HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT

a brief introduction

ROY C. WOOD

7

CAN I SPEAK TO WHOEVER'S IN CHARGE? THE ROLE OF MANAGEMENT IN HOSPITALITY

After reading this chapter, you should:

(a) understand the kind of research that has been conducted into the nature and functions of management in the hospitality industry;

(b) comprehend the significance of the particular content of managerial roles in hospitality including reasons for general variations in the career trajectories of male and female managers; and

(c) have gained insight into the nature of managerial rewards in the sector.

Introduction

> Myths abound in management, for example that senior managers sit on 'top' (of what?), that leaders are more important than managers (try leading without managing), and that people are human resources (I am a human being). (Mintzberg, 2012: 4)

Despite over a century of research generating many useful insights (and a lot of flannel) we are no closer to obtaining definitive answers as to what is 'good' management. One might argue, following that luminary of management theory Henry Mintzberg (2004), that the proper subject of 'management' is what managers do, what they think, how they operate. In this chapter we will review what is known from research studies about management (touching briefly also on leadership) in the hospitality industry. The chapter concludes with a brief consideration of managerial salaries, employing the UK as a case, and a short reflection on the status of hospitality managers.

Becoming and Being a Manager in Hospitality

Most research on managerial work in the hospitality industry focuses on *hotel management* roles (Wood, 1994b). People come to hotel management careers via three principal routes (Baum, 1989): formal hotel school training; training for management within the industry after starting either in craft positions or being given a traineeship; and via an early career in another industry followed by late entry into the hotel industry. Those who commit themselves to a hotel and catering career early on rarely leave the industry. Baum (1989) found that two-thirds of his sample of Irish hotel managers had no working experience outside the hotel industry, a trend confirmed by Guerrier (1987) in the context of British hotel managers. Ladkin (2002: 386) found a high degree of managerial mobility within the Australian hotel industry, but little mobility out of and back into the industry: 75.6% of respondents had never worked in a different industry, against 24.4% who had.

Most senior hotel managers obtain their appointments at a relatively early age (Commission on Industrial Relations, 1971). Formal qualifications do not seem to affect either position on entry or promotion prospects and career patterns (Guerrier, 1987; Baum, 1989). In their study of UK managers, Riley and Turam (1988) argue that vocational education and time spent working in the industry gaining experience are alternative uses of time that make little difference to long-term prospects. Harper et al. (2005: 55–56) in a study of Scottish hotels of over 50 rooms found that:

> Managers without a formal qualification, on average reached their first position as hotel general manager at the age of 28 years and one month, marginally sooner than their qualified counterparts, who were 29 years and four months. Excluding time spent at college/university the qualified manager took a mean nine years and two months to reach a general management position, with the actual times ranging from five to 18 years. The unqualified manager by comparison took an average 11 years and ten months to reach the same position with the actual times taken ranging from seven to 21 years.

These authors further found that one-third of their sample disagreed or strongly disagreed with the view that formal qualifications were integral to a manager's career development in hospitality with only 57% of older managers (over 35 years old) agreeing with this statement compared to 72% of younger managers. In her sample of Australian general managers, Ladkin (2002: 383) found that some 52% of respondents were without a vocational education, a factor she attributes to the relative youth of vocational hospitality education in Australia when compared to Europe.

Positional and unit mobility is a crucial factor in the development of a junior manager and can be similarly important once the position of general manager has been achieved. The first part of a manager's career is likely to find him or her in a very junior position. In the UK, Guerrier (1987) found that assistant managers gained seniority usually by acquiring functional responsibility for a department, often in

what would be called today the rooms division, and in food and beverage. As we have previously noted, experience in both (but especially the latter) has traditionally been seen as necessary to advancement. In her Australian study, Ladkin (2002: 385; see also Ladkin and Juwaheer, 2000) found that 40.9% of her general manager sample had prior experience in food and beverage and some 22% in front office; a very low number had prior experience in housekeeping, accounting, human resource management and marketing. Managers' experience is gained through multiple positions, often in numerous units. More specifically, junior managers move frequently between hotels, 'collecting' experience of both specific functions and different types of hotel. Both Guerrier (1987) and Riley and Turam (1988) found mobility a crucial feature of management career development and this appears to be true of the USA as well (Nebel et al., 1994). In Riley and Turam's (1988) study, some 43% of career moves examined involved a change of company, with the change to hotel (general) manager involving a change of company in 41% of cases.

The attainment of the general manager (GM) position in a hotel rarely means an end to mobility. Guerrier (1987) found that the average age of attaining a general manager position was 30, but this was often to a smaller hotel within the company – the pattern to promotions seems to be appointment to a small unit and subsequently – to use Guerrier's naval metaphor – to larger and more prestigious ships in the line. Harper et al. (2005) identified 29 as the average age at which Scottish general managers assumed their first role and Peacock (2012) reports that in the Malmaison and Hotel du Vin group of hotels, 75% of managers are under 35. In many countries, however, more conservative standards seem to operate in respect of the suitable age for promotion to general manager. Birdir (2002) in a study of Turkish hotels found the average age of general managers to be 42, with 33 as the average age of their first managerial role.

It is therefore unsurprising that many managers change company to gain a unit manager's post since mobility offers opportunities to 'short circuit' traditional patterns of promotion. Stalcup and Pearson (2001: 17) note that during the 1980s and 1990s lodging industry managerial turnover was estimated in the US to be as high as 46%. In their own study, these authors found that the greatest stimulus to turnover was career and financial advancement (Stalcup and Pearson, 2001: 23). Veller (2007) with a sample size of 60 global hotel general managers found that from a first entry level position to general manager took on average 14.75 years in North America, 15.8 years in Europe, and 16.5 years in Asia. Persons entering as management trainees took 14.8 years on average to become a GM, with the figures of 15.3 and 16.5 applying to rooms division and food and beverage respectively. The majority of GMs had entry level positions in food and beverage (40%) but this was more pronounced among Europeans whereas in America the rooms division route was a more sure way to a general manager post. Ladkin and Riley (1996) found the average number of years taken to attain a GM role in the UK was 12.2 and in a later study Ladkin (2002: 383) found that the figure for Australian hotel general managers was 12.6 years.

What do hospitality managers do?

It has long been recognized that hospitality managers have substantial freedom in the running of their units. Nailon (1968) found that British hotel managers engaged in a much larger number of activities than counterparts in other industries, spending considerable time in direct supervision of staff, contact with customers and continuous monitoring of their unit through brief contacts with personnel and regular movement about the establishment. Fifteen years later, the UK Education and Training Advisory Council (1983) found that over half the managers in their sample were frequently or sometimes involved in these activities as well as, at times, food preparation, cooking and service. The discretion granted to managers in the control of their units may be moderated by a number of factors. Pickworth and Fletcher (1980) found that restaurant food service managers in medium sized companies had more discretion than managers of smaller and larger companies but this latitude for control was heavily operational in nature. Managers enjoyed most discretion in the area of determining staffing requirements and had considerable autonomy to allow complimentary meals and the establishment of inventory levels.

There is a strong tradition in hospitality – hotels in particular – of senior managers being action oriented in their management practice that is, physically mobile within their unit and, to marshal two clichés, 'hands on' and 'walking the talk'. The roots of this approach lie in the Germanic or Swiss-Germanic notion of 'mein host' in which the proprietor or manager of a hotel or restaurant is always visibly in evidence and engaged in greeting and meeting guests. Guerrier and Lockwood (1989: 84) note that:

> The traditions of hotel management emphasise the hotel manager as the person who is always around to greet guests as they arrive. The Victorian hotelier was almost like a host welcoming a guest into his own home … the 'greeting' and 'being there' aspects of the role remain important.

Such traditions still persist. Cullen and McLaughlin (2006: 514) found that hotel managers are highly conscious that they are perceived as the public face of the hotel and that they offer 'brand value' in being continually present. Guerrier and Lockwood (1989: 85) found that managers expressed a preference for active management and disliked the 'sitting behind a desk' aspects of their job and doing paperwork. They write that managers:

> saw their jobs very clearly in terms of being out and about in the hotel. This very often involved working long hours – an average of 12–14 hours a day was not seen as unusual and with very few and irregular days off, if any. Rather than seeing this as a potential source of dissatisfaction, they saw it more as perfectly normal for the industry.

Similarly, Worsfold (1989: 150) quotes a respondent to the effect that:

> It's pointless the general manager sitting behind his desk all day, he needs to be out and about encouraging his staff. … If he's going to be stuck in an office all day then he's going to be away from that team and not know what's going on in his hotel.

More recently, Waryszak and King (2001) found that managers least enjoyed desk work so the peripatetic 'being there' (now normally labelled as 'presenteeism') culture of managers in hotels is fortuitously self-serving. Despite, as Baum (1989) notes, there being little evidence to show that 'being there' styles of management are costed relative to the benefits which may accrue from them, getting involved in basic operative work – even if this involves encouraging managers to be 'downwardly mobile' in their activities – tends to invite the respect rather than disapprobation of peers and other employees (Guerrier, 1987; Guerrier and Lockwood, 1989). Guerrier and Lockwood (1989: 86) further note that:

> Having sorted out the immediate problem … the manager does not pause to analyse the problem but passes on to the next operational crisis. The hotel culture sees this activity based behaviour as the 'right way' and will reward it with praise and career progression, so passing the approach higher up the organization.

'Being there' styles of management encourage the use of informal communication between management and operatives and a paternalistic and authoritarian (or at least directive) approach to staff. In Guerrier and Lockwood's (1989) study managers saw the development and care of their staff as a central part of their role whereas staff saw management as being rather critical, autocratic and controlling. Cullen and McLaughlin (2006: 514) found that hotel managers believed they had a clear duty to provide emotional support for their staff with some of their respondents estimating that they spent up to 40% of their time 'counselling' staff members, despite not being trained to do this. Interestingly, the 'being there' culture that prevails in hotels and other hospitality organizations is not necessarily what corporate level management *believes* is going on in a company's units. Hales and Nightingale (1986: 9) found that:

> Senior/head office staff expectations of unit managers seem to be predominantly focused on tasks, rather than activities, upon what the unit manager should achieve rather than what he should actually do ... and reflect a concern for broad organisational objectives in the areas of standards, customers, staffing and finance.

Further, Umbreit (1986: 56) observes:

> Traditionally, the hotel industry has had a strong operational orientation with concern primarily focused on short-term results. Hotel managers have been

evaluated on profitability measures and control of expenses. Additional criteria, if any, have included a list of key traits not necessarily related to job performance.

In a subsequent study, Umbreit and Eder (1987) developed a list of 14 performance measures which managers themselves felt they ought to be assessed against (see Figure 7.1). Magnini and Honeycutt (2003: 268) writing some 15 years later on the topic of expatriate managers observe that:

> Numerous indicators of a manager's technical competence exist in the hotel industry. A proven track record of maximizing revenue per available room (REVPAR), exceeding budgeted P&L goals, and achieving favourable guest satisfaction scores are recognized measures of technical competence.

- Guest comments on product experience cards
- Market share attained – the percentage of room nights achieved by a hotel relative to the total available in the market
- Room nights sold in a given period
- Reduction of labour turnover in a given period compared to a previous period
- Budget control – the extent to which budgets are achieved and income and expenditure reconciled
- Food and beverage profit attainment
- Rooms profit attainment
- Employee complaints and grievances – the extent to which these are reduced in a given period relative to a previous period
- Training attainments of employees – the number of employees achieving completion of training courses in a given period
- Collection of receivables
- Number of leadership positions held in the wider community by the manager
- Hotel ratings – by independent organizations
- Health and safety record, i.e. reduction of accidents in a period relative to earlier periods
- Adherence to productivity standards by employees

Figure 7.1   Performance measures against which hotel managers believe they should be measured

Source: Umbreit and Eder, 1987.

Many studies of what hospitality managers do have been conducted using the 10 managerial role categories identified by Mintzberg: figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesperson, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator and negotiator (for readers unfamiliar with Mintzberg's work, see Chareanpunsirikul and Wood (2002) for a brief summary in the context of hospitality management). Their findings again point to the reactive nature of managers in hospitality services. Ferguson and Berger (1984: 30) observed nine restaurant managers using a modified version of Mintzberg's schema and found that they spent an enormous amount of time on a variety of contacts – telephone calls (13%), unscheduled (35%) and

scheduled (29%) meetings, and 'tour' meetings (those initiated as a result of touring the unit) (6%). For each hour of a normal working day, there were, on average, 10 of these contacts. Desk sessions accounted for 17% of the restaurant managers' time. We can conclude this discussion by citing Ferguson and Berger's (1984: 30) comment that pithily captures the nature of much hospitality managerial work:

> Mintzberg described executives' activities as brief, fragmented, and reactive. The restaurant operators' activities in this study seem even further from the textbook description of a planner, organizer, coordinator, and controller than did those in the Mintzberg sample. Planning seems to have been eclipsed by reacting; organizing might be better described as simply carrying on; coordinating appears more like juggling; and controlling seems reduced to full-time watching.

In concluding this section of the discussion we can note how the factors considered reflect the operational imperatives of managerial roles in hospitality, indeed how the very nature of hotel management work is confined within an operational framework to the apparent extent of precluding measures of managerial performance based on creative general contribution and future potential.

A note on leadership

The quest to find the 'secrets' of leadership is a defining feature of a century-plus of management research. Put crudely management plus 'x' equals leadership. The problem is that there are, as one would expect given human variability, many different forms of 'x' most largely dependent on context. It is not even clear why leadership is important – or indeed if it is important. Robbins (1992: 151-152) makes the point that:

> Leadership may not always be important. Data from numerous studies collectively demonstrate that, in many situations, whatever behaviours leaders exhibit are irrelevant. Certain individual, job, and organizational variables can act as substitutes for leadership, negating the formal leader's ability to exert either positive or negative influence over subordinate attitudes and effectiveness.

Common in contemporary approaches to the study of leadership is the desire to have one's cake and eat it. Thus leadership often appears as both a process and a property (Moorhead and Griffin, 1989: 322). As a process, leadership involves the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate people. As a property, it is a quality attributed to those who appear able to exert this influence successfully. The key phrase here is 'non-coercive' for most popular definitions of leadership emphasize that leaders are able to inspire others to 'follow' them without resorting to the formal structures of authority attendant on the role of manager. From this are

derived the familiarly aphoristic views that a manager is not always a leader, and that leaders are defined to some extent by the presence of followers.

Those interested in the current status of leadership research in the hospitality industry could do worse than consult Boyne's (2010) masterly review but they should expect to be disappointed. Leadership research in hospitality is neither extensive nor systematic and the findings of studies frequently differ. We can illustrate these differences in the context of two studies utilizing Mintzberg's managerial roles. In a small-scale study of seven American managers of a single company, Ley (1980) observed the work of management personnel and classified their activities according to Mintzberg's schema. Following from this, the ratings of managers' effectiveness as perceived by corporate superiors were obtained. Two managers were graded highly effective, three effective and two less effective. The grades were then compared to the role ratings. Ley argues that the highly effective managers allocated *less* time to the leadership role than the two less effective managers, and more time on entrepreneurial activities than managers with lower effectiveness ratings. In a much larger study of American general managers, Arnaldo (1981) secured 194 responses involving self-classification of activities according to Mintzberg's model and a note of the time spent on each plus a rating of the importance of individual roles. No corporate ratings of effectiveness were available here but it is worth noting that in terms of time allocated, the most important roles were leader, disseminator and monitor while in terms of importance they were leader, entrepreneur and monitor.

In contrasting the findings of the two studies, we can observe, first, that in Ley's study there is the hint of a suggestion that an 'objective' or at least external, assessment of the roles performed by managers leads to an outcome suggestive of superiors attaching value to roles other than leadership. Secondly, where managers self-classified the various managerial roles as in Arnaldo's research, then leadership was viewed as the most important role and was the role managers most spent time on. This possibly suggests that managers believe they are, or should be seen (by superiors and others) to be operating in the leadership role. A third point here is that Mintzberg's model of managerial roles depicts leadership as one component of a broad skill-practice set. This is perhaps ill-suited to modern times where an almost obsessive preoccupation with the 'need' for leadership detracts from other desirable qualities. Arnaldo's managers seem in keeping with this *zeitgeist* – so possibly were Ley's, we shall never know, but the researcher's intervention in employing his own judgement as to the roles performed and comparing them to third party performance ratings challenges reliance upon subjective managerial assessments as to the nature of their work.

In these two simple studies we can observe some of the difficulties involved in assessing the nature and quality of leadership. If there is something we can call 'leadership', is it a skill or some other kind of quality? How do we judge when leadership is 'present', as opposed to effective management – and more importantly, who makes these judgements? Contemporary obsessing over the need for leadership has, as Eric McNulty (2013: 17), Director of Research of the US National Preparedness Leadership Initiative, observes, led to 'a proliferation of leader labels

and a gutting of the understanding of what it actually means to be a leader'. An instance of this phenomenon might be the term 'thought leader', a concept suggestive of monumental immodesty, often self-evidently inaccurate and normally applied to 'motivational' speakers of one kind or another. McNulty (2013: 18) is firmly in the Mintzberg camp seeing management and leadership as complementary skills, leadership being differentiated from management by the clear presence of followers. To this we can add that while we remain uncertain of the value of leadership, we should not exaggerate its importance among the wider repertoire of management skills.

Women Managers

Women managers in hospitality have attracted research attention not least because higher education courses in hospitality have attracted a greater proportion of women than men yet few women make it to senior management positions in the industry. As long ago as the 1990s Brownell (1994: 112) noted that although just as many women graduate from hospitality management programmes as men, they leave the industry at up to three times the rate of their male counterparts. Walmsley (2011: 36) reports that some 67.5% of UK hospitality students are female compared to 57% in the total UK student population. Yet, the number of female general managers (or women holding more senior corporate roles) in hospitality remains much smaller than would be suggested by the number of women graduating from college each year and entering the industry. Walker (2011) states that only 12% of UK company directorships are held by women, dropping to 6% in the hospitality sector. Research into the role of women hotel managers suggests that the relative absence of females from general manager positions is a global phenomenon (see, for example, Li and Wang Leung, 2001; Ng and Pine, 2003; Kattara, 2005).

It has long been established that gender differences in rearing and education orient girls to careers which involve an extension of male-defined roles for women – usually entailing caring and nurturing. Similarly, general reasons that explain the lack of progress of women in business apply to the hospitality sector (see Brownell, 2013, for a recent short summary). These are:

1. the 'channelling' of women away from roles, positions and career paths that would facilitate progress to senior positions;

2. explicit and implicit discrimination against women, both from male co-workers and as institutionalized within the organization in the form of, *inter alia*, inhospitable corporate culture; social exclusion from informal power and communication networks; lack of mentoring; and lack of appropriately planned career development; and

3. women's own attitudes, aspirations, career decisions and experiences relative to traditional career paths to general management in hospitality.

Before briefly examining each of the above in turn, we consider the role of women managers in hospitality.

What do women managers manage?

Research into what women managers do in hospitality is very clear in its implications. In the commercial sector, women managers tend not to be found in operations departments from which the route to general manager and other senior positions is most easily accessed. The exception to this is housekeeping, which despite its operational nature is, in western countries at least, more defined by the fact that it is viewed as a 'women's department' (see Guerrier, 1986). Otherwise women tend to be found in lower status 'support' departments, e.g. sales and marketing (Hackett, 1981; Hotel and Catering Industry Training Board, 1984; Guerrier, 1986). Purcell (1993: 131–136) reported research showing women comprised 94% of house-keepers; Walker (2011) found 95% of UK housekeepers were women, 61% were personnel and training managers, 18% general managers and 5% food and beverage managers. This last statistic is significant for as we have noted on multiple occasions, mobility and experience of food and beverage and accommodation/front of house management are necessary in order to achieve general manager positions.

Channelling

A range of factors contribute to the occupational and hierarchical segmentation of women managers in the hospitality industry. 'Channelling' is a difficult phenomenon to define not least because the forces behind it are often hazy and informal and part of a wider network of socially discriminating values and practices. A UK Hotel and Catering Industry Training Board (HCITB) (1984) report found that the majority of women on hotel and catering management courses expressed considerable interest in a career in operational management but were relatively rarely offered opportunities for this kind of training by their employer. Indeed, some women managers received no training at all and those that did, had done so in sales, marketing and personnel. This is suggestive of direct interventions by organizations to focus women into support roles. We should not be surprised by this – disgusted, but not surprised. Even in the twenty-first century it is still common to hear male educators and male hospitality managers rehearsing the hoary old platitude that there is little point in putting women into operational roles because eventually they will leave, get married and have children. The same HCITB report noted that both male and female students had similar aspirations concerning the post they would hold five years after leaving college, but women had lower expectations of their employment prospects upon graduation – which for the most part appear to have been realized. Formal channelling may also be present before women select their university course of study. Guerrier (1986) noted that many women chose to study hospitality management because it represented a resolution of pressures in the form of interest in management with interest in the traditionally female field of domestic science

and cookery. Guerrier argues that women are misled in their career choices and not told of the extent of either the general or industry-specific discrimination they will face. When the extent of discrimination and lack of opportunity *is* discovered, many withdraw from hospitality employment altogether or limit their aspirations, resigning themselves to lower levels of achievement.

A related 'channelling' phenomenon concerns the conventional role of hotel manager which, as Guerrier (1986) observes, is carried out in a semi-social setting, often leading to promotion decisions being affected by what she calls 'extrafunctional variables', primarily, sex, race and education. For women, jobs where contact with the public is involved may be particularly problematic as: (a) male managers and clients expect women to be attractive, servile and compliant with the demands of men and (b) it is often antithetical to the strategy adopted by token women in organizations which is to become socially invisible. In the case of the first, women thus have to contend with the twin difficulties of sexism and maintaining their authority. In the case of the second, the consequences can be more severe in that women managers will forgo a more high profile career accepting low profile jobs and promotions in order to maintain their invisibility. Guerrier (1986: 235) captures this when she writes: 'Hotel companies may prefer men to women in certain management jobs because of their greater acceptability to (predominantly male) clients, as they might prefer an older man to a younger man. And a woman who is appointed to the job of hotel manager may find it harder than a man to acquire the status and credibility she needs with clients.'

Discriminating forces

The sources of direct and indirect discrimination against women in the workplace are, generally, and in the case of hospitality, numerous. Brownell (1993) surveyed 374 US women middle managers and found that they ranked 'old boy networks' as the most serious obstacle to their professional development followed by a lack of women mentors and role models, and then by quality-of-working-life issues. These often informal networks are major sources of discriminatory behaviour. Guerrier (1986) notes that career moves within the industry tend to be handled informally and managers higher in the organization may sponsor individual mobility. Since the majority of managers are men they tend to sponsor men in preference to women, with the result that women do not acquire the mobility deemed necessary for the attainment of senior positions.

For those women who wish to raise children, the relative absence of affordable and otherwise satisfactory childcare facilities is an important source of discrimination. In the commercial hospitality industry where mobility can be important in reaching senior management positions, removing oneself, however temporarily, from the workforce can be a source of missed opportunities. Necessary consideration of the needs of partners and children can be career inhibiting. Regular uprooting and relocation is not always possible, let alone conducive to a satisfactory personal life. Many surveys over the years have found that women senior managers in hospitality are,

in the majority, single and/or childless. Brownell (1994: 112) noted from her own research of a sample of hospitality organizations that one-third of women general managers were single compared to only 7% of men (see additionally HCITB, 1984).

Attitudes and aspirations of women

However cautiously one approaches discussions of the role of women's attitudes and aspirations in and beyond the workplace it is necessary to guard against the phenomenon of victim blaming as this diverts attention from sexist and other discriminatory behaviour of the kind described above. Nevertheless, it is reasonably clear that in response to the behaviours they encounter, many women managers in hospitality modify their attitudes and aspirations, lower their career advancement expectations and settle for roles more favourable to work–life balance. Underlying such adaptations, however, is evidence of the damage that discriminatory behaviour – whether experienced prior to or while working in the hospitality industry – can cause. The HCITB (1984) study cited earlier administered attitudinal tests to its women respondents and found that many shared male stereotypical views as to the nature of women as lacking in confidence to push themselves, insufficiently ambitious, more influenced by their emotions (which affected their behaviour as managers), less worthy as employees because of their physiological capacity for child-bearing and not aggressive or competitive enough.

A study by Boone et al. (2013: 12) examined senior male and female global hospitality executives and (somewhat peculiarly) argued that 'a shift has occurred in that the barriers to women's advancement are more *self-imposed* and largely involve choices they make about family and household.' This is peculiar because, as we have tried to show, this is a long-established phenomenon. Indeed, the authors' own data largely resonate with other evidence considered here. Only 7.3% of men had never been married compared to 17.8% of women (12% in the total sample). Some 76.4% of male respondents had never been divorced compared to 42.2% (61% in the whole sample). More importantly, Boone et al. (2013: 6) note that in regard to childcare arrangements: 'male executives rely more heavily on their spouses, while the female executives rely more heavily upon school or day care and extended family.' The Boone et al. (2013) study makes many positive suggestions about how organizations can be better structured to facilitate female careers while, however, not exploring very much the reasons behind women's 'self-imposition' of limitations to career advancement.

A Note on Managerial Salaries

We saw in Chapter 3 that, allowing for cultural variations, pay and other rewards in the hospitality industry usually compare unfavourably to those in other industries. Superficially at least, the same is true of managerial salaries, at least in the UK. In 1994, independent evidence suggested that an average management salary for those in

the hospitality industry was £15,103 but around 58% of all managers earned less than this (NTC/Bacon and Woodrow, 1995). McBride (2012: 19) reports his company's 2011 general-industries salary and benefits data and comments that 'the perception of the hospitality industry as being low-waged as a whole has some substance'. He notes that median rates for corporate and management roles in the general labour market compared to the hospitality sector reveal that median rates in hospitality were lower than national rates in 57% of roles and higher in only 30%.

More recently Peacock (2012) cites a spokesperson for the Malmaison and Hotel du Vin group of hotels as quoting GM salaries of between £70,000 and £100,000 but the Berkeley Scott (2013) *Hospitality and Leisure Salary Survey 2013* (http:// www.berkeley-scott.co.uk/2013-hospitality-and-leisure-salary-survey, last accessed 03.04.13) suggests that these are possibly exceptional. The survey found that:

- For 19 out of 21 roles examined in England, salaries in London were higher than elsewhere.

- Hotel general managers averaged £85,000 in London, £60,000 in the southwest and southeast and £58,000 in the Midlands and north.

- Hotel food and beverage managers averaged £38,000 in London, £27,000 in the southeast, £24,000 in the southwest and £24,000 in the Midlands and north.

- Hotel head housekeepers averaged £35,000 in London, £25,000 in the southeast and £23,000 in the southwest, Midlands and north.

- Hotel executive chefs averaged £50,000 in London, £39,500 in the southeast and Midlands, £35,000 in the southwest and £35,500 in the north.

Table 7.1 Speculative comparison of hospitality managerial job categories analysed by Berkeley Scott compared to median gross annual earnings as determined by the Office for National Statistics

	Number/percentage of Berkeley Scott job categories in England with average annual salary falling below the national average of £26,500			
	Hotels (no. of job categories = 21)		Restaurants (no. of job categories = 13)	
Region	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
London	7	33	7	54
Southeast	16	76	8	62
Southwest	17	81	8	62
Midlands	16	76	8	62
North	16	76	8	62

Berkeley Scott note that in the restaurant sector, branded restaurants tended to offer salaries towards the lower end of the ranges observed.

According to the Office for National Statistics (2012): 'For the year ending 5 April 2012 median gross annual earnings for full-time employees (who had been in the same job for at least 12 months, including those whose pay was affected by absence) were £26,500, an increase of 1.4% from the previous year.' Although not directly comparable (the Berkeley Scott data pertain to the first quarter of 2013) of the 21 job categories reviewed for the five areas examined the number in each which fall below the national average salary is as shown in Table 7.1.

Concluding Remarks

Given the expectations of hotel managers in terms of the time spent *in situ* on the job and other pressures which they routinely face, the reward situation does not appear that favourable. However, the good news (that appears to hold true internationally) is that upon reaching the rank of unit general manager the rewards often exceed those of managers in many other industries. That in many countries GM positions can be attained at a relatively youthful age means that those who can survive several years of the kind of work described earlier can look forward to generous rewards – and generous responsibilities! Far less positive is the observation noted earlier by Riley and Turam (1988) and others that vocational education and time spent working in the industry gaining experience are alternative uses of time that make little difference to long-term career prospects. This raises the question of why anyone would want to study hospitality management at college. While much more categorical information is required as to the (financial) benefits of formal qualifications in the field, there is more than a suggestion in some research that the possession of qualifications makes little difference to earnings. For example, Bañuls and Ramón Rodríguez (2005: 128-129) write: 'Returns on education in the tourism sector are lower than in other service sectors in Spain. This lower valuation of the workers' level of education in the tourism sector contrasts with the results obtained from other studies of all Spanish workers, which demonstrate that the elasticity of the general education–earnings ratio is double that of the Spanish tourism sector.' (Thrane, 2010, offers a somewhat contrary view.) Also pertaining to Spain, Marchante et al. (2007) found no evidence that 'overeducated' workers gained better jobs from their initial entry position and inferred that many were therefore 'trapped' leading *inter alia* to moves to other sectors. A recent report for the UK Council for Hospitality Management Education (CHME) by Walmsley (2011: 36) showed that six months after graduating, hospitality students were as likely to be in graduate as non-graduate level employment although for those in small or medium sized enterprises there was a greater probability of them being in graduate level employment. In some senses this is unsurprising but it does raise questions about why expensively trained graduates in the *corporate* sector are not immediately engaged in graduate level employment (see Chapter 8).

Managerial work in the hospitality industry is demanding, requires multiple skills and abilities and at the most senior levels is usually well rewarded. As with many graduates of business and management studies courses, hospitality graduates will (if they are reasonably lucky) find themselves initially in a series of specialized or semi-specialized roles but upon attaining a general manager position will be called upon to practise a very wide range of skills whereas the majority of their business management graduate counterparts will continue in relatively narrow and specialized areas. In this respect, relatively high levels of reward are justified, as the business and moral responsibilities of hospitality unit managers are extensive. That the number of available general manager positions is relatively small goes some way to explaining the 'survival of the fittest' atmosphere that permeates, in particular, the hotel sector and inevitably contributes to driving good managers out of the industry at early stages in their career thus reducing the size and quality of the talent pool available from which to draw these senior appointments. As with so much in the sector, imminent change in the near future seems a distant prospect.

Further Reading

Brownell, J (2013) 'Women, gender and hospitality employment', in R C Wood (Ed) *Key Concepts in Hospitality Management*, London: Sage, 157–162.

Guerrier, Y (1986) 'Hotel manager: an unsuitable job for a woman?', *The Service Industries Journal*, 6, 2: 227–240.

Ladkin, A (2002) 'Career analysis: a case study of hotel general managers in Australia', *Tourism Management*, 23, 4: 379–388.

Pizam, A and Shani, A (2009) 'The nature of the hospitality industry: present and future managers' perspectives', *Anatolia – An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 20, 1: 134–150.