

LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES
REQUIRED FOR FUTURE HOTEL GENERAL
MANAGERS' SUCCESS IN THAILAND

By
NAREE WEERAKIT

Bachelor of Business Administration
Prince of Songkla University
Songkla, Thailand
1994

Master of Science
University of Surrey
Surrey, UK
1998

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 PHILOSOPHY
May, 2007

LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES
REQUIRED FOR FUTURE HOTEL GENERAL
MANAGERS' SUCCESS IN THAILAND

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Bill Ryan
Dissertation Advisor

Dr. Jerrold Leong

Dr. Bo Hu

Dr. William Warde

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have given me support and encouragement. Without their love and support, I could not have completed the doctoral degree. They deserve my thanks and acknowledgment. First of all, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my committee chair and advisor, Dr. Bill Ryan, for his guidance, encouragement, and understanding throughout my studies. I appreciated his willingness to meet and counsel with me. He has offered constructive criticism continuously. His steady support and encouragement has been critical during my studies. Sincere appreciation is also expressed to my other committee members, Dr. Jerrold Leong, Dr. Bo Hu and Dr. William Warde, who greatly assisted in providing the feedback necessary to bring this study together.

I would also like to thank Faculty of Service Industries, Prince of Songkla University who grants me scholarship for Ph.D. program. Finally, I must convey my heartiest thanks to my family, friends, and my college for all of their support during my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Problem Statement.....	4
Purpose of the research.....	4
Research Questions.....	5
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Charismatic Leadership.....	10
Transactional Leadership.....	13
Transformational Leadership.....	15
Vision.....	18
Intellectual Stimulation.....	19
Inspirational Communication.....	20
Individualized Support.....	21
Personal Recognition.....	22
Leadership in the Hospitality Industry.....	24
Thailand and Thai Culture.....	24
Effective Leadership in Thai Culture.....	27
Leadership Competency.....	30
Leadership Competencies in Hospitality Industry.....	37
3. METHODOLOGY.....	42
Research Design.....	43
Population and Sample.....	43
Procedures.....	43
Instrument.....	44
Data analysis.....	46

4. FINDING.....	48
Response Rate.....	49
Demographic Profile of Respondents.....	49
The characteristic profile of the respondents' hotels.....	52
Research Question One.....	54
Research Question Two.....	65
Research Question Three.....	67
Research Question Four.....	105
Research Question Five.....	108
5. CONCLUSION AND ECOMMENDATION.....	111
Summary.....	113
Implementation.....	122
Recommendations and Future Research.....	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	125
APPENDIXES	
Appendix A – Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval	138
Appendix B – Questionnaire (English version)	140
Appendix C – Questionnaire (Thai version).....	148

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
4.1: Respondents' demographic characteristic profile.....	50
4.2: Hotel characteristic profile.....	52
4.3: KMO and Bartlett's Test.....	55
4.4.: The Result of the Factor Analysis.....	57
4.5: Reliability Analysis with Cronbach's alpha.....	63
4.6: Descriptive statistics of leadership competency factors.....	64
4.7: Mean comparisons between Thailand and Global environment.....	66
4.8.1: ANOVA results for the hotel size and the leadership competency factors.....	68
4.8.2: Multiple Comparisons (LSD) toward "challenging others" factor.....	69
4.8.3: ANOVA results for the number of employees and the leadership competency factors.....	70
4.8.4.1: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and "leadership" factor.....	71
4.8.4.2: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and "motivation" factor.....	72
4.8.4.3: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and "strategic orientation" factor.....	73
4.8.4.4: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and "planning and implementation" factor.....	74

4.8.4.5: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “team-building and ethics” factor.....	75
4.8.4.6: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “communication” factor.....	76
4.8.4.7: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “managing stakeholders” factor.....	77
4.8.4.8: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “challenging others” factor.....	78
4.8.5: ANOVA results for hotel rating and the leadership competency factors.....	79
4.8.6.1: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “leadership” factor.....	80
4.8.6.2: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “motivation” factor.....	80
4.8.6.3: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “strategic orientation” factor.....	81
4.8.6.4: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “planning and implementation” factor.....	81
4.8.6.5: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “team-building and ethics” factor.....	82
4.8.6.6: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “communication” factor.....	83

4.8.6.7: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “flexibility” factor.....	84
4.8.6.8: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “managing stakeholders” factor.....	84
4.8.6.9: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “risk-taking” factor.....	85
4.8.6.10: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and the “challenging others” factor.....	85
4.8.7: ANOVA results for the respondents’ age and the leadership competency factors.....	86
4.8.8.1: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the leadership competency factor.....	87
4.8.8.2: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “motivation” factor.....	88
4.8.8.3: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “strategic orientation” factor.....	89
4.8.8.4: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “planning and implementation” factor.....	89
4.8.8.5: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “team building and ethics” factor.....	90
4.8.8.6: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “communication” factor.....	91

4.8.8.7: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “flexibility” factor.....	92
4.8.8.8: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “concern for community” factor.....	92
4.8.8.9: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “risk-taking” factor.....	93
4.8.8.10: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “challenging others” factor.....	94
4.8.9: ANOVA results of the education impact on the perception of the leadership competency factors.....	95
4.8.10: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ education and the leadership competency factors.....	96
4.8.11: ANOVA results for professional experience and the leadership competency factors.....	99
4.8.12: Mean comparisons between gender and competency factors.....	100
4.8.13: The independent-samples t-test results comparing means between the hotel type and competency factors.....	103
4.9: The independent-samples t-test results comparing means between the hotel management demographics and competency factors.	106
4.10: The independent-samples t-test results comparing means between expatriate status and competency factors.....	108

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1:	Selected Definition of Leadership.....	7
2:	Country and Cluster Means for GLOBE Second-order Leadership Scales.....	28
3:	Leadership-competency model for the lodging industry.....	39

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Today more than ever, hotel executives and managers are faced with significant challenges that require extraordinary insight and skill. The hospitality industry faces up to both present and future competition resulting from increased globalization, competition, higher customer turnover, growing customer acquisition costs and rising customer expectations. Olsen (1999) pointed out that the rise in employee turnover rate which is the common situation has dramatically affected negatively on the service quality and profitability of the organization. This turnover is often a function of the poor job environment, poor supervision and leadership styles. Globalization, the free market system, a knowledge-based environment, labor challenges and a growing concern for health and well being are emerging as the drivers of change in the 21st century. The future will require different management and leadership skills which may not be contained in the conceptual toolbox of today's hospitality manager, or are taught in the hotel schools of the world. As increasing demands are made on all hospitality organizations to improve their performance, to anticipate change and develop new structures, the importance of effective leadership performance may be essential to ensure that change leads to increased effectiveness, efficiency and hence profitability (Slattery and Olsen, 1984). To cope with these demands, the management framework mainly based on knowledge and skills may be insufficient.

Chung-Herrera, Enz and Lankau (2003) argued that the ability to identify the skills and competencies required for tomorrow's hospitality industry leaders is essential for companies that hope to remain competitive. Enz and Siguaw (2000) revealed that the goals of management development in high-performing hotel companies, such as Choice Hotels, Marriott International, Motel 6, and Day Hospitality, are to ensure that their future leaders develop essential skills and competencies and that pipeline of future leaders remains full. Two of these high-performing organizations—Choice Hotels and Marriott International—developed comprehensive, chain-wide leadership-development programs. Choice Hotels International assessed the core competencies needed by its future leaders and created an integrated executive-training and development system. Likewise, Marriott International used leadership competencies to help senior managers in selecting, developing, and coaching future leaders.

For many years, competency studies have been used in other industries and governments to develop lists of motivations, traits, skills, and abilities that constitute a desired behavior set for a given position. Academic studies of competencies range from compensation-related issues, such as establishing pay rates based on displaying certain competencies to outcomes-related issues. For example, Hofrichter and Spencer (1999) examined the use of competency studies by 217 organizations and found that 90% of those companies used competency modeling for performance management, 88% for staffing, 64% for training and development. Most of these companies make adjustments to training needs, performance management, and compensation, based on revised competency assessments.

Many researchers, such as Barner (2000), Ulrich, Zenger and Smallwood (2000) have focused on the issue of leadership competencies in manufacturing and project management with the idea of identifying qualities and abilities possessed by successful leaders. These competencies could be used as the basis for strengthening an organization's leadership team and determining the types of educational and leadership development opportunities that are needed for future leaders. However, there are few empirical studies that address the specific leadership competencies of general managers in the hotel industry. For example, Hsu and Gregory (1995) identified competencies needed for entry level hotel managers from the industry professional's point of view. Siu (1998) identified the managerial competencies essential for middle managers in Hong Kong hotel industry. Perdue, Woods and Ninemeier (2001) had surveyed members of Club Manager Association of America (CMAA) to determine what leadership competencies are most important to the club manager's success. Lastly, Chung-Herrera, et al. (2003) presented a leadership-competency model for a senior-level manager, future based, in the hotel industry.

When looking at the hotel industry in Thailand, one of the major trends in the past years is the growing internationalization of Thai resorts. The move by global hotel chains is certain to be carefully watched to assess its impact on locally-owned hotels. While these groups will give resorts more marketing exposure and raise professional standards, they also affect the non-affiliated hotels, which could find themselves facing staff departures and higher costs, as they are forced to upgrade to match the quality of the big players. Challenges may occur between the global hotel groups in terms of their relationship with

local owners. Besides, Thai hotels confront an oversupply problem of hotel rooms which directly affects the occupancy rate and therefore affects the profitability of most of the hotels. Some general managers in family owned hotels decided not to invest in training because they feel that they do not have an immediate financial return from training. Moreover, numerous hotels face a problem of retaining their skilled staff. Trained employees of a hotel often transfer to work in a new hotel because they obtain higher positions or higher compensation. In order to compete in this tough environment, the owners of the hotels in Thailand need to understand the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in order to remain competitive.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Thailand is a rapidly expanding tourism destination. One of the major threats for the Thai hotel industry is that growth in the presence of international hotel chains could create increased competition, a room oversupply problem, and high labor turnover. In addition, Thailand has cultural and social traditions that are unique to it's' people and which have an impact on the personal interaction and leadership styles used in that country. Also, within this changing environment, little information is known about the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The objective of this study is to determine the leadership competencies essential for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand. The outcome of this study could help Thai hotels to recruit prospective management employees who have the right mix of

competencies to be future general managers. Understanding these competencies will enable hospitality educators, corporate training and development programs and small family hotels to become more successful at developing future hotel industry leaders in Thailand, which in turn increases economic development nationwide.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions were used:

1. What are the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand?
2. Do the leadership competencies identified as necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand differ from those leadership competencies identified as necessary for success in a global environment by previous research?
3. What impact do the demographic characteristics of the respondents have on their perception of the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in the Thai hotel industry?
4. Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between respondents who work for domestic (Thai based) companies and respondents who work for international hotel management companies?
5. Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between the respondents who are native Thai and expatriate?

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Leadership is an ambiguous word, which is intuitively simple and yet is inordinately difficult to define with any degree of precision (Pittaway, Carmouche, and Chell, 1998). As can be seen in Figure 1, many studies viewed leadership in different ways, as a process (of communication and/or strategy), as a property (in terms of individual abilities), as a set of behavior patterns (such as influence and power relationships) and as a collective phenomenon (where individuals undertake different leadership responsibilities). Theories and models of leadership have tried to investigate the social exchange and interpersonal dynamics of leader and followers. Many researchers see leadership as an essentially innovative top-down process, most typically driven by some form of charismatic or transformational vision as compared to a more mundane, transactional or administrative function, considered to be management (Smith, Wang, and Leung, 1997).

Based on the contingency view of leadership, it has been recognized that different types of leaders are best adapted to different types of situations.

Figure 1: Selected Definition of Leadership

Author/Date	Definition
Stogdill(1950)	the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its effort toward goal setting and goal achievement.
Hemphill and Coon(1957)	the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of the group toward a shared goal.
Janda(1960)	a particular type of power relationship characterized by a group member's perception that another group member has the right to prescribe behavior patterns for the former regarding his(her) activity as a group member.
Tannenbaum, Wechler And Massarik (1961)	interpersonal influence, exercised in the situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of specified goal or goals.
Katz and Kahn (1978)	the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization.
Hollander(1978)	a process of influence between a leader and those who are followers.
Raunch and Behling (1984)	the process of influencing the activities of an organized group towards goal achievement.

Source: *Pittaway, L., Carmouche, R., and Chell, E., (1998), The way forward:Leadership research in the hospitality industry., International journal of hospitality management, 17, p. 407-426.*

Anderson (1983) found that the leadership behaviors which were effective for first-level managers were remarkably different from the leadership behaviors which were effective for middle-level managers. The task of first-level work groups required clear communication process, rules, and task information. Therefore, the structuring behavior was necessary for first-level groups because of the type of tasks which first-level groups perform. In contrast, the work which must be managed at middle-level management would not benefit from close surveillance and high levels of structure. Moreover, the effectiveness of a leader in a particular situation depends on “how well the leaders’ personality, abilities, and behaviors match the situation in which the leader operates”. When organizations tend to become more internally complex in order to respond to the external complexity, the types of leadership skills that are necessary include functional or technical competence, broad-based knowledge of the organization, interpersonal and conflict resolution skills, decision-making skills, learning skills, communication, meeting management, and interpersonal influence.

Based on Fiedler’s original theory, the leader’s personality and motivation are affected by the degree of perceived control and the degree of uncertainty surrounding the situation expressed as (1) the relationship between the team members and the leader in terms of their loyalty towards and motivation to assist the leader, (2) the clarity and achievability of the tasks-structure and (3) the leader’s position power in terms of his legitimate right to give directions and to evaluate team performance as well as to give out reward and punishment. Lee-Kelley and Loong (2003) revealed a significant relationship between the leader’s perception of success and his/her personal attributes and contingent experiences.

The inner confidence and self-belief from personal knowledge and experience are likely to play an important role in a manager's ability to deliver a project successfully. A leader is assumed to be restricted by the external and internal environment in which they operate and must be able to adapt their leadership approach to various situations. Some of the main situational factors include: subordinate job maturity and motivation, decision-making time, the organization's size, structure and culture, industry, technology and the individual's past experience, personality and personal history.

Over the years, many theories have been proposed describing the kinds of behaviors that make effective leadership possible—theories of behavioral styles (Lindell and Rosenqvist, 1992), transformational or charismatic leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Klein & House, 1995) and leader-member exchange (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). These theories all have a common focus on certain behavior patterns and the implications of these patterns for leader performance. Recent leadership studies have included a growing number of conceptual models describing systems and macro level leadership to provide a greater number of variables to explain and model the process of organizational leadership. Arvonen and Petterson (2002) revealed that cost-effectiveness requires a combination of structure and relations-oriented leadership behavior, so the leaders should integrate situational demands for change, relations, and structure in their behavior. These results are in accordance with theories on transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; House, 1995), and charismatic leadership (Conger and Kanungo, 1998). These theories of transformational and charismatic leadership include behaviors involving change (creativity, risk-taking and trust), and relations (considering, inspiring, and empowering).

CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP

Trice and Beyer (1986 in Beyer and Browning, 1999) elaborated a definition of charisma that contained five elements: (1) a person with extraordinary gifts and qualities; (2) a social crisis or situation of desperation; (3) a radical vision or set of ideas promising a solution to the crisis; (4) a set of followers who are attracted to the gifted person and come to believe in his or her exceptional powers and radical vision; and (5) the validation of the person's extraordinary gifts and the radical vision by repeated successes in dealing with the perceived crisis. However, because of the highly emotional, non-rational basis of the followers' attraction to the leader and to the radical vision, charisma is inherently unstable. It must be transformed into institutional patterns in order to achieve permanence over time (Beyer et al..., 1999).

A number of recent studies have documented that charismatic leadership behaviors and attributes (as rated by the leader, his or her subordinates, or independent observers) are associated with effective follower performance and positive follower attitudes. Some researchers (e.g. Wang, Chou, and Jiang, 2005) argued that charismatic leaders combine each member's personal goals with the organizational mission. Subordinates identify at a personal level with the purposes and goals of the collective as a whole and therefore feel more commitment and cohesiveness, which improves subsequent performance. Charismatic leaders excite and transform previously dispirited followers into active followers by heightening motivation and instilling a sense of purpose. The leader is idealized and becomes the model of behavior that generated follower's commitment.

Charismatic leaders are distinguished by a number of characteristics, including their risk-taking, goal articulation, high expectations, emphasis on the collective identity and vision (Ehrhart and Klein, 2001). Additionally, according to Bass (1985) and Conger, et al. (1998), four leadership behaviors were repeatedly identified as “charismatic” leader: (1) communicates high performance expectations to followers; (2) exhibits confidence in follower’s ability to reach goals; (3) takes calculated risks that oppose the status qua; and (4) articulates a value-based overarching vision and collective identity.

Behavioral tendencies of charismatic leaders include providing inspiration to motivate collective action, behaving in ways that result in being role models for followers, sensitivity to environmental trends, unconventional behavior, personal risk-taking, and formulation and articulation of a vision. Visions that are successfully understood by followers are more likely to address their needs, developmental readiness, and the contingencies associated with the environmental context (Conger, et.al, 1998; Waldman & Yammarino,1999; Sosik, Avolio, and Jung, 2002). According to Gardner and Avolio (1998), charismatic leaders’ values influence the content of their vision and the methods they choose to promote vision attainment (e.g., the symbolic behaviors they display while interacting with their followers). Leaders who self-monitor their expressive behavior and use impression management to project desired self-images (e.g. esteem, power) are predisposed to constructing a charismatic image. Self-monitoring enable charismatic leaders to use a variety of impression management strategies to project and maintain desired self-images. These include (1) *exemplification* behaviors to present oneself as a worthy role model, (2) *ingratiation* behaviors to make oneself more attractive or likable

to others, (3) *self-promotion* behaviors to present oneself as highly competent regarding certain skills or abilities, (4) *intimidation* behaviors to present oneself as a dangerous and potent person who is able and willing to challenge others, and (5) *supplication* behaviors to present oneself as helpless with the purpose of soliciting aid from others.

House (1977) proposed that charismatic leaders model their value system by displaying symbolic behaviors that reflect the values inherent in their vision. Moreover, charismatic leaders often display behaviors that reflect the cherished values of the followers and engage in symbolic behaviors aimed at shifting followers' values into alignment with the leader's personal values. Charismatic leaders are skilled at scanning the environment, recognizing followers' needs, hopes and desires, and articulating them as values. One value that may motivate charismatic leadership behavior is openness to change. This instrumental value may help charismatic leaders to articulate their vision to followers. Charismatic leaders have a high need for environmental sensitivity to change the status quo; they essentially oppose the status quo and strive to change it in promoting their vision. They support a need for change and articulate it in a vision of a better future for followers. To help add credibility to the vision, the leader displays symbolic behaviors that emphasize the need to move forward from the status quo to the desired future state (Conger,et.al., 1998; House, 1996). Sosik (2005) also suggested that high-performing managers who display charismatic leadership grounded in openness to change, collectivistic work, and self-enhancement values can promote the extra effort and extra role performances that fully engage employees.

Conger, et al... (1998) based their model of charismatic leadership on the assumption that the followers observe the leader's behavior and interpret his or her action as expressions of charismatic qualities. According to Bass (1988), charisma is a phenomenon of interpersonal relationships and is not confined to managers at the top of organizations, although it is more salient at the higher levels. Charisma can be found at various organizational levels and is not necessarily confined to top-level leaders. Indeed, the subordinates frequently described their direct supervisors, who were often at middle or even low organizational levels, as charismatic leaders who inspired them and stimulated loyalty to the organization. Yagil (1998) also supported that leaders might actually benefit from a close relationship with the followers and enjoy advantages that are missing in distant leadership situations. First, a leader's close acquaintance with followers allows him or her to deliver sensitive and individually tailored confidence-building communications, which are probably more effective than messages addressed to the group as a whole. A second advantage emanates from the perception of the leader as a realistic, approachable figure, thus enabling him or her to influence followers through personal modeling.

TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Bass (1999) proposed that the leadership process occurs in one of two ways, either transactional or transformational. Transactional leadership refers to the exchange relationship between leader and follower to meet their self-interests. It may take the form of contingent reward in which the leader clarifies for the follower through direction or participation what the follower needs to do to be rewarded for the effort. It may take the

form of active management-by-exception, in which the leader monitors the follower's performance and takes corrective action if the follower fails to meet standards. Or it may take the form of passive leadership, in which the leader practices passive managing-by-exception by waiting for problems to occur before taking corrective action and avoids taking any action. The transactional leader is a leader who initiates contact with subordinates in an effort to exchange something of value, such as rewards for performance, mutual support, or bilateral disclosure.

Based on path-goal theory, the leader's role is instrumental rather than inspirational, is based on the principal of exchange, and functions to provide the necessary incentives or disincentives to obtain desired task outcomes (Gupta, MacMillan, and Surie, 2004). According to Bass, et al... (1994), transactional leaders clarify the responsibilities for their followers, the tasks that must be accomplished, the performance objectives, and the benefits to the self-interests of the followers for compliance. In its more corrective form, the transactional leader specifies the standards for compliance, and may punish followers for being out of compliance with those standards. Transactional leaders usually operate within the boundaries of the existing system or culture, have a preference for risk avoidance, and emphasize process rather than substance as a means for maintaining control. They are also likely to be effective in stable and predictable environments in which monitoring current activity against prior performance is the most effective strategy (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramanian, 1996). Concisely, transactional leadership is based on bureaucratic authority and legitimacy associated with one's position within the organization. Transactional leaders pay attention to the clarification of tasks, work

standards, and outcomes. They emphasize on the organizational rewards and punishments to influence employee performance. Bass, Avolio, Jung, and Berson (2003) emphasized that transactional leadership can build a base level of trust in the leader as he/she clarifies expectations and rewards and reliably executes what has been agreed.

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Transformational leadership, in contrast, is characterized as a process that motivates followers by appealing to higher ideals and moral values. Transformational leaders motivate followers to achieve performance beyond expectations by transforming followers' attitudes, beliefs, and values as opposed to simply gaining compliance.

Bass et al. (1994) claimed that transformational leadership is more proactive and ultimately more effective than transactional, corrective, or avoidant leadership, in terms of motivating followers to achieve higher performance. Transformational leaders provoke feeling of trust, loyalty, and respect from followers by: generating awareness and acceptance of the purpose and mission of the organization, inducing them to transcend their own self interest for the sake of the organization, and activating their higher-order needs. Transformational leadership behavior is related to a number of positive individual and organizational outcomes. Indeed, transformational leadership behavior has been empirically linked to increased employee satisfaction (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter, 1990), organizational commitment (e.g., Bycio, Hackett, and Allen, 1995), satisfaction with supervision (e.g., Podsakoff et al., 1990), organizational

citizenship (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, and Bacharach, 2000), and overall employee performance (e.g., Yammariono, Spangler, and Bass, 1993).

Social cognitive theory proposes that personal (e.g., learning goal orientation) and extra-personal social support (e.g., transformational leadership) factors operate as mechanisms that influence each other bi-directional. Both learning goal orientation and transformational leadership produce high levels of intrinsically motivated effort exerted by individuals. Such effort raised expectations of success. Heightened levels of intrinsic motivation and expectations of success are outcomes associated with the idealized influence component of transformational leadership. Therefore, the leaders were in fact more likely to perform transformational leadership behaviour when they believed that positive change was possible. Krishnan (2005) investigated how the leader-member exchange, transformational leadership are related to value system congruence. He suggested that one should pay attention to developing transformational leadership capabilities in managers if a change in terminal values of subordinates is contemplated. Subordinates are likely to fall in line with the terminal value systems of their leaders if their leaders are more transformational.

Berson and Avolio (2004) examined how the leadership style of top and middle-level managers in a large telecommunications organization was related to their effectiveness in conveying strategic organizational goals. They found that transformational leadership is positively associated with careful listener, careful transmitter, and open communication style. The transformational leaders use their communication skills to articulate

organizational goals more effectively than other leaders by first aligning their followers around the mission by emphasizing how each of them can contribute to the strategic mission. They help their followers learn the organization's mission and vision through individualized consideration, and then adjust their messages accordingly to build higher levels of identification between the follower and the mission. Bass (1985) proposed that collectivistic societies and levels of leadership might be important antecedents to transformational behavior.

According to Bass (1999), and Bass and Avolio (1994), transformational leadership refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration. It elevates the follower's level of maturity and ideals as well as concerns for achievement, self-actualization, and the well-being of others, the organization, and society. Idealized influence and inspirational leadership are displayed when the leader envisions a desirable future, articulates how it can be reached, sets an example to be followed, sets high standards of performance, and shows determination and confidence. Intellectual stimulation is displayed when the leader helps followers to become more innovative and creative. Individualized consideration is displayed when leaders pay attention to the developmental needs of followers and support and coach the development of their followers. Other researchers, such as Podsakoff, MacKenzie, and Bommer (1996), have developed their own measures of transformational leadership. Their measure is comprised of 24 items pertaining to six transformational leader characteristics including articulating a vision (e.g., talks about the future in an enthusiastic, exciting

way), providing a model (e.g., sets a positive example of others to follow), communicates high-performance expectations (e.g., will not settle for second best), provides individual support (e.g., shows concern for me as a person), fostering the acceptance of group goals (e.g., encourages a team attitude and spirit among employees), and providing intellectual stimulation (e.g., suggests new ways of looking at how we do our jobs). Recently, Rafferty and Griffin (2004) identified five characteristics of transformational leadership that will demonstrate discriminant validity with each other and with outcomes. There are vision, intellectual stimulation, inspirational communication, individualized support, and personal recognition.

VISION.

A vision is a mental image of a possible and desirable future state of the organization. In order to be successful, leaders need to know what direction they want to go and take that direction. It is also important to define and understand goals. Leaders must set high measurable goals and define expectations for others. They must understand how policies and systems are best used to achieve organization goals. The clear vision provided by a transformational leader inspires employees by giving their work meaning and making them feel a part of the organization. It helps followers determine what is good or important in the organization, and serves to enhance the speed and quality of decision making, increase initiative, and broaden employee discretion. Having a vision for the future and communicating that vision to others are known to be essential components of great leadership. It results in the internalization of organizational values and goals, which encourages individuals to adopt behaviors because of the attractiveness of the behavior

itself as opposed to the attractiveness of a given leader (Rafferty et al., 2004). It is also important to determine whether any changes have occurred that require the vision to be re-evaluated or altered. Greger and Paterson (2000) suggested that creating an environment in which people feel comfortable questioning the old vision can lead to a new, better course for the company overall. In addition, leaders must never stop learning. They must keep up with developments and obtain as much education as possible, as a way to prepare themselves to take advantage of opportunities (Cichy and Schmidgall, 1996).

INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION

The intellectual stimulation component of transformational leadership promotes personal learning and skill development and activates achievement motives underlying learning orientation. This factor encompasses behaviors that increase followers' interest and awareness of problems, and that develop their ability and propensity to think about problems in new ways. The effects of intellectual stimulation can be seen in increases in followers' abilities to conceptualise, comprehend, and analyse problems and in the improved quality of solutions that they generate. According to social cognitive theory, the inspirational motivation component of transformational leadership increases the intrinsic value of task accomplishment, emphasizes the symbolic and expressive aspects of work effort, and raises expectations of success (Sosik, J.J., Godshalk, V.M., and Yammarino, F.J., 2004). Oftentimes, transformational leaders are able to accomplish this shift in perspective by serving as role models. By showing high expectations and confidence in followers' capabilities, transformational leaders facilitate their followers to develop

commitment to long-term goals, missions and vision and shift their focus from short-term and immediate solutions and objectives to long-term and fundamental solutions and objectives (Jung, Chow and We, 2003)

INSPIRATIONAL COMMUNICATION

Angelo and Vladimir (1994) suggested that successful leaders need to be able to translate dreams into reality by getting others to share their dreams, commitment and enthusiasm. Therefore, effective leadership is accomplished partially through effective communication. True leadership includes effectively orchestrating important change by inspiring people to attain the vision. Great leaders keep people focused on moving the organization toward its ideal future, motivating them to overcome whatever obstacles lie in the way. According to Cichy et al. (1996), staff participation through communication in the form of advice, ideas, brainstorming, comments, and the like is critical. As a result, communication was identified as critical for leaders, and their communication skills should always be improving. Tracey et al. (1996) suggested that the effectiveness of a transformational leader may be contingent on the ability to effectively communicate the followers' role in fulfilling the overall organizational goals and objectives. The effective leader must clearly communicate the vision to all levels of the organization, behave in a manner consistent with that vision, and employ every means of feedback available—direct and indirect—to check all vital signs and make certain that the vision is alive and well (Greger et al., 2000). In addition, Rafferty et al. (2004) suggested that leaders can have a powerful positive effect on employees by expressing positive and encouraging messages to staff. Inspirational communication seems to be particularly

important when expressing a vision for the future. In the absence of encouragement and confidence building efforts, articulating a vision may have a neutral or even negative influence on employees. A number of studies found that, by articulating an important vision and mission for the organization, transformational leaders increase followers' understanding of the importance and values associated with desired outcomes, raise their performance expectations and increase their willingness to transcend their self-interests for the sake of the collective entity.

INDIVIDUALIZED SUPPORT

Podsakoff et al.. (1990) defined individualized support as behaviour on the part of a leader that indicates that he or she respects his or her followers and is concerned with followers' feelings and needs. Individualized support occurs when a leader has a developmental orientation towards staff and displays individualized attention to followers and responds appropriately to their personal needs. Transformational leadership elevates others' needs in Maslow's need hierarchy from base to higher order needs, which include social needs (e.g., paying more attention to the family), promotes more collectivistic values (e.g., adopting more other-oriented and family values), and provides support for individuals who are at different career and developmental stages. Such behaviours include appreciating the unique needs and desires of others, showing empathy for a person's work and life situation, and establishing a plan to address potential work overload (Sosik et al., 2004). Leaders must build consensus and focus on people. When it is necessary to criticize the staff, they should do it positively. They should be sensitive to the needs of people and create win-win situations. Leaders should understand the

potential and capabilities of people and measure performance based on that understanding and accept the corporate responsibility to develop employees for job advancement, either within the organization or beyond (Cichy et al.,1996) Furthermore, transformational leaders often seek followers' participation by highlighting the importance of cooperation in performing collective tasks, providing the opportunity to learn from shared experience, and creating a work environment where followers feel empowered to seek innovative approaches to perform their job. The major goal of transformational leaders is to develop followers' self-management and self-development skills by allowing them to make and implement actions without direct supervision or intervention (Jung et al., 2003)

PERSONAL RECOGNITION

Personal recognition occurs when a leader indicates that he or she values individuals' efforts and rewards the achievement of outcomes consistent with the vision through praise and acknowledgment of followers' efforts. Although, Wofford, Goodwin and Whittington (1998) claimed that the negotiation of rewards for good performance represents a form of transactional leadership. Rewarding followers based on their performance was argued to represent a transformational process as followers and leaders in a transformational relationship have a personal investment in the vision. So the followers assume that performance consistent with the vision will be rewarded.

It can be summarized that transformational leaders can influence a broad range of follower performance that contributes to the overall success of an organization. As

transformational leaders articulate their vision and clarify individual roles in accomplishing desired objectives, followers gain an understanding of where the organization is going and what they must do to help accomplish the leader's vision. If followers acquire an understanding of the "big picture" and have positive perceptions about their leader, they may then develop increased levels of motivation that subsequently impact job performance, teamwork, and other important outcomes. Avolio (1999) claimed that transformational leaders are more capable of sensing their environment and then forming and disseminating strategic goals that capture the attention and interest of their followers. On the other hand, the followers of transformational leaders have been shown to exhibit higher levels of commitment to their organizational mission, a willingness to work harder, greater levels of trust in their leader, and higher levels of cohesion.

Bass and Avolio (1994) revealed that transformational and transactional styles of leadership are not deemed to be mutually exclusive. Bass (1985) argued that the transformational leadership style is complementary to the transactional style and likely to be ineffective in the total absence of a transactional relationship between leader and subordinate. The same individual may vary his or her leadership style at different times or in different situations (Tracey and Hinkin, 1996). Transformational leaders can be directive or participative, authoritarian or democratic. Nelson Mandela, for instance, is directive and transformational when he declares "Forget the past". He can be participative and transformational when he actively supports and involves himself in open, multiracial consultations. He can be directive and transactional when he promises

blacks better housing in exchange for their votes and is participative and transactional when he reaches mutual agreements about sharing power with the white minority. The same leaders display both transformational and transactional behavior as well as mix direction and participation (Bass, 1999).

LEADERSHIP IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

Many hospitality organizations are increasingly viewing leadership development as a source of competitive advantage. Since the industry tends to be labour intensive and has increasingly harsh environmental demands imposed upon it, leadership skills may help organizations to utilize the available human resources more effectively and may help to increase performance. Worsfold (1989) found that managers in the hospitality industry had an awareness of participative styles of leadership but were more inclined to use autocratic approaches. Tracey, et al. (1994) suggested that major changes in the environment of hospitality business required leaders who were able to examine holistically their organization, use vision to recognize what changes were required and manager those changes to fit with the organization's environment. With increased attention being paid to successful change management in the last decade, organizations, generally, are accepting transformation leadership behavior as an important component of leading such change.

THAILAND AND THAI CULTURE

The Kingdom of Thailand lies in the heart of Southeast Asia, making it a natural gateway to Indochina, Myanmar and Southern China. Its' shape and geography was divided into

four natural regions: the mountains and forests of the North; the vast rice fields of the Central Plains; the semi-arid farm lands of the Northeast plateau; and the tropical islands and long coastline of the peninsula South. Thais are well known for their friendliness and hospitality. A large majority of over 62 million citizens of Thailand are ethnic Thai, along with strong communities whose ethnic origins lie in China, India and elsewhere. About 7 million people reside in the capital city of Bangkok.

Buddhism plays a very significant role in a daily life of Thai people. Since about 95% of people in the kingdom of Thailand are Buddhists. Buddhist teachings are at the root of the typical Thai's sincere consideration for others, embodied in the virtue known as *namchai*, "water of the heart," a concept encompassing spontaneous warmth and compassion that allows families to make anonymous sacrifices for friends and to extend hospitality to strangers.

Burnard and Naiyapatana (2004) found that Thai interpersonal communication, in general, can be characterized as (1) Face to face, Thai people believe that social harmony is best maintained by avoiding any unnecessary friction in their contracts with others. Their belief formed the strong Thai feeling of *krengchai*, which means an extreme reluctance to impose on anyone or disturb his personal equilibrium by direct criticism, challenge, or confrontation. Thai people will talk quietly and use limited eye contact—particularly across the sexes, or between two people who are not of equal status. Both parties will seek to maintain *kreng jai*, to make sure that each feels comfortable and that neither party is compromised. Turn talking, between two people, is likely to be less

marked than may be the case in many western cultures. Importance will be attached to the status of the two people and one person is always likely to defer to the other as, in general in Thailand, 'equal status' is rare. (2)Communication and discussion is likely to be 'round-about', rather than direct to the point. It is sometimes better for a person to say what the other person wants to hear than to risk being controversial or confrontational. As a rule, confrontation and conflict are to be avoided. Gossip is likely to be a common feature of Thai communication, as is the use of compliments. In general, the aim is to ensure that both parties are respected and made to feel comfortable.

Gupta, Surie, Javidan, and Chhokar (2002) revealed that Thailand stands out with its most future and rule oriented, but least humane and least assertive societal values among other countries in Southern Asia. The lack of interest in assertiveness can be explained by a preference for avoiding confrontation. In Thai language assertiveness and aggressiveness meant the same. Thai motto was "The more you talk the more you lose, better stay quiet and you will earn more pennies!" (Pathmanand, 2001 in Gupta, et al., 2002, p. 22). Thailand also has the highest score on power distance practices, perhaps due to a military-type culture of hierarchical rule orientation, reflecting a long political history of absolute monarchy, first of Ayuthaya between 1350 A.D. and 1767 A.D., and thereafter of modern Chakir dynasty founded by military generals, until the adoption of democratic government in 1939 (Ebsen, 1997).

Knutson, Komolsevin, Chatiketun and Smith (2003) reported the results of a cross-cultural study on rhetorical sensitivity between Thai and US American students. The emphasis of

the high-context, collective Thai culture on social harmony and pleasant relationships strongly suggested that Thai people exhibit high levels of rhetorical sensitivity and reflection and low levels of noble self in their interpersonal communication. Among other characteristics of the high-context, collective Thai culture, they found that young people are quiet in the presence of older people, younger people seldom disagree with older people, students rarely express their opinions in class, and quietness is considered a virtue in Thai culture. Smutkupt and Barna (1976) reported that doubts are seldom verbalized in Thai culture. McGill (1995) also conducted the study on Thai value system and indicated that Thai people are strongly ego-oriented with a deep sense of independence, pride, and dignity. This concern for the ego produces sensitivity to criticism and great efforts to avoid it even in business situations because “it is very difficult for the Thai to dissociate one’s idea and opinion from the ‘ego’ self. Earley (1999) also confirmed that, in Thai culture, people avoid confrontation and conflict so as to avoid threatening the position of others. For example, the younger group members actively polled the older member concerning his opinions and personal estimates before committing himself or herself and revealing their own positions. If there was a disagreement between the older and younger members, it was evident that the younger members yielded quickly to the opinions expressed by the older member. There was not an open discussion and debate concerning ideas and views in the age and education conditions.

EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP IN THAI CULTURE

According to Bass (1999), although, the transformational leadership theory, model, and measurements emerged in the individualistic United States, it appears equally or even

more applicable in the collectivist societies of Asia. Collectivist cultures provide the leaders with ready-made opportunities to become transformational leaders. Most subordinates in collectivist cultures already have respect for their leaders.

Figure 2: Country and Cluster Means for GLOBE Second-order Leadership Scales

Country	Charismatic	Team-Oriented	Self-protective	Participative	Humane	Autonomous
Iran	5.81	5.90	4.34	4.97	5.75	3.85
India	5.85	5.72	3.77	4.99	5.26	3.85
Thailand	5.78	5.76	3.91	5.29	5.09	4.28
Malaysia	5.89	5.80	3.49	5.12	5.24	4.03
Indonesia	6.15	5.92	4.12	4.60	5.43	4.19
Philippines	6.33	6.06	3.31	5.40	5.53	3.75
Cluster	5.97	5.86	3.82	5.06	5.38	3.99
Contrast	0.19	0.15	0.41*	-0.27	0.60**	0.11

*p<0.05; **p<0.01.

Source: Gupta, V., Surie, G., Javidan, M., and Chhokar, J., (2002), *Southern Asia Cluster: Where The Old Meets The New?*, *Journal of World Business*, 37, p. 16-27.

Transformational leadership is more likely to be enhanced further by centrality of work in life and the high level of group orientation among followers. The mutual obligation between leaders and followers facilitates the transformational leader's individualized consideration. Leaders in collectivist cultures already have a more responsibility to take

care of their subordinates, to help them prepare a career development plan, to attend their birthday parties, funeral ceremonies, and to counsel followers about personal problems. In turn, subordinates have a moral obligation to reciprocate with unquestioning loyalty and obedience. Indeed, transformational leadership may be far more pervasive in collectivist societies compared to the individualistic societies of the West (Jung, Sosik and Bass, 1995 in Bass, 1999).

According to Gupta, et al. (2002), as seen in Figure 2, transformational-charismatic and team-oriented leadership are the most effective models for outstanding results in Southern Asia. In other words, visionary and inspirational leaders who are decisive and performance oriented, and who have high levels of integrity and are willing to make personal sacrifices, are deemed to be effective. Furthermore, leaders who are team builders, collaborative and diplomatic are also highly valued. These attributes are consistent with the high power distance and family-orientated culture. Leaders are expected to act as patriarchs who help subordinates aspire towards more ambitious and collective goals. At the same time, they need to make sure their actions and decisions help develop and sustain the team and family orientation in their organizations. They need to be open to negotiations and ideas from many corners and have to be capable diplomats to make sure they do not disenfranchise any group members. Humane and participative leaders who are modest, caring and delegate responsibility to others are also deemed as effective. The emphasis on a humane and participative leadership model is consistent with the societal cultures of humane and group orientation in these societies.

While they are in strong positions of authority, leaders are expected to be benevolent and paternalistic and to allow for input from others.

LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY

The competency model, or attribute based competency approach has been most common in the United States, while the competency standards or demonstrable performance approach has formed the basis for national qualifications frameworks in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. From this approach, a competency is defined as a characteristic of an individual that is related to criterion-referenced effective and/or excellent performance in a job or situation. Performance based assumption of competence relies upon demonstrable performance, or use of practices in the workplace in accordance with occupational, professional or organizational competency standards (Crawford, 2005).

According to Chung-Herrera, et al. (2003), competency models focus on behavior rather than on personality traits, because personality traits are usually hard to measure accurately. Expressing desirable traits in behavioral terms is essential for a competency model to be useful as a human-resources tool, because the model must not only define the competencies necessary for effective performance but also indicate how to tell when a particular competency is being demonstrated. Most competency models express traits and characteristics in behavioral terms on the grounds that behavior is the observable manifestation of personality traits and characteristics.

Building leadership competencies is a career-long activity—whether the managers want to maintain a competitive edge in the current position, or they want to move to a bigger, more challenging maze (Estep, 2005). Being competent, by definition, means having the ability, being capable, possessing certain skill and knowledge to do what one is suppose to do. Applying the competency concept to the work situation, considers a person having an underlying characteristic which results in job performance. (Siu, 1998), so it is essential for managers to understand the concept of competency. Shahar (2004) pointed out that today’s managers understand that honing their coaching competence is vital if they are to successful retained and care for the best talent in their organization. Many organizations took account of the identified leadership competencies for the manager position of its subsidiaries to enhance the recruitment strategy for future managers. Moreover, they capitalized on the leadership competency concept to pinpoint essential competencies of their managers, and then to design training and development programs for these people.

Williams and Winston, (2003) argued that leadership competencies represent statement of the areas of knowledge and the abilities that are necessary for successful leaders. Private-sector research has focused on the issue of leadership competencies for some time, with the idea of identifying those qualities and abilities possessed by successful leaders. Attempts to develop models of the skills and knowledge required for effective performance typically begin with an analysis of the demands being made on people working in a certain arena. Thus, to develop a model of the capabilities underlying

effective organizational leadership, one must identify the performance requirements imposed on organizational leaders.

Reicher, Alexander, and Hopkins (2005) argued that understanding and monitoring social dynamics within the problem domain represents a key leadership skill. Selected alternatives need to be extended and revised to ensure workability within the context of the organizational environment. Moreover, objectivity would seem to be necessary wherever one is dealing with a complex system where feedback is ambiguous. Along similar lines, sensitivity to issues of solution appropriateness, as well as an awareness of different constituencies, are likely to be important when integrating solutions into an organization composed of rather loosely linked subsystems, each having somewhat different concerns, responsibilities, and functions. House (1996) and Howard (1995) argued that solutions are often developed interactively or with the help of key subordinates, peer, and supervisors. Further, the efforts of making a change are not necessary linear and any change may be associated with a number of unanticipated consequences. Therefore, skills such as identification of restrictions, analysis of downstream consequences, coordination of multiple activities, and sensitivity to relevant goals may all play a role in leader performance.

Kaplan-Leiserson (2005) indicated that skills for effective leadership can be classified into four distinct roles: visionary, facilitator, contributor, and tactician. Each role has a unique mission and tasks to achieve it. The visionary sets direction; the tactician puts plans and processes in place; the facilitator ensures that team member and stakeholders

are on board; and the contributor makes sure the leader's own talents are being used. A leader's ability to integrate these four roles, added to the foundation of leadership character, has a dramatic influence on worker's performance.

Smith, Wang, and Leung (1997) viewed an effective leader as one who conducts interactions with superiors, peer, subordinates and other members of his or her role set in such a way as to enhance the organization's performance. Successful leaders should have a high level of personal integrity, a firm set of values, and immense inner strength. They should establish a level of trust with people and within the organization, maintaining respect and earning credibility. Commitment to the job is also essential. Leaders must take responsibility for their decisions and create an atmosphere where individual works together and has a well-defined role in the organization.

Eventually, as performance depends on implementation of a plan, implementation, however, occurs in a distinctly social context, where the leader depends on the efforts of others in implementing proposed solutions, so social cognition is required. One important requirement during the social implementation phase is knowledge of subordinates, peers, and superiors, people the leader is interacting with during solution implementation. The need to develop and implement solutions with and through others places a premium on social skills (Zaccaro, Gilbert, Thor, and Mumford, 1991), especially skills used in acquiring information, framing actions, and promoting coherent actions on the part of the group. This requires flexibility in dealing with others and in adjusting plans

opportunistically, as dictated by the demands of a changing social environment (Zaccaro, et al., 1991).

Leaders must not only be able to formulate a plan that works within the context of the organization, they must also be able to implement this plan within a distinctly social context, marshaling support, communicating a vision, guiding subordinates, and motivating others. Thus, leaders must also be able to understand and work with others—another point which underscores the need for social skills (Bass, 1999; Zaccaro, et al., 1991).

In this sense, it is clear that communication of a shared vision and flexibility in implementation may present necessary components of effective problem solving in organizations. Leader must be able to communicate vision, establish goals, monitor progress, and motivate subordinates as they attempt to implement a given solution plan. Leader must also possess a host of other social performance skills. These include: communication and persuasion; negotiation; conflict management; and coaching.

Henderson (2004) pointed out that communication is the primary task of any executive, and communication with employees regarding their concerns, problems, ideas, and suggestions about the organization is the critical skill of managing. Managers must influence a myriad of challenges that coordinate interdependent, concurrent, and cross-functional work efforts as well as effectively negotiate with a variety of stakeholders. From a skills perspective, many communication researchers view competence primarily

as a composite of interpersonal skills such as self-disclosure, openness and trust, and empathy.

Mumford, et al. (2000) claimed that there are 3 characteristics that seem essential to effective leadership. First, leaders must be willing to tackle difficult, challenging organizational problems using these problems as a vehicle for growth. Second, leaders must be willing to exercise influence. However, the dominance and power motives may not necessarily be desirable unless coupled with a third characteristic—social commitment. Moreover, Barron and Harrington (1981) suggested the characteristics that allow leaders to survive and prosper in complex organizational environments. A host of personality characteristics have been found to be related to performance on complex social problems. Some of these characteristics, for example, openness, tolerance for ambiguity, and curiosity, may influence leader willingness to tackle novel problems and success in working through these problems. Others characteristics, such as confidence, risk taking, adaptability, and independence, may influence performance by allowing leaders to apply resources more effectively in a turbulent and rather stressful environment. Estep (2005) said that another success skill for a leader is understanding and fitting into the organization's culture. For example, knowing how communication takes place is critical for success in any type of environment. Schein (1996, p. 67-68) also suggested that leaders of the future will have the following characteristics:

- Extraordinary levels of perception and insight into the realities of the world and into themselves

- Extraordinary levels of motivation to enable them to go through the inevitable pain of learning and change, especially in a world with looser boundaries, in which loyalties become more difficult to define.
- The emotional strength to manage their own and others' anxiety as learning and change become more and more a way of life
- New skills in analyzing cultural assumptions, identifying functional and dysfunctional assumptions, and evolving processes that enlarge the culture by building on its strengths and functional elements
- The willingness and ability to involve others and elicit their participation, because tasks will be too complex and information too widely distributed for leaders to solve problems on their own
- The willingness and ability to share power and control according to people's knowledge and skills, that is, to permit and encourage leadership to flourish throughout the organization.

Moreover, the list of needs of future's hospitality manager has also been identified over the past several years as below.

- A visionary, employing value adding strategies
- Using and managing knowledge and technology for competitive advantage
- Spanning boundaries of cultures, business environments and management know-how
- A synthesizer and blender of skills and knowledge in a fast changing environment

- A leader in a dynamic and complex setting

(Olsen, 1999, p.381)

In addition, leaders also need crystallized cognitive abilities including written and oral expression, and written and oral comprehension to acquire, exchange, and manipulate information in most, if not all, problem domains (Bass, 1990). Dumaine (2004) argued that strong writing is essential to an organization's success. Transforming documents from productivity drains into action, strivers can both jump-start and sustain corporate results. To achieve that change, the managers must demonstrate four leadership skills in the daily documents; get results by driving action, communicate ideas strategically to support company vision and goals, create a positive and motivating work environment, and coach others effectively and constructively.

Many crucial initiatives are conveyed and implemented companywide via emails, written reports, and presentation. Writing strategically will help to manage more productivity, establish the credibility, and improve the image as a leader. Strong writing skills will gain the respect and contribute to the organization's growth and profitability. Ultimately, managers who are the best at communicating through writing will take the lead in setting the direction for their organizations. They will move their people to achieve outstanding goals.

LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES IN HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

Hospitality companies and organizations have faced an environment that implies global competition, variable customer needs, greater utilization of human resources, as well as

demands for cutting down the workforce. Such an environment required a type of leadership oriented more towards change and development. These business environment calls for new kinds of management abilities and leadership that can motivate people, develop human resources, and manage the processes of creativity. Although, many studies focus on the leadership competencies in public and private sectors in other industries, there are few leadership competency studies in the hotel industry. For example, Hsu and Gregory (1995) investigated and identified competencies needed for entry-level hotel managers from the industry professional's view point and found that human-relation skills such as communication and leadership skills should receive extra recognition in the future. Siu (1998) identified the managerial competencies essential for middle managers in the Hong Kong hotel industry. This study found that communication was perceived as the most important attribute, followed by concern for customers and leadership competency. Team building and team membership were also considered as quite important, whereas competencies pertaining for efficiency, personal drive and results orientation were considered as lower important than others.

Chung-Herrera, et al. (2003) presented the future based leadership-competency model for use in hospitality industry (Figure 3). Competency in self management is the most important factor, followed by knowledge of strategic positioning, implementation skill, and critical thinking. The self-management factor consists of four behavioral dimensions: ethics and integrity, time management, flexibility and adaptability, and self development.

The behavior of acting ethically or with integrity was the most important among these dimensions. The ethics-integrity dimension contained six specific behavioral competencies, such as “treats people with respect”, “displays consistency between words and actions”, and “considers ethical implications prior to taking action”.

Figure 3: Leadership-competency model for the lodging industry

Factor	Mean	Dimension	Mean
Self management	4.32	Ethics and integrity	4.58 ^a
		Time management	4.28
		Flexibility and adaptability	4.22
		Self development	4.12
Strategic positioning	4.17	Awareness of customer needs	4.39
		Commitment to quality	4.26
		Managing stakeholders	4.21
		Concern for community	3.67 ^b
Implementation	4.16	Planning	4.23 ^c
		Directing others	4.15
		Re-engineering	4.02
Critical thinking	4.15	Strategic orientation	4.24 ^d
		Decision making	4.18
		Analysis	4.17
		Risk taking and innovation	4.03

Figure 2.3 (Continue)

Factor	Mean	Dimension	Mean
Communication	4.12	Speaking with impact	4.27
		Facilitating open communication	4.14
		Active listening	4.06
		Written communication	4.06
Interpersonal	4.09	Building networks	4.20 ^e
		Managing conflict	4.07
		Embracing diversity	4.01
Leadership	4.09	Teamwork orientation	4.25 ^f
		Fostering motivation	4.19
		Fortitude	4.14
		Developing others	4.02
		Embracing change	3.98
		Leadership versatility	3.97
Industry knowledge	4.09	Business and industry expertise	4.09

Note:

- a “Ethics and integrity” scored significantly higher than the other three dimensions in this factors (p<.01)
- b “Concern for community” scored significantly lower than the other three dimensions in this factors (p<.01)
- c “Planning” scored significantly higher than “Re-engineering” (p<.05)

d “Strategic orientation” scored significantly higher than “Risk taking and innovation” (p<.05)

e “Building networks” is significantly higher than “Embracing diversity” (p<.05)

f “Teamwork orientation” scored significantly higher than did “Developing others” (p<.05), “Embracing change” (p<.01), and “Leadership versatility” (p<.01).

Source: Chung-Herrera, B.G., Enz, C.A., and Lankau, M.J. (2003). Grooming Future Hospitality Leaders: A competencies Model. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 44(3), p.17-25.

Moreover, self-management skills encompass actions related to the personal characteristics of the leader and how she or he handles himself or herself. Competency in strategic positioning was considered to be second most important for future leaders. This factor comprises the following four dimensions: awareness of customer needs, commitment to equality, managing stakeholders, and concern for community. The examples of behaviors that fall in this factor are “influences and shapes owners’ and stakeholders’ decision”, “promotes quality initiatives”, and “considers customer needs when making decisions”. Additionally, implementation, critical thinking, and communication skills were also considered as important for the leaders who want to reach higher leadership positions. Surprisingly, the interpersonal, leadership skill, and the industry knowledge was still considered as important, but were ranked lower than other factors.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The tourism industry has grown rapidly in Thailand. Significant evidence to document this growth is the growing internationalization of Thai resorts during the past several years. This situation leads to highly competition environment in the Thai hotel industry. In order to compete in this environment, the owners of the hotels need to understand the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in order to remain competitive. In addition, Thailand has cultural and social traditions that are unique to it's' people and which have an impact on the personal interaction and leadership styles used in that country. Little information is known about the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand. So, the objective of this study is to determine the leadership competencies necessary for future success as a hotel general manager in Thailand.

This chapter reviewed the methodology utilized in conducting this study. First, the design of the study was described, followed by a description of the population and sample. Next, the procedures employed to gain access to the population and sample, and how the respondents were exposed to the research instrument were described. Last, the discussion of the analytic tools employed in the analysis of the data was presented.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study involved a cross-sectional design to collect data. The cross-sectional study has two distinguishing features. First, it provides a snapshot of the variables of interest at a single point in time. Second, in the cross-sectional study, the sample of elements is typically selected to be representative of some known population. Therefore, a great deal of emphasis is on selecting sample members. This technique is often called sample survey (Churchill and Brown, 2004). After a review of the literature, a survey instrument was developed from previous research to conduct this study.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The target population for this study is hotel general managers in Thailand. A comprehensive list of all accommodations in Thailand as identified by the Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT), as of January 2006, was used. This list was judged by the researcher to be the best representation of the population that was practically available. The General Managers (GMs) of these hotels were requested to complete a questionnaire, and participation was voluntary.

PROCEDURES

Prior to the collection of data for this study, written approval was obtained from the Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board (IRB), see Appendix A. Data was collected through a mail questionnaire. A mailed questionnaire was utilized since it provided the most effective, efficient method of data collection for a large sample that was geographically scattered. The mail questionnaire is the most effective method for

collecting data from the hotel general managers in Thailand where the email addresses and fax numbers provided by hotels are for front office contact only.

A mail questionnaire also allows respondents to work at their own pace. This may produce more thoughtful responses than would be obtained in personal or telephone interviews, where there is a certain urgency associated with responding (Churchill, et al., 2004). The survey instrument included a souvenir (a coaster), a postage-paid returned envelope and a cover letter, signed by the researcher and her advisor to strengthen the creditability of the study. A cover letter described the purpose of the study, the importance of his/her involvement and a solicitation for his/her participation. The letter also contained information regarding the confidential and anonymous nature of data collection, contact information used when they have any questions about their participation in the study, and instructions for completing the survey information. A follow-up telephone call was made in order to check on receipt of the questionnaire, and the second mailing was made to the non-respondents to promote a higher response rate.

INSTRUMENT

The questionnaire (Appendix B) was adapted from previous literature regarding the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager on a global basis. The survey was adapted to ensure that it was appropriate for use in Thailand. The questionnaire instrument consisted of three sections:

Section 1: Respondent's demographic characteristic information

Section 2: Hotel characteristic information

Section 3: A list of the 98 specific behavioral competencies. Using a five-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (not at all necessary) to 5 (extremely necessary), respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of the 98 competencies or skills necessary for success as a general manager in the future.

The researcher created questions about the respondent's and the hotel's demographic characteristics in section one and section two whereas a list of the 98 specific behavioral competencies in section three was adapted from Chung-Herrera, Enz, and Lankau (2003). Based on prior research and for ease of survey completion these 98 specific behavioral competencies were grouped within six dimensions as: vision and planning (29 items), communication (10 items), interpersonal stimulation (15 items), self-management and development (19 items), support and recognition (20 items), and ethic issues (5 items). The English language version of the instrument was translated into Thai by a Thai lecturer and then translated back into English by a second English-Thai lecturer who work at Prince of Songkla University, to make sure that meanings remain the same in both languages. English and Thai language versions of the instrument (see Appendix C) were used to make sure that both Thai and non-Thai respondents understand each question accurately. This could enhance the validity of the result and boost the respond rate. Before the main survey, a pilot study was conducted for 10 hotel general managers in Phuket, using personal interviews to improve the content comprehensibility and clarity of the questionnaire.

DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistical methods, such as distribution analysis, were used to analyze the characteristics of the respondents and their organization. To answer research question number one, principal component analysis with varimax rotation was employed in exploratory factor analysis to extract from the 98 competencies a set of simplified composite factors that could be used to describe the original construct to analysis the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager. Factor analysis is a statistical approach that can be used to discover interrelationships among a large number of variables and explain these variables in term of their common underlying dimensions (factors). The objective is to find a way of condensing the information contained in a number of original variables into a smaller set of variates (factors) with a minimum lost of information (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black, 1998). The Bartlett test of sphericity was used to examine the presence of correlations among the variables. It provides the statistical probability that the correlation matrix has significant correlations among at least some of the variables. Factors were considered significant and retained only if they had an eigenvalue equal to or greater than 1.0, and variable with factor loading equals to or greater than 0.50 (Hair et al., 1998). The outcome of the analysis is identification of the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand.

Subsequently, a factor solution was obtained in which all variables have significant loading on a factor. Variables with higher loading are considered more important and have greater influence on the name selected to represent a factor. Thus, all the underlying

variables were examined for a particular factor and, placing greater emphasis on those variables with higher loading, the original set of variables was replaced with an entirely new, smaller set of variables created from factor scores. All of the variables loading highly on a factor were combined, and the average score of the variables was used as a replacement variable. Cronbach's alpha was applied as the measure of reliability with the lower limit at 0.7. The factor name was developed by the researcher based on its appropriateness for representing the underlying dimensions of a particular factor. This procedure is followed for each extracted factor. The final result was a name that represents each of the derived factors as accurately as possible.

Then, an independent-sample *t*-test and F test were used to investigate mean score differences in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand among different demographic characteristics of the respondents (e.g. gender, age, education level, working experience, and expatriate status) and their organizations (e.g. the size, star-rating, number of employees, client base, location, type of the hotel). The *t*-test was used to assess whether the factor means of two groups are statistically different from each other whereas the F-test was used to determine the probability that differences in factor means across several groups are due solely to sampling error.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This study aimed to determine the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand. In this study the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand?
2. Do the leadership competencies identified as necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand differ from those leadership competencies identified as necessary for success in a global environment by previous research?
3. What impact do the demographic characteristics of the respondents have on their perception of the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in the Thai hotel industry?
4. Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between respondents who work for domestic (Thai based) companies and respondents who work for international hotel management companies?

5. Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between the respondents who are native Thai and expatriate?

RESPONSE RATE

Data was collected through a mail questionnaire because the samples were geographically scattered. The list of accommodations surveyed by Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT) as of January 2006 was used and 2,230 general managers were asked to complete the questionnaire. The survey instrument included a souvenir (a glass mat or coaster), a postage-paid return envelope and a cover letter that described the purpose of the study, the importance of his/her involvement and a solicitation of his/her participation. After two weeks, a follow-up telephone call was made in order to check on receipt of the questionnaire. 530 completed questionnaires were returned over a one-month period. The response rate was 22.6%. After missing data was screened, the useable sample size was 503. The demographic profile of the respondents is shown in Table 4.1.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

There were 288 (55.8%) male and 228 (44.2%) female respondents. In terms of nationality, 96.7% of the respondents were Thai, and only 3.3% were expatriate. In respect to age, two groups were almost equally distributed (30.2% from the 35-44 age group, and 31.2% from the 45-54 age group). Only 20.2% of respondents were under 25 years of age, while 2.1% of the respondents were above 55 years of age.

In terms of educational background of respondents, 295 (57.2%) respondents held a bachelors degree, 105 (20.3%) respondents held a diploma while 106 (20.5%) respondents held a master degree or above, only 10 (1.9%) held a school certificate.

Table 4.1: Respondents' demographic characteristic profile

Respondent's demographic characteristic	frequency	percentage
Gender		
Male	288	55.8
Female	228	44.2
Nationality		
Thai	499	96.7
Expatriate	17	3.3
Age		
less than 35	104	20.2
35-44	156	30.2
45-54	161	31.2
55-64	84	16.3
65 or more	11	2.1
Education		
School certificate	10	1.9
Diploma	105	20.3
Undergraduate	295	57.2
Postgraduate	106	20.5

Table 4.1 (Continued)

Respondent's demographic characteristic	frequency	percentage
Professional experience in the industry		
1-5 years	95	18.4
6-10 years	92	17.8
11-15 years	83	16.1
16-20 years	105	20.3
more than 20 years	141	27.3
Working experience as General Manager		
1-5 years	183	35.5
6-10 years	153	29.7
11-15 years	69	13.4
16-20 years	56	10.9
more than 20 years	55	10.7

As for the professional background, the results indicated that 83 (16.1%) respondents had 11-15 years of experience, 105 (20.3%) respondents had 16-20 years of experience, and 141 (27.3%) respondents had more than 20 years of experience. Overall, 63.7% had more than 10 years of professional experience in the industry. Moreover, 35.5 % of the respondents worked as a general manager for 1-5 years, 29.7% occupied this position for 6-10 years, while 35% worked in this position for more than 10 years (13.4% for 11-15 years, 10.9% for 16-20 years, and 10.7% for more than 20 years).

THE CHARACTERISTIC PROFILE OF THE RESPONDENTS' HOTELS

The respondents' hotel characteristics are shown in Table 4.2. In terms of hotel type, surprisingly, two groups were almost equally distributed, 50.1% were city hotel whereas 49.9% were resort. However, 89.7 % were independent hotels without affiliation, only 10.3% were chain hotel with affiliation. In terms of hotel size, 32.2 % had less than 50 rooms, 31.1% had 51-99 rooms, 21.1% had 100-199 rooms, and 15.7% had 200 rooms or more (8.3% and 7.4% for 100-199 rooms and 200-299 rooms, respectively).

Table 4.2: Hotel characteristic profile

Hotel characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
Type		
City hotel	251	50.1
Resort hotel	252	49.9
Chain		
Independent hotel without affiliate	451	89.7
Chain hotel with affiliate	52	10.3
No. of rooms		
Less than 50	162	32.2
50-99	156	31.0
100-199	106	21.1
200-299	42	8.3
300-399	17	3.4
400-499	10	2.0
500 or more	10	2.0

Table 4.2 (Continued)

Hotel characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
No. of employees		
Less than 50	265	52.7
50-99	91	18.1
100-199	74	14.7
200-299	32	6.4
300-399	14	2.8
400-499	9	1.8
500 or more	18	3.6
Rating		
No rating	222	44.1
Less than three-star	36	7.2
Three-star	133	26.4
Four-star	89	17.7
Five-star	23	4.6

As for the number of employees, 265 (52.7%) hotels hired less than 50 employees, 91 (18.1%) hotels hired 50-99 employees, 74 (14.7%) hotels hired 100-199 employees, and 63 (14.6%) hotels hired 200 employees or more.

In terms of hotel rating, 44.1% identified themselves as being no rating hotels, 7.2% rated themselves less than three-star hotels, 26.4% identified themselves as three-star hotels, 17.7% were four-star hotels, and only 4.6% rated as five-star hotels.

RESEARCH QUESTION ONE

What are the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand?

There were 98 leadership competencies used in this study. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was employed in the exploratory factor analysis to extract from 98 competencies into a set of simplified composite factors that could be used to describe the original construct to analysis the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager. By utilizing the data reduction function of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 11.5 (SPSS, 2001) possible underlying factors were examined for all 98 leadership competencies.

First, The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was used to quantify the degree of intercorrelations among the variables and the appropriateness of factor analysis. From table 4.3, Kaider-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic was calculated as 0.97 for this study. Because KMO was above 0.8, the 98 leadership competencies could be considered interrelated and they shared common underlying dimensions. Second, the Bartlett test of sphericity was conducted in order to test the significance of the correlation matrix

($\chi^2=35175.55$, $df=4753$, $p<0.000$). Both tests indicated that factor analysis was appropriate for this study.

Table 4.3: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.974
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
Approx. Chi-Square	35175.555
df	4753
Sig	0.000

After the viability of the factor analysis was determined, an exploratory factor analysis using principal component with varimax rotation was used to identify underlying factors according to which the general managers in Thailand evaluated the importance of the competencies necessary for success as a general manager in Thailand in the future. Generally, researchers utilize some predetermined criteria in deciding when to stop factoring, and these criteria are: (1) latent root criterion, (2) percentage of variance criterion, and (3) a priori criterion (Hair, et al., 1998). Based on the information obtained from factors extracted, the best representation of the data can be finalized. Each criteria was described below.

- Latent Root Criterion – this is the most commonly used technique and it can be applied to either components analysis or common factor analysis. Each variable contributes a value of 1 to the total eigenvalue. Only when a factor has latent roots or eigenvalue greater than 1, it is considered significant, otherwise, factors with less than 1 eigenvalues are disregarded.

- Percentage of Variance Criterion – this technique is based on achieving a specified cumulative percentage of total variance extracted by successive factors. Usually, researchers should not stop extracting until factors account for 95% of the variance; however, it is common in social sciences to accept for 60% (or less) of the total variance (Hair, et al., 1998).
- A Priori Criterion – this approach is most useful when testing a theory or hypothesis. Under certain circumstances, researchers already know how many factors to extract; therefore, they can stop extraction processes when the desired number of factors have extracted.

In general, when factors have an eigenvalue equal to or greater than 1, then they can be considered statistically significant. Also, a variable with a factor loading equals to or greater than 0.5 can be considered statistically significant. In this study, the competencies with a factor loading of 0.5 or higher were clustered together; the results of the factor analysis produced a clear factor structure with relatively appropriate factors. Forty-two out of ninety-eight competencies were excluded from this process. Table 4.4 shows the results of the factor analysis.

From the varimax-rotated factor matrix, eleven factors were extracted that explain 59.67% of the overall variance. These eleven factors were named as “leadership”, “motivation”, “strategic orientation”, “planning and implementation”, “team building”, “communication”, “relationship building”, “flexibility”, “concern for community”,

managing stakeholder”, “ risk-taking”, and “challenging others”. These factors were named based on the common characteristics of the items in each factor.

Table 4.4.: The Result of the Factor Analysis

FACTOR	F*
F1: Leadership (eigenvalue = 8.818, % of variance = 41.525)	
Select leadership style most appropriate for the situation (Q59)	0.515
Reduces redundancies in processes and procedures (Q62)	0.558
Protects confidential information (Q64)	0.595
Spends time on the most important issues, not just the most urgent (Q66)	0.521
Deals constructively with own failures and mistakes (Q67)	0.587
Understands complex concepts and relationships (Q68)	0.526
Confronts problems early before they become unmanageable (Q69)	0.649
F2: Motivation/Interpersonal Skill (eigenvalue = 8.526, % of variance = 3.126)	
Provides challenging assignments to facilitate development (Q42)	0.530
Encourages employees to use their initiative to remedy problems when they first occur (Q43)	0.616
Allows others to lead under the appropriate circumstances (Q44)	0.675
Deliberately allows direct reports to use their own methods for completing tasks (Q45)	0.649
Inspires and motivates others (Q46)	0.537
Prepares people to understand changes (Q47)	0.597

Table 4.4 (continued)

Factor	F*
F2: (Continue)	
Defines and sets up quality standards for employees (Q48)	0.533
Gives others the authority necessary to accomplish their objective (Q49)	0.590
Involves others in critical decisions that affect them (Q50)	0.527
Delegates enough of own works to others (Q51)	0.530
Keeps others updates with information (Q52)	0.509
Gets others interested and involved in the change process (Q53)	0.546
F3: Strategic Orientation (eigenvalue = 7.915, % of variance = 2.523)	
Knows the strengths and weaknesses of competitors (Q18)	0.596
Identifies and defines problems (Q19)	0.596
Determines which of many problems may become crises (Q20)	0.555
Creates needed systems and procedures to support changes (Q21)	0.595
Understands owners' and stakeholders' values and how they perceive things (Q24)	0.544
Recognizes and seizes strategic opportunities in the environment (Q25)	0.557
See how things fit in the big picture (Q27)	0.519
F4: Planning and Implementation	
(eigenvalue = 6.818, % of variance = 2.232)	
Anticipate obstacles and develop plans (Q1)	0.512
Manages time to ensure productivity (Q3)	0.622

Table 4.4 (continued)

Factor	F*
<p>F4: (Continue)</p> <p>Integrates planning efforts across work groups or functional units (Q4)</p> <p>Identifies measurable action steps that support strategy and mission (Q5)</p> <p>Considers a broad range of factors when resolving problems and making decisions (Q6)</p> <p>Translates business strategies into clear objective and tactics (Q7)</p> <p>Brings together different perspectives and approaches and combines them in creative ways (Q8)</p> <p>Examines and monitors trends in the hotel business (Q9)</p>	<p>0.598</p> <p>0.641</p> <p>0.616</p> <p>0.592</p> <p>0.552</p> <p>0.556</p>
<p>F5: Team Building and ethics (eigenvalue = 6.252, % of variance = 1.766)</p> <p>Champions new ideas and initiatives (Q88)</p> <p>Employs a team approach to solve problems when appropriate (Q89)</p> <p>Promotes respect and appreciation for diversity and individual differences (Q90)</p> <p>Treat people fairly (Q91)</p> <p>Promotes teamwork among groups; discourages “us versus them” thinking(Q92)</p> <p>Acts in an ethical manner (Q94)</p>	<p>0.509</p> <p>0.539</p> <p>0.569</p> <p>0.669</p> <p>0.677</p> <p>0.517</p>

Table 4.4 (continued)

Factor	F*
F6: Communication (eigenvalue = 5.461, % of variance = 1.645)	
Interacts with people in a direct and open manner (Q32)	0.607
Listens to people without interrupting (Q33)	0.613
Listens carefully to input and concerns expressed by others (Q34)	0.521
Writes in an effective manner (Q35)	0.541
Actively and frequently listens directly to customers (Q36)	0.517
Speaks clearly and articulately in a variety of situations (Q37)	0.565
Presents ideas in a convincing manner (Q39)	0.521
F7: Flexibility (eigenvalue = 5.263, % of variance = 1.613)	
Models the changes expected of others (Q84)	0.655
Adjusts leadership approach to fit other individuals (Q86)	0.562
F8: Concern for Community (eigenvalue = 3.684, % of variance = 1.408)	
Commits organizational resources for community events (Q95)	0.676
Considers ethical implication prior to taking action (Q96)	0.567
Considers the effect of decision on community well-being (Q97)	0.694
Builds partnerships and alliances with community organizations (Q98)	0.614
F9: Managing Stakeholders (eigenvalue = 2.008, % of variance = 1.330)	
Understands the agendas and perspective of owners, roles and responsibilities (Q10)	0.584

Table 4.4 (continued)

Factor	F*
F10: Risk-taking (eigenvalue = 1.991, % of variance = 1.314) Takes calculated risks when appropriate (Q14)	0.538
F11: Challenging Others (eigenvalue = 1.736, % of variance = 1.183) Challenges others to make touch choices (Q40)	0.524

* F = Factor Loading

() is the question number in Section 3 of the questionnaire.

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

The “leadership” factor had the highest eigenvalue (8.82), and it represented 41.52% of the explained variance. The second highest eigenvalue (8.526) was “motivation”, and this represented 3.13% of the explained variance in the sample. The “strategic orientation” factor contained 7 competencies and explained 2.52% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 7.96.

The “planning and implementation” factor included competencies such as “anticipate obstacles and develop plans”, “examines and monitors trends in the hotel business”, “integrates planning efforts across work groups or functional units”, and “translates business strategies into clear objective and tactics”, This factor’s eigenvalue was 6.82, and this represented 2.23%of the explained variance in the sample.

The “team building and ethics” factor included the following competencies: “champions new ideas and initiatives”, “employs a team approach to solve problems when

appropriate”, “promotes respect and appreciation for diversity and individual differences”, “treat people fairly”, “promotes teamwork among groups; discourages “us versus them” thinking”, and “acts in an ethical manner”. This factor accounted for 1.77 of the variance with an eigenvalue of 6.25.

The “communication” factor contained 7 competencies, such as: “interacts with people in a direct and open manner”, “speaks clearly and articulately in a variety of situations”, “presents ideas in a convincing manner”, “listens to people without interrupting”, “Listens carefully to input and concerns expressed by others”, and “writes in an effective manner”. This factor had a 5.46 eigenvalue and represented 1.64% of the explained variance.

The “flexibility” factor contained two competencies which was “models the changes expected of others” and “adjust leadership approach to fit other individuals”. This factor accounted for 1.61% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 5.26.

The “concern for community” factor explained 1.41% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 3.68. This factor included the following competencies: “commits organizational resources for community events”, “considers ethical implication prior to taking action”, “considers the effect of decision on community well-being”, and “builds partnerships and alliances with community organizations”.

The last three factors were identified as “managing stakeholder”, “risk-taking”, and “developing others”. The “managing stakeholder” factor accounted for 1.33% for the variance with an eigenvalue of 2.01. The “risk-taking” factor explained 1.31% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 1.99 and the “developing others” factor had 1.74 in eigenvalue and explained 1.18% of variance.

For subsequent analysis, “managing stakeholders”, “risk-taking” and “challenging others” factors had only one competency variable for each factor so mean scores of those three variables were used for further analysis. In case of eight factors, summated scales were constructed, all of competencies loading highly on each factor were combined, and the average scores of the variables were used as replacement variables. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to test the reliability of these summated scales. Generally, the agreed upon lower limit for Cronbach’s alpha is 0.70 (Hair et al., 1998). In this study, the reliability analysis with Cronbach’s alpha results in Table 4.5 showed that all of the reliability values exceed the recommended level of 0.70.

Table 4.5: Reliability Analysis with Cronbach’s alpha

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
No. of items	6	12	7	8	6	7	2	4
Alpha	0.87	0.93	0.88	0.86	0.90	0.88	0.72	0.88

The descriptive analysis results are shown in Table 4.6. After analyzing the overall mean value of eleven factors on leadership competencies necessary for future success as a

general manager in Thailand, the ranking was listed in descending order of mean value ranging from “1” as “not at all unnecessary” and “5” as “extremely necessary. The respondents agreed that the eleven derived factors were necessary competencies for future success, but in different degrees of agreement. Among all these eleven factors, competency in team building and ethics was rated highest by the respondents, followed by managing stakeholders, leadership, communication, planning and implementation, motivation, concern for community, strategic orientation, flexibility, risk-taking and challenging others.

Table 4.6: Descriptive statistics of leadership competency factors

	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Ranking
F1: Leadership	1.43	5.00	3.9747	0.69077	3
F2: Motivation	1.83	5.00	3.7686	0.67001	6
F3: Strategic orientation	1.14	5.00	3.6833	0.73264	8
F4: Planning and implementation	1.75	5.00	3.8834	0.64000	5
F5: Team building and ethics	1.83	5.00	4.0789	0.71595	1
F6: Communication	1.57	5.00	3.8909	0.70162	4
F7: Flexibility	1.00	5.00	3.2903	0.93421	9
F8: Concern for community	1.00	5.00	3.7416	0.82829	7
F9: Managing Stakeholders	2.00	5.00	4.0179	0.91342	2
F10: Risk-taking	1.00	5.00	3.2724	1.05778	10
F11: Challenging others	1.00	5.00	3.2068	1.14357	11

RESEARCH QUESTION TWO

Do the leadership competencies identified as necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand differ from those leadership competencies identified as necessary for hotel manager success in a global environment by previous research?

When comparing the leadership competencies identified as necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand and those leadership competencies identified as necessary for success in a global environment by previous research. The results in table 4.7 show that from an overall perspective the leadership competencies necessary for future success as a general manager in Thailand do not differ from those competencies identified in the global environment by previous research, but do slightly differ in the degree of agreement. However, it is impossible to use a statistical significance to test the mean differences because of incomplete information (data) from the previous study (Chung-Herrera, et al., 2003). By observation the mean scores, Team building and Ethics was rates highest in Thailand and global environment. But the mean scores of leadership competencies rated by general managers in Thailand were somewhat lower than the mean scores presented in previous study except the leadership and concern for community competencies.

Table 4.7: Mean comparisons between Thailand and Global environment

Thailand		Global*	
Leadership Competencies	Mean	Leadership Competencies	Mean
Team-building	4.04	Teamwork orientation	4.25
Ethics	4.29	Ethics and integrity	4.58
Strategic Orientation	3.68	Strategic Orientation	4.24
Flexibility	3.29	Flexibility and Adaptability	4.22
Managing Stakeholders	4.02	Managing Stakeholders	4.21
Planning and Implementation	3.88	Planning and Implementation	4.16
Communication	3.89	Communication	4.12
Motivation	3.76	Interpersonal	4.09
Risk-taking	3.27	Risk-taking and innovation	4.03
Leadership	3.97	Leadership versatility	3.97
Concern for Community	3.74	Concern for community	3.67
Challenging Others	3.21	Developing Others	4.02

* Chung-Herrera, B.G., Enz, C.A., and Lankau, M.J. (2003). *Grooming Future Hospitality Leaders: A competencies Model. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*,44(3), p.17-25.

RESEARCH QUESTION THREE

What impact do the demographic characteristics of the respondents have on their perception of the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in the Thai hotel industry?

An independent-sample *t*-test and F test were used to investigate mean score differences in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand among different demographic characteristics of the respondents (e.g. gender, age, education level, working experience, and expatriate status) and their organizations (e.g. the size, star-rating, number of employees, client base, location, type of the hotel). The *t*-test was used to assess whether the factor means of two groups are statistically different from each other whereas the F-test and multiple comparison (LSD) were used to determine the probability that differences in factor means across several groups are due solely to sampling error. If the ANOVA procedures show that type of significantly affected the leadership competencies at 0.05 significant levels, the Fishers LSD post test can be used when the overall ANOVA has a P value less than 0.05 (Hair et al., 1998).

In terms of hotel size, the ANOVA results in table 4.8.1 showed that there were no significant differences between hotel size and leadership competency factors included “leadership”, “motivation”, “strategic orientation”, “planning and implementation”, “team building and ethics”, “communication”, “flexibility” and “concerns for community” factors. But there was significant difference between hotel size and “challenging others” factor ($p > 0.05$).

Table 4.8.1: ANOVA results for hotel size and the leadership competency factors.

	F	Sig.
F1: Leadership	0.485	0.820
F2: Motivation	1.113	0.353
F3: Strategic Orientation	0.208	0.974
F4: Planning and Implementation	1.463	0.189
F5: Team Building and Ethics	1.492	0.179
F6: Communication	0.264	0.954
F7: Flexibility	0.801	0.569
F8: Concern for Community	0.604	0.727
F9: Managing Stakeholders	0.842	0.538
F10: Risk-taking	0.330	0.921
F11: Challenging Others	3.315	0.003*

* $p < 0.05$

As seen in table 4.8.2, when multiple comparisons (LSD) were calculated, the results showed that the “less than 50 rooms” hotels viewed “challenging others” factor less necessary than the “50-99 rooms”, “100-199 rooms”, and “200-299 rooms” hotels while the “50-99 rooms” hotels rated more important than the “less than 50” hotels but less important than the “200-299” hotels.

Table 4.8.2: Multiple Comparisons (LSD) toward “challenging others” factor

Hotel Size	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	162	2.9383	1.2887	a
50-99	156	3.2115	1.1014	bc
100-199	106	3.3585	1.0253	bc
200-299	42	3.6905	0.9236	c
300-399	17	3.2941	0.9852	abc
400-499	10	3.5000	0.9718	abc
500 or more	10	3.4000	0.8433	abc
Total	503	3.2068	1.1436	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “50-99”, and “c” = “200-299”

In terms of number of employees, Table 4.8.3 showed that there were significant differences between number of employees and eight factors; “leadership”, “motivation”, “strategic orientation”, “planning and implementation”, “team building and ethics”, “communication”, “managing stakeholders” and “challenging others” factors ($p < 0.05$). Then, the multiple comparisons with LSD were conducted; the results were shown in Tables 4.8.4.1 - 4.8.4.8.

Table 4.8.3: ANOVA results for number of employees and the leadership competency factors.

	F	Sig.
F1: Leadership	2.569	.018*
F2: Motivation	3.125	0.005*
F3: Strategic Orientation	2.708	0.013*
F4: Planning and Implementation	3.655	0.001*
F5: Team Building and Ethics	2.349	0.030*
F6: Communication	2.441	0.025*
F7: Flexibility	0.995	0.428
F8: Concern for Community	1.057	0.387
F9: Managing Stakeholders	3.630	0.002*
F10: Risk-taking	0.754	0.607
F11: Challenging Others	4.987	0.000*

* $p < 0.05$

The result in Table 4.8.4.1 showed that the hotels that hire less than 50 employees viewed “leadership” competency less necessary than the hotels hired 50-99, and 500 or more employees and the hotels that hired 300-399, and 400-499 employees perceived less necessary than the hotels that hired 500 or more employees. Additionally, the results in

Table 4.8.4.1: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “leadership” factor.

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	3.8965	0.73134	a
50-99	91	4.0973	0.63634	bc
100-199	74	4.0656	0.62614	abc
200-299	32	4.0089	0.58839	abc
300-399	14	3.8265	0.70472	ab
400-499	9	3.6667	0.69620	ab
500 or more	18	4.3413	0.54153	bc
Total	503	3.9747	0.69077	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “50-99”, and “c” = “500 or more”

Table 4.8.4.2 showed that the hotels which hired less than 50 employees perceived “motivation” competency less necessary than the hotels that hired “50-99”, “100-199”, and “500 or more employees” whereas the hotels that hired 500 or more employees viewed this competency more crucial than the hotels that hired 50-99, 300-399, and 400-499 employees.

Table 4.8.4.2: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “motivation” factor.

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	3.6786	0.68447	a
50-99	91	3.8498	0.66146	b
100-199	74	3.8986	0.54519	bc
200-299	32	3.8646	0.69003	abc
300-399	14	3.6488	0.74763	ab
400-499	9	3.5278	0.76490	ab
500 or more	18	4.1898	0.57792	c
Total	503	3.7686	0.67001	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “50-99”, and “c” = “500 or more”

From Table 4.8.4.3, the results showed that the hotels that hired less than 50 employees perceived “strategic orientation” competency less necessary than the hotels which hired 50-99, 100-199, and 500 or more employees while the hotels that hired 400-499 employees viewed less vital than the hotels that hired 500 or more employees.

Table 4.8.4.3: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “strategic orientation” factor.

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	3.5898	0.75181	ac
50-99	91	3.7802	0.70157	bc
100-199	74	3.8205	0.70187	bc
200-299	32	3.7946	0.61465	abc
300-399	14	3.6020	0.66813	abc
400-499	9	3.3333	0.82993	abc
500 or more	18	4.0476	0.70328	b
Total	503	3.6833	0.73264	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “50-99”, and “c” = “400-499”

Table 4.8.4.4 showed that the hotels that hired less than 50 employees perceived “planning and implementation” competency less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-99, 100-199, 200-299, and 500 or more employees.

Table 4.8.4.4: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “planning and implementation” factor.

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	3.7689	0.67041	a
50-99	91	3.9574	0.64232	
100-199	74	4.0034	0.56130	
200-299	32	4.0508	0.47504	
300-399	14	3.9911	0.66770	a
400-499	9	4.0278	0.34674	a
500 or more	18	4.2500	0.50730	
Total	503	3.8834	0.64000	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”

From Table 4.8.4.5, the results showed that the hotels which hired less than 50 employees perceived “team-building and ethics” competency less vital than the hotels that hired 200-299, and 500 or more employees while the hotels that hired 500 or more employees also viewed this competency more crucial than the hotels that hired 50-99 employees.

Table 4.8.4.5: Multiple comparisons between number of employees and “team-building and ethics” factors

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	3.9937	0.73752	ab
50-99	91	4.1117	0.77102	a
100-199	74	4.1554	0.59124	ab
200-299	32	4.2708	0.55641	b
300-399	14	4.2024	0.71665	ab
400-499	9	3.9259	0.99691	ab
500 or more	18	4.4907	0.44455	b
Total	503	4.0789	0.71595	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “500 or more”

Moreover, Table 4.8.4.6 showed that the hotels that hired less than 50 employees viewed “communication” competency less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-99, and 500 or more employees. Likewise, the hotels that hire 50-99, and 500 or more employees perceived more necessary than the hotel that hired 400-499 employees while, surprisingly, the hotels that hired 400-499 employees viewed less necessary than the hotels that hired 200-299 employees.

Table 4.8.4.6: Multiple Comparisons (LSD) between number of employees and “communication” factor.

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	3.8167	0.74354	ac
50-99	91	4.0031	0.68312	b
100-199	74	3.9363	0.60892	abc
200-299	32	4.0536	0.56767	ab
300-399	14	3.7755	0.69921	abc
400-499	9	3.5079	0.45799	ac
500 or more	18	4.2222	0.64117	b
Total	503	3.8909	0.70162	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “50-99”, and “c” = “400-499”

Table 4.8.4.7 showed that the hotels which hired less than 50 employees viewed “managing stakeholders” competency less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-99, 200-299, and 500 or more employees while the hotel that hired 100-199 employees rated less necessary than the hotels which hired 50-99 employees.

Table 4.8.4.7: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “managing stakeholders” factor.

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	3.8679	0.93009	ac
50-99	91	4.2857	0.82038	b
100-199	74	3.9730	0.93593	ac
200-299	32	4.2188	0.90641	bc
300-399	14	4.2857	0.82542	abc
400-499	9	4.3333	0.70711	abc
500 or more	18	4.3333	0.76696	bc
Total	503	4.0179	0.91342	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “50-99”, and “c” = “100-199”

In addition, Table 4.8.4.8 showed that the hotels which hired less than 50 employees rated “challenging others” competency less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-99, 100-199, 200-299, and 500 or more employees whereas the hotels that hired 50-99 and 400-499 employees perceived less crucial than the hotels that hired 500 or more employees.

Table 4.8.4.8: Multiple Comparisons between number of employees and “challenging others” factor.

No. of Employees	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 50	265	2.9811	1.23231	a
50-99	91	3.3407	1.06687	b
100-199	74	3.5000	.93998	bc
200-299	32	3.6250	.87067	bc
300-399	14	3.2857	.72627	abc
400-499	9	3.0000	1.22474	ab
500 or more	18	3.9444	.72536	c
Total	503	3.2068	1.14357	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 50”, “b” = “50-99”, and “c” = “500 or more”

As seen in Table 4.8.5, ANOVA results showed that there were strongly significant differences between hotel rating and all competency factors, excluded “concern for community” factors ($p < 0.01$). Then, further analysis was conducted, after multiple comparisons using LSD were calculated, the results were presented in Tables 4.8.6.1 – 4.8.6.10.

Table 4.8.5: ANOVA results for hotel rating and leadership competencies.

	F	Sig.
F1: Leadership	3.266	0.012*
F2: Motivation	4.648	0.001*
F3: Strategic Orientation	6.774	0.000*
F4: Planning and Implementation	8.866	0.000*
F5: Team Building and Ethics	4.248	0.002*
F6: Communication	4.486	0.001*
F7: Flexibility	5.096	0.000*
F8: Concern for Community	1.981	0.096
F9: Managing Stakeholders	4.851	0.001*
F10: Risk-taking	5.712	0.000*
F11: Challenging Others	5.303	0.000*

* $p < 0.05$

The results in Table 4.8.6.1 showed that the no-star hotels rated the “leadership” competency less necessary than the four-star hotels whereas the less than the three-star hotels viewed the “leadership” competency as less crucial than the four- and five-star hotels. In terms of motivation competency, Table 4.8.6.2 showed that the no-star hotels perceived the “motivation” competency less necessary than three-, four- and five-star hotels. Also, the three or less-star hotels rated the “motivation” competency less vital than the five-star hotels.

Table 4.8.6.1: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “leadership” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.8887	0.72590	ab
Less than three star	36	3.8095	0.70649	ab
Three star	133	4.0215	0.66228	abc
Four star	89	4.1332	0.61701	c
Five star	23	4.1801	0.60642	ac
Total	503	3.9747	0.69077	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “less than three star”, and “c” = “four star”

Table 4.8.6.2: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “motivation” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.6532	.67951	ab
Less than three star	36	3.7222	.61978	ab
Three star	133	3.8145	.66141	b
Four star	89	3.9148	.67338	bc
Five star	23	4.1232	.43219	c
Total	503	3.7686	.67001	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “less than three star”, and “c” = “five star”

From Tables 4.8.6.3 and 4.8.6.4, the no-rating hotels viewed “strategic orientation” and “planning and implementation” competency factors less necessary than the three-star, four-star, and five-star hotels. Also, the three-star hotels perceived these two factors less

crucial than the four-star hotels. The less than three-star hotels rated “planning and implementation” less necessary than four-star hotels.

Table 4.8.6.3: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “strategic orientation” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.5328	0.72600	a
Less than three star	36	3.6865	0.70716	abc
Three star	133	3.6971	0.74812	b
Four star	89	3.9599	0.68714	c
Five star	23	3.9814	0.52807	bc
Total	503	3.6833	0.73264	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “three star”, and “c” = “four star”

Table 4.8.6.4: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “planning and implementation” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.7432	0.66140	a
Less than three star	36	3.7639	0.69999	ab
Three star	133	3.9248	0.59590	b
Four star	89	4.1868	0.52363	c
Five star	23	4.0109	0.56898	bc
Total	503	3.8834	0.64000	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “three star”, and “c” = “four star”

The results in Table 4.8.6.5 showed that the no-rating hotels viewed “team-building and ethics” less necessary than the three-star, four-star, and five-star hotels while the four-star hotels perceived “team-building and ethics” more necessary than the no rating hotels and the less than three-star hotels.

Table 4.8.6.5: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “team building and ethics” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.9610	0.73720	ab
Less than three star	36	3.9722	0.67788	ab
Three star	133	4.1341	0.68148	bc
Four star	89	4.2790	0.70745	c
Five star	23	4.2899	0.57564	bc
Total	503	4.0789	0.71595	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “less than three star”, and “c” = “four star”

The results in Table 4.8.6.6 showed that the no rating hotels perceived “communication” less important than the four star and five star hotels. Likewise, the less than three star and three star hotels rated this competency less crucial than the four star hotels

Table 4.8.6.6: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “communication” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.7896	.73054	ab
Less than three star	36	3.8611	.63474	ab
Three star	133	3.8700	.70128	ab
Four star	89	4.1332	.64495	c
Five star	23	4.0994	.47465	bc
Total	503	3.8909	.70162	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “less than three star”, and “c” = “four star”

The results from Table 4.8.6.7 showed that the no rating hotels rated “flexibility” less necessary than the three star, four star and five star hotels. The less than three star hotels rated also perceived this competency less crucial than the four star hotels. In addition, in terms of “managing stakeholders”, Table 4.8.6.8 showed that the upscale hotels perceived “managing stakeholders” more necessary than the no rating hotels. In contrast, the less than three star and three star hotels rated this competency less important than the four star hotels.

Table 4.8.6.7: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “flexibility” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.1149	0.97670	ab
Less than three star	36	3.1667	0.72703	ab
Three star	133	3.3835	0.91056	bc
Four star	89	3.5506	0.88884	c
Five star	23	3.6304	0.75705	bc
Total	503	3.2903	0.93421	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “less than three star”, and “c” = “four star”

Table 4.8.6.8: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “managing stakeholders” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.8919	0.93549	ab
Less than three star	36	3.8333	0.94112	ab
Three star	133	4.0150	0.91275	ab
Four star	89	4.3371	0.81106	c
Five star	23	4.3043	0.70290	bc
Total	503	4.0179	0.91342	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “less than three star”, and “c” = “four star”

The results in Tables 4.8.6.9 and 4.8.6.10 showed that the no-rating hotels rated “risk-taking” and “challenging others” competencies less necessary than the three-star up hotels whereas the less than three-star hotels viewed these two competencies less crucial

than the five-star hotels. The three star hotels also rated both competencies less necessary than the five star hotels. However, the less than three-star hotels perceived “challenging others” less necessary than the four-star hotels.

Table 4.8.6.9: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “risk-taking” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.0586	1.10580	a
Less than three star	36	3.2500	0.93732	ab
Three star	133	3.3759	1.01952	b
Four star	89	3.5056	1.00140	bc
Five star	23	3.8696	0.69442	c
Total	503	3.2724	1.05778	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “three star”, and “c” = “five star”

Table 4.8.6.10: Multiple comparisons between hotel rating and “challenging others” factor.

Star rating	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
No rating	222	3.0090	1.20703	ab
Less than three star	36	3.0556	0.92410	ab
Three star	133	3.2707	1.18147	b
Four star	89	3.5056	0.94296	c
Five star	23	3.8261	0.83406	c
Total	503	3.2068	1.14357	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “no rating”, “b” = “less than three star”, and “c” = “five star”

Table 4.8.7 showed the ANOVA results of the impact of respondents' age on the perception of the leadership competency factors. There were significant differences between the respondents' age and all leadership competency factors, except "managing stakeholders" factor.

Table 4.8.7: ANOVA results for the respondents' age and the leadership competency factors.

	F	Sig.
F1: Leadership	3.027	0.011*
F2: Motivation	3.513	0.004*
F3: Strategic Orientation	2.677	0.021*
F4: Planning and Implementation	3.118	0.009*
F5: Team building and Ethics	3.397	0.005*
F6: Communication	4.114	0.001*
F7: Flexibility	3.620	0.003*
F8: Concern for Community	4.530	0.000*
F9: Managing Stakeholders	1.129	0.344
F10: Risk-taking	4.118	0.001*
F11: Challenging Others	2.478	0.031*

* $p < 0.05$

From Table 4.8.8.1, after multiple comparisons using LSD were calculated, the results showed that the respondents who were less than 25 years old perceived "leadership" less essential than the respondent who were 25-34 and 35-44 years old. Surprisingly, the 45-

54 and 55-64 year-old respondents viewed “leadership” less necessary than the respondents whose age was between 25 and 34.

Table 4.8.8.1: Multiple comparisons (LSD) of respondents’ age on the perception of the leadership factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.5397	0.68055	a
25-34	94	4.1596	0.65912	bc
35-44	151	4.0142	0.71785	bc
45-54	158	3.8689	0.68880	ac
55-64	81	3.9347	0.65272	ac
65 or more	10	4.0286	0.52511	abc
Total	503	3.9747	0.69077	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 25”, “b” = “25-34”, and “c” = “35-44”

From Table 4.8.8.2, the respondents who were less than 25 years old rated “motivation” less necessary than the respondents who were 25-34 and 35-44 years old whereas the 25-34 and 35-44 year-old respondents perceived “motivation” more necessary for success as a general manager than the 45-54 respondents. Moreover, the 55-64 year-old respondents perceived “motivation” less vital than the 25-34 year-old respondents.

Table 4.8.8.2: Multiple comparisons between respondents' age and "motivation" factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.3796	0.75128	ac
25-34	94	3.9486	0.66858	b
35-44	151	3.8273	0.66242	b
45-54	158	3.6646	0.66739	ac
55-64	81	3.6739	0.65008	abc
65 or more	10	3.9500	0.47336	abc
Total	503	3.7686	0.67001	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when "a" = "less than 25", "b" = "25-34", and "c" = "45-54"

In terms of "strategic orientation" and "planning and implementation" factors, the results in Table 4.7.8.3 showed that the respondents who were less than 25 years old perceived that both factors were less necessary than the respondents who were 25-34, 35-44, and 65 years or older whereas the 25-34 year-old respondents rated "strategic orientation" more crucial to success than the 45-54 year-old respondents. Furthermore, the results from Table 4.7.8.4 showed that the respondent who were less than 25 years old viewed "planning and implementation" less essential than the respondents who were 25 years or older.

Table 4.8.8.3: Multiple comparisons between the respondents' age and "strategic orientation" factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.2063	0.47975	a
25-34	94	3.8389	0.68118	b
35-44	151	3.7323	0.75454	b
45-54	158	3.5805	0.76544	a
55-64	81	3.6367	0.68327	ab
65 or more	10	3.9143	0.54378	b
Total	503	3.6833	0.73264	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when "a" = "less than 25", and "b" = "25-34"

Table 4.8.8.4: Multiple comparisons between the respondents' age and "planning and implementation" factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.2639	0.75634	a
25-34	94	3.9827	0.60786	
35-44	151	3.9603	0.67367	
45-54	158	3.8228	0.60208	
55-64	81	3.8133	0.64564	
65 or more	10	3.8750	0.48233	
Total	503	3.8834	0.64000	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when "a" = "less than 25"

In terms of “team building and ethics” and “communication” factors, the results in Tables 4.8.8.5 and 4.8.8.6 showed that the respondents who were less than 25 years old perceived these two factors less vital than the 25-34 year-old respondents whereas the 25-34 year-old respondents viewed “team building and ethics” more crucial than the 35-44 and 45-54 year-old respondents. In terms of “communication”, the 25-34 year-old respondents rated this competency more crucial than the 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 year-old respondents and the 35-44 year-old respondents perceived more vital than the 45-54 year-old respondents.

Table 4.8.8.5: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and “team-building and ethics” factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.6481	0.91076	a
25-34	94	4.2979	0.64567	b
35-44	151	4.0728	0.76849	a
45-54	158	3.9610	0.70238	a
55-64	81	4.1029	0.67060	ab
65 or more	10	4.1667	0.39284	ab
Total	503	4.0789	0.71595	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “less than 25” and “b” = “25-34”

Table 4.8.8.6: Multiple comparisons between the respondents' age and "communication" factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.4762	0.77262	ac
25-34	94	4.1140	0.66400	b
35-44	151	3.9205	0.69039	a
45-54	158	3.7505	0.69312	ac
55-64	81	3.8748	0.73241	ac
65 or more	10	4.0714	0.43252	abc
Total	503	3.8909	0.70162	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when "a" = "less than 25", "b" = "25-34", and "c" = "45-54"

From Table 4.8.8.7, in terms of the "flexibility" factor, the respondents who were less than 25 years old rated this factor less necessary than the respondents who were 25 years or older whereas the respondents who were 25-34 years old rated it higher than the respondents who were 35 years or older. In terms of "concern for community" competency, the results in Table 4.8.8.8 showed that the respondents who were less than 25 years old rated "concern for community" less crucial than the respondents who were 25-34 and 65 years or older. Not surprisingly, the 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 viewed "concern for community" less necessary than the 25-34 year-old respondents. The 45-54 year-old respondents perceived "concern for community" less vital than the 35-44 year-old respondents. The 65 years or older managers also rated "concern for community" less important than the 55-64 years old managers.

Table 4.8.8.7: Multiple comparisons between the respondents' age and "flexibility" factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	2.5556	1.15770	a
25-34	94	3.5957	0.78383	bc
35-44	151	3.2450	0.95720	c
45-54	158	3.2247	0.98159	c
55-64	81	3.2099	0.89395	c
65 or more	10	3.4500	0.49721	bc
Total	503	3.2903	0.93421	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when "a" = "less than 25", "b" = "25-34", and "c" = "65 or more"

Table 4.8.8.8: Multiple comparisons between the respondents' age and "concern for community" factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.2500	0.51539	acd
25-34	94	4.0186	0.69487	b
35-44	151	3.7798	0.87983	ac
45-54	158	3.5744	0.85655	ad
55-64	81	3.6944	0.77156	acd
65 or more	10	4.0250	0.61745	bcd
Total	503	3.7416	0.82829	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when "a" = "less than 25", "b" = "25-34", "c" = "35-44", and "d" = "45-54"

From Table 4.8.8.9, the respondents who were 25-34 years old perceived the “risk-taking” competency more necessary than the respondents who were in the age of 35-44, 45-54, and 55-64 whereas the respondents in the age of 55-64 viewed this competency less necessary than the respondents in the age of 35-44. Furthermore, in terms of “challenging others”, Table 4.8.8.10 showed that the respondents who were less than 25 years old rated the “challenging others” competency less necessary than the respondents in the age of 25-34, 35-44, and 65 or more while the respondents in the age of 25-34 viewed this competency more necessary than the respondents in the age of 45-54 and 55-64.

Table 4.8.8.9: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ age and the “risk-taking” factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	3.0000	1.11803	abc
25-34	94	3.6277	0.87969	a
35-44	151	3.3046	1.07699	b
45-54	158	3.1772	1.08563	bc
55-64	81	2.9753	1.08369	c
65 or more	10	3.6000	0.69921	abc
Total	503	3.2724	1.05778	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “25-34”, “b” = “35-44”, and “c” = “55-64”

Table 4.8.8.10: Multiple comparisons between the respondents' age and the "challenging others" factor.

Age	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Less than 25	9	2.4444	0.72648	a
25-34	94	3.4681	1.05445	b
35-44	151	3.2252	1.14410	b
45-54	158	3.1266	1.18770	a
55-64	81	3.0617	1.17628	a
65 or more	10	3.6000	0.69921	b
Total	503	3.2068	1.14357	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when "a" = "less than 25" and "b" = "25-34"

ANOVA results were presented in Table 4.8.9. There were significant differences between the education and these leadership competency factors; "motivation", "strategic orientation", "planning and implementation", "team building and ethics", "communication", "concern for community", and "challenging others" factors.

Table 4.8.9: ANOVA results for the education and the leadership competency factors.

	F	Sig.
F1: Leadership	1.985	0.115
F2: Motivation	2.758	0.042*
F3: Strategic Orientation	6.950	0.000*
F4: Planning and Implementation	5.177	0.002*
F5: Team building and Ethics	3.138	0.025*
F6: Communication	3.159	0.024*
F7: Flexibility	1.159	0.325
F8: Concern for Community	2.808	0.039*
F9: Managing Stakeholders	2.089	0.101
F10: Risk-taking	1.931	0.124
F11: Challenging Others	8.005	0.000*

*p<0.05

When multiple comparisons using LSD were calculated, the results in Table 4.8.10 showed that the respondents who held school certificate viewed “motivation”, “strategic orientation”, “planning and implementation”, “team building and ethics”, “communication”, “concern for community”, and “challenging others” factors not significantly different from the respondents who held higher degrees. However, the respondents who held postgraduate degree perceived “motivation, “planning and implementation”, “communication”, and “concern for community” factors more necessary than the respondents who held a diploma or bachelors degree. There were no

significance difference in perception between the respondents who held diploma and the respondents who held a bachelors degree. Unsurprisingly, the respondents who held a diploma viewed “strategic orientation” and “challenging others” factors least significant whereas the highest level of necessity for these two factors belonged to the respondents who held master or doctoral degree. Furthermore, the respondents who held master or doctoral degree perceived “team orientation and ethics” more necessary than the respondents who held a bachelors degree.

Table 4.8.10: Multiple comparisons between the respondents’ education and the leadership competency factors.

Factor	Education	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Motivation	School Certificate	9	3.8056	0.78285	ab
	Diploma	104	3.6883	0.68492	a
	Undergraduate	289	3.7388	0.66876	a
	Postgraduate	101	3.9332	0.62971	b
Total		503	3.7686	0.67001	
Strategic Orientation	School Certificate	9	3.7302	0.53186	abc
	Diploma	104	3.4739	0.79956	a
	Undergraduate	289	3.6708	0.72644	c
	Postgraduate	101	3.9307	0.62093	b
Total		503	3.6833	0.73264	

Table 4.8.10 (Continued)

Factor	Education	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Planning & implementation	School Certificate	9	3.9306	0.52333	ab
	Diploma	104	3.7296	0.64450	a
	Undergraduate	289	3.8707	0.65084	a
	Postgraduate	101	4.0743	0.56959	b
Total		503	3.8834	0.64000	
Team building and Ethics	School Certificate	9	4.0185	0.68437	bc
	Diploma	104	4.0929	0.67063	bc
	Undergraduate	289	4.0115	0.75222	c
	Postgraduate	101	4.2624	0.62864	b
Total		503	4.0789	0.71595	
Communication	School Certificate	9	4.1111	0.48853	ab
	Diploma	104	3.8352	0.74451	a
	Undergraduate	289	3.8423	0.70061	a
	Postgraduate	101	4.0679	0.64920	b
Total		503	3.8909	0.70162	
Concern for community	School Certificate	9	3.5278	0.70094	ab
	Diploma	104	3.6683	0.87539	a
	Undergraduate	289	3.7024	0.83079	a
	Postgraduate	101	3.9480	0.75525	b
Total		503	3.7416	0.82829	

Table 4.8.10 (Continued)

Factor	Education	N	Mean	SD	Letter*
Challenging	School Certificate	9	3.0000	1.22474	abc
Others	Diploma	104	2.8654	1.37987	a
	Undergraduate	289	3.1903	1.07776	c
	Postgraduate	101	3.6238	0.91489	b
Total		503	3.2068	1.14357	

* Means with the same letter are not significantly different (at the 5% level), when “a” = “diploma”, “b” = “postgraduate”, and “c” = “undergraduate”

From the results in Table 4.8.11, there were no significant differences between professional experience and the leadership competency factors. Likewise, there were no significant differences between working experience as a hotel general manager and all competency factors.

Table 4.8.11: ANOVA results for the professional experience and the leadership competency factors.

	Professional experience		Working experience	
	F	Sig.	F	Sig.
F1: Leadership	0.076	0.989	0.847	0.496
F2: Motivation	0.243	0.914	0.155	0.961
F3: Strategic Orientation	0.483	0.748	0.399	0.809
F4: Planning and Implementation	0.350	0.844	1.261	0.284
F5: Team building and Ethics	1.566	0.182	1.860	0.116
F6: Communication	0.893	0.468	0.726	0.575
F7: Flexibility	1.700	0.149	1.252	0.288
F8: Concern for Community	0.360	0.837	0.934	0.444
F9: Managing Stakeholders	0.673	0.611	0.440	0.780
F10: Risk-taking	0.435	0.783	1.511	0.198
F11: Challenging Others	1.176	0.320	0.941	0.440

* $p < 0.05$

As shown in Table 4.8.12, there was a statistically significant difference between male and female general managers regarding “risk-taking” factor. The perception of female general managers toward the importance level of the “risk-taking” factor was greater than male general managers. In contrast, for the case of “challenging others” factor, male general managers viewed “challenging others” factor more necessary than female general managers.

Table 4.8.12: Mean comparisons between gender and competency factors.

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (p<0.05)		t-test	Sig.*
			F	Sig.		
Leadership			6.586	0.011	-0.110	0.91*
Male	3.9716	0.664				
Female	3.9785	0.724				
Motivation			1.039	0.308	-0.576	0.57
Male	3.7530	0.647				
Female	3.7876	0.698				
Strategic Orientation			4.423	0.036	0.000	1.00*
Male	3.6833	0.694				
Female	3.6833	0.779				
Planning and Implementation			3.014	0.083	-0.818	0.41
Male	3.8624	0.619				
Female	3.9093	0.665				
Team Building and Ethics			1.600	0.206	0.603	0.55
Male	4.0963	0.690				
Female	4.0575	0.747				

Table 4.8.12 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (p<0.05)		t-test	Sig.*
			F	Sig.		
Communication			4.897	0.027	-0.550	0.58*
Male	3.8752	0.664				
Female	3.9102	0.746				
Flexibility			7.292	0.007	0.906	0.37*
Male	3.3249	0.862				
Female	3.2478	1.016				
Concern for Community			1.251	0.264	0.064	0.95
Male	3.7437	0.797				
Female	3.7389	0.867				
Managing Stakeholders			1.068	0.302	-0.879	0.38
Male	3.9856	0.901				
Female	4.0575	0.929				
Risk-taking			0.523	0.470	-2.941	0.00
Male	3.1480	1.098				
Female	3.4248	0.987				

Table 4.8.12 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance ($p < 0.05$)		t-test	Sig.*
			F	Sig.		
Challenging Others			3.119	0.078	2.023	0.04
Male	3.2996	1.077				
Female	3.0929	1.213				

Note: *t*-test two tail probability < 0.05

* Equal variance assumed

Base on the independent-samples *t*-test, the results in Table 4.8.13 showed that there were significant differences in five competency factors as “motivation”, “strategic orientation”, “planning and implementation”, “team building and ethics”, and “communication” factors between resorts and city hotels. The respondents who work for resorts viewed these five factors more necessary than the respondents who work for city hotels.

Table 4.8.13: The independent-samples t-test results comparing means between the hotel type and competency factors.

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for		t-test	Sig.
			Equality of			
			Variance (p<0.05)			
		F	Sig.			
Leadership			0.130	0.718	1.782	0.08
Resort	4.0296	0.6860				
City	3.9201	0.6925				
Motivation			4.464	0.035	2.116	0.04
Resort	3.8317	0.6323				
City	3.7057	0.7012				
Strategic Orientation			3.869	0.050	2.951	0.00*
Resort	3.7792	0.6964				
City	3.5879	0.7565				
Planning and Implementation			0.090	0.764	2.522	0.01
Resort	3.9552	0.6299				
City	3.8120	0.6433				
Team-building and Ethics			3.684	0.056	2.382	0.02
Resort	4.1547	0.6556				
City	4.0033	0.7652				

Table 4.8.13 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (p<0.05)		t-test	Sig.
			F	Sig.		
Communication			2.258	0.134	2.235	0.03
Resort	3.9607	0.6702				
City	3.8214	0.7263				
Flexibility			1.343	0.247	1.255	0.21
Resort	3.3426	0.8923				
City	3.2381	0.9732				
Concern for Community			1.760	0.185	1.739	0.08
Resort	3.8058	0.8009				
City	3.6776	0.8515				
Managing Stakeholders			2.075	0.150	1.713	0.09
Resort	4.0876	0.8811				
City	3.9484	0.9412				
Risk-taking			0.548	0.460	0.222	0.824
Resort	3.2829	1.0216				
City	3.2619	1.0946				
Challenging Others			0.012	0.913	0.632	0.528
Resort	3.2390	1.1343				

Table 4.8.13 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance ($p < 0.05$)		t-test	Sig.
			F	Sig.		
City	3.1746	1.1541				

Note: *t*-test two tail probability < 0.05

* Equal variances not assumed

RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR

Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between respondents who work for domestic (Thai based) companies and respondents who work for international hotel management companies?

Once more, the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was conducted to check the equality of variance and the independent-samples *t*-test results to compare means between respondents who work for domestic (Thai based) companies and respondents who work for international hotel management companies. The results were shown in Table 4.9. Based on the independent-samples *t*-test, there were significant differences in five competency factors "motivation", "strategic orientation", "planning and implementation", "flexibility", and "challenging others" factors between independent hotels without affiliation and chain affiliated hotels. The respondents who work for chain affiliated hotels viewed these five factors more necessary than the respondents who work for domestic (Thai based) hotels.

Table 4.9: The independent-samples t-test results comparing means between the hotel management demographics and competency factors.

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (p<0.05)		t-test	Sig.
			F	Sig.		
Leadership			6.277	0.013	-.040	0.97*
Independent hotel	3.9743	0.6997				
Chain hotel	3.9780	0.6136				
Motivation			8.536	0.004	-2.937	0.00*
Independent hotel	3.7437	0.6793				
Chain hotel	3.9840	0.5428				
Strategic Orientation			6.451	0.011	-2.683	0.01*
Independent hotel	3.6592	0.7454				
Chain hotel	3.8929	0.5748				
Planning and Implementation			5.767	0.017	-2.639	0.01*
Independent hotel	3.8625	0.6508				
Chain hotel	4.0649	0.5070				
Team Building and Ethics			1.996	0.158	-1.002	0.32
Independent hotel	4.0680	0.7244				
Chain hotel	4.1731	0.6365				
Communication			11.390	0.001	1.922	0.06*
Independent hotel	3.8742	0.7152				
Chain hotel	4.0357	0.5550				

Table 4.9 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (p<0.05)		t-test	Sig.
			F	Sig.		
Flexibility			4.350	0.038	-2.522	0.01*
Independent hotel	3.2594	0.9453				
Chain hotel	3.5577	0.7900				
Concern for Community			.212	0.645	-0.785	0.43
Independent hotel	3.7317	0.8265				
Chain hotel	3.8269	0.8468				
Managing Stakeholders			.804	0.370	-1.456	0.15
Independent hotel	3.9978	0.9250				
Chain hotel	4.1923	0.7931				
Risk-taking			1.882	0.171	-0.392	0.70
Independent hotel	3.2661	1.0730				
Chain hotel	3.3269	0.9229				
Challenging Others			5.190	0.023	-3.644	0.00*
Independent hotel	3.1552	1.15 8				
Chain hotel	3.6538	0.9050				

Note: *t*-test two tail probability < 0.05

* Equal variances not assumed

RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE

Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between the respondents who are native Thai and expatriate?

Based on the t-test results which were shown in Table 4.10, expatriate respondents perceived four competency factors: “motivation”, “strategic orientation”, “flexibility” and “challenging others” factors, more essential for future success as a general manager in Thailand than Thai respondents.

Table 4.10: The independent-samples t-test results comparing means between expatriate status and competency factors.

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (p<0.05)		t-test	Sig.
			F	Sig.		
Leadership			0.575	0.449	-0.612	0.541
Thai	3.9712	0.690				
Expatriate	4.0756	0.736				
Motivation			5.963	0.015	-3.643	0.00 *
Thai	3.7543	0.672				
Expatriate	4.1765	0.461				

Table 4.10 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for		t-test	Sig.
			Equality of			
			Variance (p<0.05)			
		F	Sig.			
Strategic Orientation			4.955	0.026	-2.418	0.03*
Thai	3.6731	0.738				
Expatriate	3.9748	0.495				
Planning and Implementation			0.691	0.406	-0.378	0.71
Thai	3.8814	0.642				
Expatriate	3.9412	0.581				
Team Building and Ethics			0.110	0.740	-1.004	0.39
Thai	4.0737	0.714				
Expatriate	4.2255	0.777				
Communication			3.089	0.079	-2.004	0.32
Thai	3.8851	0.705				
Expatriate	4.0588	0.606				
Flexibility			0.960	0.328	-0.862	0.05
Thai	3.2747	0.937				
Expatriate	3.7353	0.752				
Concern for Community			0.272	0.603	-0.728	0.39
Thai	3.7356	0.830				
Expatriate	3.9118	0.780				

Table 4.10 (Continued)

	Mean	SD	Levene's Test for Equality of Variance (p<0.05)		t-test	Sig.
			F	Sig.		
Managing Stakeholders			0.088	0.767	-1.253	0.47
Thai	4.0123	0.915				
Expatriate	4.1765	0.883				
Risk-taking			0.219	0.640	-4.524	0.21
Thai	3.2613	1.061				
Expatriate	3.5882	0.939				
Challenging Others			8.685	0.003	-4.524	0.00*
Thai	3.1811	1.149				
Expatriate	3.9412	0.659				

Note: *t*-test two tail probability < 0.05

* Equal variances not assumed

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Thailand is a rapidly expanding tourism destination; one of the major trends of the past several years is the growing internationalization of Thai resorts. This growth by global hotel chains is certain to be carefully watched to assess its impact on locally-owned hotels in Thailand. This situation leads to highly competitive environment in Thai hotel industry framed within the uniqueness of the Thai culture. The ability to identify the skills and competencies required for general managers is essential for the owners of the hotels in Thailand that hope to remain competitive. Unfortunately, little information is known about the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand. Therefore, the objective of this study was to determine the leadership competencies essential for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand. The outcome of this study could help Thai hotels to recruit prospective management employees who have the right mix of competencies to be future general managers. Understanding these competencies will enable hospitality educators, corporate training and development programs and small family hotels to become more successful at developing future hotel industry leaders in Thailand, which in turn increases economic development nationwide. Five research questions were formed.

1. What are the leadership competencies necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand?
2. Do the leadership competencies identified as necessary for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand differ from those leadership competencies identified as necessary for success in a global environment by previous research?
3. What impact do the demographic characteristics of the respondents have on their perception of the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in the Thai hotel industry?
4. Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between respondents who work for domestic (Thai based) companies and respondents who work for international hotel management companies?
5. Is there a difference in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand between the respondents who are native Thai and expatriate?

This study involved a cross-sectional design to collect data. After a review of the literature, a survey instrument was developed from previous research to conduct this study. Data was collected through a mail questionnaire. A comprehensive list of accommodations in Thailand, surveyed by Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT), as of January 2006, was used. The General Managers (GMs) of these hotels were requested to complete a questionnaire, when the participation is voluntary. The questionnaire instrument consisted of three sections:

Section 1: Respondent's demographic characteristic information

Section 2: Hotel characteristic information

Section 3: A list of the 98 specific behavioral competencies. Using a five-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 (not at all necessary) to 5 (extremely necessary), respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of the 98 competencies or skills necessary for success as a general manager in the future.

SUMMARY

Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was employed in exploratory factor analysis to extract from the 98 competencies a set of simplified composite factors that could be used to describe the original construct to analysis the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager.

Eleven factors were extracted that explain 59.67% of the overall variance. These factors were "leadership", "motivation", "strategic orientation", "planning and implementation", "team building and ethics", "communication", "Flexibility", "flexibility", "concern for community", "managing stakeholder", "risk-taking", and "challenging others". When compare the level of necessary of these eleven factors, the results showed that competency in team building and ethics was rated highest by general managers, followed by managing stakeholders, leadership, communication, planning and implementation, motivation, concern for community, strategic orientation, flexibility, risk-taking and challenging others.

An independent-sample *t*-test and F test were used to investigate mean score differences among different demographic characteristics of the respondents (e.g. gender, age, education level, working experience, and expatriate status) and their organizations (e.g. the size, star-rating, number of employees, type of the hotel) in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand.

The “leadership” competency was considered to top competency necessary for future success as a general manager in Thailand. The study found that, in terms of age, the general managers who were 25-34 years old perceived leadership more crucial than the general managers who were in other groups of age. In terms of star-rating, the five-star hotels perceived competency in leadership more essential than “3-stars or less” hotels. When considering the number of employees, the hotels which hired less than 50 employees viewed “leadership” competency less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-99, and 500 or more employees whereas the hotel that hired 300-499 employees perceived less necessary than the hotels which hired 500 or more employees.

Competency in motivation was the second most important factor considered to be necessary for future success as a general manager. The general managers’ age, education level, and expatriate status have impact on their perception of importance for this competency. The 25-44 years old general managers viewed “motivation” competency more vital than the general managers in other groups of age. Besides, the general managers who held master or doctoral degree perceived competency in motivation more necessary than the general managers who held diploma, and bachelor degree. Expatriate

general managers also perceived this competency to be more important for future success as a general manager in Thailand than Thai general managers.

Beside, in terms of organization's demographics, the five-star hotels considered the motivation competency more important than "three or less-star" and "no rating" hotels. The number of employees in the property also had impact on their perception. The hotels that hired 500 or more employees viewed motivation competency significantly more necessary than hotels that hired less than 500 employees. Additionally, the general managers who worked for resorts and those who work for chain affiliated hotels perceived motivation more important than the general managers who work for city hotels and those who work for domestic (Thai based) hotels.

For the "strategic orientation" and "planning and implementation" competencies, the hotel general managers in Thailand rated these two competencies as somewhat important. The demographic characteristics of the general managers and their organization have an impact on the manager's perception toward "strategic orientation" and "planning and implementation" competencies. The general managers who held diploma viewed "strategic orientation" competency least significant whereas the highest level belonged to the general managers who held masters or doctoral degree. The 25-34 year-old general managers rated strategic orientation competency more crucial than those in other groups of age. Expatriate general managers also perceived strategic orientation more important as a necessary competency for future success as a general manager in Thailand than Thai respondents. From the hotel's demographic impact, the no-rating hotels viewed "strategic

orientation” and “planning and implementation” competency factors as less necessary than the three-star, four-star, and five-star hotels. Also, the three-star hotels perceived these two factors to be less crucial than the four-star hotels. The general managers who were less than 25 years old viewed “planning and implementation” as less essential than the respondents who were 25 years or older. Likewise, the less than three star hotels rated the competency in “planning and implementation” less necessary than the four-star hotels. General managers in chain affiliated hotels and resorts perceived strategic orientation and planning and implementation competencies more important than general managers who worked for domestic (Thai based) hotels and city hotels. The hotels that hired less than 50 employees perceived this competency as less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-299 and 500 or more employees.

The general managers rated team-building and ethics as an extremely necessary competency and communication as a particularly necessary competency for future success as a general manager. When look at the impact of demographics on these two competencies, the results showed that general managers who were 25-34 years old perceived team-building and ethics and communication competencies more important than general managers in other groups of age. In terms of education, team-building and ethics competency was rated by general managers who held postgraduate degree as more essential than general managers who had bachelors degree. The masters or doctoral degreed general mangers also viewed competency in communication more as necessary than diploma, and bachelor degree general managers. The hotels that hired less than 50 employees viewed the “communication” competency as less necessary than the hotels

that hired 50-99, and 500 or more employees. Likewise, the hotels that hire 50-99, and 500 or more employees perceived “communication” as more necessary than the hotel that hired 400-499 employees while, surprisingly, the hotels that hired 400-499 employees viewed “communication” as less necessary than the hotels that hired 200-299 employees. In addition, the hotels that hired 200-299, and 500 or more employees viewed “team building and ethics” less necessary for success than hotels that hired less than 100 employees. Lastly, resorts and upscale hotels viewed team building and ethics, and communication competency more crucial than city hotels and “less than three star” hotels.

The flexibility competency was considered to be an important competency for the future success of hotel general managers in Thailand. In terms of demographic characteristics of the managers and hotels, the study found that expatriate and 25-34 years general managers viewed the flexibility competency more necessary than Thai and the general managers in the other age groups. The upscale hotels and chain affiliated hotels also perceived the flexibility competency as more crucial than “less than three star or no rating” hotels and domestic (Thai based) hotels.

In the concern for community competency, only general managers’ age and education level had an impact on the perception of this competency. The general managers who were 25-34 years old and who held masters or doctoral degree perceived the concern for community competency as more necessary for future success as a general manager than the general managers in other groups of age and who held diploma, and bachelors degree.

For the last three factors, managing stakeholders, risking-taking and challenging others competencies, the hotels that hired less than 50 employees viewed “managing stakeholders” competency less necessary than the hotels which hired 50-99, 200-299, and 500 or more employees while the hotel that hired 100-199 employees rated managing stakeholders less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-99 employees. Also, the hotels which hired less than 50 employees rated “challenging others” competency less necessary than the hotels that hired 50-99, 100-299, and 500 or more employees whereas the hotels that hired 50-99 and 400-499 employees perceived less crucial than the hotels which hired 500 or more employees. The upscale hotels viewed the “managing stakeholders” skill as more important than “three-star or less” and “no-rating” hotels. Also, the no-rating hotels rated “risk-taking” and “challenging others” competencies as less necessary than the three-star up hotels whereas the three star or less hotels viewed these two competencies less crucial than the five-star hotels. However, the less than three-star hotels perceived “challenging others” less necessary than the four-star hotels. The general managers who held masters or doctoral degree also viewed “challenging others” competency more significant than the general managers who held diploma or bachelor degree. Moreover, the general managers who were 25-34 years old perceived risk-taking competency more necessary than the general managers in other groups of age. Female general managers also rated risk-taking competency more necessary than male general managers.

In contrast, female general managers and Thai general managers rated the importance level for challenging others lower than male general managers and expatriate general managers. Among three groups of education level, the general managers who held diploma rated least important whereas the general managers who held postgraduate degree indicated the highest score in challenging others competency. The general managers who work for chain affiliated hotels also rated challenging others more important than the general managers who work for domestic (Thai based) hotels. Additionally, hotels that had less than 50 rooms viewed this competency less necessary than the hotels that had 50 or more rooms. However, in terms of professional experience and working experience as a general manager, there were no significant differences between professional experience and leadership competency factors. Likewise, there were no significant differences between working experience as a hotel general manager and all competency factors.

The results of this study confirmed previous research, especially Chung-Herrera, Enz, and Lankau (2003), Hsu and Gregory (1995), and Siu (1998). The hotel general managers in Thailand have a strong tendency to be transformational leaders which was considered as the most effective leadership style by many researchers such as Tracey and Hinkin (1996) and Gupta, et al. (2002). This result is not surprising given the characteristics of Thai culture and interpersonal interactions.

As Estep (2005) stated that building leadership competencies is a career-long activity—whether the managers want to maintain a competitive edge in the current position, or they

want to move to a higher position. From this study, team building and ethics, managing stakeholders, leadership and communication skills were rated as the most important competencies necessary for future success. Henderson (2004) also remarked that communication is the primary task of any executive, and communication with employees regarding their concerns, problems, ideas, and suggestions about the organization is the critical skill of managing. Likewise, Estep (2005) suggested that knowing how communication takes place is critical for success in any type of environment. Therefore, the general managers should build consensus and focus on people. When it is necessary to criticize their subordinates, they should do it positively and be sensitive to the needs of people and create win-win situations. Beside, one of the most important tools for a manager is the ability to engage effectively in communication activities with other individuals, managers who do not possess effective communication skills will not possess the ability to act as effective managers. Additionally, communication persuasively, listening, and enabling others will be essential skills for managers and supervisors hoping to reach higher management position.

Planning and implementation, motivation, concern for community, and strategic orientation skills were deemed necessary by general managers. This supported the argument from Reicher, et al. (2005) that understanding and monitoring social dynamics within the problem domain represents a key leadership skill. Moreover, objectivity would seem to be necessary wherever one is dealing with a complex system. Additionally, House (1996) and Howard (1995) also argued that skills such as identification of restrictions, analysis of downstream consequences, coordination of multiple activities,

and sensitivity to relevant goals might play a role in leader performance. Future general managers need to possess a strategic orientation and approach to decision-making that permits them to plan, implement and redesign strategies in their hotels. They should pay attention in motivation applications if they want their subordinates to be willing to perform better jobs at the accomplishment of the hotel's objectives. Fortunately, a concern for community competency was considered as one of leadership competency necessary for future success. This might be because of their extensive connections with local community events and activities. The hotel market, especially the global hotel chains, such as Accor and Marriott International, are very active in protecting the environment, using internal measurement management systems for energy consumption, water, disposal and so on.

Zaccaro, et al. (1991) revealed that one important requirement during the social implementation phase is knowledge of subordinates, peers, and superiors, people the leader is interacting with during solution implementation. This places a premium on social skills, especially skills used in acquiring information, framing actions, and promoting coherent actions on the part of the group. This requires flexibility in dealing with others and in adjusting plans opportunistically, as dictated by the demands of a changing social environment. Surprisingly, flexibility, risk-taking and challenging others in a changing business environment were ranked lower than other leadership competencies. However, this result might reflect a truth that current Thai culture was not concerned over much with autonomy. Traditionally, Thai people would like to have guidelines on task fulfillment and even confess to being wrong rather than asking

management to tolerate mistakes. Wordford (1989) also argued that managers in the hospitality industry have an awareness of participative leadership styles but are more inclined to use autocratic approaches.

IMPLEMENTATION

The competencies that are essential for hotel general manager success in Thailand which were confirmed and newly identified by this study may constitute a foundation for the development of job descriptions as well as providing the basis for training and career development. Moreover, the acknowledgement and use of these leadership competencies could facilitate the design of effective performance-appraisal instruments. This competency models can also help in educating future generations of leaders by guiding university faculties in designing curricula and training program to meet the industry's expectations and needs. The hospitality programs offered by universities should focus on competency building in an effort to prepare students for industry. This study also provides a comprehensive framework to inform future general managers about what will be needed or expected to be a successful general manager in the future. Beside, the hotel owners can use this model to recruit prospective management employees who have the right mix of competencies to be future general managers.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

As the tourism industry in Thailand had rapidly growth. Whenever needed to survive and succeed in the future, under highly competitive environment in Thailand, general managers must accept changes and global business dynamics, and be stimulated by the

process of re-inventing himself or herself, as well as the hotel. They must lead while also becoming students again, learning all the lessons and information available to become better and more informed; then thus equipped, engage in new and creative thinking and take the initiative in guiding and making decisions for their hotels, including when to take calculated risks. The recruitment and career development program for a hotel general manager should emphasize the leadership competencies essential for success identified by this study. Hospitality education should offer training courses to develop the skills or competencies for present and future general managers and develop a comprehensive curriculum that emphasizes these essential leadership competencies. Hospitality educators should encourage students to practice the leadership competency skills, especially “team building and ethics”, “leadership”, and “communication” skills, in order to prepare them to be effective leaders for the industry. Lastly, some hospitality education institutes have questioned whether hospitality management programs are preparing hospitality students adequately. In order to answer this question for the industry-relevant hospitality education to deliver high-quality, educators should continually identify and investigate those competencies that are recognized by industry as being essential for successful managers.

There were some limitations in this study. The general managers who participated in this study might rate the necessary level of those 98 leadership competencies based on his/her experience instead of predicted future phenomenon. The majority of the respondents were Thai who worked for domestic (Thai based) hotels. This might lead to bias results in some competencies. Lastly, the results of this study are only a reflection of

those respondents who participated this survey. The representativeness and generalizability of the findings are limited to the target population. Only 503 usable responses were received out of 2.230 questionnaires that were mailed in this study. The respondents who did not complete the survey may have different opinions about leadership competencies.

This study identified the leadership competencies necessary for future success as a general manager in Thailand from the current general managers' view point. Once identified, the acquisition and use of those competencies must be examined to ensure maximum effectiveness. Accordingly, future research could investigate the possible relationship between the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager and firms' performance. It is also interesting to identify the leadership competencies required for future success as a hotel general manager for the subordinates' view point. Another interesting study might investigate the essential competencies required by hotel's departmental managers in Thailand. It would be interesting to replicate this study every few years to assess whether changes in perception occur over time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, L.R. (1983). Management of the mixed-cultural work group, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 31(3), 303-330.

Angelo, R.M. and Vladimir, A.N. (1994). *Hospitality Today: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Educational Institute of the American Hotel and Motel Association.

Arvonen, J. and Petterson, P. (2002). Leadership behaviors as predictors of cost and change effectiveness. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 18(1),101-112.

Asian Institute of Technology, Pathumthani, Thailand. (22-23 November 2001), Issue 4: Development and Marketing of Tourism Can Yield Potentially Damaging Impact on the Environment. Retrieved September 29, 2005, from <http://www.ait.ac.th/gmsarn/forum/Issue4.htm>

Avolio, B.J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations*. California, USA:Sage.

Barner, R. (2000). Five Steps to Leadership Competencies, *Training and Developing*, 54, 47-52.

Barron, F., and Harrington, D.M. (1981). Creativity , intelligence, and personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32, 439-476.

Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1988). Evolving perspectives on charismatic leadership. In Conger, J.A., and Kanungo, R.N., (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness* (pp. 41-71). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B.M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), 9-32.

Bass, B.M., and Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving leadership effectiveness through transformational leadership*. California, USA:Sage.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207–218.

Burnard, P., and Naiyapatana, W. (2004). Culture ad communication in Thai nursing: a report of an ethnographic study. *International Journal of nursing studies*, 41(7), 755-765.

Berson, Y., and Avolio, B.J. (2004). Transformational leadership and the dissemination of organizational goals: A case study of a telecommunication firm. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(5), 625-646.

Beyer, J.M., and Browning, L.D. (1999). Transforming an industry in crisis: Charisma, routinization, and supportive cultural leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(3), 483-520.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R., and Allen, J. (1995). Further Assessment of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 468-478.

Chung-Herrera, B.G., Enz, C.A., and Lankau, M.J., 2003, Grooming Future Hospitality Leaders: A Competencies Model, *Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44(3), 17-25.

Churchill, G.A. and Brown, T.J. (2004). *Basic marketing research*, 5th ed. Thompson:South-western.

Cichy, R.F., and Schmidgall, R.S. (1996). Leadership Qualities of Financial Executives in the U.S. Lodging Industry. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 37(2), 56-62.

Conger, J.A., and Kanungo, R.N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. California, USA:Sage.

Crawford, L. (2005). Senior management perceptions of project management competence. *International Journal of Project Management*, 23(1), 7-16.

Dumaine, D. (2004). Leadership in writing: best practices and worst mistakes. *Training and development*, 58(12), 52-54.

Earley, P.C. (1999). Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 80(3). 192-212.

Ebsen, G.L. (1997). *A visitor's guide to Phuket*. Plain Paper Guide Book Col, Ltd.

Ehrhart, M.G., and Klein, K.J. (2001). Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: the influence of follower values and personality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12(2), 153-179.

Enz, C.A., and Siguaw, J. (2000). Best Practices in Human Resources, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 48-61.

Estep, T. (2005). Winning the rate race. *Training and Development*, 59(1), 71-72.

Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The Charismatic Relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32–58.

Graen, G.B., and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.

Greger, K.R. and Peterson, J.S. (2000) Leadership Profiles for the New Millennium. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 16-28.

Gupta, V., MacMillan, I.C., and Surie, G. (2004), Entrepreneurial leadership: developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(2), 241-260.

Gupta, V., Surie, G., Javidan, M., and Chhokar, J. (2002). Southern Asia cluster: where the old meets the new?. *Journal of World Business*, 37(1),16-27.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., and Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*, 5th ed. Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.

Henderson, L.S. (2004). Encoding and decoding communication competencies in project management—an exploratory study. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22(6), 469-476.

Hofrichter, D. and Spencer, L.J. (1999). Competencies The Right Foundation for Effective Human Resources, *Compensation and Benefits*, 28(6), 21-23.

Hotel Development in Full Swing Again. Diethelm Travel's Thailand Tourism Review 2003. Retrieved on September 30, 2005, from <http://www.bangkokpost.net/tourism2003/hotel.html>

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (pp. 189–207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R.J. (1995). Leadership in the twenty-first century. In Howard, A. *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

House, R.J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.

Howard, T. (Ed). (1995). *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Hsu, J.F., and Gregory, S.R. (1995). Developing Future Hotel Managers in Taiwan: From an Industry Viewpoint, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14(3/4), 261-269.

Jung, D.I., Chow, C. and We, A. (2003) The Role of Transformational Leadership in Enhancing Organizational Innovation: Hypotheses and Some Preliminary Findings. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4/5), 525-544.

Kaplan-Leiserson, E. (2005). Integrated Leadership: A new model from experts in human performance improvement. *Training and Development*, 59(7), 12-13.

Klein, K.J., and House, R.J. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 183-198.

Knutson, T.J., Komolsevin, R., Chatiketu, P., Smith, V.R. (2003). A cross-cultural comparison of Thai and US American rhetorical sensitivity: implications for intercultural communication effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27(1), 63-78.

Krishnan, V.R. (2005). Leader-member exchange, transformational leadership, and value system. *OJBO Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organizational Studies*, 10(1), 14-21.

Lee-Kelley, L., and Loong, K.L. (2003). Turner's five-functions of project-based management and situational leadership in IT services projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(8), 583-591.

Lindell, M., and Rosenqvist, G. (1992). Management behavior dimensions and development orientation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 355-377.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramanian, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.

McGill, R. (1995). Urban management in developing countries. *Cities*, 15(6), 463-471.

Olsen, M. (1999). Macroforces Driving Change into the New Millennium—Major Challenges for the Hospitality Professional. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 18(4), 371-385.

Perdue, J., Ninemeier, J., and Woods, R. (2001). Competencies Required for Future Club Managers' Success, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 60-65.

Perdue, J., Woods, R., and Ninemeier, J. (2000). Competencies Required for Club Managers, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(2), 79-85.

Pittaway, L., Carmouche, R., and Chell, E. (1998). The way forward: Leadership research in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 17(4), 407-426.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B. and Bommer, W.H. (1996). Transformational Leader Behaviors and Their Effects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., and Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational Leader Behaviours and Their Effects on Followers' Trust in Leader, Satisfaction, and Organizational Citizenship Behaviours. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., and Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviours: A Critical Review of the Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.

Rafferty, A.E. and Griffin M.A. (2004). Dimensions of Transformational Leadership: Conceptual and Empirical Extensions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(3), 329-354.

Reicher, S., Alexander, S., and Hopkins, N. (2005). Social identity and the dynamics of leadership: Leaders and followers as collaborative agents in the transformation of social reality. *The leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), 547-568.

Siu, V. (1998). Managing by Competencies—A Study on the Managerial Competencies of Hotel Middle Managers in Hong Kong, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 17(3), 253-273.

Shahar, A. (2004). The Need for Reflection. *Training and Development*, 58(7), 36-40.

Slattery, P., Olsen, M.D. (1984). Hospitality organizations and their environment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 3(2), 55-61.

Smith, P.B., Wang, Z.M., and Leung, K. (1997). Leadership, decision-making and cultural context: Event management within Chinese joint ventures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(4), 413-431.

Smutkupt, S., and Burna, L. (1976). Impact of non-verbal communication in an intercultural setting: Thailand. In Casmir, F(Ed.). *International and Intercultural Communication Annual*, Vol. III. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Sosik, J.J. (2005). The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: a model and preliminary field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(2), 221-244.

Sosik, J.J., Avolio, B.J., and Jung, D.I. (2002). Beneath the mask: examining the relationship of self-presentation attributes and impression management to charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(3), 217-242.

Sosik, J.J., Godshalk, V.M., and Yammarino, F.J. (2004). Transformational Leadership, Learning Goal Orientation, and Expectations for Career Success in Mentor-protégé Relationships: A Multiple Levels of Analysis Perspective. *The leadership Quarterly*, 15(2), 241-261.

Tourism Authority of Thailand Statistic Report. Retrieved September 28, 2005, from <http://www.tat.or.th>

Tourism Industry in Thailand. Retrieve on December 20, 2004, from <http://www.hotelbenchmark.com/frames.htm?http%3A//www.hotelbenchmark.com/itk/MarketSnapshots/040908Asia.htm>.

Tracey, J.B. and Hinkin, T.R. (1996). How Transformational Leaders Lead in the Hospitality Industry. *International Journal Hospitality Management*, 15(2), 165-176.

Ulrich, D., Xenger, J., and Smallwood, N. (2000). The New Leadership Development. *Training and Development*, 54, 22-27.

Waldman, D.A., and Yammarino, F.J. (1999). CEO charismatic leadership: Levels-of-management and levels-of-analysis effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 266-285.

Wang, E., Chou, H., and Jiang, J. (2005). The impacts of charismatic leadership style on team cohesiveness and overall performance during ERP implementation. *International Journal of Project Management*, 23(3), 173-180.

Williams II, J.F., and Winston, M.D. (2003). Leadership competencies and the importance of research methods and statistical analysis in decision making and research and publication: A study of citation patterns. *Library & Information Science Research*, 25(4), 387-402.

Wofford, J.C., Goodwin, V.L., Whittington, J.L. (1998). A field study of a cognitive approach to understanding transformational and transactional leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), 1998.

Worsfold, P. (1989). Leadership and managerial effectiveness in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 8(2), 145-155.

Yagil, D. (1998). Charismatic leadership and organizational hierarchy: Attribution of charisma to close and distant leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 161-176.

Yammarino, F.J., Spangler, W.D., and Bass, B.M. (1993). Transformational Leadership and Performance: A Longitudinal Investigation. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 4(1), 81-102.

Zaccaro, S.J., Gilbert, J., Thor, K.K., and Mumford, M.D. (1991). Leadership and social intelligence: Linking social perceptiveness and behavioral flexibility to leader effectiveness. *Leadership Quarterly*, 2(4), 317-331.

APPENDIX A

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Monday, November 20, 2006
IRB Application No HE06107
Proposal Title: Leadership Competencies Required for Future Hotel General Managers' Success in Thailand

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 11/19/2007

Principal Investigator(s)
Naree Weerakit Bill Ryan
210 HES 210 HESW
Stillwater, OK 74078 Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Sue C. Jacobs, Chair
Institutional Review Board

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire (English version)

November, 2006

OSU	
Institutional Review Board	
Approved	11/20/06
Expires	11/19/07
Initials	HE 06107

Dear Hotel General Manager:

The purpose of this study is to collect the information regarding the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in Thailand. Members of the Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT) as of January 2006 were selected to participate in this study. Would you please take few minutes of your time to complete this survey? Your input is extremely important to the outcome of this study. The results will be valuable to both the academic and industry sectors of hospitality management to become more successful at developing future hotel industry leaders in Thailand.

Your response is completely voluntary and will be kept strictly confidential. No individual responses will be reported. All information gained by this study will be presented in aggregate form. Data will be held in a secure environment, only the researcher will have access to the data, and all responses will be destroyed after a period of one year. There are no known risks associated with this project which are greater than those encountered in daily life. Responding to this survey indicates your consent to participate in the study. If you would like to receive the results of this study, please send a separate email to naree@okstate.edu or naree@fsl.psu.ac.th and include your email address.

Please accept this glass mat (coaster) as a token of our appreciation for participating in this study.

If you have any further questions or need further assistance, please contact me at my email address or call me at 01-5383786. Contact information for Oklahoma State University's Research Compliance is also provided below.

Dr. Sue C. Jacobs
University Research Compliance
219 Cordell North
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078
405-744-1676 (phone)
405-744-4335 (fax)
irb@okstate.edu

I am looking forward to receiving your response. Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Naree Weerakit
Ph. D. Candidate
School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration
Oklahoma State University

Bill Ryan, Ed.D., R.D., L.D.
Associate Professor & Interim Director
School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration
Oklahoma State University

Questionnaire

Part 1: Organizational Information

1. Your hotel size:

- less than 50 rooms
- 50-100 rooms
- 100-199 rooms
- 200-299 rooms
- 300-399 rooms
- 400-499 rooms
- 500 or more

2. No. of employees in your hotel:

- less than 50
- 50-99
- 100-199
- 200-299
- 300-399
- 400-499
- 500 or more

3. Your hotel rating

- Five-star
- Four-star
- Three-star
- Two-star
- One-star

4. Your hotel is:

- Independent hotel without affiliation
- Chain (brand name) affiliated hotel

5. Your hotel is:

- Resort hotel
- City hotel

Part 2: Respondent Demographics Information

1. You are:

- Thai
- Expatriate

2. Age:

- less than 25
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65 or more

3. Education:

- School Certificate
- Diploma
- Undergraduate
- Postgraduate
- Others, please specify.....

4. Gender:

- Male
- Female

5. Professional experience in the industry:

- 1-5 years
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- over 20 years

6. Working experience as hotel general manager

- less than 5 years
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- over 20 years

Part 3: Leadership Competencies

Please rate the importance of the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in Thailand in the future. (1 = not need, 2 = slightly important, 3= fairly important, 4 = very important, and 5 = extremely important)

Vision and Planning

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
1.	Anticipates obstacles and develop plans					
2.	Adapts to changing circumstances					
3.	Manages time to ensure productivity					
4.	Integrates planning efforts across work groups or functional units					
5.	Identifies measurable action steps that support the hotel's strategy and mission					
6.	Considers a broad range of factors (internal, external, and trends) when resolving problems and making decisions					
7.	Translates business strategies into clear objectives and tactics					
8.	Brings together different perspectives and approaches and combines them in creative ways					
9.	Examines and monitors trends in the hotel business					
10.	Understands the agendas and perspective of owners, roles, and responsibilities					
11.	Applies cross-functional knowledge to understand and solve problems					
12.	Develops action plans to meet customer needs					
13.	Considers alternatives before making decisions					
14.	Takes calculated risks when appropriate					
15.	Considers pros and cons of proposed solutions to problems					
16.	Develops new systems or processes for increased efficiency					
17.	Handles multiple demands and competing priorities					
18.	Knows the strengths and weaknesses of competitors					
19.	Identifies and defines problems					
20.	Determines which of many problems may become crises					
21.	Creates needed systems and procedures to support changes					
22.	Considers customer needs when making decisions					
23.	Focuses on important information without being distracted by unnecessary details					
24.	Understands owners' and stakeholders' values and how they perceive things					

Vision and Planning (Cont')

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
25.	Recognizes and seizes strategic opportunities in the environment					
26.	Understands organizational strengths and weaknesses					
27.	See how things fit in the big picture					
28.	Stays informed about industry practices and new developments					
29.	Makes sound decisions under time pressure and with limited resources					

Communication

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
30.	Seeks feedback from others					
31.	Summarizes and clarifies what people say to ensure understanding					
32.	Interacts with people in a direct and open manner					
33.	Listens to people without interrupting					
34.	Listens carefully to input and concerns expressed by others					
35.	Writes in an effective manner					
36.	Actively and frequently listens directly to customers					
37.	Speaks clearly and articulately in a variety of situations					
38.	Expresses disagreement in a tactful and sensitive manner					
39.	Presents ideas in a convincing manner					

Interpersonal Stimulation

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
40.	Challenges others to make tough choices					
41.	Clarifies expectations to staff members about assignments, roles, and responsibilities					
42.	Provides challenging assignments to facilitate development					
43.	Encourages employees to use their initiative to remedy problems when they first occur					
44.	Allow others to lead under the appropriate circumstances					
45.	Deliberately allows direct reports to use their own methods for completing tasks					

Interpersonal Stimulation (Cont')

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
46.	Inspires and motivates others					
47.	Prepares people to understand changes					
48.	Defines and sets up quality standards for employees					
49.	Gives others the authority necessary to accomplish their objectives					
50.	Involves others in critical decisions that affect them					
51.	Delegates enough of own works to others					
52.	Defines priorities for the staff					
53.	Keeps others updated with information					
54.	Gets others interested and involved in the change process					

Self management and development

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
55.	Works effectively in ambiguous situations					
56.	Takes a stand when resolving important issues					
57.	Displays consistency between words and actions					
58.	Works constructively under stress and pressure					
59.	Select leadership style most appropriate for the situation					
60.	Addresses and works through conflict					
61.	Views problems as opportunities and mistakes as progress					
62.	Reduces redundancies in processes and procedures					
63.	Adjusts behavior in response to feedback and experience					
64.	Protects confidential information					
65.	Builds networks with people inside and outside the hotel					
66.	Spends time on the most important issues, not just the most urgent					
67.	Deals constructively with own failures and mistakes					
68.	Understands complex concepts and relationships					
69.	Confronts problems early before they become unmanageable					
70.	Pursues continual learning and self-development					
71.	Promotes quality initiatives					
72.	Demonstrates awareness of own strengths and weaknesses					
73.	Works to establish strong relationships with owners					

Support and Recognition

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
74.	Works toward win-win solutions with others whenever possible					
75.	Steers conflict away from personalities and toward issues					
76.	Provides employees access to information					
77.	Treats people with respect					
78.	Coaches others in skill development					
79.	Works to understand why others resist change instead of forcing others to accept change					
80.	Accurately identifies strengths and weaknesses in others					
81.	Expresses confidence in people's competence to do their jobs					
82.	Understands and harnesses individual differences to create a competitive advantage					
83.	Gives specific, timely, and constructive feedback					
84.	Models the changes expected of others					
85.	Encourages others to express their views, even contrary ones					
86.	Adjusts leadership approach to fit other individuals					
87.	Works as a member of a team					
88.	Champions new ideas and initiatives					
89.	Employs a team approach to solve problems when appropriate					
90.	Promotes respect and appreciation for diversity and individual differences					
91.	Treats people fairly					
92.	Promotes teamwork among groups; discourages "us versus them" thinking					
93.	Monitors progress of others and redirects efforts when necessary					

Ethic Issues

Lodging Competencies		1	2	3	4	5
94.	Acts in an ethical manner					
95.	Commits organizational resources for community events					
96.	Considers ethical implication prior to taking action					
97.	Considers the effects of decisions on community well-being					
98.	Builds partnerships and alliances with community organizations					

Thank you very much for your time and effort

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire (Thai version)

แบบสอบถาม

เรียน ผู้จัดการทั่วไปหรือตำแหน่งเทียบเท่า

วัตถุประสงค์ในการศึกษานี้คือต้องการเก็บข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับสมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำที่จำเป็นต่อการประสบความสำเร็จในฐานะผู้จัดการทั่วไปของโรงแรมในประเทศไทย ดิฉันใคร่ขอความกรุณาท่านสละเวลาในการให้ข้อมูล ผลการศึกษานี้จะเป็นประโยชน์ในด้านวิชาการซึ่งจะนำไปใช้ในการพัฒนาผู้นำในอนาคตให้แก่อุตสาหกรรมบริการในประเทศไทยต่อไป

การให้ข้อมูลของท่านในครั้งนี้เป็นไปด้วยความสมัครใจและดิฉันขอรับรองว่าข้อมูลของท่านจะถูกเก็บเป็นความลับ หากท่านต้องการทราบผลของการศึกษาในครั้งนี้ โปรดแจ้งให้ดิฉันทราบที่ 3naree@okstate.edu หรือ naree@fsi.psu.ac.th พร้อมแจ้งที่อยู่ทางอีเมลของท่าน เพื่อผู้วิจัยจะได้จัดส่งผลการศึกษานี้แก่ท่านในภายหลัง

หากท่านมีความสงสัยหรือต้องการรายละเอียดเพิ่มเติมเกี่ยวกับการศึกษาในครั้งนี้ โปรดติดต่อดิฉันได้ตามที่อยู่ทางอีเมลข้างต้น หรือติดต่อทางโทรศัพท์ได้ที่หมายเลข 08-1538-8766 ดิฉันหวังเป็นอย่างยิ่งว่าจะได้รับความกรุณาในการกรอกข้อมูลและขอความกรุณาส่งแบบสอบถามชุดนี้กลับมาภายในวันที่ 30 ธันวาคม 2549 และขอขอบพระคุณไว้ ณ โอกาสนี้ด้วย

ด้วยความเคารพอย่างสูง

นางสาวนารี วีระกิจ

นักศึกษาระดับปริญญาเอก

The School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration,
Oklahoma State University

ขอให้ท่านกาเครื่องหมาย (/) หน้าข้อที่ท่านเลือก

ส่วนที่ 1: ข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับองค์กร

1. ขนาดของโรงแรม:

- น้อยกว่า 50 ห้อง
- 50 - 100 ห้อง
- 100-199 ห้อง
- 200-299 ห้อง
- 300-399 ห้อง
- 400-499 ห้อง
- 500 ห้องหรือมากกว่า

2. โรงแรมท่านเป็นโรงแรม:

- ห้าดาว
- สี่ดาว
- สามดาว
- น้อยกว่าสามดาว
- ไม่มีการจัดอันดับ

3. จำนวนพนักงานของโรงแรม:

- น้อยกว่า 50 คน
- 50 - 99 คน
- 100 - 199 คน
- 200 – 299 คน
- 300 – 399 คน
- 400 – 499 คน
- 500 คนขึ้นไป

4. โรงแรมของท่านเป็น:

- โรงแรมที่บริหารโดยอิสระ
- โรงแรมในเครือ

5. ประเภทของโรงแรมท่าน:

- โรงแรมรีสอร์ท
- โรงแรมในเมือง

ส่วนที่ 2 : ข้อมูลส่วนตัวของผู้กรอกข้อมูล

เชื้อชาติ:

- ไทย
- ต่างชาติ

อายุ:

- น้อยกว่า 25 ปี
- 25 – 34 ปี
- 35 – 44 ปี
- 45 – 54 ปี
- 55 – 64 ปี
- 65 ปีขึ้นไป

เพศ:

- ชาย
- หญิง

การศึกษา:

- ระดับประถมศึกษา
- ระดับมัธยมศึกษาหรือประกาศนียบัตร
- ระดับปริญญาตรี
- ระดับปริญญาโทหรือสูงกว่า

ประสบการณ์การทำงานในอุตสาหกรรม:

- น้อยกว่า 5 ปี
- 6 – 10 ปี
- 11 – 15 ปี
- 16 – 20 ปี
- มากกว่า 20 ปี

ประสบการณ์การทำงานในตำแหน่งผู้จัดการทั่วไปหรือตำแหน่งเทียบเท่า

- น้อยกว่า 5 ปี
- 6 – 10 ปี
- 11 – 15 ปี
- 16 – 20 ปี
- มากกว่า 20 ปี

ส่วนที่ 3 : สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ

โปรดประเมินความสำคัญของสมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำที่จำเป็นต่อการประสบความสำเร็จในฐานะผู้จัดการโรงแรมใน
อนาคตของประเทศไทย. (1 = ไม่จำเป็น, 2 = ก่อนข้างจำเป็น, 3= จำเป็น, 4 = จำเป็นมาก, และ 5 =
จำเป็นอย่างยิ่ง)

วิสัยทัศน์และการวางแผน

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
1. คาดการณ์ถึงอุปสรรคที่จะเกิดขึ้นในอนาคตและพัฒนาแผนต่างๆเพื่อรองรับ					
2. ปรับตัวให้เหมาะกับสภาพแวดล้อมที่เปลี่ยนแปลง					
3. จัดการเวลาให้เกิดประโยชน์					
4. บูรณาการแผนการทำงานระหว่างแผนกหรือกลุ่มงาน					
5. ระบุขั้นตอนในการประเมินผลงานเพื่อสนับสนุนพันธกิจและกลยุทธ์ของ โรงแรม					
6. พิจารณาปัจจัยต่างๆ (ทั้งภายนอก,ปัจจัยภายใน,และแนวโน้มในอนาคต) เมื่อต้อง แก้ปัญหาหรือตัดสินใจ					
7. แปลงกลยุทธ์ทางธุรกิจให้เป็นวัตถุประสงค์และยุทธวิธีที่ชัดเจน					
8. รวบรวมและประสานแนวคิดที่แตกต่างอย่างสร้างสรรค์					
9. ตรวจสอบและติดตามแนวโน้มของธุรกิจโรงแรม					
10. เข้าใจความต้องการและแนวความคิดของเจ้าของ ตลอดจนบทบาทและความ รับผิดชอบ					
11. ประยุกต์ใช้ความรู้ข้ามสายงานเพื่อนำมาใช้ทำความเข้าใจและแก้ปัญหาต่างๆ					
12. พัฒนาแผนการดำเนินงานเพื่อตอบสนองความต้องการของลูกค้า					
13. พิจารณาทางเลือกหลายๆทางก่อนการตัดสินใจ					
14. ยอมเสี่ยงตาม โอกาสที่เหมาะสมเมื่อได้คำนวณผลได้ผลเสียอย่างรอบคอบแล้ว					
15. พิจารณาจุดดี-จุดด้อยของข้อเสนอที่มีเพื่อแก้ปัญหาต่างๆ					
16. พัฒนาระบบและกระบวนการใหม่ๆเพื่อเพิ่มประสิทธิภาพในการทำงาน					
17. จัดการกับความต้องการที่หลากหลายและจัดลำดับความสำคัญ					
18. รู้จุดแข็งและจุดอ่อนของคู่แข่ง					
19. รู้ลักษณะของปัญหาและกำหนดขอบเขตของปัญหา					
20. ระบุปัญหาที่อาจนำไปสู่วิกฤต					
21. สร้างสรรค์ระบบและวิธีปฏิบัติที่จำเป็นเพื่อสนับสนุนการเปลี่ยนแปลง					
22. พิจารณาความต้องการของลูกค้าเมื่อตัดสินใจในเรื่องต่างๆ					
23. ให้ความสำคัญกับข้อมูลที่สำคัญโดยไม่ไขว้เขวกับรายละเอียดที่ไม่จำเป็น					
24. เข้าใจคุณค่าและมุมมองต่อสิ่งต่างๆของเจ้าของและผู้ถือหุ้น					

วิสัยทัศน์และการวางแผน (ต่อ)

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
25. รับรู้และประเมินโอกาสเชิงยุทธศาสตร์จากสิ่งแวดล้อม					
26. เข้าใจจุดแข็งและจุดอ่อนขององค์กร					
27. มองว่าสิ่งต่างๆ เข้ากับภาพรวมอย่างไร					
28. ตัดสินใจได้อย่างเหมาะสมภายใต้ความกดดันด้านเวลาและทรัพยากรที่จำกัด					
29. ติดตามข้อมูลข่าวสารเกี่ยวกับแนวปฏิบัติและทิศทางของอุตสาหกรรมตลอดเวลา					

การสื่อสาร

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
30. แสวงหาข้อมูลสะท้อนกลับ (feedback) จากผู้อื่น					
31. สรุปและทำความเข้าใจอย่างชัดเจนกับสิ่งที่ผู้อื่นพูดเพื่อให้แน่ใจว่าเข้าใจถูกต้อง					
32. โต้ตอบกับผู้อื่นด้วยท่าทางที่เปิดเผยและตรงไปตรงมา					
33. รับฟังผู้อื่นโดยไม่ขัดจังหวะ					
34. ตั้งใจฟังข้อมูลที่ผู้อื่นส่งให้อย่างระมัดระวัง					
35. เขียนได้อย่างมีประสิทธิภาพ					
36. รับฟังลูกค้ายโดยตรงอย่างกระตือรือร้นและทำเป็นนิจสิน					
37. พูดชัดเจนในสถานการณ์ต่างๆ					
38. แสดงความไม่เห็นด้วยด้วยความรู้สึกเข้าใจและเห็นใจ					
39. นำเสนอความคิดด้วยท่าทางที่เชื่อมั่นและน่าเชื่อถือ					

ความสามารถในการกระตุ้นผู้อื่น

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
40. ทำทนายผู้อื่นให้ทำสิ่งที่ยากขึ้น					
41. อธิบายความคาดหวังเกี่ยวกับงาน บทบาทและความรับผิดชอบให้แก่พนักงาน					
42. มอบหมายงานที่ทำทนายให้ผู้อื่นเพื่อส่งเสริมการพัฒนา					
43. สนับสนุนพนักงานให้ใช้ความคิดริเริ่มเพื่อแก้ปัญหาแต่เนิ่นๆ					
44. เปิดโอกาสให้ผู้อื่นได้เป็นผู้นำในสถานการณ์ที่เหมาะสม					
45. อนุญาตให้ผู้อื่นได้มีโอกาสทำงานตามวิธีของตนเองเพื่อให้งานสำเร็จตามเป้าหมาย					
46. สร้างแรงบันดาลใจและให้กำลังใจแก่ผู้อื่น					
47. เตรียมความพร้อมให้ผู้อื่นเข้าใจการเปลี่ยนแปลง					

ความสามารถในการกระตุ้นผู้อื่น (ต่อ)

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
48. กำหนดและวางมาตรฐานคุณภาพสำหรับพนักงาน					
49. มอบหมายอำนาจหน้าที่ที่จำเป็นให้แก่พนักงานเพื่อให้ทำงานได้บรรลุวัตถุประสงค์					
50. ให้ผู้อื่นได้มีส่วนร่วมในการตัดสินใจที่มีผลกระทบต่อพวกเขา					
51. มอบหมายหน้าที่ของตนเองให้ผู้อื่นทำแทนในปริมาณที่เหมาะสม					
52. แจ้งลำดับความสำคัญของงานให้แก่พนักงาน					
53. ให้ผู้อื่นรับรู้ข้อมูลข่าวสารที่เป็นปัจจุบัน					
54. ทำให้ผู้อื่นสนใจและเข้าร่วมในกระบวนการเปลี่ยนแปลง					

การพัฒนาและการจัดการตนเอง

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
55. ทำงานอย่างมีประสิทธิภาพแม้จะอยู่ภายใต้สถานการณ์ที่ไม่ชัดเจน					
56. มีจุดยืนในการแก้ปัญหาที่สำคัญ					
57. รักษาคำพูดอย่างสม่ำเสมอ					
58. ทำงานอย่างมีหลักการภายใต้ความเครียดและความกดดัน					
59. เลือกรูปแบบผู้นำที่เหมาะสมที่สุดกับสถานการณ์					
60. ระบุและทำงานให้ผ่านพ้นความขัดแย้ง					
61. มองปัญหาให้เป็นโอกาส และความผิดพลาดให้เป็นความก้าวหน้า					
62. ปรับพฤติกรรมให้สอดคล้องกับผลสะท้อนกลับและประสบการณ์					
63. ปกป้องข้อมูลที่เป็นความลับ					
64. สร้างเครือข่ายกับผู้อื่นทั้งภายในและภายนอกโรงแรม					
65. ใช้เวลากับปัญหาที่สำคัญ ไม่ใช่เพียงแก้ปัญหาเร่งด่วน					
66. จัดการอย่างมีหลักการกับความล้มเหลวและความผิดพลาดของตนเอง					
67. เข้าใจความสัมพันธ์และความคิดที่ซับซ้อน					
68. เผชิญหน้ากับปัญหาแต่เนิ่นๆ ก่อนที่ปัญหาจะทวีความรุนแรงจนไม่สามารถจัดการได้					
69. มุ่งเน้นการเรียนรู้อย่างต่อเนื่องและการพัฒนาตนเอง					
70. ส่งเสริมการคิดริเริ่มสร้างสรรค์ที่มีคุณภาพ					
71. แสดงความตระหนักถึงจุดแข็ง จุดอ่อนของตน					
72. ทำงานเพื่อสร้างความสัมพันธ์ที่เข้มแข็งกับเจ้าของ					
73. รับรู้ข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับกิจปฏิบัติและการพัฒนาใหม่ๆ ของอุตสาหกรรม					

การรับรู้และการให้ความสนับสนุน

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
74. ทำงาน โดยเน้นการแก้ปัญหาให้ทุกฝ่ายพอใจเมื่อมีโอกาส					
75. พยายามลดความขัดแย้งระหว่างบุคคลหรือต่อหัวข้อต่างๆ					
76. ให้พนักงานสามารถเข้าถึงข้อมูลได้					
77. ปฏิบัติต่อผู้อื่นด้วยความเคารพ					
78. ฝึกผู้อื่นเพื่อการพัฒนาทักษะ					
79. ทำงานอย่างเข้าใจเหตุผลที่ผู้อื่นต่อต้านการเปลี่ยนแปลงแทนที่จะบังคับให้ผู้อื่นยอมรับการเปลี่ยนแปลง					
80. ระบุจุดแข็งและจุดอ่อนของผู้อื่น ได้อย่างถูกต้อง					
81. แสดงความมั่นใจต่อศักยภาพในการทำงานของผู้อื่น					
82. เข้าใจและนำความแตกต่างของแต่ละบุคคลมาใช้ในการสร้างความสามารถในการแข่งขัน					
83. ให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับ (feedback) อย่างมีหลักการ ตามเวลาและชัดเจน					
84. จัดทำรูปแบบ (Model) การเปลี่ยนแปลงตามความคาดหวังของผู้อื่น					
85. ส่งเสริมให้ผู้อื่นแสดงความคิดเห็น แม้จะเป็นความคิดเห็นที่ขัดแย้ง					
86. ปรับเปลี่ยนลักษณะผู้นำให้เหมาะสมกับบุคลิกของพนักงาน					
87. ทำงานในฐานะสมาชิกของทีม					
88. สนับสนุนความคิดใหม่ๆ และความคิดริเริ่มสร้างสรรค์					
89. นำวิธีการทำงานเป็นทีมมาใช้ในการแก้ปัญหาเมื่อเหมาะสม					
90. ส่งเสริมการให้ความเคารพและชื่นชมความหลากหลายและความแตกต่างของบุคคล					
91. ปฏิบัติกับทุกคนอย่างเสมอภาค					
92. ส่งเสริมการทำงานเป็นทีม พยายามลบสิ่งความคิด "เรากับเขา"					
93. ติดตามความก้าวหน้าของผู้อื่นและพยายามชี้แนะทางอ้อมเมื่อจำเป็น					

จรรยาบรรณในการทำงาน

สมรรถนะความเป็นผู้นำ	1	2	3	4	5
94. ปฏิบัติตามหลักจรรยาบรรณ					
95. ให้การสนับสนุนการเงินและทรัพยากรขององค์กรแก่ชุมชน					
96. พิจารณาหลักจรรยาบรรณก่อนปฏิบัติเสมอ					
97. พิจารณาผลกระทบของการตัดสินใจต่อความอยู่ดีของชุมชน					
98. สร้างหุ้นส่วนและพันธมิตรกับองค์กรชุมชนท้องถิ่น					

ขอขอบพระคุณที่ท่านสละเวลาและความตั้งใจในการให้ข้อมูลครั้งนี้

VITA

Naree Weerakit

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES REQUIRED FOR FUTUR HOTEL
GENEAL MANAGERS' SUCCESS IN THAILAND

Major Field: Hospitality Administration

Biographical:

Education:

Received Bachelor of Business Administration (Accounting), Second Class Honour, from Faculty of Management Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Had Yai campua, Songkla, Thailand in 1994.

Received Master of Science (international Hotel Management) from School of Management Studies For The Service Sector, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, UK in 1998.

Completed the requirements for a Doctor for Philosophy degree in Human Environmental Sciences at Oklahoma State University in May 2007.

Experience: Lecturer at the Faculty of Service Industries, Prince of Songkla University, Phuket campus

Professional Memberships:

Member of the Hospitality and Tourism Educator Association

Name: Naree Weerakit

Date of Degree: May, 2007

Institution: Oklahoma State University

Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES REQUIRED FOR FUTURE HOTEL
GENERAL MANAGERS' SUCCESS IN THAILAND

Pages in Study: 156

Candidate for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Major Field: Hospitality Administration

Scope and Method of Study: The objective of this study is to determine the leadership competencies essential for success as a hotel general manager in Thailand. This study involved a cross-sectional design to collect data. After a review of the literature, a survey instrument was developed from previous research to conduct this study. Data was collected through a mail questionnaire. Descriptive statistical methods, such as distribution analysis, were used to analyze the characteristics of the respondents and their organization. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation was employed in exploratory factor analysis. Then, an independent-sample *t*-test and F test were used to investigate mean score differences in the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand among different demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Findings and Conclusions: The study derived eleven factors necessary competencies for the future success of general managers. Amongst all the eleven factors, competency in team building and ethics was rated highest by the respondents, followed by managing stakeholders, leadership, communication, planning and implementation, motivation, concern for community, strategic orientation, flexibility, risk-taking and challenging others. The different demographic characteristics of the respondents (e.g. gender, age, education level, and expatriate status) and their organizations (e.g. the size, star-rating, number of employees, type of the hotel) had an effect on the leadership competencies necessary for success as a general manager in hotels in Thailand.

The results of this study confirmed previous research. Hotel general managers in Thailand have a strong tendency to be transformational leaders primarily based on the characteristics of Thai culture and interpersonal interactions. They have an awareness of participative leadership styles, which previous studies identified as the most effective leadership style for the hospitality industry; but in some demographics especially the smaller operations with less education managers are inclined to use an autocratic approach to leadership.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: _____

Dr. Bill Ryan