recognizing facilities and safety issues	1	2	3	4	5

PART II (continued)

Level of Responsibility				Level of Importance to Multi-Unit Manager's Job				
REGIONAL (25 to 50 units)	DISTRICT (4-7 units)	UNIT (1 unit)		No Importance	Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Of Critical Importance
			Dimension #4 (continued)					
☐	☐	☐	(7) conducts cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(8) manages and controls repair and maintainance budget within district	1	2	3	4	5
			Dimension #5--Human Resource Management					
☐	☐	☐	(1) oversees district-wide analysis of personnel needs and develops manpower plans through individual unit management	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(2) reinforces and rewards the training and development of management employees	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(3) supervises the execution and implementation of in-unit training and development programs	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(4) identifies and prepares management subordinates for promotion	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(5) effectively manages employee relations issues	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(6) supervises and conducts formal management performance evaluations	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(7) minimizes employee turnover	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(8) coaches and motivates both managers and employees and takes disciplinary action when necessary	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(9) ensures personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	1	2	3	4	5

PART II (continued)

Level of Responsibility				Level of Importance of Multi-Unit Manager's Job				
REGIONAL (25 to 50 units)	DISTRICT (4-7 units)	UNIT (1 unit)		No Importance	Some Importance	Important	Very Important	Of Critical Importance
			Dimension #5 (continued)					
☐	☐	☐	(10) insures compliance with company personnel policies and practices	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(11) models effective supervisory behavior	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(12) creates and maintains favorable working environment	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(13) serves as a resource and provides feedback to unit manager	1	2	3	4	5
			Dimension #6--(If Identified in Part I)					
☐	☐	☐	(1) _____	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(2) _____	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(3) _____	1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	(4) _____	1	2	3	4	5

Part III

Determining Which Performance Dimension of a Multi-Unit Fast Food Manager's Job Provides the Greatest Problem in the Transition from Single Unit to Multi-Unit Responsibility

Instructions:

1. Select the one performance dimension below that your multi-unit fast food managers experience the greatest problems with in making the transition from single unit to multi-unit responsibility. (circle number)

   (1) Financial Management
   (2) Restaurant Operations
   (3) Marketing and Promotions Management
   (4) Facilities and Safety Management
   (5) Human Resources Management
   (6) Other . . . (specify) _____

2. Please discuss briefly why the performance dimension you selected above is a problem for multi-unit fast food managers during the transition period.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

PART IV

General Information

1. How many restaurant units are operated by your company?
(circle number)

    1) Less than 5
    2) 6 to 15
    3) 16 to 50
    4) 51 to 200
    5) 201 to 500
    6) 501 to 1,000
    7) Over 1,000

2. How many first-level multi-unit managers are currently employed by your company?
(circle number)

    1) One
    2) 2 to 5
    3) 6 to 10
    4) 11 to 20
    5) 21 to 50
    6) 51 to 100
    7) Over 100

3. What is the average span of control (number of units) for your first-level multi-unit managers?
(circle number)

    1) 2 to 4 units
    2) 5 to 8 units
    3) 9 to 12 units
    4) Over 12 units

4. Do you have difficulty finding competent individuals for the position of first-level multi-unit manager?
(circle number)

    1) NO
    2) YES

PART IV (continued)

5. From which of the following sources do you obtain the majority of your multi-unit managers?
(circle number)

1) Promotion from within the company
2) Hire from outside the company (competitors)
3) Hire from outside the foodservice industry
4) Other . . . (specify) _____

6. What is the annualized turnover percentage for individuals in the position of multi-unit manager with your company?
(circle number)

1) Zero to 10%
2) 11 to 15%
3) 26 to 50%
4) 51 to 75%
5) 76 to 100%
6) 101 to 200%
7) Over 200%

7. What is the principal reason for turnover of multi-unit managers in your company?
(circle number)

1) Individuals lack of technical knowledge
2) Individuals lack of human relation skills
3) Position is too demanding
4) Position is not well defined
5) Individuals in position do not obtain sufficient reward satisfaction
6) Other . . . (specify) _____

8. Which of the following segments best describes your company?
(circle number)

1) Fast service
2) Coffee shop
3) Family/theme
4) Fine dining
5) Other . . . (specify) _____

PART IV (continued)

9. If the answer above was fast service, which of the following menu categories best describes your operations?
(circle number)

1) Hamburger
2) Chicken
3) Fish
4) Mexican
5) Pizza
6) Budget/Steak
7) Oriental
8) Other . . . (specify) _____

10. Would you like a copy of the survey results?
(circle number)

1) NO
2) YES

(If you indicated yes please provide name and address in the space below)

NAME _____

POSITION _____

COMPANY _____

ADDRESS _____

APPENDIX C

PILOT STUDY COVER LETTER

September 27, 1991

Dear

The attached questionnaire is the first part of a study designed to determine the management skills required in single and multi-unit management positions within the college and university food service industry. This study received the support of the NACUFS Board of Directors at the July, 1991 National Conference in Denver.

Your participation in the pilot study phase of this research project is greatly appreciated. The information gathered in this phase is critically important to the development of the research study. Please take approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the postage paid envelope.

Thank you for your time and interest in this research project.

Sincerely,

Bill Ryan
Manager
Food Service Center

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER, INSTRUMENT

NACUFS
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICES

1405 South Harrison Road, Suite 303-304
Manly Miles Building, M S.U
East Lansing, MI 48824
Ph· (517) 332-2494
Fax (517) 332-8144

Dear NACUFS Colleague:

The attached questionnaire was mailed to you, and the other NACUFS Voting Delegates, as part of a study designed to determine the management skills required in single and multi-unit management positions within the college and university food service industry. This study received the support of the National Board of Directors at the July, 1991 National Conference in Denver. The research is being conducted by Bill Ryan at Oklahoma State University.

Supporting research and education within NACUFS provides the membership with many potential benefits, including a greater self-awareness, opportunity to improve educational programs, and continuing professional development. Results of this study will be shared with the NACUFS membership in order to provide you with current information regarding our industry.

We encourage you to take about fifteen minutes to complete, and return this questionnaire within the next week. Individual input on this, and all issues regarding NACUFS, is important to continue the success which our organization enjoys.

Sincerely,

Dane Grant-Shambaugh

Dane Grant-Shambaugh
President
NACUFS

Joseph Spina

Joseph Spina, Ph.D.
Executive Director
NACUFS

IDENTIFICATION AND COMPARISON OF SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT SKILLS IN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICES

For the purpose of this study please use the following definitions.

Food Service Facility: A stand alone facility which operates as one entity. This facility may have one or more serving areas, themes, or supervisory levels.

Single Unit Manager: The individual with overall responsibility for the operation of one food service facility.

Multi-Unit Manager: The individual with responsibility for the direct supervision of more than one single unit manager, this position is also identified as a manager of managers.

PART I: Instructions
Place a check or an X in the blank beside the most appropriate answer for your school.

1. What is your institution's membership classification in NACUFS?

	Total Annual Food Service Revenue	NACUFS Mailings
a. _____	Up to $1,000,000	2
b. _____	$1,000,001 to $3,000,000	4
c. _____	$3,000,001 to $4,000,000	5
d. _____	$4,000,001 to $5,000,000	6
e. _____	$5,000,001 to $6,000,000	7
f. _____	$6,000,001 to $7,000,000	8
g. _____	Over $7,000,001	10

2. Approximately what is the total enrollment of your school? _____

3. Approximately how many meals do you serve per day at your school? _____

4. How many separate food service facilities fall under your responsibility? _____

5. How many single unit managers are employed by your school? _____

6. From which of the following sources do you hire the majority of your single unit managers?

a. _____ promotion from within the organization
b. _____ hire from outside the organization, but within the food service industry
c. _____ hire from outside the food service industry
d. _____ hire recent graduates of higher education, or other certification programs
e. _____ other (please describe) _____

7. What degree of difficulty do you have finding competent individuals for the single unit management position?

a. _____ no difficulty
b. _____ minor difficulty
c. _____ moderate difficulty
d. _____ major difficulty
e. _____ critical difficulty

8. What is the principal reason for turnover of single unit managers at your school?

   a. _____ lack of technical knowledge
   b. _____ lack of human relations skills
   c. _____ position is too demanding
   d. _____ position is not well defined
   e. _____ individuals in the position do not attain sufficient award satisfaction
   f. _____ promotion to another job
   g. _____ other (please describe) _____

9. What is last years turnover percentage for your single unit managers? _____ %

10. How many Multi-Unit Managers are employed by your school? [If none are employed as defined, indicate a zero (0)]. _____

IF YOU ANSWERED ZERO (0) TO QUESTION 10, PLEASE PROCEED TO PART II

11. What is the normal span of control (number of single unit managers directly supervised) for your multi-unit manager(s)? _____

12. From which of the following sources do you hire the majority of your multi-unit managers?

   a. _____ promotion from within the organization
   b. _____ hire from outside the organization, but within the food service industry
   c. _____ hire from outside the food service industry
   d. _____ hire recent graduates of higher education, or other certification programs
   e. _____ other (please describe) _____

13. What degree of difficulty do you have finding competent individuals for the multi-unit management position?

   a. _____ no difficulty
   b. _____ minor difficulty
   c. _____ moderate difficulty
   d. _____ major difficulty
   e. _____ critical difficulty

14. What is the principal reason for turnover of multi-unit managers at your school?

   a. _____ lack of technical knowledge
   b. _____ lack of human relations skills
   c. _____ position is too demanding
   d. _____ position is not well defined
   e. _____ individuals in the position do not attain sufficient award satisfaction
   f. _____ promotion to another job
   g. _____ other (please describe) _____

15. What is last years turnover percentage for your multi-unit managers? _____ %

Please proceed to PART II

PART II

Food service management activities have been divided into 5 performance dimensions. This section will help to determine the importance of specific management skills related to each dimension.

Instructions

1. Review the management skills listed under each performance dimension
2. Circle a number from 1 to 5 to indicate the management skill's level of importance for single and multi-unit management positions
3. If you answered zero (0) to question 10 in Part I then respond to the single unit scale based on the staff you have currently, and do not answer the multi-unit management rating scale.
4. The rating scale of importance for each management skill is:
   - 1 - No Importance
   - 2 - Minor Importance
   - 3 - Moderate Importance
   - 4 - Major Importance
   - 5 - Critical Importance

FOR EACH LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT, HOW IMPORTANT IS:	Management Skill's Level of Importance: Multi-Unit Management	Management Skill's Level of Importance: Single Unit Management
Dimension # 1 - Financial Management		
1. preparing financial plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. establishing financial goals	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. authorizing expenditures within policy limits	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. managing competitive bidding/purchasing processes	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. monitoring compliance with purchasing controls	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. assisting in the development of financial forecasts	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. monitoring financial performance	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. recognizing cost variances and causes	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. developing financial corrective action plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. evaluating financial results related to budgets	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. developing plans to correct financial deficiencies	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Dimension # 2 - Food Service Operations		
1. enforcing quality and service standards	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. developing operational plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. implementing operational plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. monitoring effective labor scheduling techniques	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. assuring quality customer experiences	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. identifying operational problems or issues	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	Management Skill's Level of Importance	
	Multi-Unit Management	Single Unit Management
FOR EACH LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT, HOW IMPORTANT IS:		
Dimension # 2 - Food Service Operations (continued)		
7. developing solutions to operational problems or issues	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. implementing corrective action for operational problems	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. enforcing organizational policies and procedures	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Dimension # 3 - Marketing and Promotions Management		
1. supervising the execution of organizational marketing and promotional plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. developing in-house advertising programs and promotional materials	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. implementing marketing concepts and promotional programs	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. developing an awareness of customer preferences	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. assessing competitor operations, including marketing and advertising campaigns	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. assisting in the development of university or community relations programs	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. gathering consumer research information	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. supervising new product introduction	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Dimension # 4 - Facilities and Safety Management		
1. approving low-cost improvements to facilities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. recommending more costly improvements to facilities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. supervising preventive maintenance programs	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. supervising inside or outside contractors performing maintenance and improvements	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. ensuring facilities are in compliance with health codes	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. monitoring security and safety procedures	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. recognizing facility safety issues	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. conducting cost benefit analysis for repair and maintenance proposals	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. ensuring employees are in compliance with health codes	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	Management Skill's Level of Importance	
	Multi-Unit Management	Single Unit Management
FOR EACH LEVEL OF MANAGEMENT, HOW IMPORTANT IS:		
Dimension # 5 - Human Resources Management		
1. analyzing personnel needs and developing manpower plans	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. training and development of employees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. supervising the implementation of in-unit training and development programs	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. preparing employees for promotion	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. effectively managing employee relations issues	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. conducting formal performance evaluations	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. minimizing employee turnover	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. coaching and motivating employees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. taking disciplinary action when necessary	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. ensuring personnel practices are in compliance with all regulations	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. monitoring compliance with company personnel policies and practices	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
12. modeling effective supervisory behavior	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
13. maintaining a favorable working environment	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
14. serving as a resource to the employees	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
15. providing constructive feedback when appropriate	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

If you answered zero (0) to question 10 in Part I do not answer the following question.

Select the one performance dimension below that your multi-unit managers experience the greatest problems with in making the transition from single to multi-unit responsibility. (Mark with an X)

a. _____ Financial Management
b. _____ Food Service Operations
c. _____ Marketing and Promotions Management
d. _____ Facilities and Safety Management
e. _____ Human Resources Management

Thank you for your input. Please return the completed questionnaire in the postage paid envelope which accompanied this survey.

All responses to this survey will be kept absolutely confidential. The following number will be used by the researcher to avoid duplication of follow up correspondence _____

APPENDIX E

NONRESPONDENT FOLLOW UP LETTER

December 30, 1991

Dear

Please take 10 minutes to answer this questionnaire and return it in the postage paid envelope. Your input is valued, and when combined with other responses should provide beneficial information for other NACUFS members. Information gathered to date has proven useful in refining this study.

Thank you for your time, and interest in this study.

Sincerely,

Bill Ryan
Manager
Food Service Center

VITA

William Emmett Ryan III

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: IDENTIFICATION AND COMPARISON OF MANAGEMENT SKILLS REQUIRED FOR SINGLE AND MULTI-UNIT MANAGEMENT IN INDEPENDENTLY OPERATED COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FOOD SERVICES

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Chicago, Illinois, September 19, 1955 the son of William E. and Patricia M. Ryan Jr. Married to Rita Derichsweiler, September 27, 1980.

Education: Graduated from Broken Arrow High School, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, in May, 1974; received Bachelor of Science degree in Hotel and Restaurant Administration from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in December, 1981; received Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in May, 1984; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1992.

Professional Experience: Variety of management positions held at Philmont Scout Ranch, Cimarron, New Mexico, summer of 1975-80; Supervisory rotation among cafeterias, Oklahoma State University Food Services, 1977-81; Food Service Coordinator, Oklahoma State University Food Service, January 1982 to June 1984; Manager of Food Service, Oklahoma State University, July 1984 to present. Visiting Instructor, School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration, Oklahoma State University, August 1991 to present.

Professional Organizations: Kappa Omicron Nu, The National Association of College and University Food Services, The American Dietetic Association, The Oklahoma Dietetic Association.