MELBURNIA: TRANSFORMING THE TRANSACTION

Heath S. Grow
Victoria University, Australia

Anona Armstrong, AM
Victoria University, Australia

ABSTRACT

This study explored the relationship between leaders' sex, age, and education level and their preferred leadership style. Data were collected from staff employed in accommodation hotels in Melbourne, Australia. Data from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire were analysed using MANOVA and ANOVA. The findings suggested that this study is consistent with previous sex-difference research while providing a counterintuitive perspective: males appeared more Transformational. Sex and sex with age were strongly related with the ANOVAs of the MLQ factors. Inspirational Motivation and Contingent Reward were highly valued by both sexes. The findings provide insight into the sex differences related to leadership within the Australian Hospitality Industry. This may assist senior managers when developing human resource strategy and hiring staff. The originality of the study, in terms of being the first in an Australian Hospitality context, means that it will contribute empirical evidence to the body of research, undertaken predominantly in North America, in other industries.

KEYWORDS: Leadership, sex, age, education, Melbourne, hospitality

INTRODUCTION

Intense competition is a characteristic of the globalisation of worldwide markets and economies. This is evident in the tourism industry per se but more specifically in the international hotel sector and prompted Fyall & Spyriadis (2003) to advise that "international hotel chains need to adopt a more sophisticated approach to strategic marketing and planning" (p. 108). A significant downturn in the Australian economy caused by the Global Financial Crisis has exacerbated this need (Austrade, 2009). Hospitality and tourism has suffered further due to the rising value of the Australian dollar against the United States dollar (Lapperman, 2009). In order to improve this situation and improve long-term planning, effective leadership is urgently required (NLTS Steering Committee, 2009). Prior to the introducing the *National Long Term Tourism Strategy* (Australian Government - DRET, 2009) the Australian Government was presented with a view by peak tourism industry group TTF Australia (2008) that leadership within the industry appeared to be inadequate:

> Of all the challenges facing the Australian tourism industry leadership is the biggest – for without strong leadership, none of the other challenges will be addressed in a comprehensive manner. Leadership is required at all levels of the industry (p. 28).

This study addressed a gap in current leadership research in the industry by determining whether the Hospitality Industry can benefit from harnessing both Transformational and Transactional leadership. In particular, this paper reports the relationship between sex, education, and age and leaders' leadership style and to replicate previous research conducted in various industries, government agencies and educational institutions in the United States of America by Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, & Marx (2007). The leadership paradigm developed by Avolio and Bass (1994) forms the framework for this research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Transactional Theory

Transactional leaders are seen to be concerned with the day-to-day management of a particular work group or department. Behaviour displayed by Transactional leaders is strongly aligned with what most service-sector managers would associate with generic 'management' skills rather than 'leadership' (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transactional leaders reward or discipline their followers based on their performance by employing one of the following four factors:

- Contingent Reward – leaders and followers agree on what needs to be done. When tasks are completed satisfactorily, leaders reward their followers. A commission for reaching a sales target is an example of this approach;
- Management by Exception (Active) – leaders proactively monitor standards, notice potential errors or mistakes, and takes corrective action before a problem arises;
- Management by Exception (Passive) – leaders, in contrast to the active style, wait for problems to arise and then react when they need to be addressed;
- Laissez-Faire Leadership – the absence of leadership, no transaction occurs between leaders and followers: no leadership takes place.

Transformational Theory

Transformational leaders engage in a more strategic style of leadership, which communicates the organisation's long-term vision (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transformational leaders focus on longer-term issues as they "motivate their followers by means of a value-based, inspiring vision of the future" (Krüger, Rowold, Borgmann, Staufenbiel, & Heinitz, 2011, p. 49) to produce superior performance over the long-term. To achieve this Transformational leaders employ one or more of the following four components of leadership when managing employees:

- Idealised Influence – leaders become role models for followers to try and emulate;
- Individual Consideration – leaders act as mentors for followers by providing support. In addition, leaders recognise and embrace the differences of each of their followers to influence change;
- Inspirational Motivation – leaders motivate and inspire followers by involving them and providing challenges and meaning to their work;
- Intellectual Stimulation – leaders stimulate followers to question practices and problems, to think creatively and develop new approaches to work issues.

Leadership in Hospitality

Leadership research that employs the Transformational and Transactional theories is sparse in the Hospitality Industry. Between 1990 and 2012, there were 11 journal articles published. Five of the 11 articles were aimed at advancing knowledge by vigorously testing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; refer to the methodology section for more information. Each of the five studies used Hospitality based sample, for convenience, and were conducted in the United States of America (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008; Hinkin & Tracey, 1994; Scott-Halsell, Shumate, & Blum, 2007; Tracey & Hinkin, 1994, 1998). The remaining six articles were aimed at applying the theory to determine practical implications for managers working in that environment (Chiang & Jang, 2008; Erkutlu, 2008; Gill, Flaschner, & Shachar, 2006; Patiar & Mia, 2009; Tracey & Hinkin, 1996; Whitelaw & Morda, 2004). It would also appear that applying Transformational and Transactional Leadership

within the context of Hospitality was valued in various parts of the world, as is evident in Table 1, which contains a summary of effects of those leadership styles.

Table 1: A Summary of Articles that apply Transformational and Transactional Leadership

Year	Researchers	Items leadership may affect	Country of research
1996	Tracey and Hinkin	Leader effectiveness Leader satisfaction Mission clarity Openness of communication Role clarity	United States of America
2004	Whitelaw and Morda	The perception of one's own leadership style Sex differences	Australia
2006	Gill, Flaschner, and Shachar	Burnout Job stress	Canada
2008	Chiang and Jang	Job satisfaction Organisational commitment Organisational culture Psychological empowerment Trust	Taiwan
2008	Erkutlu	Leader effectiveness Organisational effectiveness	Turkey
2009	Patiar and Mia	Financial performance Non-financial performance	Australia

As may be noted in Table 1, the effect of leadership is clearly linked to the nature of the research, its purpose and the aims of the researcher. It also affirms prominent leadership researcher Gary Yukl's (2010) position that leadership research is subjective. Of the six articles, two are of particular relevance to this paper: Whitelaw and Morda (2004) and Patiar and Mia (2009).

The analysis undertaken in Melbourne by Whitelaw and Morda (2004) highlighted that there were general similarities in the self-perceived leadership rankings between the sexes in terms of leadership style. It was revealed, however, that males were likelier than females to engage in Management by Exception behaviour, both active and passive. This indicates, as Whitelaw and Morda (2004) suggested, that males in the Melbourne Hospitality scene are absorbed by 'fixing' and 'preventing' problems. Interestingly, both male and females viewed that it was desirable, if not necessary, to manage using a combination of both Transformational and Transactional styles in order to induce leadership effectiveness, satisfaction and elicit extra effort from staff. This view appears to be counterintuitive and specific to Hospitality as evidence from the Australian Banking sector suggests that females perceive that only Transformational leadership is desirable (Carless, 1998). This position is echoed in the general management literature (Avolio & Bass, 1994; Bass, 1985; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Burns, 1978).

Whitelaw's and Morda's (2004) research also reinforced the view of Tracey and Hinkin (1994) and Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) that Contingent Reward is a positive aspect of leadership, rather than a negative one as suggested by the original theorists (Avolio & Bass, 1994; Bass, 1985). Indeed, "females more[so] than males tended to emphasise the importance of clear role expectations and rewards for task accomplishment" (Whitelaw & Morda, 2004, p. 147). As such, current managerial perceptions toward Contingent Reward, a factor of Transactional leadership, need to be investigated further.

It may appear that Contingent Reward is a useful element of leadership, Patiar and Mia (2009) argued that exemplary attitude displayed by staff, and improved interpersonal, and technical skills are induced by Transformational leadership and in turn these skills result in a higher quality of service being provided to guests. In turn, service improvements positively influence the financial performance of a hotel (Patiar & Mia, 2009). Interestingly, Tracey and Hinkin (1996) suggested that employees need to be provided with clear communication and an understanding of an organisation's mission, and their role in achieving that mission, in order to achieve enhanced levels of performance and reduce their perception of stress and burnout (Gill et al., 2006), a common side effect of working in Hospitality. The reduction of stress is important as it aids the development of an organisational culture where strong relationships exist between subordinates and their leaders (Brownell, 2010) because of mutual trust and psychological empowerment (Chiang & Jang, 2008). The result of which is that subordinates will perform beyond the expectations of their leaders (Avolio & Bass, 1994; Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Sex, Age, and Education

Notwithstanding Whitelaw's and Morda's (2004) contribution to sex differences, the literature as it applies to Hospitality appears to overlook sex, age and education as an influencing factor on leadership style. This may be perceived as a reinforcement of the position taken by Barbuto et al. (2007) who indicated that sex, age and education levels as "predictors of leadership style … are nearly absent from the [management and psychological] literature research" (p. 73). Today, the literature reflects a similar situation and, as such, this paper will provide a discussion of those issues in order to narrow the current gap in knowledge.

The scope of relevant age and education studies in relation to leadership is limited because papers either focus on retirees or teenagers (Barbuto et al., 2007). Barbuto et al. (2007) tested the impact of sex, age, and education and their interactions on leadership and their associated outcomes. Sex differences were evident as females expressed a desire for considerateness, a significant factor of Transformational Leadership, whereas males were indifferent. Additionally, the greater one's education level, the less structuring was required by leaders (Vecchio & Boatwright, 2002).

The results of Barbuto's et al. (2007) work, presented in Table 2 below, indicate that the only significant item was for age with education. In replicating Barbuto's et al. (2007) work, this study will use the same six hypotheses.

Hypotheses

H1 There will be a significant relationship between leadership and sex
H2 There will be a significant relationship between leadership and age
H3 There will be a significant relationship between leadership and education
H4 There will be a significant relationship between leadership and sex with age
H5 There will be a significant relationship between leadership and sex with education
H6 There will be a significant relationship between leadership and age with education

Table 2: Hypotheses Based on Barbuto et al. (2007)

Hypotheses	Theme or topic	Wilks'	F	p	Observed Result
1	Sex	0.94	0.98	0.473	Reject
2	Age	0.83	1.46	0.079	Reject
3	Education	0.86	1.49	0.068	Reject
4	Sex × Age	0.86	1.14	0.302	Reject
5	Sex × Education	0.84	1.32	0.148	Reject
6	Age × Education	0.68	1.52	0.015*	Accept

Note:* Hypotheses were accepted if $p = <0.05$

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

Human Resource Managers (HRM) at properties that managed 150 staff or more were posted a package containing a letter from the researchers, an overview of the study, and an abridged copy of the survey document. The letter sought organisational consent to invite employees at the property to participate in the study and an offer to present the findings and explain the implications during a Head of Department presentation. Participation in the study was voluntary and the organisation and associated participants could withdraw their consent at any time.

Sample

The sample group consisted of persons currently working in the following capacities:
- line supervisors;
- line managers;
- middle managers with department level focus;
- senior managers.

Persons who held an organisational rank below line supervisor were excluded from the study on the grounds that they would not have any managerial responsibilities and accountability within their organisation.

The sample was a sample of convenience and there were 218 participants of which 54.59 per cent were female, with an average age of 32.5 years. 31.7 per cent had undertaken an undergraduate degree, with 53.2 per cent holding a postgraduate qualification.

Measures

The survey was designed as a two-part document. The first part asked participants to provide job-related and demographic information. The second part asked participants to provide their view about their own leadership style by completing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) version 5x-Short. This version of the MLQ was developed by Avolio and Bass (1994) to assess the level of Transformational and Transactional behaviour exhibited by leaders. The instrument has been found to be structurally valid and reliable in English and other languages (Krüger et al., 2011; Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Indeed, before the turn of the century, Parry (1998) argued for an increased use of Avolio's and Bass' (1994) theory and the associated instrument in Australian and New Zealand research.

RESULTS

The method of analysis undertaken in Barbuto's et al. (2007) was to undertake a MANOVA analysis. A comparison of the level of significance p values are presented in Table 3 and the p values for the dependent variables are presented in Table 4.

Table 3: Comparison of Leadership and Individual Variables (MANOVA Results)

	Wilks'		F		p	
	This Study	Barbuto	This Study	Barbuto	This Study	Barbuto
Individual variables						
Sex	0.905	0.940	2.175	0.980	0.021*	0.473
Age	0.880	0.830	1.355	1.460	0.140	0.079*
Education	0.923	0.860	0.840	1.490	0.664	0.068
Sex × Age	0.859	0.860	1.609	1.140	0.047*	0.302
Sex × Education	0.916	0.840	0.915	1.320	0.568	0.148
Age × Education	0.814	0.680	1.062	1.520	0.370	0.015*

Note: * Variables were significant when $p = < 0.05$

Table 4: Comparison of Manova for MLQ

	Sex		Age		Education		Sex × Age		Sex × Education		Age × Education	
	This Study	Barbuto	This Study	Barbuto	This Study	Barbuto	This Study	Barbuto	This Study	Barbuto	This Study	Barbuto
MANOVA Result												
	0.021*	0.473	0.140	0.079	0.664	0.668	0.047*	0.302	0.568	0.148	0.370	0.015*
MLQ p-scores												
Transactional Leadership	0.276	0.584	0.025*	0.241	0.036*	0.756	0.925	0.104	0.851	0.199	0.519	0.206
Management by Exception	0.042*	0.115	0.382	0.051	0.104	0.652	0.633	0.121	0.959	0.013*	0.474	0.043*
Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.142	0.260	0.116	0.422	0.116	0.491	0.488	0.298	0.846	0.143	0.242	0.052
Contingent Reward	0.046*	0.065	0.303	0.254	0.150	0.466	0.213	0.316	0.441	0.132	0.313	0.215
Transformational Leadership	0.028*	0.032*	0.307	0.016*	0.735	0.220	0.263	0.603	0.652	0.006*	0.679	0.033*
Inspirational Motivation	0.046*	0.156	0.125	0.271	0.950	0.717	0.598	0.621	0.927	0.05*	0.698	0.016*
Idealised Influence	0.042*	0.051	0.561	0.017*	0.615	0.276	0.871	0.757	0.202	0.023*	0.713	0.048*
Intellectual Stimulation	0.124	0.058	0.786	0.052	0.522	0.821	0.048*	0.701	0.871	0.050*	0.113	0.195
Individualised Consideration	0.052	0.072	0.295	0.005*	0.737	0.011*	0.047*	0.287	0.365	0.003*	0.925	0.066
Extra Effort	0.040 *	0.052	0.213	0.153	0.902	0.821	0.392	0.809	0.368	0.032*	0.717	0.147
Effectiveness	0.000 *	0.035*	0.488	0.009*	0.553	0.464	0.212	0.625	0.773	0.002*	0.419	0.005*
Satisfaction	0.002 *	0.003*	0.347	0.193	0.307	0.356	0.252	0.635	0.153	0.051	0.760	0.151

Note: * Variables were significant when $p =< 0.05$

The p values for the dependent variables are presented in Table 4. Sex as an independent variable is shown to have a significant relationship with many of the MLQ factors, whereas in Barbuto's et al. (2007) no independent variable was significant in its own right.

Table 5, shown below, shows the comparison of means for the MLQ items and the individual variables of sex, age, and education. The significant values from the ANOVA are highlighted as per those identified in Table 4.

Table 5: Means of Individual Variables – Leader's Sex, Age, and Education

	Total	Sex		Age			Education		
		Male	Female	22-35	36-45	46+	HS	UG	PG
						n			
	218	99	119	158	36	24	33	69	116
						Mean values			
Transactional Leadership	1.831	1.862	1.805	1.874*	1.700*	1.743*	1.698*	1.802*	1.885*
Management by Exception	1.692	1.775*	1.622*	1.721	1.649	1.563	1.511	1.688	1.745
Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.883	0.801	0.952	0.946	0.674	0.781	0.856	0.739	0.976
Contingent Reward	2.917	3.010*	2.840*	2.954	2.778	2.885	2.727	2.978	2.935
Transformational Leadership	2.858	2.949*	2.782*	2.853	2.780	3.005	2.787	2.873	2.868
Inspirational Motivation	2.963	3.058*	2.884*	2.972	2.806	3.146	2.932	2.975	2.966
Idealised Influence	2.779	2.867*	2.705*	2.771	2.736	2.896	2.686	2.790	2.798
Intellectual Stimulation	2.819	2.894	2.756	2.810	2.799	2.906	2.712	2.804	2.858
Individualised Consideration	2.869	2.975	2.782	2.859	2.778	3.073	2.818	2.924	2.851
Extra Effort	2.613	2.727*	2.518*	2.614	2.472	2.819	2.566	2.638	2.612
Effectiveness	2.923	3.093*	2.782*	2.938	2.813	2.990	2.818	2.964	2.929
Satisfaction	3.071	3.217*	2.950*	3.092	2.931	3.146	2.924	3.138	3.073

Note: * Items correspond to significant relationships in Table 4

Table 6, shown below, and Table 7, shown overleaf are continuations of Table 5. Table 6 shows the comparison of means for the MLQ items and the interactional effect of sex mediated by age as well as sex mediated by education level. Table 7 shows age mediated by education. The significant values from the ANOVA are highlighted as per those identified in Table 3.

Table 6: Means of Individual Varaiables - Leaders' Sex × Age and Sex × Education

	Total	Sex × Age						Sex × Education					
		Male			Female			Male			Female		
		22-35	36-45	46+	22-35	36-45	46+	HS	UG	PG	HS	UG	PG
							n						
	218	70	17	12	88	19	12	11	35	53	22	34	63
							Mean values						
Transactional Leadership	1.831	1.903	1.757	1.771	1.850	1.649	1.715	1.758	1.806	1.921	1.669	1.798	1.856
Management by Exception	1.692	1.827	1.728	1.542	1.636	1.579	1.583	1.636	1.746	1.823	1.449	1.629	1.679
Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.883	0.864	0.500	0.854	1.011	0.829	0.708	0.659	0.679	0.910	0.955	0.801	1.032
Contingent Reward	2.917	3.018	3.044	2.917	2.903	2.539	2.854	2.977	2.993	3.028	2.602	2.963	2.857
Transformational Leadership	2.858	2.914	3.013	3.057	2.804	2.571	2.953	2.932	2.903	2.982	2.714	2.843	2.772
Inspirational Motivation	2.963	3.046	3.000	3.208	2.912	2.632	3.083	3.000	3.079	3.057	2.898	2.868	2.889
Idealised Influence	2.779	2.868*	2.831*	2.917*	2.693*	2.651*	2.875*	2.795	2.768	2.948	2.631	2.813	2.673
Intellectual Stimulation	2.819	2.861*	3.103*	2.792*	2.770*	2.526*	3.021*	2.818	2.836	2.948	2.659	2.772	2.782
Individualised Consideration	2.869	2.882	3.118	3.313	2.841	2.474	2.833	3.114	2.929	2.976	2.670	2.919	2.746
Extra Effort	2.613	2.695	2.745	2.889	2.549	2.228	2.750	2.939	2.733	2.679	2.379	2.539	2.556
Effectiveness	2.923	3.068	3.147	3.167	2.835	2.513	2.813	3.068	3.071	3.113	2.693	2.853	2.774
Satisfaction	3.071	3.257	3.147	3.083	2.960	2.737	3.208	3.136	3.143	3.283	2.818	3.132	2.897

Note: * Items correspond to significant relationships in Table 4

Table 7: Means of Individual Varaiables - Leaders' Age × Education

	Total	22-35			36-45			46+		
		HS	UG	PG	HS	UG	PG	HS	UG	PG
						n				
	218	17	48	93	7	13	16	9	8	7
						Mean values				
Transactional Leadership	1.831	1.833	1.850	1.893	1.488	1.689	1.802	1.606	1.698	1.970
Management by Exception	1.692	1.632	1.747	1.723	1.357	1.548	1.859	1.403	1.563	1.768
Laissez-Faire Leadership	0.883	1.118	0.786	0.997	0.786	0.538	0.734	0.417	0.781	1.250
Contingent Reward	2.917	2.750	3.016	2.960	2.321	2.981	2.813	3.000	2.750	2.893
Transformational Leadership	2.858	2.724	2.862	2.872	2.656	2.921	2.719	3.007	2.863	3.165
Inspirational Motivation	2.963	2.971	2.958	2.978	2.536	2.981	2.781	3.167	3.063	3.214
Idealised Influence	2.779	2.632	2.792	2.785	2.625	2.817	2.719	2.833	2.734	3.161
Intellectual Stimulation	2.819	2.485	2.807	2.871	2.786	2.942	2.688	3.083	2.563	3.071
Individualised Consideration	2.869	2.809	2.891	2.852	2.679	2.942	2.688	2.944	3.094	3.214
Extra Effort	2.613	2.549	2.625	2.620	2.143	2.538	2.563	2.926	2.875	2.619
Effectiveness	2.923	2.765	2.932	2.973	2.643	3.077	2.672	3.056	2.969	2.929
Satisfaction	3.071	2.882	3.156	3.097	2.643	3.077	2.938	3.222	3.125	3.071

Note:* Items correspond to significant relationships in Table 4

DISCUSSION

Table 8, shown below, summarises the key findings from the hypotheses testing in both studies. As is evident in Table 5, there was a lack of consistency between the two studies; however, there were some individual items of consistency, which will be discussed subsequently. The researchers compared the findings of this study to that of Barbuto et al. (2007). A comparison of the results of the ANOVAs of the individual items is presented first, followed by a discussion of the interaction effects of the individual items as explained below.

Table 8: Comparative Results of the Studies

Hypotheses	Theme or topic	Results	
		This Study	Barbuto
1	Sex	Accept	Reject
2	Age	Reject	Reject
3	Education	Reject	Reject
4	Sex × Age	Accept	Reject
5	Sex × Education	Reject	Reject
6	Age × Education	Reject	Accept

Individual Variables – Sex, Age, and Education

It is evident from Table 4 that sex has an effect (p=0.021) on the outcomes of leadership: Extra Effort, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction. Additionally, sex had a significant relationship with two of the Transactional leadership factors: Management by Exception and Contingent Reward, the composite Transformational leadership score and two Transformational factors: Inspirational Motivation and Idealised Influence. In the Barbuto et al. (2007) study, the relationship between many of these variables was explained as being related to age and education. In this study, in all cases, males scored higher than the average. Means based on sex are presented in Table 5.

The p values in Table 4 and their associated means in Table 5 of this study indicate that males, rather than females, embrace Contingent Reward and Management by Exception as preferred elements of leadership. The means show that leaders who reported relatively higher levels of Contingent Reward and relatively lower (yet above average) levels of Management by Exception also appeared to have higher levels of reported effectiveness. The findings related to Management by Exception are consistent with Whitelaw and Morda (2004).

The sample in both studies appeared to view Contingent Reward as a positive aspect of leadership, rather than a negative one (Tracey & Hinkin, 1994; Whitelaw & Morda, 2004).

No significant relationships were found between leadership and age (p=0.140) and leadership and education (p=0.664) in the current study. Despite the MANOVA not being significant, there were significant ANOVAs for the composite Transactional leadership score and age (p=0.025), and education (p=0.036) respectively. No other variables showed significant relationships with age or education. This is unusual, as generational differences often exist in sample groups of varying ages.

Interaction Effects

When any two individual variables were combined, for example sex × age, Barbuto et al. (2007) described this as an interaction effect. The current study found that of the three interaction effects

measured, sex × age, sex × education and age × education, only the first has a significant relationship with leadership (p=0.047) when measuring at the 0.05 level of confidence. An effect was indicated in the p values for Intellectual Stimulation (0.048) and Individualised Consideration (0.047). Upon inspection of the means in Table 6, it was found that males of all ages, and particularly those between 36-45 years of age and females over the age of 46 years, were more likely to engage in Inspirational Motivation behaviour, whereas females under the age of 46 were less likely to engage in such behaviour.

The analysis also revealed that males of all ages, but particularly those over 46 years of age, were more likely than females to engage in Individual Consideration behaviour. Of the female groupings, those who were between the ages of 22-35 had a greater propensity to engage in this behaviour than their female peers. As such, it would appear that the results of the current study in a Hospitality context do not support Carless' (1998) assertion that females desire Transformational leadership.

Implications

This study aimed to explore the relationship between leaders' sex, age, and education level in order to determine if there were differences with the work of Barbuto et al. (2007). To do this the researchers collected data using the same instrument, the MLQ, from 218 leaders of various rank worked at a four- or five star in Melbourne. The same analytical technique was employed in this study as was used by Barbuto et al. (2007).

The results showed that some elements were consistent with the previous literature and others that were not. The issue of consistency is problematic and warrants further research. While it was disappointing that stronger relationships were not found between the independent variables, leading to the rejection of Hypothesis 2 and 3, it is unusual that generational differences did not have a more significant effect on leadership style as indicated by Bass, Avolio, & Atwater (1996); Bass & Bass (2008); Lub, Bijvank, Bal, Blomme, & Schalk (2012) and Wong (2000). Although the group contained a mix of generations (Baby Boomer and Generations X and Y), the study's major contribution to the literature was the effect of sex and sex mediated by age, in a Hospitality context. It would appear that the interaction effect mediates the generational gap differences.

Another significant difference was the positive association of Contingent Reward with Transformational leadership. This association is not confined to this study and that suggests that, perhaps, it should be incorporated into Transformational Theory in certain contexts (Tracey & Hinkin, 1994). This finding, in particular, builds upon the understanding leadership researchers have of 'effective leadership'. As it is counterintuitive it therefore warrants further investigation both within an operational Hospitality context and in a general business setting.

Three factors may contribute to the overall difference between the two studies. The first is the use of MLQ self-rated version rather than peer-rated version as was used in Barbuto et al. (2007). Subordinates often have different perceptions to those of their superiors (Avolio & Bass, 1994). The self-rated responses given by individuals may be subject to some social desirability bias. It has been argued in the psychological literature that if there is no perceived threat and anonymity is maintained, as was the case in this study, that Social Desirability Bias may be minimised (Ong & Weiss, 2000).

The second factor affecting this study is the comparison between a broad array of industries in Barbuto et al. (2007) and the Hospitality sample in this one. There is anecdotal evidence that the demands placed upon leaders and their leadership are different in every industry (Morrow, Suzuki, Crum, Ruben, & Pautsch, 2005; Sellgren, Ekvall, & Thomson, 2007). Nevertheless, Gilbert and Guerrier (1997) commented that the work environment in Hospitality is unique in that unlike in other sectors managers were found to be more heavily involved in the external environment, in particular

with customers than with their own staff. They monitor the hotel's performance through fleeting contact and frequent movement about the establishment (pp. 115-116).

Therefore, it may be concluded that because managers are engaged with customers (presumably building relationships, or fixing their problem – which is a Management by Exception behaviour), and have little time, subordinates need to be self-sufficient. This would reinforce the view in the literature that subordinates of Transformational leaders are inspirationally motivated and psychologically empowered by their leader and are more self-sufficient in their leadership needs (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Chiang & Jang, 2008).

Finally, the cross-cultural nature of this research may have yielded problems in the results. It has been argued by Scandura and Dorfman (2004) that national culture may affect perceptions and acceptability of leadership to subordinates. This view reinforces Testa's (2002, 2004, 2009) findings in the Cruise-Ship Industry. Scandura and Dorfman (2004) further argue that the concepts measured by Transformational leadership may not exist in different countries and that the theory is applicable only in Anglo-Western countries. The perceived universality of charisma in each culture led Bass (1985) and House & Aditya (1997) to disagree with this sentiment and addressed this issue in their earlier research. As such, this may have implications for the design of cross-cultural, trans-national research projects.

CONCLUSION

Previous findings about sex roles and leadership preferences highlighted in the management and psychological literature (Bass & Bass, 2008; House & Aditya, 1997) have been shaken by this research. Males appear to be rising to the challenge and adopting a more Transformational role, or are they? Perhaps Melburnia, like her mother Britannia, is developing a more traditionally masculine persona (Vandenbroeck, 2010) while adapting to a changing environment in order to survive (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004; Hall, 2002; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). This area of investigation may be investigated in the future.

Limitations and Future Research

As was noted in Table 1, very few studies have been undertaken in the Hospitality Industry using the Transactional and Transformational leadership theories. Further research is required in order to make meaningful judgements as to the suitability of its implementation within hotels. This study was contextually confined and in order to generalise the results, studies should be undertaken in hotels of various standing and other intra-industry sector organisations such as restaurant chains and commercial conference and catering venues.

A substantial limitation upon this study was the industry's disenchantment with permitting a peer-assessed leadership questionnaire to be distributed. As was mentioned in the methodology section, time constraints and associated labour costs were of concern. In order to assess leadership from a more holistic perspective, however, the peer rated version of the MLQ must be used. This would require the substantial support and engagement from the industry, particularly if the issues raised by TTF Australia (2008) (c.f. Introduction) are to be appropriately addressed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

collect the data that has been analysed in this paper. For more information about the Australia Awards please visit http://www.AustraliaAwards.gov.au.

REFERENCES

Austrade. (2009). Crunch time - what does the global financial crisis mean for Australia? 5 Jan 2010. Retrieved 23 February, 2010, from http://www.austrade.gov.au/What-does-the-global-financial-crisis-mean-for-Australia/default.aspx

Australian Government - DRET. (2009). *National long-term tourism strategy* (pp. 12). Canberra, ACT: Australian Government.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Barbuto, J., Fritz, S., Matkin, G., & Marx, D. (2007). Effects of gender, education, and age upon leaders' use of influence tactics and full range leadership behaviors. *Sex Roles, 56*(1), 71-83. doi: 10.1007/s11199-006-9152-6

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

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45*(1), 5-34. doi: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.1996.tb00847.x

Bass, B. M., & Bass, R. (2008). The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brownell, J. (2010). Leadership in the service of hospitality. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 51*(3), 363-378. doi: 10.1177/1938965510368651

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Carless, S. A. (1998). Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Roles, 39*(11), 887-902. doi: 10.1023/a:1018880706172

Chiang, C.-F., & Jang, S. (2008). The antecedents and consequences of psychological empowerment: The case of Taiwan's hotel companies. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 32*(1), 40-61. doi: 10.1177/1096348007309568

Erkutlu, H. V. (2008). The impact of transformational leadership on organizational and leadership effectiveness: The Turkish case. *Journal of Management Development, 27*(7), 708-726. [DOI: 10.1108/02621710810883616].

Fugate, M., Kinicki, A. J., & Ashforth, B. E. (2004). Employability: A psycho-social construct, its dimensions, and applications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 65*(1), 14-38. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2003.10.005

Fyall, A., & Spyriadis, A. (2003). Collaborating for growth: The international hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management, 10*(2), 108-123.

Gilbert, D., & Guerrier, Y. (1997). UK Hospitality managers past and present. *The Service Industries Journal, 17*(1), 115-132. doi: 10.1080/02642069700000006

Gill, A. S., Flaschner, A. B., & Shachar, M. (2006). Mitigating stress and burnout by implementing transformational-leadership. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 18*(6), 469-481. [DOI: 10.1108/09596110610681511].

Hall, D. T. (2002). *Careers in and out of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). A theoretical and empirical examination of the transactional and non-leadership dimensions of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*(5), 501-513. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.001

Hinkin, T. R., & Tracey, J. B. (1994). Transformational leadership in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 18*(1), 49-63. doi: 10.1177/109634809401800105

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management, 23*(3), 409-473. doi: 10.1177/014920639702300306

Krüger, C., Rowold, J., Borgmann, L., Staufenbiel, K., & Heinitz, K. (2011). The discriminant validity of transformational and transactional leadership: A multitrait-multimethod analysis of and norms for the German Transformational Leadership Inventory (TLI). *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 10*(2), 49-60. doi: 10.1027/1866-5888/a000032

Lapperman, S. (2009). *Gold Coast hit hardest by tourism job losses* 5 Jan 10. Retrieved 23 February, 2010, from http://www.goldcoast.com.au/article/2009/11/26/162701_tourism-news.html

Lub, X., Bijvank, M. N., Bal, P. M., Blomme, R., & Schalk, R. (2012). Different or alike?: Exploring the psychological contract and commitment of different generations of hospitality workers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 24*(4), 553-573. [DOI: 10.1108/09596111211226824].

Morrow, P. C., Suzuki, Y., Crum, M. R., Ruben, R., & Pautsch, G. (2005). The role of leader-member exchange in high turnover work environments. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(8), 681-694. [DOI: 10.1108/02683940510631444].

Muenjohn, N., & Armstrong, A. (2008). Evaluating the structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), capturing the leadership factors of transformational-transactional leadership. *Contemporary Management Research, 4*(1), 3-14.

NLTS Steering Committee. (2009). *The Jackson Report on behalf of the Steering Committee: Informing the national long-term tourism strategy*. In M. Jackson (Ed.). Canberra, ACT: Australian Government.

Ong, A. D., & Weiss, D. J. (2000). The Impact of Anonymity on Responses to Sensitive Questions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(8), 1691-1708. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2000.tb02462.x

Parry, K. W. (1998). The new leader: A synthesis of leadership research in Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 5*(4), 82-105. doi: 10.1177/107179199900500408

Patiar, A., & Mia, L. (2009). Transformational leadership style, market competition and departmental performance: Evidence from luxury hotels in Australia. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(2), 254-262. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.09.003

Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(4), 612-624. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.612

Scandura, T., & Dorfman, P. (2004). Leadership research in an international and cross-cultural context. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(2), 277-307. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.004

Scott-Halsell, S., Shumate, S. R., & Blum, S. (2007). Using a model of emotional intelligence domains to indicate transformational leaders in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, *7*(1), 99-113. doi: 10.1300/J171v07n01_06

Sellgren, S., Ekvall, G., & Thomson, G. (2007). Nursing staff turnover: Does leadership matter? *Leadership in Health Services, 20*(3), 169-183. [DOI: 10.1108/17511870710764023].

Testa, M. R. (2002). Leadership dyads in the cruise industry: The impact of cultural congruency. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *21*(4), 425-441. doi: 10.1016/s0278-4319(02)00036-1

Testa, M. R. (2004). Cultural similarity and service leadership: A look at the cruise industry. *Managing Service Quality, 14*(5), 402-413. [DOI: 10.1108/09604520410558001].

Testa, M. R. (2009). National culture, leadership and citizenship: implications for cross-cultural management. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(1), 78-85. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.04.002

Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1994). Transformational leaders in the hospitality industry. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, *35*(2), 18-24. doi: 10.1177/001088049403500213

Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1996). How transformational leaders lead in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *15*(2), 165-176. doi: 10.1016/0278-4319(95)00059-3

Tracey, J. B., & Hinkin, T. R. (1998). Transformational leadership or effective managerial practices? *Group & Organization Management*, *23*(3), 220-236. doi: 10.1177/1059601198233002

TTF Australia. (2008). *Project X*. Sydney: Tourism and Transport Forum Australia.

Vandenbroeck, P. (2010). Unrealistic expectations prevent women in the Netherlands from reaching the top: "Act like a man, but don't show it!" 17 February 2010. Retrieved 23 February, 2010, from http://www.20-first.com/806-0-unrealistic-expectations-prevent-women-in-the-nertherlands-from-reaching-the-top.html

Vecchio, R. P., & Boatwright, K. J. (2002). Preferences for idealized styles of supervision. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(4), 327-342. doi: 10.1016/s1048-9843(02)00118-2

Whitelaw, P. A., & Morda, R. (2004). Leadership in the hospitality industry: Boadecia vs. Attila - bring it on! *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 11*(2), 139-148.

Wong, L. (2000). *Generations apart: Xers and boomers in the Officer Corps*. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.