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The study aimed to illuminate two fields of study, that relating to work in the hospitality industry and to the wider field of managerial work. The fundamental questions to which it addressed itself were; what is the nature of managerial work in hotels? Is that work similar or different for managers in the same position in a given company? What are the determinants of that work? In terms of work in the hospitality industry the study showed that managerial work followed distinct patterns and was evenly paced, not very hectic and largely under the control of the manager. Managers spent a large percentage of their time in their offices undertaking managerial functions, particularly those concerned with information processing and control. In all these respects the work and behaviour of managers was broadly similar. To understand the determinants of this similarity it was necessary to consider managerial work within the context in which it occurred. Although managers faced direct work demands from the working situation and had limited areas of apparent discretion, the overriding influence on managerial work came from the culture and managerial strategies which dictated the context in which managerial work was performed. These were passed to each manager through the process of socialisation and effectively bound the work and behaviour of each manager within the prescribed norms of the situation.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 - this chapter provides a very brief overview of each following chapter.

Chapter 2 attempts an integration between the overall field of management studies and studies of managerial work. Studies of managerial work are shown as a sub-field within the larger area of the field of management studies.

Chapter 3 - outlines the methodologies which have been used to study managerial work and shows the influence which methodology has had upon the results and subsequent theorising.

Chapter 4 - follows a chronological study of the studies of managerial work. It shows the diversity of approach and conclusions within the area as well as outlining the areas which were in need of further development.

Chapter 5 deals with a consideration of managerial work within the hospitality industry. The chapter reviews both the research evidence and the more subjective views which have developed on the nature of work in the industry.
Chapter 6 - is concerned with the methodology of the study. It considers both the major issues which needed to be addressed in arriving at the methodology and the specific methods used.

Chapter 7 - reviews the nature of the situation in which the work was conducted in terms of the nature of the industry, the characteristics of the company, the features of the specific hotels in the study and the background of the managers involved.

Chapter 8 - gives the results of the study in terms of the demands made upon the managers from their role set, their activities in terms of time and events and their functions.

Chapter 9 shows the patterns and characteristics of managerial work in hotels and how these are seen to differ from the descriptions shown in other studies of managerial work.

Chapter 10 - is concerned with the determinants of managerial work and with placing managerial work within the context in which it occurs. In particular, it shows the nature of managerial work as being resultant upon its context.

Chapter 11 - is a summary of the conclusions of the study, showing the link between organisational culture, strategies and managerial work and the directions which might be taken in future research.
CHAPTER 2

MANAGERIAL WORK AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Knowledge needs to be understood within its social and historical context (Knorr-Cetina, 1981) and hence it is fundamental to an understanding of currently held paradigms that these are reviewed within the historical development of the field of study and of its current state. This chapter looks at how studies of managerial work fit into the systems of belief which have developed in management studies, how these have integrated and overlapped and the changing and fluid nature of the area.

This chapter aims to trace chronologically the development of management studies from a four strand base of mathematics, engineering, sociology and psychology and show its overall development with the aim of indicating how studies of managerial work integrate into the overall field of study. Although there has been a certain amount of integration of the original strands
it will be shown that the area remains highly fragmented. However, the development of the area has been fluid in nature with systems of belief integrating and overlapping with time. This is a continuing process and partly explains why it has had difficulty establishing itself as an independent discipline.

2.2 THE FIELD OF STUDY

Management studies has been a fragmented field of study which has developed through the work of sub-fields. These sub-fields have tended to progress in relative isolation from each other and have been typified by competing rather than complementary theorizing (Astley, 1984; Stewart, 1984). This has led to considerable debate as to whether management studies can be considered a clear 'scientific discipline' or whether it remains a field of study of the original four discipline strands. Strong arguments have been placed for its status as a discipline (Redding, 1984) while equally strong statements claim its status as a field of study (Hunsaker and Cook, 1986). There has been substantial debate regarding the topic (Astley, 1984; Stewart, 1984; Whitley, 1984, 1988). One of the more persuasive arguments is presented by Madge (1963), who says:

"A mature science possesses refined and systematic methods of data collection, suitable analytic tools, and an appropriate conceptual equipment .... Looming beyond them is the systematic theory that is needed to guide and understand action." (Madge, 1963, p.1)
Certainly methods of data collection in management studies have been diverse and often not highly systematic (Whitley, 1984). At the centre of the methodological debate is the divide between qualitative and quantitative research. On the one side are those who have criticised empiricism; believing that it provided only partial insights in the social sciences and caused hypotheses to become narrower with the outcome of small fragmented pieces of knowledge (Magee, 1973; Fineman and Mangham, 1983). On the other side, were those who wished management studies to produce pieces of research which were testable and subject to replication (Hofstede, 1984; Trigg, 1985). This major disagreement about the way in which the field should be approached has led to research strategies which are very differentiated and are based upon differing intellectual objectives (Whitley, 1984). The problems of methodology have led to increased fragmentation in the field and can be seen in the way in which studies of managerial work have developed.

There are two other major reasons for the fragmentation of the area, firstly historical and secondly linguistic. The historical factors lie in the fact that management studies has its origins in a number of other disciplines; sociology, psychology, mathematics and engineering. Sociologists have taken an interest in the work of organisations particularly since the work of Weber (1947), while psychologists such as Munsterberg were working on studies of selection testing and fatigue as early as 1913. The
Mathematicians brought their expertise to the area in the form of operational research which developed during the Second World War. However, the dominant influence on management studies has come from engineering, as most of the early theorists had this as their background. An outcome of this is that until very recently, those who chose to observe and comment on management studies have tended to have a first allegiance to their own specialist field and the methodologies contained therein. Whitley (1984) points out that this has led to researchers pursuing:

"a considerable range of strategies with diverse skills and procedures to establish positive reputations among a varied set of audiences whose identities, standards and concerns fluctuate considerably. Knowledge production and validation in management studies, then, is rather fragmented and disjointed." (Whitley, 1984, p. 341)

This has meant that the results from research have tended not to be cumulative and that researchers have referred back to their own disciplines for comparison and validation (Roberts et al., 1978). Only comparatively recently have researchers began to emerge who view management studies as their sole area for investigation.

The second major factor which has continued to cause fragmentation in the field are linguistic difficulties. If language determines our view of reality (Wittgenstein, 1953), then the problems of linguistics at all levels within the area
must be considered critical. At the macro level the field lacks a nomenclature. The terms management studies, organisation studies and management science have all been used to describe the overall field of study which encompasses organisations and the work of those within them. Further, within this title the word 'management' has a multiplicity of different meanings which have been interpreted in a number of different ways. In particular, the field has never been entirely clear as to whether it was undertaking studies 'of managers' or 'for managers'. Within the field the technical terms have rarely been clearly defined and are subject to widespread interpretation by both practitioners and researchers. Terms such as planning, coordination, control etc have been used in a number of differing ways in different circumstances. Overall the area has been linguistically bereft in annotating its key paradigms and concepts and this has led to widespread linguistic ambiguity. Recently there has been an increasing interest in the use of metaphors as a method by which to describe the area (Morgan, 1980, 1986; Whitley, 1988). This linguistic problem has been central in studies of managerial work where researchers have had difficulty distinguishing and defining the terms management, managerial work and managerial behaviour.

The following sections will show how studies of managerial work have developed alongside other areas of study concerned with management and how they have integrated or diverged from other views in the area. Four major themes are shown to recur
throughout the development of the field of study and each of these can be shown along a continuum. These are referred to as 'continuum concepts' and are:

i) The relative degrees of prescription and description in studies.

ii) Whether the emphasis of the study is the organisation or the individual.

iii) Whether the study concentrates on the nature of the work itself or the behaviour of individuals.

iv) Whether the theorizing and results are aimed to be situation specific or universal in perspective.

Each of the concepts is not proposed as being mutually exclusive from the others, and as one might expect in a highly fragmented field of study there has been a proliferation of viewpoints which often cross simple boundaries. The whole field is presented as one which has been essentially fluid, constantly changing and developing with no one clear point of focus. In such circumstances ideas are better shown on a continuum rather than as being relatively fixed.

2.3 PRE-1940: THE EARLY STUDIES

Although research based studies of managerial work did not emerge until the early 1950's, they owe their origins to previous work. The origins of early twentieth century management thought can be traced back to the field of engineering. The earliest writers
such as Taylor, Gantt and the Gilbreths, all had an engineering background and the influence of engineering is still evidenced in the way in which in Germany and in France management is still connected with the application of technical skills, particularly those connected with engineering (Fores and Glover, 1976).

F.W. Taylor (1947), hailed the father of scientific management, is widely attributed to be founding father of the overall field of study. His work conducted at the Bethlehem Steel works at the turn of the century began both the sub-fields of classical and scientific management. Taylor attempted through 'scientific' methods to find a better system for the completion of work tasks. His primary concern, then, was with work structuring rather than management, but he realised the necessity of adjusting management practice and organisational structure in order to achieve the results which he required. In essence, Taylor separated planning from doing (Drucker, 1955). The outcome of these Pig Iron experiments was an interest in the study of working methods and the beginnings of scientific management and this later developed into areas such as industrial engineering.

In terms of methodology Taylor was the first to adopt methods which he referred to as being 'scientific', to the study of work and although work study has been found not to be particularly suited to the study of managerial work, other areas which have developed from it, such as activity sampling and the critical incident method, have been used in some studies. Taylor's
separation of planning from doing laid a basis for the development of classical management principles and for the study of the work of managers as an independent field. Despite the criticisms which have emerged both of the outcomes of Taylorism, his methodology and conclusions (Wrege and Perroni, 1974), his work was influential on the development of methodologies for studying work and in the way in which it focused attention on work processes.

Fayol (1949) was the first major writer to be concerned specifically with the field of management and the functions of managers. He wished to lay down prescriptive principles and functions of management from which the subject could be taught in a universal manner. Fayol defined the functions of management as:

"to forecast and plan, to organise, to command, to co-ordinate and to control." (Fayol, 1949, p.5)

This has remained the overriding paradigm as to the functions of management and was the initial hypothesis that studies of managerial work directly or indirectly attempted to test. Fayol wrote from the viewpoint of the 'body corporate' rather than of the individual manager and therefore tended toward an overriding prescriptive universalism. This universalism and general classification of management has been a feature of those who have continued in the classical management tradition (Mooney and Reiley, 1938; Urwick, 1943) and it has been only since the late nineteen sixties that there has been a widespread recognition
that management practice may vary with the situation.

The nineteen thirties saw a reaction against the mechanistic approach of the classical school which emerged from the experiments conducted by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1941) at the factories of the Western Electric Company in Chicago between 1924-1932. The experiments placed an emphasis upon the informal patterns present in the workplace and the effect of leadership styles upon subsequent productivity. This became known as the human relations approach and centred its attention on managerial behaviour rather than the work or functions of managers. In this way it acted as the forerunner of many influential studies during the late 1950's and early 1960's.

The human relations school was influential upon the development of the field in the way in which it focused attention on the informal organisation and the importance of concepts such as co-ordination and communication which occur consistently throughout the work of writers such as Barnard (1938) and Parker Follett (1941). The major outcome of the Hawthorne studies was the development of a paradigm in which it was believed that the personality and behaviour of managers was the influencing factor on work productivity and hence the area most in need of study.

The early contribution from the field of sociology to the study of organisations and their management came from the work of Weber (1947). Weber's interests in this area centred on social forms
and the nature of the structures within which work was completed. As such, he outlined the characteristics of bureaucracy, power, domination and authority. In particular, Weber was interested in the description of formal organisations based upon clear divisions of work. This highly universalistic approach represented both a description of certain types of organisation and a prescription for future organisation. Max Weber's influence has dominated the field of industrial sociology. Lowe (1984) says:

"Max Weber still remains the most significant single influence on managerial thinking about organization, organizations, organizational behavior, and organizational effectiveness and efficiency." (Lowe, 1984, p.256)

The work of Weber highlighted two clear and conflicting paradigms which have run through management thought. Whereas Weber (1947) saw organisational efficiency as being dominated by the organisational form, other strands, including most studies of managerial work have seen the work which managers' undertake and managerial behaviour as the major determinant in organisational efficiency.

The period until 1940 was dominated by the work of Weber, Taylor, Fayol and the Hawthorne Experiments. Each of these offered different perspectives and developed different paradigms with regard to organisational and managerial work and behaviour. The
trend in this period was to offer universal prescriptions to management dilemmas. The diverse strands of the field had only partially overlapped or fragmented during this period, and each area was fairly distinct from the others. However, this period offered the basis on which future studies of managerial work would continue.

One of the problems facing studies of managerial work has been whether they were concerned with the study of the behaviour of managers, the work which they undertook or their functions. This problem relates back to the fundamental differences between the concerns of the scientific management school with completion of work, those of the classical theorists with the functions of managers and the human relationists with managerial behaviour. Also, the work of Weber (1947) highlights a major weakness of managerial work research in the way in which it has tended to study managerial work without consideration of the organisational context in which it occurs.

2.4 1940-1960 DEVELOPMENT AND DIVERSIFICATION

The period 1940-1960 saw the refinement and diversification of the central areas developed in the early part of the century as well as the beginnings of some new areas such as operational research and research based studies of managerial work.

The Second World War meant that attention was paid to methods of
solving complex logistical problems and this led to the development of the sub-field of operational research (Stoner, 1984). With a base in the field of mathematics this became the beginning of a sub-field within management studies which has been referred to as management science, the rational school and the decision making school. The ideas of this school of thought expanded substantially from the work of Herbert Simon (1947). During the 1950's March and Simon (1958) developed a view of organisations based on the ability of the individual as a decision maker, having the concept of 'bounded rationality' as a central theme, with the aim of describing a form of organisation which would allow for more rational forms of decision making. The 1950's and the early 1960's were the peak of the period of importance for management scientists and despite their continued usage the ideas of this field have not accrued importance since that time.

The area began to divide into a number of distinct areas during the early 1950's. In particular the division between those who were concerned with organisations, their structuring and functioning as entities and those who were more interested in the work and behaviour of individuals within these structures became better established. The work of the organisation theorists was dominated by those who tried to link technology, environment and organisation structure and their collective work became known as the socio-technical school (Trist and Bamforth, 1951; Woodward, 1958; Burns and Stalker, 1961; Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967).
studies were research based and their move away from universal prescriptions to more contingent approaches was an indication of the increasing sophistication of the area. However, their interest was primarily in the form of organisation rather than directly with managerial work.

The field concerned with the behaviour of managers in the workplace developed considerably during this period. However, it tended to concentrate on specific aspects of the managerial job. One grouping, which became known as the neo-human relationists (Maslow, 1954; Argyris, 1957; Herzberg, 1959) became interested in specific concepts of workplace behaviour such as leadership, motivation, job satisfaction etc. In general, the neo-human relationists were looking for universal prescriptions for human behaviour and their work concentrated heavily on individual workplace behaviour. They tried to represent an alternative to the more rational prescriptions of scientific management being very critical of the way in which the applications of scientific management treated people. Their emphasis was on how managers should behave, rather than on what they do.

Also, during the 1950s the school of research which concentrated on managerial work began to establish itself from the initial work of Carlson (1951). Those concerned with studies of managerial work in this early period set out to test the paradigm established by Fayol (1949) that the functions of managers were to plan, organise, command, coordinate and control. Their approach was to be more research based and more descriptive than
had been the norm with other theorists in the area. It centred on the manager’s use of time and was therefore more concerned with the work of the individual manager rather than his behaviour.

The third area of management thought which developed further during this period was a grouping which may be referred to as the ‘pragmatists’. These writers generally wrote from their own experience of managing, offered little research evidence, referred to other sources infrequently and generally used their own subjective experiences as the basis for generalisation. Not surprisingly, these were of very varied quality, but have tended to be popular with management practitioners. The work of Drucker (1955) would fit into this school and has been influential with both theorists and practitioners.

This period saw the beginnings of direct research into managerial work as a means to test the central paradigm relating to the functions of managers. Although the research was not widely embraced it did begin to offer both a challenge and a broadening to the widely accepted paradigms about the work of managers. The total field of study began to develop and diversify during this period and the amount of research undertaken began to escalate substantially, so that by the early 1960’s there was a considerable amount of previous work to which researchers and authors could refer. However, the field remained dominated by prescriptive texts which looked for universalities in organisational and individual work behaviour.
2.5 1960-1975: A PERIOD OF UNIFICATION

During this period there were some signs of unification within the field as two of the major sub-fields effectively linked and the extent and degree of overlapping in other areas made them increasingly difficult to differentiate from each other. Industrial psychology and sociology effectively joined forces under the collective name of organisational behaviour, while organisation theorists seemed to find the boundaries between themselves and those within management studies increasingly blurred. Also, as the number of studies of managerial work evolved these became increasingly concerned with managerial behaviour and the nature of managerial work.

Organisational sociology continued through the 1960's with the work of authors such as Etzioni (1961), Blau and Scott (1962), Fox (1966) and Goldthorpe et al. (1968). However, apart from work on typologies of organisations it seemed to lack a central point of focus and could be seen as overlapping substantially with organisation theory. Given that Weber acted as a partial base for both of the sub-fields this is not surprising. The field of industrial psychology similarly lost a clear boundary between itself and the work of the neo-human relationists such as McGregor, 1960 and Herzberg, 1966.

All these fields linked together at the beginning of the 1970's
under the collective name of organisational behaviour. In one of the early texts Hersey and Blanchard (1972) say that:

"Our purpose is to identify a framework which may be helpful in integrating independent approaches from these various disciplines to the understanding of human behaviour and organisation theory." (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972, p.xvii)

As well as acting as an integrating mechanism for industrial sociology and psychology, organisational behaviour also drew on the human relations movement. The new area encompassed both prescriptive and descriptive approaches in its interest in the individual in the organisation. Its advent also coincided with the development of the situational and contingency approaches to management which moved away from the all embracing theories of the classical school toward theories which were adaptable to the specific situation in which the action occurred. There was also a closing of the gap with organisational studies as the boundaries became less clear.

In organisation studies the work of the Aston group, an increasing interest in strategy and planning and the development of systems theory were the dominant aspects of this period. The Aston group (Pugh, 1969) were primarily concerned with the influence of specific elements on the structuring of organisations. Their work was research based and concerned with organisations rather than individuals. While in other areas systems theory became important in showing the interrelationships
among variables connected with organisations. Contingency and situational approaches aimed to move organisation studies toward more 'situation specific' approaches.

The management scientists became increasingly interested in long range planning and corporate strategy (Chandler, 1962; Ansoff, 1965; Ackoff, 1970). These writers laid emphasis on the importance of the planning process as the basis of effective organisational functioning and developed extensive models for the process of long term planning in organisations. The field continued to develop throughout this period but then became increasingly closely linked with the more practical approaches to organisation theory and organisational behaviour (Drucker, 1974).

Studies of managerial work in the 1960's became increasingly concerned with the characteristics of managerial work and the way in which managers spent their time as managerial functions were found difficult to identify. However, the number of studies of managerial work did increase significantly during this period even though the area continued to attract only limited attention until the work of Mintzberg (1973). Borrowing extensively from the earlier studies Mintzberg developed a ten part categorization of the roles of management which was proposed as a challenge to the paradigm developed by Fayol (1949). The Mintzberg perspective attracted widespread attention and acted to stimulate interest in the field of managerial work as well as being a link with topics in organisational behaviour.
The period from 1960-1975 acted as a period of unification. The field had been very differentiated among its four major strands since its inception at the beginning of the century. However, the proliferation of research and writing within the field during the 1950’s and 1960’s brought considerable overlap between the areas and this culminated in the emergence of organisational behaviour as an interlinking mechanism for work from industrial sociology, psychology, organisation theory and the human relationists. Therefore the period represented a 'coming together' of the various areas. However, studies of managerial work still stood on the fringe of these developments and were still unclear as to whether they were primarily concerned with the functions or behaviour of managers. Overall this was a period in which the level of prescription in the field was reduced, the emphasis was firmly placed on the behaviour of individuals in the workplace, and there was a general move along the continuum from universal to more specific prescriptions.

2.6 1975 - FRAGMENTATION

The first signs of integration which were apparent during the early 1970’s were largely still born. Although organisational behaviour continued as an important sub-field it was not able to act as an integrating mechanism for all the other areas. The effect of this has been a widespread splintering in the number of different approaches taken to the study of management. Whereas human relations acted as a unifying theme in the 1950’s and
1960's and this was similarly true of organisational behaviour in the early 1970's, the study of management has lacked any unifying focus or central interest in the 1980's. The period since 1975 has been dominated more by specific themes such as organisational culture and politics, cross cultural research and labour process studies rather than by specific schools of thought. The boundaries between organisational behaviour, management studies and organisation studies have become increasingly indistinct as the effect of the thematic approach has increasingly splintered the field.

Although organisational behaviour continued its interest in individual behaviour at work there were signs of lessening interest and redundancy in some of its central themes. Job satisfaction and motivation, for instance, have attracted less interest than previously in the study of management. Some of these areas have been interlinking with new themes such as the way in which the work of Hunt et al. (1984) has linked leadership with studies of managerial work. Of the newer themes the 1980's have seen an increasing interest in cross cultural studies and with the concept of organisational culture (Peters and Waterman, 1982). Cross cultural studies have been dominated by the extensive work of Hofstede (1984), although works such as those of Duchi (1981) and Pascale and Athos (1982) have attracted popular attention. In terms of organisational culture there have been a wide selection of readings to show the importance of culture and philosophy on organisational functioning (Morgan,
Perhaps the most unifying influence of this period is the work of the labour process school (Braverman, 1974; Clegg and Dunkerley, 1980; Storey, 1985; Knights and Willmott, 1986) in that their work crosses most of the earlier boundaries. Tending to come from a sociological background this movement is concerned with processes of control and power in organisations. This linked with those who became interested in political processes in organisations (Pfeffer, 1981), albeit from a different perspective. Their approach, although generally not research based, has been an attempt at description and sometimes offers a radical alternative to existing paradigms.

Summary

The field of management studies has developed from a four strand discipline base of mathematics, engineering, sociology and psychology. From this base it developed relatively slowly, with only a few major influential studies until the late 1950's. At this time the number of studies began to escalate rapidly and the area began to fragment into a number of differing schools of thought. The first major challenges to the early paradigms provided by Taylor (1947) and Fayol (1949) also began to appear at this time. Studies of managerial work emerged in the early nineteen fifties as a challenge to the paradigm presented by Fayol as to the work and functions of managers. The 1960's and 1970's saw some unification in the area as the human relations
stance, organisational psychology and sociology largely joined forces under the collective name of 'organisational behaviour'. However, the period since 1975 has, once again, been one of fragmentation with a number of different interests and approaches to the field.

Throughout the development of the field there have been four central continuum themes which have influenced all the major approaches and studies; whether they concerned the organisation or the individual; if the approach was essentially prescriptive or descriptive, if it concerned the nature of work or the behaviour of the role holder and whether the aim was to produce universal or specific explanations. These themes continue to recur within the field and can be seen in the development of studies of managerial work.

Studies of managerial work now represent one of the many subfields of management studies. Their origin lay essentially with the classical theorists and particularly with the work of Fayol (1949). For it was Fayol's (1949) widely accepted definition of the functions of management that most early studies attempted to challenge. However, studies of managerial work also owe a debt to the early work of Taylor for developing an approach to the study of working methods. Further, the studies overlap with the area of organisational behaviour in their mutual interest in the behaviour of managers at work. However, the differences in approach of the classical theorists and organisational
behaviourists are reflected in the confusion in studies of managerial work as to whether they are concerned with what managers do or how they do it. Also, the failure of studies of managerial work to embrace the work of those who have been more concerned with the description of the nature of organisations has led to a major area of weakness in the studies, that of studying the work of managers in isolation from the context in which it is performed.

In terms of the four continuum themes, studies of managerial work have clearly been concerned with the individual rather than the organisation, have been more interested in commenting on work rather than directly on behaviour, have tended toward a universalistic perspective and have been generally descriptive rather than prescriptive.

Studies of managerial work have been influenced also by the central concerns of the field. Firstly, the extent to which it could be called a discipline and its failure to link together its sub-fields have meant that studies of managerial work have been widely scattered and sometimes written without recourse to the wider field. Secondly, the diversity of its methodologies and central analytical tools have caused difficulties both in the methods and interpretation of research. Lastly, the lack of linguistic precision is reflected in the difficulties those working in the field of managerial work have found both in the collection of data and in the analysis of results.
Managerial work research is clearly a sub-field of management studies, however it does inherit many of the difficulties which have grown with that field of study. It is fragmented in approach and methodology, has lacked consistency in interpretation, has been subject to researchers from a variety of backgrounds with a variety of interests and has been linguistically imprecise.
CHAPTER 3

STUDIES OF MANAGERIAL WORK: METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Method and theory do not exist in isolation from each other but are necessary parts of the same process of answering questions and tackling problems. The consideration of methodologies cannot be adequately undertaken without some reference both to the theories upon which that methodology is based and to which it aspires. Problems, methods and theories form what is effectively a non-divisable trinity. In management studies, research and theory have often seemed to be somewhat divorced from one another (Dunbar, 1983) and this has also been the case in studies of managerial work where relatively few studies have successfully related empirical observation and explanatory theory. This chapter deals with critical considerations of methodologies that have been used in the study of managerial work.

Studies into the nature of managerial work have provided important insights into managerial action over the last 35 years, but have been troubled by a lack of consistent methodology and a theoretical framework within which to place the results. In many ways this mirrors the general development of both methodology and theory in the underlying field of management studies. Hence, the
development of methodologies connected to the study of managerial work has been comparatively slow and has faced a number of difficulties, many of which are typical of research problems in the social sciences. The outcome of this has been a series of studies which appear disjointed both in method and conclusion.

Table 2 outlines the five main strategies that have been devised for the study of managerial work situations and the studies in which they have been used. The main methodologies have been:

1. Observation - participant, non participant, episodic, interaction analysis.
2. Interview and Questionnaire
3. The Diary Method
4. Anecdotal Studies
5. Mixed methodologies.

Each of these has a number of critical advantages and disadvantages and more recent studies have tended to apply a mixed methodological approach to overcome some of the drawbacks of using a single method. However, the methodologies for studying managerial work are far from stabilised or entirely satisfactory and there is still a need for more studies using mixed methodologies if adequate theoretical constructions of the managerial work process are to be attained.
Table 1: Methodologies used in Studies of Managerial Work

1. Observation

A - Participant Observation - Dalton (1959), Sayles (1964), Fletcher (1973)


C - Episodic Studies - O'Neill & Kubany (1959), Kelly (1964), Marples (1967), Hinrichs (1976), Shapira & Dunbar (1980)


2. Interview and Questionnaire


3. The Diary Method


4. Anecdotal

Dimock (1945), Learned et al (1951), Copeland (1957)

5. Mixed Methodologies

3.2 OBSERVATION STUDIES

A. Participant Observation

There have been relatively few participant observation studies of managerial work, the best known being those of Dalton (1959) and Fletcher (1973). The Sayles (1964) study is included here, although Sayles is extremely vague about the methodology that he used. Dalton (1959) said that his aim in participant observation was:

"to get as close as possible to the world of managers and to interpret this world and its problems from the inside, as they are seen and felt at various points and levels." (Dalton, 1959, p.1)

The strengths of participant observation lie in the ability of the researcher to get 'close' to the material and to spend a substantial amount of time in its observation. This should lead to real insights into operational processes, and this is shown in the illuminating way in which Dalton (1959) and Sayles (1964) described political systems in organisations and subsequently improved the understanding of informal processes in managerial work. The case study approach adopted in participant observation studies, has therefore shown itself capable of developing theoretical generalisations (Bryman, 1988) which Yin (1984) described in terms of being 'analytic' rather than 'statistical'
in nature.

However, the studies show a substantial number of weaknesses. All the data gathered tends to be anecdotal leaving it open to a wide variety of interpretations. The lack of quantitative data makes any kind of replication study or data comparison difficult and these studies tend to have been more enlightening about the informal than the formal processes of organisations (Hales, 1986). Many of the weaknesses of participant observation can be shown from a comparison of the research of Dalton (1959) and Fletcher (1973). This 'case study' approach depends heavily on the ability of the researcher to interpret the data, and whereas Dalton manages to fit the action into a clear theoretical framework, Fletcher admits to being puzzled. They both fail to get close to the actions of senior managers, which is indicated in Dalton's analysis of 'the office', and Fletcher's admission that he was somewhat 'afraid' of managers. In participant observation the strengths or weaknesses of the research are likely to mirror those of the researcher more closely than with other methods as there is usually no quantitative data to stand for itself. This may explain why, coupled with the amount of research time required, this has not been a more popular method for researching managerial work.
B. Non-Participant Observation

Non-participant observation has been the most popular means by which to study managerial work. Two of the best known studies of managerial work, Carlson (1951) and Mintzberg (1973), and more recent mixed methodological studies have all used non-participant observation as a methodology. There are two essential approaches to non-participant observation, the first is more deductive so that the mode of observation is at least partially structured, and the second is a more inductive approach with the observation being conducted in an unstructured manner and the necessary categorization process developed inductively from the data. Non-participant observation allows studies to be conducted in depth and gives the researcher the opportunity to explore key issues at the appropriate time and to probe and investigate as issues emerge. The method is unique among methodologies for studying managerial work in that it allows for a continuous observation of the work process and for the study of all work activities. This methodology allows also for the simultaneous collection of both quantitative and qualitative data. The collection of some quantitative data means that more reliable comparison between sites and studies is theoretically possible, even though subsequent replication has proved difficult (Stewart, 1976; Larson, 1986).

Martinko and Gardner (1985) outline the limitations of structured observation under eight headings; sample size, reliability, coding, effectiveness, environment, theory, cognitive processes
and epistemology:

1) **Sample size** - The expense and time needed for non-participant observation has had the effect of making sample sizes small (O'Neil & Kubany, 1959; Hinrichs, 1976). This, coupled with the difficulties of using more than one researcher, has led to most studies being intensive rather than extensive and involving a very limited sample.

2) **Reliability** - O'Neil and Kubany (1959) and Martinko and Gardner (1985) both question the reliability of non-participant observation as a method. Martinko and Gardner (1985) note that:

"despite the face value of Mintzberg's research, there is really no empirical evidence that his data was either reliable or valid. Of the studies conducted after Mintzberg (1973), only Scott and Ekland (1978), Bussom et al. (1981), Larson et al. (1981) and Martinko and Gardner (1984) report reliability checks. Thus, few studies have taken steps to insure reliability, and it is plausible that much of the current descriptive literature is unreliable. Moreover, these potential reliability problems suggest that the value of comparative analyses may be limited." (Martinko and Gardner, 1985, p.687)

Thus where non-participant observation has been used as a descriptive method without the use of inferential statistics
there are some doubts as to its reliability as a method.

iii) Coding - Coding systems for recording managerial work activities and functions have proved to be consistently problematic. For instance, those who have used the best known and most used coding system for the study of managerial work, developed by Mintzberg (1973), have found a number of difficulties (Stewart, 1976; Snyder and Glueck, 1980; Kurke and Aldrich 1983; Ferguson and Berger, 1984; Martinko and Gardner, 1984). Firstly, some of the terms used by Mintzberg (1973) appeared ambiguous when applied to specific events and secondly the system was one of mutually exclusive categories so that a single event had to be placed within a single category. Those who subsequently used this method found that a simple event might easily fit into two or more categories simultaneously.

iv) Effectiveness - Hales (1986) and Stewart (1989) both noted that the non-participant observation methodology failed to differentiate between the effective and ineffective conduct of tasks. Similarly, there have been criticisms that this observation of the whole task fails to identify the key areas of activity and therefore limits the understanding of the managerial job (Marples, 1967; Hales, 1986).

v) Environment - When used in isolation from other methodologies non-participant observation has tended to lead researchers into considering the manager in relative isolation from the framework and environment in which his activities occur, giving the studies

vi) **Theory** - In terms of the development of theory several authors (O'Neill and Kubany, 1959; Pym, 1975; Stewart, 1976; Hales, 1986) note that while non-participant observation allows for the collection of data about simple managerial activities, it fails to note their functions. This has led to difficulty in understanding the functions of managers rather than their activities or the characteristics of their work.

vii) **Cognitive processes** - Non-participant observation clearly does not inform about the mental processes connected with management. As a methodology it is only capable of noting action and therefore ignores such items as expectations, intentions, beliefs, purposes etc. Mintzberg (1973), Snyder and Glueck (1980) and Stewart (1989) all comment on this as a major weakness of the methodology.

viii) **Epistemology** - Burns' (1954) comments on the epistemological weakness of diaries may equally be applied to structured observation in that the language which is available for the development of categories is highly ambiguous. Where a classification scheme is developed in advance, there are linguistic and operational difficulties in matching actions to the classifications (Marples, 1967). This also presents a problem where there is more than one observer and for replication studies.
Although giving the opportunity for the observation of all the actions of managers, the work of Martinko and Gardner (1985) and others clearly outlines a number of weaknesses of non-participant observation when it is used in isolation from other methodologies.

C. Episodic Studies

Two distinct and different methods come within this category, activity sampling and the critical incident method. The best known of the studies using activity sampling are those of Kelly (1964), Hinrichs (1976) and Whiteley (1985). Activity sampling allows for a large number of random observations to be taken of managerial activities, and gives results to which inferential statistics can be applied. The method means that replication studies should be relatively easy to complete. It is also one of the few methodologies which could be said to have emerged and be distinct to the field of management studies.

Marple (1967) and Campbell et al. (1970) both advocate the critical incident method, believing that a truer picture of managerial work can be obtained by a consideration of the critical areas of the managers' job, rather than a global picture. They note that a high proportion of the manager's time is absorbed by relatively few issues, and believe that a detailed consideration of these issues will give a more accurate picture of the essence of managerial work.
Episodic methods are subject to a number of criticisms. Activity sampling is primarily used in work study where tasks are repetitious, and may not be suited to studies, such as those of managerial work, where the job is highly fragmented and changeable in nature. This method demands that a classification scheme is developed prior to the research and these have consistently proved linguistically problematic. It also only gathers quantitative data and so much of the 'richness' associated with qualitative data may be lost. Because of this emphasis on quantitative data activity sampling only records activities and may therefore fail to explain 'why', giving a description of managers jobs only in terms of 'what' and 'how many'. From a purely mechanical point of view, if a number of managers are being observed then they must all be in close proximity to each other if the researcher is to carry out the required number of observations. The critical incident method may fail to give an overall picture of the job (Mintzberg, 1973), although it is accepted that it may give greater insight into key areas. The most obvious problem is how these key areas are chosen (Stewart, 1975) and that they may change. If the objective is to get a description of the whole of managerial work, then the critical incident method is clearly flawed.

D. Interaction Analysis

The five studies which have been included in this section are rather different in nature. Those of Silverman and Jones (1976) and Gowler and Legge (1983) were concerned with analysing the
nature and content of language used by managers as a means to establishing the nature of their work; whereas Machin's (1981,1982) studies consider the broader framework of the managers' communication patterns. Bourgoyne and Hodgson (1983, 1984) use an episodic type approach, asking managers to think aloud while they carry out certain events which is then coupled with the recall of the event at a later stage, with the aim of providing a better understanding of the reasons behind the action. Smith (1980) uses a repertory grid technique to establish the mental constructs that managers use in thinking about their work. All five represent a considerable departure from the type of methodologies used elsewhere in the study of managerial work. They have the advantage of looking in detail at a specific aspect of managerial work and this has allowed them to be innovative in approach. In particular, these studies have been illuminating in terms of their descriptions of political and social systems in organizations and have helped to establish methodologies which can be used to ascertain cognitive processes in the conduct of managerial work.

The disadvantages of these methods lay mainly in their subjectivity of approach. The interpretation of language in the studies of Silverman and Jones (1976), Gowler and Legge (1983) and Bourgoyne and Hodgson (1983, 1984) is such that they would be extremely difficult to replicate. Silverman and Jones (1976) do go to some lengths to explain this as a common problem of all methodologies in the social sciences, but what they do not
consider is 'degrees of subjectivity'. Any interpretation of language involves a very high degree of subjectivity in interpretation. Machin (1981, 1982) asks managers to describe their own communication patterns, but managers have been shown to be very bad observers of their own behaviour. Also, the methodology is so constructed that managers may have an advantage in constructing the pattern to their own benefit. All these studies only consider management in terms of a specific concept, either communication patterns or mental constructs. This means that the studies have concentrated on only one aspect of the manager's role performance and for this reason have tended not to be very enlightening about the total process of managerial work.

3.3 INTERVIEW AND QUESTIONNAIRE STUDIES

Interview and questionnaire studies have continued to be used as a method for studying managerial work throughout each decade from the 1950's onwards, reflecting the popularity of this method throughout the social sciences. Most of the studies in this section use a mailed questionnaire survey rather than an interview (Fortune Magazine, 1946; Hemphill, 1959; Mahoney et al., 1965; Inkson et al., 1970; Copeman, 1971; Pheysey, 1972; Child and Ellis, 1973; Tornow and Pinto, 1976; Allan, 1981). Only Clements (1958), Nichols and Benyon (1977) and Marshall and Stewart (1981) have used face-to-face interviews. Either method has the primary advantage over observation studies of being able to conduct extensive rather than intensive surveys. This is particularly the case with questionnaire studies which can cover
large numbers of managers without using equivalent amounts of research time. The questionnaire does give the researcher relatively easy access to the manager, and may be considered less of 'a nuisance' by managers than observation studies. They are also easy to replicate and deceptively easy to interpret, and allow for the simultaneous collection of quantitative and qualitative data. Questionnaires, and to a lesser extent interview methods, allow the researcher to collect large quantities of data in a form which lends itself to the use of inferential statistics. Lastly, questionnaires have proved themselves useful in areas which have shown themselves to be resistant to observation, both Hemphill (1959) and Tornow and Pinto (1976) used extensive questionnaires as a method by which to establish the functions of managers, a topic which had proved difficult to study using observation methods.

The great drawback of both questionnaires and interviews in collecting data concerned with managerial work is that managers have consistently shown themselves to be bad judges of how they spend their time or the functions they undertake (Burns, 1954, 1957; Horne and Lupton, 1965; Mintzberg, 1973; Pym, 1975; Stewart, 1975; Kotter, 1982). Marshall and Stewart (1981) and Stewart (1982) suggest that this is because managers generally do not think analytically about their work and so, when asked to judge how they spend their time, produce results which are substantially at variance with those indicated in observation studies. Coupled with this there are considerable linguistic
problems associated with the construction of questionnaires which are likely to lead to inconsistency in interpretation and subsequently in results (Pheysey, 1972; Stewart, 1975; Hinrichs, 1976). In particular, questionnaires need to develop preformed categories for recording data and the field of managerial work has yet to evolve generally agreed categories for classifying that work. Like questionnaires, interview studies also depend on the manager to interpret managerial action. The study by Marshall and Stewart (1981) threw up two specific problems connected with interview studies, firstly the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee may influence results, and secondly the difficulty of asking about issues which do not rest in the conscious domain.

The relatively structured approach of using questionnaires and interviews on their own does not seem the most appropriate approach in studying the nature of managerial work activities. The major breakthroughs in this topic area have occurred through studies using observation, diaries or a mixed methodology. It would seem that the use of questionnaires or interviews alone is not appropriate where, the task to be studied is highly complex, knowledge of the process does not readily lie in the conscious domain, where the language available for use is imprecise or open to a number of interpretations or where established categories for the recording of data are absent. Overall, as Sayles (1964) points out, questionnaires are more likely to inform about perceptions and values with regard to managerial work than about action and behaviour.
3.4 THE DIARY METHOD

The diary method was responsible for some of the most important early advances in the study of managerial work especially with regard to the patterns of contacts and the use of time of managers (Burns, 1954, 1957; Stewart, 1967; Hales, 1986). The method involves managers completing a precoded form on which they record their activities during the period of study. The use of diaries allows for more people and longer time periods to be covered than is usually practical with observation studies and allows for comparisons between the work of managers in different functions and levels in organisations. In particular, the studies have shown where, with whom and how the manager works, and have helped to establish a picture of the types of communication patterns that different managers use. The development of quantitative data has allowed for some limited comparison between studies and the results from Burns (1954, 1957), Brewer and Tomlinson (1964), Dubin and Spray (1964) and Horne and Lupton (1965) were all important in building up a picture of the manager as someone who spends the majority of his time in communication and is more reactive than proactive. Lastly, diaries allow for all time to be covered, whereas with observation studies the observer may be excluded from situations which are considered 'private' or 'sensitive'. Diaries probably represent the best single method yet constructed for conducting extensive surveys of managerial work.

Commenting on the diary method, Burns (1957) said:—
"the use of a simplified diary schedule of this kind means that the amount of information contained in each is extremely limited; it amounts to a description of one's behaviour in a language of less than fifty verbs and nouns, and however carefully these are selected a very great deal of behaviour, even in the limited social area of a workplace, will be indescribable. Moreover, each of the terms will be stretched to the farthest possible limits of its meaning for the reader, and these may include references which elude any outsider. Comprehension and precision, then, are sacrificed." (Burns, 1957, p.46)

The problems involved with developing unambiguous categories has been such that diaries have been useful for describing the characteristics of managerial work but not the content (Stewart, 1968; Mintzberg, 1973; Weick, 1974). Stewart (1967), for instance, started her study with the intention of considering the functions of management but decided to exclude the results from her conclusions. The perceived meanings of terms used in diaries to describe functions have been open to such varied interpretation that an action which one manager calls, for instance, 'planning' another may describe as 'communicating'. A further criticism of diaries is that they are burdensome for managers to complete so they may be filled in either erratically or inaccurately (Hinrichs, 1976) and this has forced studies to rely on 'cooperative' managers. Despite these criticisms diaries
still represent an effective way of conducting large scale surveys of managerial work in terms of activities and communication patterns.

3.5 ANECDOTAL STUDIES

Anecdotal studies are those that use the personal experiences of the writer or of interviewees as the basis of research evidence. This highly subjective approach was typical of management writing in the period up to the mid nineteen fifties. Studies by Dimock (1945) and Copeland (1957) were both based upon their own personal work experiences, the former in the recruitment and manning office of the War Shipping Administration and the latter as an academic. However, more recent work by Terkel (1974) has shown how informal, unstructured, highly subjective and emotive interviewing can be used to produce interesting views of work situations. This has led to authors such as Mintzberg (1973) and Kotter (1982) using anecdote as part of a mixed methodological approach to managerial work. The advantage of anecdotal studies is that they allow for the introduction of 'emotion', giving people the opportunity to express what they 'feel' about a situation and hence give added depth to the study.

The disadvantages of this methodology are that it fails to produce quantitative and replicable data and much depends on the skill of the interviewer or writer in interpreting experiences in such a way as to produce realistic and generalisable results and subsequent conceptual constructions. Where the study is based
on the individual experiences of the writer there is a tendency for the results to be shallow and too subjective to be of use as a basis for further research. The anecdotal methodology is useful in bringing 'feelings' into research and to give depth to other results, but depends strongly on the skills of the interviewer and his ability in interpreting the results.

3.6 MIXED METHODOLOGIES

More recent research (Stewart 1976, 1980, 1982; Kotter 1982; Martinko and Gardner, 1984; Lawrence, 1984; Whiteley, 1985) has tended to use a mixed methodological approach, using a mixture of those methods so far described. Stewart (1976, 1982) used a mixture of structured and unstructured interview, observation and sometimes diaries, while Kotter (1982) adopted a mixture of observation, interviews, questionnaires, anecdote and secondary sources. The use of a mixed methodological approach partially stems from criticisms throughout the social sciences of the use of questionnaires as the sole method of data collection (Webb et al., 1966). All research methods introduce some bias and the purpose of using a mixed methodology is the belief that the strengths of one method will overcome the weaknesses and bias introduced by another. Methods may also complement one another, for where one method is useful for gathering quantitative data and expanding the extent of the research, another may help to add qualitative information giving the study greater depth. Hence it is believed that the use of a mixed methodology will overcome the
problems of single methods and produce more varied interpretations of the data.

The arguments against the use of mixed methodologies is that methods may not be complementary and therefore there is no reason why the use of a second method should offset the weaknesses inherent in the first. Although the use, for instance, of a diary as well as observation may help to give a broader, more extensive study, the research will still be left with the inherent weaknesses of each. Secondly, if the object of research is to produce more reliable results, there seems no reason why the use of two methods should necessarily aid this cause. Indeed, the studies which have been conducted using a mixed methodology would be as difficult to test or replicate as those using a single method. So mixed methodologies might be seen as adding an extra dimension of subjectivity rather than leading to more objective, scientific data. However, mixed methodologies do offer the opportunity to gather a wider variety of information than any single method reasonably allows.

3.7 SUMMARY

The diversity of method used in the study of managerial work reflects the breadth of the topic. The methodologies have varied from those typical of the social sciences, such as observation, questionnaire and interview to more interactionist type approaches primarily concerned with communication patterns. The combination of these in a mixed methodological framework probably
represents the best method for studying managerial work yet established, for although mixed methodologies may not overcome the individual weaknesses of their constituent parts they should give a broader overall perspective of the topic.

While observation methods have proved reasonably satisfactory for establishing the activities and characteristics of managerial work in terms of what managers do, they have been less satisfactory in establishing the functions of managers, the rationale behind patterns of managerial work or in answering the question; why do managers do certain things and not others? The latter area has been best addressed, so far, through the use of questionnaires, interviews and more innovative methodologies. Thus, as Hales (1986) concluded, the methodologies used for the study of managerial work have been highly influential in shaping the area of study and the subsequent conclusions.

In order for studies of managerial work to move forward the three areas which would seem in need of further development are greater use of larger scale surveys which allow the use of inferential statistics in their analysis, rather more replication studies and studies using previously established methodologies and for studies which place greater emphasis on the context in which the work occurs. There have still been relatively few studies of managerial work which have attempted to combine qualitative and quantitative data and which have used a sample large enough to enable the use of inferential statistics in
establishing results. The work of Luthans et al., 1985, could form the basis on which more studies of this type are conducted.

If studies of managerial work are to be considered 'scientific' there must be more replication studies. Replication studies would help to advance and test the limited amount conceptual development which has occurred in the field. Linked to the question of replication studies is the amount of inductive research that has been conducted in the area. Although useful in developing new theoretical stances, inductive research means that interpretations tend to become more subjective, and the research is less likely to build on existing theoretical frameworks. More deductive research, testing of previous theory and further development of new more specific perspectives, may be needed as the body of theory develops.

Lastly, managerial work needs to be placed within its contextual and institutional arrangements and for this to be possible methods must become more rigorous in their control of variables. As Stewart (1982, 1989) pointed out, there has been very little attempt to control the variables which affect the studies. So comparison has been made between managers at different functions and levels, and who come from different organisations, locations, industries, and in some cases countries. Even more recent studies, such as that of Kotter (1982), only control level and function. Hence, there is a need for further studies which compare like with like; that is managers at the same level, in the same industry, in the same size of operation, in the same.
function, and if possible within a similar geographic area.

Overall, in order to enhance the different perspectives of managerial work there is a need for a variety of approaches and methodologies. Collectively, this should help to overcome the difficulties inherent in the methodologies used in any one study and help to give a number of perspectives on a complex area.
CHAPTER 4

THE DEVELOPMENT OF KNOWLEDGE OF MANAGERIAL WORK

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The conceptual explanations of managerial work have been closely allied to the methodologies used. For instance, questionnaires have tended to produce information regarding the functions of managerial work, diaries on time usage and communication patterns, and participant and non-participant observation on the activities of managers and the more 'informal' aspects. Hales (1986) summed up this approach saying:

"before the adoption of multi-method studies, what was discovered about managerial work was critically influenced by how managers were studied: diary studies inevitably focused upon contacts and time allocation, structured questionnaires generated work elements, whilst participant observation studies made much of 'informal' behaviour." (Hales, 1986, p.105)

This chapter shows the development of the area in the period up
to 1973, considers the specific work of Stewart and Mintzberg and reviews more recent developments in the field. Each of these is considered in terms of three fundamental dimensions of the area:

1) Activities – how do managers spend their time?
2) Functions – what do managers do?
3) Context – what influences what they do?

The pattern of development of the field has been from noting the situation in descriptive terms to trying to understand the underlying constructs which determine it. The early writers on managerial work were primarily concerned with managerial activities and the underlying characteristics of managerial work. They established that there was, in effect, a gulf between the functions of management and the activities of managers and that the prescriptions of classical management theory failed to adequately explain either. Although some early writers tried to investigate both activities and functions this was found, in practice, to be difficult (Burns, 1957; Stewart 1967) and led to a general split among the studies between those interested in activities and those in functions. The studies up until 1973, while providing descriptions of managerial activities and the characteristics of the work, had difficulties in finding a framework in which to conceptually explain their findings.

The work of Mintzberg (1973) and the continuing studies of Stewart (1967, 1976, 1980, 1982, 1987) have provided the central axis around which the field of managerial work studies has
developed. However, they have adopted very different approaches to the area, both methodologically and conceptually. Central to this has been that while Mintzberg (1973) attempted to show that the functions and activities of managers were all very similar regardless of industry, size of company or position; Stewart has shown them as so dissimilar as to make comparison difficult or impossible (Stewart, 1967, 1976, 1982). This mirrors what has been happening throughout the study of organisation theory and comprises a central debate in the study of managerial work; namely, is the work of managers fundamentally similar or different? McKelvey (1983) commented that:

"we think that investigators are using two broad approaches to describe organizations: (1) organizations are all alike, or (2) organizations are all unique." (McKelvey, 1983, p.104)

More recent studies, conducted during the 1980's, have been interested in explaining the context of managerial work as well as the functions and activities of managers. The approach to these contextual explanations has been twofold, cognitive and institutional. Cognitive explanations have concentrated on explaining managerial work in terms of perceived choice or demands (Stewart, 1982) or agendas and networks (Kotter, 1982) while institutional approaches have been interested in the framework in which the action occurs, either in terms of the role set (Machin, 1981; Hales, 1987) or the organisational and political setting (Willmott, 1984, 1987).
Overall, the studies have developed in an uneven and mostly atheoretical manner, and Hales (1986) sees few links between the studies viewing them as a diverse collection with few points of similarity or comparison. However, such diversity might be expected where the choice of sample, methodology and interpretation of results are all essentially a subjective exercise and given the breadth and complexity of the topic.

4.2 PRE-1973 : EARLY STUDIES

Studies of managerial work began from a questioning of the original paradigms attached to the classical school of management. Central to this was the concept that management consisted of planning, organising, coordinating, commanding and controlling (Fayol, 1949) and therefore managerial functions and activities could be understood in these terms. The classical perspective assumed that managers were proactive, rational decision makers who largely controlled their personal work and the work environment. Carlson's (1951) non-participant observation study of 10 Swedish chief executives presented a very different picture. With the subsequent diary studies of Burns (1954, 1957) it helped to establish a view of managerial work that seriously questioned that presented in most management texts. What they found was that managers tended to be reactive, rather than proactive, spent 60-90% of their time communicating with others, that they had few periods of uninterrupted time longer than 20 minutes and that the nature of their work was
highly fragmented. Carlson (1951) used the twin metaphors of the manager being a 'puppet on a string' rather than the 'leader of the orchestra'.

Other studies conducted during the 1950's used a number of methodologies; interviews (Clements, 1958), postal questionnaires (Hemphill, 1959), anecdote (Copeland, 1957), participant observation (Dalton, 1959), non-participant observation (Guest, 1956), activity sampling (O'Neill and Kubany, 1959) and mixed methodologies (Martin, 1956). Guest's (1956) study of supervisors in a car plant helped to reinforce the studies of Carlson (1951) and Burns (1954) and provided some of the language that was to be used to describe managerial activities in later studies, describing the work of supervisors in terms of interruption, variety and discontinuity. Dalton's (1959) participant observation study was important in the way that it studied the more informal and political aspects of managerial work and behaviour, while Hemphill's (1959) questionnaire study was concerned with the elements of the managerial job. Hemphill's (1959) study was the first major study to be interested primarily in the functions of management rather than managerial activities. He devised 10 'dimensions of managerial work' to describe managerial functions - staff service, supervision of work, business control, technical products and markets, human affairs, planning, broad power, business reputation, personal demands and preservation of assets and these were to be influential in later studies, such as that of Mintzberg (1973).
There were a proliferation of studies during the 1960s, again using a number of different methodologies. Copeman (1963), Brewer and Tomlinson (1964), Dubin and Spray (1964), Horne and Lupton (1965), Thomason (1966 & 1967) and Stewart (1967) all used the diary as their main method. Other studies included those by Sayles (1964) - participant observation; Landsberger (1961) and Hodgson et al. (1965) - non-participant observation; Kelly (1964) - activity sampling; Marples (1967) - critical incident technique; Mahoney et al (1965) - questionnaire. The diary studies emphasised the activities undertaken by managers in terms of time distribution and contact analysis and collectively reinforced the earlier view that the managerial job was highly fragmented, primarily concerned with contacts and communication, involved the gathering and dissemination of information and was essentially reactive in nature. The observation studies generally acted to reinforce the political and informal perspective presented by Dalton (1959), while those using a critical incident approach (Marples, 1967) were concerned to indicate that a consideration of time allocation alone failed to show the full nature of the work. Lastly, Mahoney et al. (1965) used a postal questionnaire with a total of 452 managers and indicated, in a similar manner to Stewart (1967), that there were specific 'types' of manager; i.e. planner, generalist, multispecialist etc., each of which had a distinct work pattern.

In the early 1970's the studies of Pheysey (1972) and Child and Ellis (1973) attempted to move away from and develop the earlier activities approach. Pheysey (1972) built on the earlier work of
Hemphill (1959) with regard to the functions of management using a questionnaire to ask managers about the importance of six functional areas in their work—trouble shooting, forward planning, briefing subordinates, conducting meetings, reviewing the progress of subordinates and personal problems. Child and Ellis (1973) was one of the first studies to try to place managerial work within a contextual framework. They set out to find if work role characteristics varied with industry, organizational size, managerial function and hierarchical level. They say:

"the data reported in this paper point to several predictors of variation in managerial roles, of which industry, functional specialism and the prevailing type of organizational structure appear to be the most pervasive." (Child and Ellis, 1973, p.247)

This group of early studies collectively established the characteristics of managerial work and began to consider some of the variables which influence it. The general characteristics of managerial work were strikingly different from the classical prescription of their functions and activities. Managers emerged from the studies as being informal, reactive, office based, communicators who spent much of their time collecting and disseminating information. Further they were subject to constant interruptions which led to both variety and discontinuity in their work. Horne and Lupton (1965) summarised this by saying:
"Middle management does not seem, on this showing, to require the exercise of remarkable powers to analyse, weigh alternatives and decide. Rather, it calls for the ability to shape and utilise the person-to-person channels of communication, to influence, to persuade, to facilitate."

(Horne and Lupton, 1965, p.32)

Although the majority of the studies were concerned with finding the common characteristics of managerial work, there was a limited attempt to define managerial functions through the use of questionnaire studies. Towards the end of the period a number of authors also began to note the differences between those at different levels and in different functions in the hierarchy (Dubin and Spray, 1964; Horne and Lupton, 1965; Marples, 1967; Stewart, 1967; Campbell et al., 1970; Child and Ellis, 1973). By 1973, there was increasing agreement that although there might be a core of characteristics common to all managerial jobs, managerial activities were likely to vary substantially between those in different functions and at different levels.

The major problem with the studies were that they were essentially descriptive and although this provided a simple explanation of time usage and communication patterns it did not provide for any more generalised conceptual explanations of the nature of managerial work. This process was further hindered by the fact that each study used distinctly different samples and tools of analysis thereby making comparison between the studies virtually
impossible. Indeed, a comparison by Nailon (1968) of the studies by Copeman et al. (1963), Burns (1957), Brewer and Tomlinson (1964), Horne and Lupton (1965), Stewart (1967) and Nailon (1968) found that the only activity that could be compared easily across each of the studies was time spent on 'correspondence'.

By the beginning of the 1970s a picture was emerging of the managerial job as having a number of general characteristics but that there were distinct differences between types of manager, those in different functions, and at different levels in the hierarchy. However, the studies were highly disjointed, not open to ready comparison and lacked conceptual explanations for the nature of managerial work.

4.3 MINTZBERG AND STEWART

The dominant work of the 1970s and the early 1980s was that of Mintzberg (1973) and Stewart (1976, 1980, 1982). The striking feature of these studies is the conflicting stances which they adopt, Mintzberg being primarily interested in similarities and Stewart in differences. Also, whereas Mintzberg (1973) depended heavily on non-participant structured observation as his main methodology, each of the Stewart studies used a mixed methodology not relying extensively on any one approach. From his research Mintzberg (1973) identified the key characteristics of managerial activity and a series of ten managerial roles. His work had an immediate appeal because it was a summary of the earlier, little
known, studies of managerial work, and provided what seemed a plausible framework for analysis. The work of Stewart (1976, 1980, 1982) developed an explanatory framework around a threefold conceptualisation of managerial work - demands, choices and constraints, which she used to explain the differences which occur within managerial work situations.

Mintzberg

Mintzberg's (1973) study of 5 chief executives used a structured observation methodology based around 3 records; a chronology record, a mail record and a contact record. As much of the coding occurred after the event, the methodology allowed Mintzberg to arrive at his classification scheme inductively. Mintzberg (1973) used his data to note the key characteristics in the nature of managerial work, which he summarised as:-

a) Much work at unrelenting pace
b) Activity characterised by brevity, variety and fragmentation
c) Preference for live action
d) Attraction to the verbal media
e) The maintenance of a network of outside contacts
f) A blend of rights and duties.

Mintzberg (1973) was the first person to attempt to develop a conceptual picture of the functions or roles of managers. These he described in a series of ten roles under three headings:-
Interpersonal roles - figurehead, liaison, leader

Informational roles - monitor, disseminator, spokesman

Decisional roles - entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, negotiator.

Mintzberg's (1973) work provided a useful description of the activities and characteristics of managerial work and provided a simple, easily understandable and plausible description of managerial roles to which both other researchers and practitioners could relate. However, there have been an increasing number of criticisms of Mintzberg's approach both conceptually and methodologically. These have emerged as a series of nine criticisms:

1) The construct validity of the roles model - Both Shapira and Dunbar (1980) and Luthans et al. (1985) make the point that there is no evidence that the roles have construct validity. Indeed, the only attempt to test for validity cast considerable doubts upon it (McCall and Segrist, 1980).

11) The arbitrariness of the roles - Mintzberg (1973) appeared to arrive at the roles in an arbitrary manner and it is difficult to understand how this particular set of roles, and not others, came from the data. In many ways the list appears as arbitrary as that of Fayol (1949), stemming from Mintzberg's preconceived ideas rather than from the data (Bourgoyne and Hodgson, 1984).

111) The ambiguity of the language of the roles - The other
criticisms are compounded by the generality of the language in which the roles are proposed. The language is open to such varied interpretation as to suffer the same problems as the prescriptions of the classical theorists. When other researchers such as Stewart (1976), Kurke and Aldrich (1983), Martinko and Gardner (1984) and Ferguson and Berger (1984) came to use Mintzbergs' roles in future research they found the descriptions difficult to operationalise.

iv) The suggested universality of the roles - Stewart (1976), commenting on the universality of the roles noted that:

"the relative importance of the roles differs greatly in different jobs; they do not apply in all managerial jobs; it is hard to allocate some activities to his categories; and some of his roles, especially that of leader, are too broad to be of practical use." (Stewart, 1976, p.123)

v) The coding system used in the methodology - There have been a number of criticisms of the coding system used in the conduct of the research and these were well summarised by Martinko and Gardner (1985) in terms of the ambiguity of the language and Mintzberg's (1973) use of mutually exclusive categories.

vi) The discreteness of the interpersonal roles - Shapira and Dunbar (1980) believe that the interpersonal roles are unnecessary and could have been subsumed under the other two
vii) **The absence of planning from the roles** - Snyder and Glueck (1980) criticise Mintzberg for the absence of planning from the roles.

viii) **A high level of reactivity is assumed on the part of managers** - In seeing work as the key determinant of managerial activity, Mintzberg (1973) presents the manager as being highly reactive. The work of Stewart (1976, 1980, 1982) and Larson et al. (1986) questions the extent to which this represents a correct picture, with Stewart seeing the job as more flexible to the choices of the manager.

ix) **The lack of contextual consideration** - Mintzberg (1973) appeared to study the work of managers with only a very limited reference to the context in which the action occurred (Willmott, 1984). Although he notes that the determinants of managerial work could be the situation, the job, the incumbent, the organisation or the environment he effectively studied the work of the chief executives without reference to them in a unitary and abstract manner.

**Stewart**

While Mintzberg was seeking to find similarities Stewart (1976, 1980, 1982) was more concerned with an understanding of the underlying constructs which affect managerial work. As such, she
attempted to understand the differences in managerial work in terms of demands, constraints and choices; while continuing her typologies of managerial types and work patterns.

One of Stewart's major strengths is the way in which she has continued her research in one specific area, gradually improving and refining her conclusions. Contrasts in Management (1976) was a continuation of the Reality of Management (1963) and more importantly Managers and Their Jobs (1967). The study used a mixture of questionnaire, interviews, diaries and observation with 274 managers over a period of two and a half years. In the study she tried to identify the differences in managerial work on a threefold basis, demands, choices and constraints and explained the terms as:

i) Choices - all the opportunities for one jobholder to do the job differently from another, including what is done, how it is done, with whom, when and where.

ii) Demands - what any job holder must do; cannot avoid doing without invoking penalties that will make it harder to do the job, or may lead to sanctions being taken against him or her.

iii) Contraints - the factors that limit what the job holder can do. These include, legislation, policies and procedures, available resources, attitudes and time.

The study by Stewart et al. (1980) of district administrators in the National Health Service was important for two reasons.
Firstly, it was one of the first studies to make a conscious attempt to reduce the number of variables, comparing managers on one level of the NHS in England. Secondly, that Stewart comes to the conclusion that 'choices' are the most important factor influencing the nature of managerial work.

In Choices For the Manager (1982) she develops the idea that managers are given a substantial amount of choice in how they conduct their operations, on which functions they concentrate and how they spend their time. Using a mixed methodology she studied the work of 98 managers and drew on the work of Marshall and Stewart (1981) to describe managers as 'intuitive responders' in that they are not generally conscious of the choices that are available to them. Whereas Mintzberg (1973) had viewed the managerial job as essentially fixed to which the manager responded, Stewart saw it as fluid in nature allowing the manager to shape both its content and conduct.

The criticisms of Stewart's work have been less frequent and less direct than that of Mintzberg's. One of the main reasons for this is that it is difficult to replicate Stewart's work and she had no fixed methodology which was open to common usage, and hence comment. The major criticisms have been:

1) Reluctance to use Role Theory - Although Levinson (1957) and Hodgson, et al. (1965) had come to similar conceptualisations as demands, choices and constraints using role theory, Stewart has always been reluctant to base her findings on role theory or any
other accepted conceptual base.

ii) Lack of conceptualisation of findings - Apart from the demands, choices and constraints approach, Stewart's work has lacked strong, well defined models which were open to further testing. This problem is most apparent in her earlier work where she had difficulty in developing appropriate theory for her conclusions. Underlying this has been a general reluctance in the field for researchers to abstract from the particular to the general and she seems reluctant to take what Mintzberg (1979) described as the necessary 'creative leap' from data to theory.

iii) Emphasis on differences - Although her emphasis on differences was useful in the way that it acted as a counterweight to Mintzberg, it made the development of conceptual models difficult. All theory must deal with some degree of generalisation so that knowledge can be subsequently tested and advanced and a continuing emphasis on differences does not help this process.

iv) The use of extensive 'sub-divisions' - Her earlier work (1967, 1976) lacked the directness of Mintzberg (1973) partly due to her habit of subdivision in classification schemes, particularly when she was dealing with work and contact patterns.

v) The cognitive nature of 'choice' processes - The study of Marshall and Stewart (1981) suggested that the notion of 'managerial choice' may not rest in some managers' conscious
domain. Where this is the case, there are major methodological questions regarding whether the topic can be the subject of either interview or observation? If a topic is not subject to any form of 'observation', how can its existence be indicated and its form tested?

vi) The lack of contextual consideration - Stewart's emphasis on choice, rather than constraints or demands, opens her to the criticism that she considered work in a non-contextual fashion (Hales, 1986). She viewed the major influences on the manager as being the particular work undertaken and the nature of the individual and she followed other authors (Shartle, 1956; Mahoney et al., 1965; Campbell et al., 1970; Mintzberg, 1973) in viewing these of roughly equal importance (Marshall and Stewart, 1981). Such an approach largely ignored the influence of the institutional arrangements in which the action occurred.

vii) Non-definition of terms - Finally, she recognised two of her own weaknesses (Stewart, 1989) as being the inability to relate managerial work and managerial effectiveness and the difficulties of definition and interpretation of the terms management, managerial behaviour and managerial work. Hales (1986, 1988) commented that managerial work may not be the exclusive preserve of managers, nor may all of the managers' work be managerial. Accepting this criticism Stewart (1989) believed that her future area of study should be the managerial job rather than managerial work.
In terms of the development of knowledge of managerial work both Mintzberg (1973) and Stewart (1976, 1980, 1982) provided frameworks which were helpful. Their collective studies show managerial work to have characteristics of brevity, variety and fragmentation; that it is instinctive and, at least partially, reactive; that oral communication is a large part of the job and that this involves the development of networks of relationships; that managers like and use informal sources of information; and that the managerial work process is highly political (Earl, 1983, p.96). In terms of the functions of management, Mintzberg's (1973) roles provided a model which was easy to understand and readily testable. Stewart's concept of demands, choices and constraints allowed for the influence of personality on the conduct of the job and showed the nature of jobs to be fluid thus broadening the understanding of the contextual nature of managerial work.

4.4 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Kotter's (1982) study into the work of general managers has been important in the way that he framed their work in terms of two concepts; agendas and networks. Kotter (1982) believed that managers developed an agenda while in the early stages of a job which largely dictated their future performance. In order to achieve this agenda the manager developed a network of relationships which he used to pursue his goals. Kotter (1982) seemed to propose both of these as relatively conscious
processes. The problem with Kotters' (1982) work comes from the difficulties of replication, given that these phenomena exist, how are they to be observed? Further, the earlier work of Marshall and Stewart (1981) throws considerable doubt on Kotters' contentions. In the process of asking managers about the choices that were open to them in their job, Marshall and Stewart (1981) found that these ideas were not held within the conscious domain and that managers did not appear to think strategically about their work, but tended to react to immediate circumstances and demands. Much of the research into managerial work has shown managers developing networks of relationships in their work, but the work of Marshall and Stewart (1981) seriously questions whether this is directly linked to a preconceived agenda, as Kotter seemed to suggest.

Further studies into the work of managers included those by Snyder and Glueck (1980), Lawrence (1984), Martinko and Gardner (1984), Whiteley (1985) and Larson et al. (1986). The study of Snyder and Glueck was a partial replication of Mintzberg (1973), but concentrated on one element of the Mintzberg analysis, the function of planning. Mintzberg (1973) had excluded planning from his ten roles seeing it as a vague objective of management rather than a specific managerial action. Snyder and Glueck (1980) and Luthans et al. (1985) both contradict this view. Lawrence (1984), in a study of managers in Britain and Germany, noted the differences between managers at different hierarchical levels, and followed Stewart (1982) in seeing managers as intuitive
decision makers. This study and that of Larson et al. (1986) both showed managers as being more proactive than earlier descriptions of managerial work had suggested. The study by Larson et al. (1986) also indicated the need for the development of language for the description of managerial work so that certain concepts are not shown in terms of one extreme or another, i.e. reactive or proactive, but along a continuum.

The work of Martinko and Gardner (1984) was the first study of managerial work to attempt the link between qualitative and quantitative research. Using a mixed methodology and a sample of 50 principals from different types of school they were able to compare their results using inferential statistics. Their conclusion, that there were distinct differences in managerial behaviour between those in education and business led them to the belief that managerial behaviour occurs through an interaction of the specific environment and the competencies of the individual (Martinko and Gardner, 1984, p.144). This represented a further development in the contextual approach to managerial work. Whitely (1985) studied 70 managers to see if there was any convergence between those with similar work content, as measured through a diary and activity sampling, and those with similar work functions, measured using the MPDO questionnaire of Tornow and Pinto (1976). He noted a 'moderate convergence' but generally followed Stewart (1976, 1982) in noting the extent of differences in work patterns between those in different industries, functions and at different levels in the hierarchy.
The managerial functions approach of Hemphill (1959) was extended through the work of Tornow and Pinto (1976), Luthans and Lockwood (1984) and Luthans et al. (1985). Tornow and Pinto (1976) developed a questionnaire to describe the job content and functions of executives, called the Management Position Description Questionnaire (MPDQ). From their data they developed a 13 part description of managerial work; i) product, marketing and financial strategy; ii) coordination of other organisational units and personnel; iii) internal business control; iv) products and services responsibilities; v) public and customer relations; vi) advanced consulting; vii) autonomy of action; viii) approval of financial commitments; ix) staff service; x) supervision; xi) complexity and stress; xii) advanced financial responsibility; xiii) broad personnel responsibility. The problems of Tornow and Pinto's (1976) work are both methodological and linguistic. Managers have been shown consistently to be bad judges of their own use of time (Burns, 1954, 1957; Horne and Lupton, 1965; Stewart, 1976; Kotter, 1982) and there seems no reason why their judgment with regard to functions should be any different. Linguistically the categories that are developed are imprecise, i.e. 'autonomy of action', non-observable, i.e. complexity and stress and inconsistent with actions, responsibilities, functions and characteristics of managerial work variously represented elsewhere in the literature.

The work of Luthans and Lockwood (1984) and Luthans et al. (1985) was concerned with the development of an instrument for observing leadership functions, called the Leader Observation System (LOS).
They believed that the questionnaire method did not allow for effective study of situations, such as managerial work, which were essentially interactive and interpersonal (Luthans and Lockwood, 1984, p. 118) and so developed a classification system for the observation of leadership functions. The LOS system involved a 12 part categorisation:

1) planning and coordinating
2) staffing
3) training/developing
4) decision making/problem solving
5) processing paperwork
6) exchanging routine information
7) monitoring/controlling performance
8) motivating/reinforcing
9) disciplining/punishing
10) interacting with outsiders
11) managing conflict
12) socialising/politicking.

The study by Luthans et al. (1985) used LOS as a method by which to compare the work patterns and effectiveness of 52 managers and largely followed Kotter (1982) in seeing interacting with outsiders and socialising/politicking as key organisational functions. Although LOS represents the most observable classification system for managerial functions yet developed there is a need for further testing to see whether some joined
items are compatible, i.e. planning/coordinating, and the extent to which some items, such as motivation, are readily observable phenomena.

The studies of managerial work which used a methodology involving interaction analysis, (Silverman and Jones, 1976; Gowler and Legge, 1983; Bougoyne and Hodgson, 1983) chose to put more emphasis on language and its interpretation as a means of understanding managerial work. Their belief was that research evidence could only be properly understood within the context of the language of the actor or of the researcher. A detailed analysis of this language, and its production, would therefore provide more insight into the 'real' nature of managerial work and behaviour than a mere observation of actions. Such an approach followed much of the same thinking as the critical incident method believing that management could be best understood through a more detailed understanding of certain important events or interactions. Although providing a useful experimental methodology and an alternative view on the phenomena, these studies have largely failed to produce serious conceptual explanations of either management or managerial work, and may be perceived as placing too much emphasis on the communication process.

The work of Machin (1981, 1982) provided a link between those concerned with an analysis of interaction and those who took a radical structuralist or labour process view of managerial work. In the Expectations Approach (EA) he proposed a methodology which
involved the manager's role set assessing their expectations of
the manager and vice versa. This, he suggested, provided a
comprehensive audit of communications within the management team
and allowed each individual to understand the nature of the
expectations placed upon them by their colleagues. The strength of
EA was that it represented the first approach to place managerial
work in the context of the expectations of members of the role
set. Until this point studies had tended to treat managerial work
in a unitarist and isolationist manner.

The work of the radical structuralists or labour process
theorists largely rested on the early work of Braverman (1974).
Later studies, (Nichols and Benyon, 1977; Clegg and Dunkerley,
1977; Storey, 1981; Willmott, 1984, 1987; Knights and Willmott,
1986) have concentrated on placing managerial work within the
context of the control and power arrangements within which it
operated. Knights and Willmott (1986) say of their text that:

"In opposition to conventional accounts of management, in
which its practices tend to be abstracted from the power
relations in which they are embedded (Willmott, 1984), the
papers collected here attend to management as a medium and
outcome of the distinctive, historical, and often
contradictory, relations of power and production." (Knights
and Willmott, 1986, p.2)

The overall approach of the labour process studies was that
management was resultant from certain institutional arrangements and that these influenced the operation of managerial work. The labour process theorists offered an extremely useful, radical perspective on managerial work which helped to place it within the context of its environment. However, they represented a fragmented group of studies which had only limited points of reference with each other and they have failed to develop methodologically from the case study. Partly because of this, they have not properly indicated the relationship between managerial work and its structural context except in the most generalised terms.

In terms of managerial activities and characteristics the studies of the 1980's have begun to show the manager as more proactive and influential on the design of the work. This emerged through the direct work of Lawrence (1984) and Larson et al. (1986) as well as through the more indirect conceptualisations of Kotter (1982) and Stewart (1982). These studies also indicated the intuitive way in which managers tended to behave. The LOS classification scheme devised by Luthans and Lockwood (1984) represented a method by which it might be possible to observe managerial functions and was a considerable refinement on the work of Hemphill (1959) and Tornow and Pinto (1976). The studies of the interactionists helped to offer alternative methodologies, particularly for the study of phenomena which may normally lie outside of the conscious domain, while that of Machin (1981, 1982) began to show how managerial work was influenced by the role set. The diverse collection of labour process studies
offered a radical perspective on placing managerial work within its contextual structure. What is most striking about these more recent studies is their degree of differentiation, whereas one might have expected that the studies would draw together as the field of study became more mature, the evidence of these studies suggests that the opposite is the case.

4.5 AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT IN MANAGERIAL WORK RESEARCH

Despite the number of completed studies the understanding of managerial work is very much in its infancy. Although some knowledge has accumulated regarding the characteristics of managerial work, and the way that managers allocate time and develop contacts, there is still little understanding of the factors which influence these processes. So although the questions - how do managers spend their time? and, what contact patterns do they develop? may have been partially answered, the other questions relating to, what do managers do? and, what influences what they do? are still some way from being effectively addressed. In order to improve the understanding of managerial work there appear to be 7 main problematical areas to which future research might address itself:

1) Methodology

The field has been fraught with methodological problems which have significantly delayed its development, and only very recently have methodologies appeared which allow managerial work
to be placed in the context of other organisational processes (Machin, 1981, 1982; Hales and Nightingale, 1986). As Hales (1986) pointed out, methodology has been important in establishing conclusions and this would seem to suggest that there need to be further studies using mixed and experimental methodologies. Those involved with the study of interactions, such as Silverman and Jones (1976) and Bourgoyne and Hodgson (1982, 1983), have shown how different methodologies can be used to bring new perspectives to the study of managerial work and behaviour. So, in order for knowledge of managerial work to move forward there needs to be both innovation and variety in methodology.

11) Managerial Language.

One of the major problems facing the development of studies into managerial work relates to the ambiguity of managerial language. Central to this has been the reluctance to reconcile or define the terms management, managerial work and managerial behaviour. Hales (1988) noted that studies;

"fail to distinguish, within the vague term managerial work, between: first, 'management' as a process and 'managers' as a particular category of agents; second, managerial work as a totality and managerial jobs as clusters of that (and other) work; third, what managers are required to do (role definition) and what they actually do
(role performance) and fourth, the outputs and purpose of managerial work (managerial tasks and responsibilities) versus the inputs and practice of managerial work (managers' behaviour and activities)." (Hales, 1988, p.1)

Some recent refinement of terms has begun (Larson et al., 1986) but there is still a need for considerable improvement in this area. If language continues to be a problem, then an alternative may lay in the development of better metaphors to understand the process (Morgan, 1980).

iii) Managerial Work – Characteristics, Activities and Functions

Figure 1 presents a model which divides the nature of managerial work into 3 phases; inputs and demands, conduct and discretion and goals and outputs. The intention is not that these three levels should be mutually exclusive or divided. They are presented as a continuum rather than as distinct and clearly defined areas and there is an acceptance that there is a continuing interaction between each level. The aim is that the model should provide some direction to future research with regard to demands, discretion and goals in a similar manner to that of Stewart (1989) shown in Appendix 1.

Level 1 – Inputs and Demands – This represents the inputs to the job, and are factors over which the role holder has relatively little immediate influence. At this level there is a need to know more about jobs in different sectors of industry, and at
different levels and functions. In particular there has been little comparison between the prescribed role, in terms of the job description and actual role performance in terms of activities and functions. Although some work has been done on the influence of the role set (Machin, 1981, 1982; Hales and
Nightingale, 1986) there is a need for further study with regard to the relative influence of the demands and expectations of peers, subordinates and superiors in the hierarchy. Lastly, further investigation is required on the influence of contextual factors. In particular, there have been no research studies which have sought to consider the importance of company culture and philosophy, strategy and managerial divisions of labour upon managerial work and its performance (Hales, 1988).

**Level 2 - Conduct and Discretion** - This represents the conduct of the position. At this level there appear to be choices open to the manager, but the nature of these areas of discretion and the rationale behind the making of choices is little understood. The understanding of patterns of role conduct is similarly limited apart from the broad categorisation schemes developed by Mahoney et al. (1965) and Stewart (1967, 1976) and the work developed from studies of leadership. In terms of the characteristics of managerial work there has been a widespread acceptance of the analyses of Carlson (1951), Guest (1956) and Mintzberg (1973) with only the element of reactivity being seriously questioned (Lawrence, 1984; Larson et al, 1986), however knowledge is still limited as to whether these terms apply equally across industries, functions and levels. Stewart (1989) believed there may be a case for reconsidering managerial activities and devising improved classification schemes. In terms of what do managers do? there is a need to better refine the terms that are used to describe managerial functions and there is still a
widespread need to study what managers actually do in terms of functions other than those of Fayol (1949) or the roles described by Mintzberg (1973). The best approach to this may be to use and refine the LOS categorisation scheme developed by Luthans and Lockwood (1984) and from this point to study each function in a similar way to the work of Snyder and Glueck, 1980 and Larson et al., 1986.

Level 3 - Goals - This relates to the goals of managers and their outputs. Although there has been some consideration of inputs in terms of 'demands', it has been the conversion process in terms of the conduct of the job which has been the centre of attention, largely taken in isolation from both inputs and outputs. In particular, no-one has chosen to consider managerial work or managerial behaviour in terms of 'goals' or 'ends'. Given the presumed importance of the profit motive as the guiding force of managers, this looks a serious omission. The concepts of agenda and networks (Kotter, 1982) further suggested that managers develop a clear pattern of the goals they are attempting to achieve and that these are consciously realised. A study of the way that managers perceive these goals and the extent to which they conform to the expectations of head office personnel and to the general strategy of the company would provide a useful insight into managerial work. Further, a number of authors (Martinko and Gardner, 1985; Hales, 1986, 1988; Stewart 1989) have commented on how studies have failed to relate to managerial effectiveness. However, there is still a great deal of uncertainty as to what would correspond to 'effective behaviour
patterns' and how effectiveness might be measured.

iv) The Context of Managerial Work

Although in the social sciences the need to observe phenomena in the context of their relations to other phenomena is well recognised (Whitley, 1984), this has not been the case of studies into managerial work. A drawback of most studies has been that they have studied the managerial task in isolation from the complete management process. A major need is for a better understanding of the processes which influence the nature of managerial work. At the moment the basic debate is the extent to which the managerial job is influenced by the nature and personality of the individual (choices) or the nature of the job and position/function (demands). Future studies must widen and develop this approach so that more detailed analyses are made between the nature of the demands that are placed upon the role encumbent, the subsequent activity in the conduct of the position, the perceived demands of the job and the choices that the role holder makes in the use of time and contact patterns. In particular, those who have researched into demands (Machin, 1981, 1982; Hales and Nightingale, 1986) have considered the demands only from the immediate role set and this approach ignores essential elements of the institutional arrangements in which work occurs. Willmott (1984, 1987) and Hales (1988) have both suggested that further research was needed to place the managerial job in the context of the company culture and
philosophies, its strategy, the managerial division of labour and the overall institutional arrangements of the workplace.

vi) Specialisation

If managerial work is fundamentally different according to the situation in which it occurs (Stewart et al., 1980; Whitley, 1989) then there is a need for greater specialisation in studies. Although certain sectors, such as education (Kmetz and Willower, 1982; Martinko and Gardner, 1984), have been relatively well served, this would appear to be the exception rather than the rule. Some future studies need to be concerned with specific jobs or sectors of industry and take care in studying managers who occupy one hierarchical level, one function, in similar sized establishments, within one sector of industry and in one company. This approach would allow for an exploration of the nature of work demands, the degree of uniformity of role demands and for a consideration of choices and work patterns. As such, there is a need for both intra and inter company research. Single company research would allow the contention from classical management theory that the process of management is conducted in a broadly similar fashion to be tested. If this was found to be the case, it would suggest that role demands were highly influential in structuring the nature of managerial work, if this was not the case, as with Stewart et al. (1980), then it would lend support to the contention that managers have substantial areas of discretion as to how they conduct their position. Inter-company studies following a similar approach would allow some comparison
of the similarities and differences in managerial jobs across one industry. Lastly, there is a need for a better understanding of managerial jobs at different levels and the way that they interact with each other through the managerial division of labour.

The Development of Conceptual Constructions

The area is still at the theory building rather than theory testing stage (Stewart, 1989), and as with management studies in general (Dunbar, 1983), relatively few studies have related successfully empirical observation and explanatory theory (Hales, 1986). The point of research must be to extend the knowledge of a particular phenomena and to provide a base upon which that understanding can be developed still further. Astley (1985) says:

"the real significance of research lies not in the mechanical collection and reporting of data, but in the opportunity to extend scientific investigation by developing new modes of thinking and interpretation." (Astley, 1985, p.511)

The mere presentation of data fails to make necessary connections between variables and thereby fails to properly illustrate the complete nature of that being studied. Theory building, in the area of studies of managerial work, is essentially a creative process which requires a 'jump' from data to theoretical
construction (Mintzberg, 1979; Morgan, 1980; Rose, 1982; Whitley, 1984; Astley, 1985). Mintzberg (1979) commented that:

"The fact is that there would be no interesting hypothesis to test if no one ever generalized beyond his or her data." (Mintzberg, 1979, p. 584)

It is this creative leap which has been distinctly lacking within the studies to date, and has left the area with relatively little theoretical base upon which to build. Future studies need to be prepared for theoretical and linguistic development while taking adequate care not to 'leap' too far in the interpretation and conceptualisation of data.

4.6 SUMMARY

Although the studies have been collectively quite effective at describing what managerial work is like, they have been much less satisfactory with regard to what it is. The broad activities, in terms of time distribution among simple activities and contact patterns has been reasonably well, if inconsistently, mapped. This has led to some recent descriptions of the characteristics of managerial work (Hales, 1986; Stewart, 1989; Whitley, 1989) in terms of it being:

1) variable and changeable;
2) conducted within a 'dynamic negotiable space' (Stewart, 1989, p. 4);
iii) collective and interdependent within an institutional arrangement;
iv) choice offering and discretionary;
v) pressurised and busy.

In terms of what managerial work 'is', there have been those who have offered predetermined classifications (Hemphill, 1959; Tornow and Pinto, 1976; Luthans and Lockwood, 1984), those who have used role theory, notably Mintzberg (1973) and the replications of that study, and those who have chosen to describe it from a more radical viewpoint, primarily in terms of a process of control (Braverman, 1974; Nicholls and Benyon, 1977; Knights and Willmott, 1986). These studies have mostly provided only limited descriptions of either managerial functions or the complete managerial process. Those who have attempted more general 'understandings' of the area have found difficulties with both language and conceptualisation (Stewart, 1982; Kotter, 1982).

It is not desirable that future studies should follow a simple linear direction. In order for a broad base of theory to develop there needs to be a variety of research concerned with from different perspectives into a number of areas. The major topics which need to be addressed are:

1) A reappraisal of the activities of managers and the characteristics of managerial work in a wide variety of
industries and settings with particular reference to areas of similarity and difference.

ii) The development and testing of schema of the functions of managers, such as that of Luthans and Lockwood (1984).

iii) A consideration of the qualitative and quantitative importance of both 'demands' and 'discretion' in the performance of the managerial task.

iv) The determinants of managerial work and the influence of contextual factors upon its performance.

This research should use a wide variety of methodologies, which can be used to provide differing points of reference. Further, there is still a need for a greater number of replication studies and research which takes greater care in the control of variables.

In the process of conceptualisation much of the language used to describe managerial activities and functions needs to be refined. Also, studies need to be concerned with the 'ends' as well as the 'means' of managerial work and researchers must be prepared to have greater courage in taking the creative leap necessary to develop theory from the data.

The studies then, have been highly diverse both in approach and in their ability to provide adequate conceptualisations of the area, but do show a development from the study of the concrete to that of the interpretational. Certainly, the development of research and knowledge in the field of managerial work, akin to
management studies in general (Astley, 1985), has not been clear cut and linear in nature and this has led to a series of studies which are disjointed both in method and conclusion. Indeed, recent studies seem to indicate an increasing divergence rather than convergence from a single body of knowledge.
5.1 INTRODUCTION

Studies of managerial work in the hospitality industry have tended to follow the general pattern of the field in terms of attempting to identify the activities and characteristics of managerial work in the industry, the functions of managers and the context within which managerial work occurs. These issues have been addressed in the 8 major studies which have been directly concerned with the nature of managerial work in the hospitality industry; Nailon, 1968; Ley, 1978; Arnaldo, 1981; Ferguson and Berger, 1984; Koureas, 1985; Hales and Nightingale, 1986; Hales, 1987; Shortt, 1989. Of these, that by Nailon was primarily concerned with time and contact patterns, those of Ley (1978), Arnaldo (1981), Ferguson and Berger (1984) and Shortt (1989) all began from the framework of Mintzberg (1973) and those of Koureas (1985), Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) all attempted to consider the influence of different variables on managerial work. These major studies have been supported by work in a number of related fields and areas which have enlightened specific aspects of managerial work in the industry.
There have been a number of texts which outline the nature of managerial work in the hospitality industry in a prescriptive fashion (e.g. Lundberg, 1959; Brymer, 1977; Keiser, 1979; Gullen and Rhodes, 1983). These tended to rely on the classical approach of Fayol (1949) for their basis and were therefore very similar in form and content to many texts in the general field of management studies. The research based studies, in constrast, set out to illuminate the process of managerial work in hospitality situations in a more descriptive manner. An early intention was to show that the hospitality industry was different from other industries, both in its characteristics and in its functioning, while later studies sought to apply the work of particular theorists such as Mintzberg (1973). However, the studies are so few, and so diverse in both methodology and conclusion, as to present a far from clear picture of activities, functions or the contexts of managerial work in the hospitality industry.

5.2 RELATED STUDIES CONNECTED WITH THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

Aside from the 8 major studies, there have been 5 subsidiary approaches which have enlightened the processes of work in the industry without being directly related to managerial work or without being research based.

i) The Classical Approach

A number of theorists in attempting to explain the field of hospitality management have adapted classical management
principles to the hospitality situation. This is typified by the work of Powers (1979), who said of Mayo (1933), Taylor (1947) and Fayol (1949) that:

"we should note that the basic issues in hospitality management for the foreseeable future are embodied in the work of these three men and those who followed them." (Powers, 1979, p. 247)

Those adopting this approach to hospitality management have, therefore, been most concerned with the functions of management and the terms used by these writers to describe managerial functions have been, for example:

- Winslet (1955) - controlling and directing;
- Lundberg (1959) - planning, policy making, setting standards, training, motivating, organizing, coordinating;
- Witsky (1964) - control, measuring results, setting targets;
- Lattin (1977) - setting standards, controlling;
- Sapienza et al. (1977) - planning, organizing, decision making;
- Powers (1978) - setting goals and plans, directing, controlling;
- Boella (1979) - planning, decision making, organizing, controlling, motivating;
- Gullen and Rhodes (1983) setting objectives, planning, controlling, organizing, coordinating, communicating, motivating and decision making.

These descriptions show a great deal of similarity and act to reinforce the belief that managerial work functions are
fundamentally similar irrespective of position or industry. Keiser (1979) summarised this approach saying:

"Certain functions or principles are common to all management, and if a manager is familiar with these functions and knows how to apply them, he should, ideally, be able to manage any type of organization." (Keiser, 1979, p.33/34)

The classical theorists used a prescriptive, non-research based approach to identifying managerial functions. They were unwilling or unconcerned with separating functions from activities and hospitality theorists generally did not undertake research to test their assumptions. So, it was assumed that if, for instance, motivating was considered an important function, then managers must undertake substantial amounts of 'motivating' activity. However, the nature of managerial activities and the ambiguity of the language used for its description are such that it is difficult to observe the activity of motivating, what the manager may be doing is discussing with subordinates, attending meetings, writing memos etc. As Lockwood and Jones (1984) point out:

"the trouble with management functions is that first line managers do not think, act or behave in these terms."

(Lockwood and Jones, 1984, p.142)

The fundamental problem with the classical approach to management is that it is not research based, the prescriptions that it makes
about managerial functions are therefore merely assumptions which are in need of further testing and this has not been conducted by those who have adopted this type of approach to hospitality management. However, this classical approach did offer a 'benchmark' for comparison in the research studies.

ii) Action Theorists
These studies relate to the 'action approach' to research beginning from the work of W.F. Whyte (1948). Whyte's (1948) study entitled Human Relations in the Restaurant Industry was the first major piece of research conducted into work in the hospitality industry. Whyte's (1948) methodology involved a mixture of participant observation coupled with interview. Although concerned primarily with supervisory staff and their ability to develop 'harmonious human relations' the study did show how in hospitality situations status orientation and the influence of symbols might influence behaviour. A later study using a similar methodology, Whyte and Hamilton (1964), laid emphasis on the structural features of the hotel situation in determining subsequent behaviour. A more recent study by Bowey (1976) using an 'action research' frame of reference and participant observation was conducted into staff relations in five Manchester restaurants. She used the results as a basis on which to launch a critique of functionalism, seeing it as reifying the social system and causing action to emerge from structure. In its place she proposed an 'action theory' perspective in which she saw structure as the outcome of actions and organisations as the
result of the behaviours of participants. This approach fits well with those who have taken a more interactionist stance to studies of managerial work. Collectively these studies, although not actually illuminating the activities and functions of managers in the industry, did help to define its contextual and structural characteristics and indicated how it was possible to conduct research into hospitality situations and then develop the results within clear conceptual frameworks.

iii) Hospitality Anthropologists

A field has developed which might loosely be called the 'hospitality anthropologists'. This has been concerned with understanding the work of certain occupational categories within the industry, at least partially in anthropological terms, and has been typified by the work of Mars (1973), Mars and Nicod (1984) and Saunders (1981). The studies of Mars (1973) and Mars and Nicod (1984) were concerned with understanding the role of waiters and that of Saunders (1981) with kitchen porters. Each of the studies attempted to frame the action within the structural framework within which it occurred. Mars and Nicod (1984) used the work of Douglas (1978, 1982) in viewing the social environment in terms of 2 concepts 'grid' and 'group' while Saunders (1981) presented his analysis of kitchen porters in terms of occupational stigma. Although none of these studies is specifically concerned with the nature of managerial work in the hospitality industry, they help to provide important insights into the context in which that work occurs and generally add to the overall understanding of work in the industry. Moreover, they
offer a perspective which might be utilised in studying managers.

iv) Personal and Leadership Characteristics
The fourth subsidiary sector relates to those who have tried to define the managerial job in terms of the personal characteristics of those who occupy it and the style of management they adopt and this links with the traits type approach common throughout managerial work studies (Fortune Magazine, 1946; Clements, 1958; Copeman, 1971). The traits approach to managerial work has involved attempting to describe the managerial position in terms of a 'set of traits'. This has a comparatively long history in the hospitality industry and relates to a commonly held belief that the industry demands a specific type of person in its managerial positions. Capper (1948) and Winslet (1955) describe the traits in terms of factors such as courteous, firm, just, sober, placid, tact and an ability to deal with people, while later work, such as that of Brymer (1977) and Lundberg (1984), developed this list of traits with particular concern to those involved with dealing with people.

There have been two research based studies into the characteristics of managers in the industry, Shaner (1978) and Worsfold (1988, 1989a). The work of Shaner (1978) was primarily concerned with the values of managers in the industry and used a Rokeach Value Survey in asking managers about the values and characteristics they believed important for the job. The four leading characteristics were honesty, ambition, responsibility
and capability. The study by Worsfold (1988, 1989a) used the 16PF scale of Cattell et al. (1970) to ascertain the personality characteristics of a group of 28 general managers from one company in the United Kingdom and to compare them with managers from other industries. The characteristics which emerged from the study as being important included the ability to relate and deal with people, competitiveness, enthusiasm, sociability, communication skills, venturesomeness and a more extrovert type of personality. In terms of comparison with managers from other industries the group were found to be more assertive, forthright, uninhibited, imaginative and have less anxiety. The problem with the traits approach, as indicated by the work of Stogdill (1948), is that any list of traits fails to be definitive. Although Worsfold (1989a) noted that the traits needed by different companies might vary, he failed to address himself adequately to the differences in the traits among the 28 managers. As Stogdill (1948) indicated the traits approach is so open to varied interpretation as to make it an unreliable method by which to judge the skills or characteristics needed by managers and the study of Worsfold (1988, 1989a) generally failed to address these problems.

Work into leadership styles in the industry has not been extensive. The initial study of White (1973) drew comment from Landmark (1974), Downey (1978) conducted a small scale study using case studies and Worsfold (1989b), as part of the same research mentioned above, asked managers to complete a Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (Fleishman, 1960). The work of White
(1973) suggested that managers were using an autocratic style while the preferred style of their subordinates would have been a mixture of autocratic and consultative. Landmark (1974) presented arguments for a contingency style for the industry while Downey (1978), in a similar vein, saw managers using a wide variety of styles. The results of the Worsfold (1989b) research saw managers as benevolent autocrats, high on dimensions of both consideration and structure.

While studies into the personality characteristics of managers and their leadership style add to the knowledge about managers, their characteristics and styles of operation, they do not directly inform about the nature of managerial work. Also, the number of these studies connected with the hospitality industry has been limited and their methods and conclusions of varying quality.

v) Career Patterns

There have been a number of research studies concerned with understanding the career paths of managers in the industry. This is reflected in the work of Swanljung (1981), Arnaldo (1981), Pickworth (1981, 1982), Guerrier (1986, 1987) and Ruddy (1988). The patterns which emerged from these studies were that the industry was 'closed' (Guerrier, 1987) in the sense that it was not usually possible for those outside of it to enter into operational management positions, that managers acquired their first general management post at around the age of 30, that they
moved fairly frequently, about once every three years, that general managers were more likely to have a food and beverage background than any other and that the number of graduates in general management posts appeared to be increasing. These studies helped to provide background information with regard to employment patterns in the industry and to the context in which managerial work occurred.

5.3 THE MAJOR STUDIES

Activities and Characteristics

The studies which have dealt with the activities and characteristics of managerial work in the industry have been those of Nailon (1968), Ferguson and Berger (1984), Koureas (1985) and Hales (1987). Only in Nailon's (1968) study were activities and characteristics the primary concern of the study; Ferguson and Berger (1984) were more interested in functions and both Koureas (1985) and Hales (1987) with the contextual aspects of managerial work. This has left the understanding of the nature of managerial activities and characteristics in the hospitality industry somewhat under researched.

The first researched study of managerial work in the hospitality industry was that of Nailon (1968). Nailon's (1968) stated intention was to develop a methodology suitable for the study of managerial work, but the work tended to be more concerned with a study of general managers' time usage and contact patterns. The
study covered 3 hotel general managers over the period of a working week using a diary method. He asked participants to record events which lasted for a period of 5 minutes or more under 5 headings: function, content, location, activity and interaction. The results of the study showed managers as spending nearly 40% of their time on supervision, 23% on talking and 19% on correspondence. In terms of participants, 38% of time was spent with subordinates, 36% with customers or potential customers and 17% with superiors; 62% was spent in external communication and 38% internally. Most work, 43%, was conducted in the managers office, 14% in the restaurant and 11% in public rooms.

Nailon (1968) wished to compare managerial work in the hospitality industry with results from other research. Appendix 2 shows how he compared his results with the work of Burns (1957); Copeman, Luijk & Hanika (1963); Brewer and Tomlinson (1964); Horne and Lupton (1965) and Stewart (1967). Nailon’s (1968) managers spent less time in their offices and more with customers and on external activities than did those in the general studies. Overall, Nailon (1968) observed hospitality managers as having a highly fragmented job, spending relatively little time alone, tending to avoid group situations, spending large amounts of time with guests and in direct supervision, relatively little on personnel matters and a high proportion of time dealing with the external environment. He summarised in terms of hotel manager’s having:
"1. A heavy involvement with the external environment rather than with their own staff. 2. They are engaged in a continuous monitoring of their unit through fleeting contacts and frequent movement about the establishment." (Nailon, 1968, p.120)

The major weakness of the Nailon (1968) study lay in its methodology, and particularly that relating to the recording of functions. Both Burns (1957) and Stewart (1967) had commented on the difficulties of using diaries to record functions. Nailon (1968) also failed to develop adequate descriptions of the characteristics of the work, so that the figures presented in the data were largely left to speak for themselves without adequate conceptualisation. However, it was a major piece of work in the sense that it helped to place managerial work in the hospitality industry within the context of more general studies and provided the first research based insights into the activities and characteristics of managerial work in the hospitality industry.

The other studies which, at least partially, addressed themselves to the activities and characteristics of managerial work in the industry were those of Ferguson and Berger (1984), Koureas (1985) and Hales (1987). While Koureas (1985) used the Nailon (1968) diary, the other two studies adopted the documentation of Mintzberg (1973). The Koureas (1985) study allowed a direct comparison with Nailon (1968) in terms of activities, location and interaction and this is shown in Appendix 3. The broad
patterns between the two studies are similar, although the managers in the Koureas (1985) study spent more time in discussion and less in supervision and on external contacts than Nailon (1968) suggested.

Appendix 4 shows a comparison of the results of Mintzberg (1973), Ferguson and Berger (1984) and Hales (1987) in terms of the activities of managers. The results from Ferguson and Berger's (1984) study showed substantial differences from Mintzberg (1973). Whereas Mintzberg (1973) found managers spending most of their time in scheduled meetings, the managers in Ferguson and Berger's (1984) study spent more time in unscheduled meetings and on the telephone. The reasons for these differences could have been one of level, Mintzberg (1973) was dealing with chief executives whereas the Ferguson and Berger (1984) study dealt with restaurant managers. Also, Mintzberg (1973) defined an event as an activity which took longer than 5 minutes, this meant that his managers were seen to have only 22 activities per day whereas those of Ferguson and Berger (1984) had 86. What the Ferguson and Berger (1984) study indicated was that the work of restaurant managers was very hectic, fragmented and reactive in nature and that managers were essentially information processors rather than decision makers. Unfortunately, Hales (1987) adopted a slightly different methodology from the others so that a single activity might be placed under more than one category. Although this helped to overcome the mutually exclusive nature of Mintzberg's (1973) categories it meant that his results were not directly comparable with other studies. The study indicated substantial
differences in the work patterns of a restaurant manager and a hospital domestic services manager. The restaurant manager's time was spent on contacts, paperwork, desk work and unscheduled meetings whereas the domestic services manager had a high proportion of time spent in contact with others and an almost equal amount split between scheduled and unscheduled meetings. Also, while the restaurant manager undertook periods of operational work, this was not the case for the domestic services manager. Hales (1987) summed up saying:

"All in all, there was a contrast between the relatively routine "clerical" administration and maintenance of a pre-programmed and stable operating system by the restaurant manager and the relatively proactive, personalised management of an inherently unstable system by the domestic services manager." (Hales, 1987, p. 31)

These studies indicated that it was possible to separate the activities of managers and how they conducted their work from the classically prescribed functions of managers. Nailon's (1968) study showed the work of managers in terms of their activities, location and participants rather than the bland functions of planning, controlling, coordinating etc. This gave much wider vision and understanding to the work of managers in the industry and increased the dimensions by which the process could be viewed. The managers he studied emerged as spending large amounts of time in supervision and talking both with subordinates and
with customers. They spend over 40% of their time in their office and over 60% of time is spent on contacts external to the organisation. Ferguson and Berger (1984) expand this analysis of activities into a more general assessment of the characteristics of managerial work in the industry, describing it as hectic, fragmented, reactive and largely concerned with information processing. Ley (1978, p. 159) similarly described hospitality managerial work in terms of it being conducted at a quick pace, with many interruptions, with managers liking action rather than reflection and tending to use the verbal rather than the written media. Finally, Hales (1987) draws attention to the differences in activities between those in different sectors of the industry who appear to be on a roughly equivalent level.

Functions

All the studies which were primarily concerned with identifying what managers do in the hospitality industry, use the work of Mintzberg (1973) as their base. (Ley, 1978; Arnaldo, 1981; Ferguson and Berger, 1984; Shortt, 1989). The first of these is that of Ley (1978) who conducted a structured observation study of 7 hotel general managers over a period of 3-5 days each. Ironically, the major strength of Ley's (1978) work was its methodology which used the same instrument as did Nailon (1968). However, he used the Nailon (1968) diary as a basis for structured observation, rather than as a self-completion diary and added to this a further document which allowed him to note the purpose of each activity. He also attempted to link
managerial work patterns with managerial effectiveness by asking a senior member of the management of the hotel chain to rank each of the managers in the study highly effective, effective or less effective. Lastly, he asked each manager to judge their own use of time. Ley (1978) was perhaps the first study of managerial work to be concerned with limiting the number of variables which directly affected it. Hence, he consciously set out to study managers from one industry, one company, at one hierarchical level, and just two main geographical locations. One of the major weaknesses of managerial work studies to this point was that they had consistently studied managers from a variety of industries, companies, levels, functions and locations often without due regard to these variables.

Ley (1978) fitted each observed activity into Mintzberg's (1973) ten roles, so that he could allocate a time usage to each role. He then compared the patterns with the effectiveness rating given to the managers. Although he commented that the process of allocating activities to roles was not difficult, later work such as that of Ferguson and Berger (1984) and Larson et al. (1986), had difficulties when adopting a similar approach. Ley (1978) found that those managers who spent a proportionately higher amount of time on the entrepreneurial role seemed to be more effective, which was supported in the later work of Arnaldo (1981) and Stewart (1982), and that those who spent greater amounts of time on the leadership role were less effective. He found that managers believed their most important roles to be those of leader, information disseminator, entrepreneur and
disturbance handler but he concluded that managers had only a limited ability to judge their own use of time. Overall, Ley (1978) largely followed the conclusions of Mintzberg (1973) seeing both the roles and activities of managers as fundamentally similar. Although this was methodologically a comparatively sound study, Ley (1978) both failed to present his raw data and make the best use of it. His transformation of action into Mintzberg’s (1973) roles appeared too ‘glib’, given the difficulties encountered by other authors, and he failed to question the validity and reliability of the roles. He also did not equate his raw data with that of Nailon (1968) and so his analysis of the characteristics of managerial work stood unsubstantiated.

The work of Arnaldo (1981) was similarly influenced by Mintzberg (1973) but was less satisfactory both in method and results than that of Ley (1978). Arnaldo (1981) conducted a postal questionnaire of 194 general managers in American hotels. He asked each of them about their personal and career details; about the measures which were used to judge their effectiveness; and to rate each of Mintzberg’s (1973) ten roles against their use of time and their perceived importance. His results suggested that managers believed their most important roles to be those of leader, disseminator, entrepreneur, monitor and resource allocator. However, there were a number of problems with this study. Although a postal questionnaire methodology might have been appropriate for establishing a profile of the personal and career characteristics of general managers, it was likely to be
problematic in understanding the nature of their work because of managers' limited ability to judge their own use of time (Burns, 1954, 1957; Mahoney et al., 1965; Pheysey, 1972; Ley, 1978). Also, the ability of managers to perceive each of Mintzberg's roles in a similar fashion seems highly unlikely and it was possible that a wide variety of interpretation was attached to the terms. Like Ley (1978), he appeared to accept the Mintzberg (1973) analysis of managerial work and work roles without question. The results were therefore of only limited interest, although the study did extend the analysis of the importance of Mintzberg's (1973) roles in terms of the perceptions of managers.

The work of Ferguson and Berger (1984), was illuminating in the way in which they were prepared to be critical of themselves and of others. Whereas Ley (1978) and Arnaldo (1981) had been prepared to accept both the methodology and conclusions of Mintzberg (1973), Ferguson and Berger (1984) used Mintzberg as a base from which to develop their own conclusions and perceptions about the functions and characteristics of managerial work in the hospitality industry. Their study used the same documentation as Mintzberg (1973) in conducting a structured observation study of 9 restaurant managers over a period of 5 days each. They had considerable problems with the methodology and said that they found Mintzberg's (1973) categories:

"neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive" (Ferguson and Berger, 1984, p.30)
Their results concluded that the functions of managers were somewhat different from that typically presented in management texts, they said:

"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." (Ferguson and Berger, 1984, p. 30)

Their analysis concentrated more on describing the characteristics of the work rather than the functions or roles of the managers. They viewed restaurant managers as being constantly busy, spending most of their time communicating with others and as being in a permanent 'interrupt mode'. They noted that managers made no apparent attempt to limit the number of contacts nor did they try to proactively manage their time. This suggested, together with their later work, Ferguson and Berger (1986), and that of Kotter (1982), that this pattern of high levels of communication and frequent interruption may be a chosen and effective mode of operation for managers.

The study by Shortt (1989) was a postal questionnaire study conducted in Northern Ireland. It followed the work of Ley (1978) and Arnaldo (1981) in being concerned with ranking the importance of Mintzberg's (1973) roles. Shortt (1989) used the questionnaire developed by McCall et al. (1980) and asked managers to rank on a five point scale the importance of the ten roles to their job.
The main part of the survey was sent to 134 hotel managers and received 62 usable responses. Shortt (1989) then tried to find correlations between various organisational factors such as size, number of staff and the educational background of the manager and the way in which the managers' ranked Mintzberg's (1973) roles. His results indicated that managers ranked the disturbance handler, entrepreneurial and leadership roles as the most important and Appendix 5 compares these results with those of Ley (1978) and Arnaldo (1981). Only one of the correlations produced a significant result, that between number of employees and entrepreneurial activities, suggesting that the entrepreneurial role became more important to managers as the size of unit increased. This result led him to believe that managerial work may vary with the situation. It was surprising that Shortt (1989) chose to use the McCall et al. (1980) questionnaire given that Ley (1978) had used something similar and was quite critical of the results and given the difficulties of using postal questionnaires for this type of research. Although this study did act as a further point of comparison with the work of Ley (1978) and Arnaldo (1981), it did not add substantially to what is known about the functions connected with managerial work in the hospitality industry.

Overall, the studies into the functions of managers in the hospitality industry have failed to enlightened the process beyond that of Mintzberg (1973). The main criticism of the studies, aside from that of Ferguson and Berger (1984), was their acceptance of the ten roles presented by Mintzberg (1973). A
problem with Mintzberg's (1973) roles was that they begged the question; why these roles and not others? Further, those using Mintzberg's (1973) roles as the basis for investigation faced the same sort of linguistic problems as early researchers (Burns, 1957; Stewart, 1967) found in classifying functions, that the terms used were linguistically so imprecise as to make for varied interpretation. This situation was made worse when the research used a postal questionnaire in which the opportunities for explanation were limited. Although amusing, the terms provided by Ferguson and Berger (1984); reacting, carrying on, juggling and full-time watching, do not resolve the problem. What these studies did achieve was that they began to show that some roles may be perceived as more important than others by managers, even if their observed activities did not bear out these results in terms of the actuality of their work (Ley, 1978). Further, the later study of Shortt (1989) began to suggest that there might be differences in managerial functions connected with differing situations.

**Contexts**

The studies of Koureas (1985), Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) were primarily concerned with the contexts in which managerial work occurred, rather than simply managerial functions or activities. This seemed to reflect the influence of both Stewart (1976, 1980, 1982) and those writing within the labour process frame of reference, all of whom became concerned with the variables associated with managerial work at this time.
The study of Koureas (1985) was partially a replication of Nailon (1968) and partly an attempt to relate the nature of managerial work to a number of contextual variables. Koureas (1985) undertook a study of the managerial activities of hotel general managers and then compared these with the type, category and geographical location of the hotel. He asked six hotel general managers in Cyprus to complete a diary for a period of one working week, using the instrument developed by Nailon (1968). Overall, there were broad similarities between his results and those of Nailon (1968) in terms of the activities and patterns of work of hotel general managers. With regard to the variables he found that both category and location seemed to make relatively little difference to the pattern of work, but that the type of hotel, affected both interactions and activities. Although methodologically rather weak this was the first study of managerial work in the hospitality industry to suggest that managerial work may vary with the influence of certain specific variables.

The two studies by Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) reported two stages of the same research. The first study related to an attempt to understand the managerial job in terms of the expectations of those in the role set and therefore took a similar perspective to that of Machin (1981, 1982). This study covered 6 organisations from different sectors of the hospitality industry; family restaurants, hotels, steak-houses, school meals,
hospital catering and contract catering. The methodology involved a 3 part process; establishing the role set; asking a representative member from each section of the role set to state their expectations and the strength of such for the manager; and finally asking the manager to judge his own expectations of his position and involved conducting a total of 121 interviews with members of the manager's role set. Hales and Nightingale (1986) referred to the method as the 'managerial wheel' as each participant was asked to attach an expectation to the spoke of a wheel and then indicate the subsequent strength of that expectation in terms of essential/must, desirable/should or possible/can.

The study led to six major conclusions; firstly that the nature and size of the role set tended to differ between the commercial and institutional sectors of the industry. Secondly, that there were frequent differences between role set expectations and individual interpretations. Thirdly, that certain expectations such as maintaining organisational standards, monitoring customer satisfaction, controlling costs and stock and staffing issues appeared to be widespread and were given substantial importance. Fourthly, that managers had a large number of often conflicting role expectations, an average of between 40-70 per role. Fifthly, that demands lay in two major areas, administration/organisation and entrepreneurship/marketing. Sixthly, that the mass of competing demands made the job both conflicting and fragmented.

In the second study, Hales (1987) used a mixture of the
managerial wheel and structured observation to study the work of a restaurant manager from a chain restaurant and a domestic services manager from a hospital for a period of one working week each. He found major differences in both the content and form of the jobs. While the restaurant manager was spending his time on controlling cash and stocks and general administration, the domestic services manager was involved with matters primarily concerned with staffing and industrial relations. This led Hales (1987) to describe the restaurant manager’s job as primarily administrative and that of the domestic services manager as more interactive.

The studies led Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) to see fundamental differences between work in different sectors of the industry. They said:

"We have a picture of a job which, not only in the way it is constituted, but also how it is practised, is subject to a mass of competing, often contradictory or conflicting, demands and expectations from a multiplicity of sources, both inside and outside the manager’s organisation. Surrounding a common core of tasks and activities, relating to standards, customers, costs and stock control and human resource management, there is considerable variation, both between different sectors, with some notable differences between the public and private sectors, and with individual jobs, with differences of emphasis and substance in the expectations of
members of the manager's role set. These differences and variations suggest to us not only that the skills required to undertake different unit managerial jobs in the industry are somewhat different, but also that individual jobs require skills which vary in kind as well as degree." (Hales and Nightingale, 1986, p.10)

The results of Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) led them to observe that there were a core of similarities in managerial jobs in the industry, but around this core there were substantial differences. These differences could be explained partly by the large number and conflicting role demands that were received from the role set. Overall, the two studies helped to place managerial work in the context of the total managerial process of the organisation and added considerably to the debate regarding the relative importance of demands and choices as influences on managerial work.

5.4 SUMMARY

In general, research in the hospitality industry has followed the broader field of managerial work studies in the way in which both methodology and theory have developed. The early work of Nailon (1968) fitted with most of the studies which had been undertaken in the 1950's and 1960's and provided an understanding of the nature of managerial work in terms of time and contact patterns. The later studies of Ley (1978), Arnaldo (1981), Ferguson and Berger (1984) and Short (1989) acted as a link between the
hospitality industry and the work of Mintzberg (1973), while the more recent work of Koureas (1985), Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) were concerned with the variables that influenced the conduct of managerial work in the industry. The work of Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) also provided a methodology which allowed the conduct of managerial work to be placed within the context of the total managerial process. The major studies combined with those from a number of subsidiary fields or approaches to present a very fragmented picture of the activities and functions of managers in the hospitality industry and the contexts in which that managerial action was performed.

No study gave its major aim as a greater understanding of the activities of managers in the hospitality industry in terms of time distribution and contact patterns and so knowledge in this area is fragmented and very limited. The picture which emerged from the studies was that managers spent the highest proportion of their time:

* - on supervision,
* - talking to subordinates and to those external to the organisation
* - on desk work.
* - and almost half of their time in their office.

This pattern of work was described as being hectic, fragmented, reactive, interrupted and quick in pace, and managers were seen as preferring the verbal media and action rather than reflection.

These descriptions have led to three debates in the associated
literature. Firstly, whether managerial work in the industry is proactive and rational (Fearn, 1968; Gamble, 1984; Gale, 1985; Merricks and Jones, 1986; Ruddy, 1988) or reactive to events (Shamir, 1978; Ley, 1978; Ferguson and Berger, 1984; Koureas, 1985; Hales and Nightingale, 1986; Hales, 1987; Kostoulas, 1988). Secondly, the extent to which the manager should spend time in the office or close to operational events. This debate may have arisen from the work of Peters and Waterman (1982) and their belief that managers should spend a high proportion of their time 'being there', which was supported in the work of Venison (1983). Thirdly, the extent to which managerial work activities are essentially similar (Nailon, 1968; Ley, 1978; Vallen, 1978; Mars et al., 1979; Arnaldo, 1981; Ferguson and Berger, 1984) or different (Wood, 1983; Mars and Nicod, 1984; Hales and Nightingale, 1986; Hales, 1987; Umbreit and Eder, 1987; Shortt, 1989).

The approach to managerial functions in the studies was primarily concerned with trying to assess the relative importance of Mintzberg's (1973) ten roles. Apart from the work of Ley (1978), this assessment was dependent on the manager's own perception of his work roles and their relative importance. However, managers' abilities in noting their own use of time and presumably their allocation of time to functions has been consistently questioned (Mahoney et al., 1965; Pheysey, 1972; Ley, 1978) and Ley (1978) found substantial differences between the way in which hotel managers perceived their use of time and how time was actually
allocated during the period of the research. Overall, the studies suggested that the roles which were perceived to be most important were those of leadership and entrepreneurship. This area has remained linguistically bereft and it is difficult to see how the ten roles from Mintzberg (1973) were, in essence, any easier for managers or researchers to interpret in an unambiguous manner than were those of Fayol (1949).

In terms of the context of managerial work the studies indicated that the type of hotel, resort or city centre, might be influential on the activities of managers (Koureas, 1985) and that the managerial job was influenced by a wide range of demands made upon the manager from the role set (Hales, 1987). This added to the debate as to whether managerial work patterns were the outcome of the context in which the work occurred, the role demands of the position or of individual choices made by the manager. Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) saw core similarities in the work around which there was room for managers to place a different emphasis on varying aspects of the job, while both Lattin (1977) and Stewart (1982) suggested that the breadth of the general manager’s job in hotels might be such as to enforce choices on the manager. Lundberg (1959), Stewart (1976, 1982), Medlik (1978), Boella (1979) and Guerrier and Lockwood (1988) all commented that the managerial job in hospitality appeared to present the manager with choices, as well as demands and constraints.

The studies of managerial work in the hospitality industry
present a small, fragmented picture. The number of studies, their emphasis and methodology all mean that knowledge of managerial work in the industry remains very limited. The needs of research into managerial work in the hospitality industry largely follow those of the broader field in terms of the need for methodological development, a wider range of descriptions and language and the development of conceptual constructions. In particular, there is a need to know more about:

i) the activities of managers in the hospitality industry in terms of how they spend their time; where, with whom and on what activities;

ii) the functions which hospitality managers undertake in terms other than those of Mintzberg (1973) or Fayol (1949);

iii) the characteristics of managerial work and whether Mintzberg's (1973) description is applicable to the work of managers in the hospitality industry;

iv) the conduct of a variety of managerial positions within the industry, as well as those of general manager;

v) whether the work of general managers in a given company and in a similar size of operation is fundamentally 'similar' or 'different';

vi) the relative importance of demands and choices in establishing the work of managers;

vii) the influence of various contextual variables such as organisational culture, managerial strategies and managerial divisions of labour on managerial work.
There is a need for a great deal more research in the whole field of managerial work in the hospitality industry and in particular with regard to the activities and functions of managers and the contexts and determinants of that work. Also, there has been little attempt to try to develop the somewhat fragmented studies into a clearer framework within the broader field of managerial work studies. Yet, there remains a need to try to bring together these diverse studies in a more coherent form if knowledge is to develop.
CHAPTER 6

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The process of 'scientific' research was viewed as entailing a sequence of observation, classification, analysis and theory but it was believed that this cycle could be approached in different ways. The particular stance that this research chose to take was inductive and qualitative both in the methods used and in the way that the conclusions were drawn. Blau and Scott (1963) described three types of organisational research; exploratory, descriptive and hypothesis testing. The qualitative approach led the study to be descriptive and exploratory rather than hypothesis testing. It was descriptive in its depiction of managerial activities and functions and exploratory in the understanding of why managers undertook similar or different work in broadly comparable situations.

The first part of the chapter deals with some of the larger issues which confronted the research, the middle section with the specific methodologies used in the study and the last part with the tactics and the implementation of the methods and the methods of data analysis.
6.2 META ISSUES IN THE METHODOLOGY

In arriving at the specific methodology the researcher had to confront a number of scientific and philosophical questions other than those directly concerned with individual research techniques. Morgan (1983) noted that:

"we are encouraged to see the research process as involving choice between modes of engagement entailing different relationships between theory and method, concept and object, and researcher and researched, rather than simply a choice about method alone." (Morgan, 1983, p.19/20)

In particular, methodological questions arose from the 'scientific' nature of studies of managerial work; the relative value of quantitative and qualitative data; the size of samples and the perceptual nature of meanings.

1. Managerial work research as 'science'

The nature of the social sciences as a field of study and its comparison with the natural sciences, has been an area which has attracted considerable attention from management writers in the last decade (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Dunbar, 1983; Whitley, 1984; Astley, 1984, 1985). The central debate concerns the feasibility of treating management topics in a similar way to
research in the natural sciences, or whether the nature of the phenomena is so different as to make the use of such methodologies invalid. The more traditional approach aimed to make management a 'science' comparable with the natural sciences and Astley (1984) laid out the central axioms of such an approach:

"the methods of management science should be objective; empirical observations should be impartial representations of managerial reality, unbiased by particular researchers' interests, values or viewpoints." (Astley, 1984, p.259)

The alternative viewpoint has suggested that because of the nature of data and its subsequent interpretation, all study in the social sciences is inherently subjective. Whitley (1984) summed up this view commenting:

"that because of the inherent meaningfulness of human action and its highly contextual nature it is impossible to acquire knowledge of the human world which is similar to that obtained of the natural world." (p.370)

Given the contextual nature of topics in the social sciences and the difficulties in constructing closed systems in which variables are held constant, it is difficult to see how the social sciences can be treated in the same way as the physical sciences. However, as Redding (1984) points out, it is possible to accept the idea of managerial studies as 'science' within a
social science framework if one is prepared to accept the notion that different phenomena require substantially different approaches. Redding (1984) suggested that:

"A closer examination of the methods of science will reveal that the continuum of natural, biological and social science is just that—a continuum. Along it there are changes of degree, but there are no radical changes of type. Misunderstanding arises from the unjustified assumption that the laboratory type of methods of procedure of natural science confer on them superiority and some sort of monopoly of 'true' science." (Redding, 1984, p.9)

This study largely adopted this viewpoint believing that the social sciences need to accept that 'science' can be developed in other ways than through the essentially positivist deductive paradigm of the pure sciences (Whitley 1984, Capra, 1982). While management studies cannot be studied in the same way as the natural sciences, except in the artificially created arena of the laboratory, there is no reason why it cannot be seen to rest within the generic field of the social sciences and be approachable through the methods of that field.

Qualitative and Quantitative Data

The outcome of this belief was that the study adopted an inductive rather than deductive approach, accepting that the
social sciences deal with variable rather than fixed phenomena and with action within a working and changing context. Further it was felt that inductive methods were more appropriate when an area was at the theory building rather than theory testing stage of its development and it was important that something was learned rather than something was proved. As such the issues were more in need of description and exploration than measurement and hypothesis testing and this linked with the decision to adopt an essentially qualitative rather than quantitative approach to the study. Filstead (1979, p.38) had noted that qualitative methods were more suited to situations which required the discovery of theory rather than its verification. Note was also taken of those who believed that there was really no alternative to qualitative data in the social sciences as there is no objective reality to be measured (Silverman, 1970; Crompton and Jones, 1988). In the end, the nature of the phenomena to be studied dictated that a qualitative method was more appropriate than a quantitative one. Bryman (1988a) suggested:

"that quantitative and qualitative research are each appropriate to different kinds of research problem, implying that the research issue determines (or should determine) which style of research is employed." (Bryman, 1988a, p.106)

While the field of management studies has traditionally been heavily influenced by the quantitative approach there has recently been a growing acceptance of a more qualitative stance
(Hunt et al., 1984; Bryman, 1988b). The key advantage of qualitative methods is the richness and variety of data which can be gathered and how this allows for different approaches than the use of inferential statistics in the analysis and conceptualisation of data. Weick (1968) and Miles (1979) comment on the ability of qualitative data to give 'thick descriptions' and a more 'holistic view'. Miles (1979) says of qualitative research:

"Qualitative data are attractive for many reasons: they are rich, full, earthy, holistic, "real"; their face validity seem unimpeachable; they preserve chronological flow where this is important, and suffer minimally from retrospective distortion; and they, in principle, offer a far more precise way to assess causality in organizational affairs than arcane efforts like cross-lagged correlations." (Miles, 1979, p.590)

Also, qualitative methods in the broader sense allow for the action to be shown within an overall context or process. In part this is because a qualitative approach allows for research methods to be relatively unstructured and open and therefore more responsive to the particular circumstances of the research as they occur. It has been a criticism of quantitative methods that they tend to offer a rather static and non-contextual view of events. Bryman (1988a) noted that:

"whereas quantitative research tends to invoke a perspective which implies that social reality is static and beyond the
actor, the image deriving from qualitative research gives a sense of that same reality in processual terms and as socially constructed." (Bryman, 1988a, p.103)

As a stated intention of this research was to attempt an understanding of the reasons for similarities or differences in managerial work it seemed likely that these might rest within the contextual domain of the actors. Hence, a qualitative approach seemed more likely to provide the insights required.

The adoption of a qualitative stance influenced the methods of inquiry, the form of data sought and its subsequent analysis. The adoption of a natural science approach would have led from the development of specific hypotheses to the collection of 'hard', empiricist data and the use of inferential statistics. Whereas, the qualitative approach opened itself to the use of a variety of methods of data collection, differing types of data and a form of analysis which allowed for exploration and description of the phenomena.

Miles (1979) did warn however, of the problems of qualitative research in terms of its labour intensiveness, problems of data analysis, comparability of data and methods of analysis. Whereas a quantitative approach would have allowed for the collection of larger quantities of data from a well constructed sample, the type of data this would have collected and the ability of the actors to accurately assess their behaviours were both in doubt.
It was felt that a small intensively observed sample would allow for a more appropriate approach to this research problem and to the use of the researcher's limited time. Comparability of data has been a constant problem throughout studies of managerial work and a structured observation format was adopted in an attempt to overcome some of these weaknesses. However, it was accepted that this only represented a partial solution as much of the data of this study would still remain uncomparable with that previously undertaken due to the differing methods and tools of previous research. Certainly a major difficulty of the qualitative approach lay not in the process of collecting data but in their subsequent analysis. The use of a structured observation sheet was designed to make analysis somewhat easier and less haphazard. However, the process of coding and subsequent analysis was difficult. Inevitably then, interpretations will be subjective, but it is questionable if this is less valid than objective assessments. Yin (1984) and Mitchell (1983) expressed the idea that whereas quantitative methods are expressions of statistical generalisation, qualitative analysis represents analytic generalisation.

Overall, the approach which this study adopted was that while qualitative data may not present the same opportunities for replication, they offered greater opportunity to develop areas in which there was a further need for explanation, rather than determination of 'truth'.
Sampling

Sampling has been a general problem for those wanting to study the nature of managerial work. The choice has been between the case study (Dalton, 1959; Sayles, 1964; Nichols and Benyon, 1977); small, intensive samples (Mintzberg, 1973; Ley, 1978; Kotter, 1982); or more extensive samples (Martinko and Gardner, 1984; Luthans et al. 1985). In none of the cases has any attempt been made to gather data through random sampling methods. The samples used in most studies appear to have been constructed on a highly subjective basis; either on the number of observations or participants that the researcher thought would give a clear picture or on the number of those willing to take part in the research. There appears to have been little attempt to distinguish between homogeneous and heterogeneous samples, and the general trend throughout organisation theory and studies of managerial work has been towards small, heterogeneous, convenience samples (Miller, Anderton & Conaty, 1985). Bryman (1988b) noted that:

"what we know or think we know about organizations is based on samples providing little external validity. Researchers sample organizations or subunits of organizations in opportunistic ways. When they do achieve a modicum of generalizability, the populations from which the samples are selected often are themselves defined arbitrarily." (Bryman, 1988b, p.17)
Most of the early studies of managerial work used heterogeneous samples with very little attempt to control any variables except perhaps those concerned with function or level. This led Stewart (1982, 1989) to comment on the need to control the variables in future studies of managerial work. This study made a deliberate decision to undertake a small scale intensive sample of managers from one organisation thereby reducing the variables concerned with industry, organisation, level and function.

Although small, case study type approaches do give potential problems of generalisability (McKelvey and Aldrich, 1983) they offer, as Crompton and Jones (1988b) point out, the opportunity to gather in-depth information on a particular topic which provides a basis for subsequent theorising. This research believed that the ability of the case study to act as a basis for theorising depended in part on its topic area. Dunkerley (1988) said:

"There is, nevertheless, a criticism that is frequently raised against the use of case studies in social and organization studies — that the possibility of generalizing is minimal. Whilst there is much to support this criticism in terms of the limited ability to move from the particular, a lot depends upon the aims and function of the particular case study." (Dunkerley, 1988, p.91)

In the terms offered by Yin (1984) of analytic generalisation there is no reason why the case study cannot be used as a basis
for the exploration of a phenomena from which further theoretical analysis proceeds.

Other problems connected with sampling in studies of managerial work have been linked to time, resources and access. Because the study of managers is time consuming, it is not possible for a single researcher to conduct extensive samples using observational methods. Hence, studies that wish to undertake observation of a large number of participants need more than one researcher. So, where the resources of the study are limited to a single researcher, as in this case, this has the effect of limiting the size of sample which the researcher can reasonably undertake given the time and resources available. In Bryman’s (1988b) text Doing Research in Organizations one of the most recurring themes throughout the series of readings was the problem of access. This study similarly suffered problems with gaining access to organisations for in-depth qualitative research and this had the effect of automatically limiting the sample available to the researcher.

Buchanan et al. (1988) stress the need for organisational researchers to adopt a pragmatic view at to what is possible and available to them and the most direct outcome of this relates to sampling. Access was a key problem for this research and to a limited extent this influenced sample size. However, the decision to undertake a case study type approach of one organisation, so as to reduce the number of variables, was taken without the constraint of resources.
The Interpretation of Meanings

A central question which faced this study and previous studies of managerial work was: whose meanings were the most appropriate, those of the participant or those of the researcher? This broadly represented a central difference between the positivist and interpretive methodological paradigms. The positivist approach has tended to use the interpretation of the researcher of hard, empiricist data whereas the interpretive approach has been more concerned with the meanings of the actors and their interpretation of events. The problem with the more positivist approach is summarised by Bryman (1988a):

"what has proved disquieting to some commentators, both within and outside the qualitative approach, is whether researchers really can provide accounts from the perspective of those whom they study and how we can evaluate the validity of their interpretations of those perspectives." (Bryman, 1988a, p.74)

However, the study of social action through the meanings of agents creates considerable problems in the study of managerial work in the collection of data, its interpretation and theorising. In terms of asking managers to assess their own use of time or their functions, managers have consistently proved to be bad estimators of their own work behaviour (Burns 1954, 1957; Pheysey, 1972; Ley, 1978). Similarly, where study is being made
of mental constructs or of processes which do not readily lie within the conscious domain, participants interpretations have been found wanting. The work of Marshall and Stewart (1981) suggests that, for instance, the concept of 'choice' is not held consciously by most managers.

The alternative of allowing the agent to interpret meanings seems to cause problems in managerial work research. The approach of Bourgoyne and Hodgson (1983, 1984) was to ask managers to talk through actions as they conducted them and to recall these events in their own words at a later date. If work is as hectic and fragmented as earlier studies suggest, (Guest, 1956; Mintzberg, 1973; Ley, 1978; Ferguson and Berger, 1984), the first part of this would seem to be both difficult and restrictive for managers, and would be likely to interfere substantially with their normal working practice. The second part relies heavily on the manager's memory of events and this is likely to have been distorted by subsequent occurrences.

However, it was accepted that researchers are similarly bound to attach meanings to actions and such meanings are inherently subjective because different researchers hold different world views (Whitley, 1984; Astley, 1985). What this study attempted was a social construction of reality in terms of the researcher and the actor. However, it was chosen to use the researcher as the main interpreter of meanings. To counteract this heavy bias toward the interpretations of the researcher, there was frequent interaction between the researcher and the participant to help to
understand events in the actors own terms. This was supported by unstructured and semi-structured interviews to give the manager the opportunity to express their beliefs about their work.

Hence it was felt that the best understanding of the area would accrue from an analysis of the data in terms of the researchers' interpretation coupled with the use of anecdote, immediate informal investigation of actions as they occurred and some unstructured and semi-structured interviewing to add the actors viewpoint.

6.3 THE METHODS OF THE STUDY

Background

The aim of the study was to observe, in detail, the activities and functions of managers in a given position in a single organisation and to assess both the nature of their work, its degree of similarity or difference and its determinants. In this situation non-participant observation seemed to offer the best alternative as it allowed for the simultaneous collection of qualitative and quantitative data causing the minimum amount of disturbance to the work flow of each manager. However, it was recognised that the usage of this method alone would mean that the interpretation of events would lay only with the researcher and it seemed desirable to allow the manager the opportunity to interpret and discuss immediate events and their context. This
was done through the use of semi-structured interviews to gather specific pieces of information and unstructured interviewing during the course of the action and at the end of each working day to ascertain the perspectives of the manager on events. A further view was gathered from members of the role set as to their view of the managerial job. These methods collectively offered a form of triangulation on the phenomena.

Major Research Methods

Structured Non-Participant Observation — Each of the major methods available to the study offered severe limitations; participant observation may limit the objectiveness of the observer by being 'too close' to the subject, it restricts the researcher to a single situation and is very difficult to conduct in managerial situations unless the researcher is employed by the organisation prior to the commencement of the research. Questionnaires and interviewing while allowing for an extensive sample, seemed unlikely on their own to provide sufficient detail to describe what was likely to be a highly frenetic and complex activity and past studies of hotel managers using this method had produced only limited results (Arnaldo, 1981; Shortt, 1989). The diary method limited detail, had severe linguistic problems and seemed unlikely to be completed with great regularity or accuracy over a sustained period. More interpretive methods, which relied solely on the accounts of the participants, seemed likely to take up substantial amounts of the participants time and thereby alter the 'normal' flow of their work.
Against these a method of structured non-participant observation offered a method which had been already extensively used in the study of managerial work and which allowed for the intensive study of managers while facilitating the simultaneous collection of qualitative and quantitative information. Access was likely to be less of a problem than with participant observation and it allowed for the observation of a number of managers on different sites. The decision to adopt a structured approach stemmed from a desire to collect some information systematically, to give a basis of comparison with some previous studies and to ease the process of observation and data collection. Patton (1980) noted that:

"it is not possible to observe everything .... For both the human observer and the camera there must be focus .... Once in the field, however, the observer must somehow organise the complex reality represented by the program so that observing that reality becomes manageable." (Patton, 1980, p.137)

It was not believed that using a structured approach necessarily precluded induction, for as Mintzberg (1973) had indicated it was possible to be inductive in adapting an initial structured observation sheet to the immediate needs of the research. Overall it was felt that structured non-participant observation offered significant advantages over the other methods as a means by which to study managerial work especially in terms of its ability to gather 'rich' data, to collect quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously, to note data systematically, in its non-
interference with the work flow of managers and in that it allowed the immediate investigation of events as they occurred.

However, non-participant observation did have the disadvantages outlined by Martinko and Gardner (1985). It was hoped to limit the problems of reliability, effectiveness, environment and the observation of cognitive processes through the use of unstructured interviewing during the course of events. The problems of coding and epistemology were addressed through the use of the structured observation document tested by Martinko and Gardner (1984) and by the adoption of an inductive stance to the collection of data and the design of the observation sheet. However, the use of non-participant observation made initial access more difficult, limited the size of sample and had the potentially contaminating effect of the participant being constantly observed by a researcher who might be viewed as an agent of management.

Non-participant observation was used for the collection of quantitative as well as qualitative data. Most studies of managerial work have had an element of quantitative data within them and this has proved an effective manner in which to compare time usage and patterns of interaction. Given that this was the first non-participant observation study to report on managerial activity in hotels it was deemed important to collect a certain amount of empirical data. However, except in terms of simple time or interaction patterns, it is difficult to describe the nature
of managerial work in quantitative terms and inevitably a more detailed description depended upon the gathering of more qualitative data. Therefore there was clearly a need for the use of some other methods to help in counteracting the weaknesses of non-participant observation and to give a different view of the phenomena. This led to the development of a mixed methodology in line with the more recent studies of managerial work by Kotter (1982), Martinko and Gardner (1984) and Stewart (1989).

Interviewing and Discussion - Non-participant observation was supplemented by a number of structured and semi-structured interviews aimed at gathering specific information about the participants. Also, informal discussions were held between the researcher and the participant during the course of events and at the end of each working day. These were used to obtain the actors perspective upon the events of that day and to add anecdote and insight to the data gathered on the structured observation sheet. Coupled with this the managerial wheel was used with members of the role set to ascertain their perspective on the managerial role. These secondary methods were used to gain background information about the participants, their objectives and the framework within which action was conducted.

Triangulation - Collectively it was hoped that this mixed methodological approach would form some degree of triangulation by bringing different perspectives upon the single phenomena. The use of triangulation in the social sciences developed from the work of Webb et al. (1966) and was defined by Denzin (1978) as:
"the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon." (Denzin, 1978, p.291)

The aim of triangulation was to mix methodologies with the intention of overcoming the weaknesses of single methods and developing wider perspectives on the phenomena. As Fielding and Fielding (1986, p.31) noted any one type of data collection method is privileged and constrained by its own nature and tends to the collection of a certain type of data. The amalgamation of methods in a mixed methodology might then lead to more valid results and a wider perspective of the phenomena (Jick, 1979, p.603).

However, the rationale for the adoption of this approach developed from the demands of the study rather than any presumption that the process of triangulation would make the data any more 'scientific'. Both Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) and Fielding and Fielding (1986) had noted that triangulation was no guarantee of reliability, validity or even a more complete picture.

6.4 THE SAMPLE

One of the major sampling problems facing studies of managerial work has been the control of variables. As Stewart (1982, 1989) pointed out, there has been very little attempt to control the
variables which potentially affect the studies. So comparison was made between data derived from managers who had different functions and levels, and who came from different organisations, locations, industries and in some cases countries. There was a need for further studies which compared like with like; that is managers at the same level and function, in the same size and type of operation within a similar geographic area and in the same organisation and industry. This would allow for comparison of managerial work, its similarities, differences and its determinants, as well as being able to place action more firmly within a specified context.

Hence it was chosen to reduce as many of these variables as possible. The initial research design stipulated the following conditions:

* - A single organisation - probably a major operator of hotels and large enough to provide a sample of managers.
* - A single level of manager - preferably, general managers in hotels
* - Comparable size of unit
* - Comparable type of hotel - i.e commercial, resort, old, new etc.
* - Within the United Kingdom
* - That the participant should have been in position for at least 3 months.
The participating organisation then placed a number of constraints upon the research. These related to the length of the period of observation, the number of managers involved and the choice of participating hotels. The organisation limited the period of observation to one working week and the size of the sample to six managers. These were selected by the personnel director and managing director of the part of the organisation. Although it would have been desirable to obtain a random sample of managers, the problems of access would not allow it. Those who chose the sample said that it was done on a haphazard basis, bearing in mind geographical considerations and the availability of managers who fitted the research design. They felt that those chosen were generally neither worse nor better, as managers, than another similar group may have been. However, there was a general 'feeling' among those in the company, outside of senior management, that these were relatively 'good' managers.

The final research design then involved:

* A large hotel and catering organisation.
* Six hotel general managers - for a period of one week each.
* Hotels of between 80-120 bedrooms.
* Three new hotels carrying a brand name and three older hotels which were individually named. All six hotels in the study catered to the business market.
* All the hotels were in the United Kingdom, but were geographically widely spread.
* Each manager had been in position for at least 3 months.
6.5 DATA COLLECTION

The study used a series of documents with which to collect its data:

i) The Observation Form
ii) The Mail Record
iii) Hotel Background Questionnaire
iv) Personal Details Questionnaire
v) The Goals Interview
vi) The Managerial Wheel
vii) Self Assessment Record

The Observation Form

The design of the structured observation recording document was based on that used by Martinko and Gardner (1984). A major consideration was whether to use the same documentation as some earlier studies, notably that of Nailon (1968) or Mintzberg (1973), or to design a new form. The first alternative would permit a direct comparison with the results of a limited number of previous studies, while the latter would allow for refinements indicated by subsequent research and comment. It was decided to adopt the broad design of Martinko and Gardner (1984) and adapt this inductively to the specific demands of the situation. This allowed some comparison with other studies while overcoming some of their failings and allowed for the development of a recording
document appropriate to the research. A major strength of the Martinko and Gardner (1984) document was in its ability to simultaneously notate the activities of managers and make a narrative description events. Also, it used one form, compared to the three of Mintzberg (1973).

Appendix 6 shows the headings used in this study and that of Martinko and Gardner (1984). The form was adjusted prior to the commencement of the research to make it easier for recording purposes, all the events which were recorded at the time of observation were grouped together on the left hand side of the page, while those which were noted after observation were on the right. The main adjustments made to the observation recording document of Martinko and Gardner (1984) were that on the left hand side of the document the categories of race/sex, duration in minutes and observer presence were dropped. Race/sex was irrelevant given that all the managers were white caucasian males, duration could be calculated using other means and the number of occasions that the observer would not be present would be rare. On the right hand side there were found to be substantial difficulties in the interpretation of both Mintzberg's (1973) roles and a Principal Competency Index. These were replaced by Luthans and Davis' (1984) Leader Observation System and a classification scheme of discretion, demands and critical events which emerged from the study.

The left hand side of the observation document allowed for the notation of the number of the event, its duration,
classification, location, the participants, form of initiation and whether other events were 'embedded' within the main event:

Events - The earlier studies of Stewart (1967), Nailon (1968), Mintzberg (1973) and Ley (1978), had classified events in comparatively long time spans, usually of at least five minutes duration. If, as had been suggested by Guest (1956) and Ferguson and Berger (1984), managers had to cope with a large number of differing and sometimes overlapping activities then this needed to be reflected in the notation of events. Hence it was decided to classify an event as 'any activity with a duration in excess of one minute'.

The classification of events used by Martinko and Gardner (1984) was that of Mintzberg (1973); i.e. telephone call, scheduled meeting, unscheduled meeting, tours and desk work. This study adjusted this initially to include the category of operational work used by Hales (1987). However, it became obvious during the early part of the research that these categories did not adequately cover all situations, as had been intimated by Ferguson and Berger (1984). Therefore the categories of 'short contacts', 'other' and 'with researcher' were added to overcome the weaknesses. The category of unscheduled meetings gave a rather false impression, the study found that general managers had a large number of short contacts with staff and guests and it was felt misleading to describe these as 'meetings', except in the very broadest sense of the word. The study therefore
introduced the category of 'short contacts' to describe unscheduled interactions of up to 3 minutes duration, the category of 'unscheduled meetings' thereby becoming unscheduled meetings of longer than 3 minutes.

Some events were unusual and did not fit easily with any of the other categories and therefore the category of 'other' was instigated. Hales (1987) had linked together the categories of 'other' and 'operational' but it was felt, given the comparatively high amount of time his restaurant manager spent on operational activities, that it would be useful to separate these categories. 'Other' covered events such as casually reading the newspaper, leisure activities, meetings with friends or family or other unusual events. As an aim of the research was to interact with the participants to gain their interpretation of events it was decided to have 'interaction with the researcher' as a separate category, as had Lawrence (1984). Therefore, the final categorisation for events became:

- Telephone Call
- Scheduled Meeting
- Unscheduled Meeting
- Desk Work
- Short Contacts
- Tours
- Operational
- Other
- With Researcher
Location - The categories for location, shown in Appendix 7, emerged partly from the work of Nailon (1968) and Mintzberg (1973) and were adjusted to the needs of the situation as the research developed.

Participants - The classification scheme for participants began from the work of Mintzberg (1973) but added 'secretary', 'head office staff', 'other external' and 'researcher'. It was found that each general manager had their own secretary and therefore it seemed likely that a significant number of contacts would be with the secretary. The fact that the hotels were geographically separated from their head office meant that contacts with head office personnel represented an important part of the job and were indicative of the extent to which the job was demand led. 'Other external' referred to contacts with those outside of the organisation other than guests. This replaced Mintzberg's (1973) categories of 'independent' and 'other' which were felt to be somewhat unclear. The category of 'researcher' was included for similar reasons to those presented in the 'events' category. The final classification scheme for participants is shown in Appendix 7.

Form of initiation - was used in a slightly different way to Mintzberg (1973) to cover all 'events' rather than all interactions. It was decided that it would be possible to classify all events in terms of their initiation and this would give a greater indication of the reactivity or proactivity of managers. However, in practice this proved problematic as it was
difficult to distinguish between events that were self initiated and those which were other initiated. For instance, when a manager returned a telephone call was that an example of a self initiated or other initiated activity? The outcome of this was that relatively little account was taken of these results in the analysis stage.

**Embedded events** - was a category devised by Martinko and Gardner (1984) to overcome the difficulty of events not being mutually exclusive. For instance, if a manager took a short phone call during an unscheduled meeting, the system used by Mintzberg (1973) meant that either this phone was excluded or the meeting was shown as occurring twice, once before and once after the phone call. Clearly, both alternatives were unrealistic. Using Martinko and Gardner's (1984) system of embedded events it was possible to show the telephone call as a subsidiary event during the course of the meeting. The only area where this caused a serious problem was in the category of 'tours'. In practice, it was found that a tour encompassed a continual number of embedded events and therefore in the analysis of the results tours were not included as a separate item.

On the right hand side of the document were two categories which were completed after the observations occurred:

**Leader Observation System (LOS)** - The first related to Luthans and Lockwood (1984) Leader Observation System which is shown in
Appendix 8 and was recorded during each evening of the research. Luthans and Lockwood (1984) devised LOS as a method by which to record the functions of managers and was methodologically a development of the earlier work of Hemphill (1959) and Tornow and Pinto (1976). However, the original document needed adjustment to suit the needs of the research. A major point of difficulty was the category of motivating/reinforcing. This was omitted for many of the reasons that Stewart (1976) put forward in finding that the category of 'leadership' in Mintzberg's (1973) roles was both ambiguous and unobservable. Managers in this study did not directly motivate people in the sense that this could be observed as a distinct activity, motivation or the reverse occurred through the perceptions of subordinates to a wide range of different events.

The category of 'disciplining/punishing' was rarely used by managers and they believed that it was essentially part of their 'staffing' role and so these two categories were linked together. The place of the two categories of motivating and disciplining/punishing was taken by an 'other' section and by an 'operational' one. Some events simply did not fit into any of the pre-ordained categories and so it was important that there should be an 'other' category in which to record them. Also, Luthans and Lockwood (1984) make the assumption that managers do not carry out non-managerial work or direct operational work, this was found not to be the case and therefore a category of 'operational work' was introduced. The final list of functions was:
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i) Interacting with those external to the organisation
ii) Monitoring/Controlling Performance
iii) Planning/Coordinating
iv) Socialising/Politicking
v) Paperwork
vi) Exchanging routine information
vii) Operational Work
viii) Decision Making/Problem Solving
ix) Staffing/Disciplining
x) Training/Developing
xi) Managing Conflict
xii) Other

Discretion, Demands from Above, Demands from Below, Critical Events - The last category on the right hand side of the observation form was devised after the research was complete and arose from a desire to understand events in terms of their origin and form of initiation. As Larson et al. (1986) had pointed out, categorising events as proactive or reactive was, in practice, difficult. The problem was, for instance, if a manager decided not to open a letter until the afternoon, was he being proactive in the sense of deciding when to open it, or reactive to the presence of the letter? Similarly, in communications, if the manager phoned a department head about a specific event was he being reactive to the needs of that event or proactive in making the call? Therefore it was decided to classify each event according to its perceived origin. The categories were:
a) Discretionary - events that the manager chose to undertake at that time, rather than another event. These events were not the obvious result of a direct demand from the workplace or of a demand from above or below in the hierarchy.

b) Demands from above - were events which occurred directly from the demands which the manager faced from head office and regional office.

c) Demands from below - were events which came from demands placed upon the manager from subordinate staff or from outside the establishment.

d) Critical events - were events which emerged from workflow exigencies and which demanded the immediate attention of the manager. A section of the managers' time was taken up with events which evolved during the course of the day and needed a quick resolution, such as a customer complaint. These were termed 'critical events', as they were events which were critical to the immediate situation or to the continuing success of the enterprise.

The work of Stewart (1976, 1982), while introducing the concept of managerial work in terms of demands, constraints and choices had failed, except in the broadest possible terms, to identify their relative influence upon managerial work. The classification scheme outlined above aimed to describe the amounts of time and
areas of activity open to the discretion of the manager and the extent to which work was led by different types of demands.

2. The Mail Record

The mail record followed that used by Mintzberg (1973) and Hales (1987), however there were found to be substantial difficulties in noting this information in a non-obtrusive manner. In order for a detailed notation to be made of the content of mail it would have been necessary for the manager to talk about each document he received and what he did with it, this would have been highly intrusive. So, the stance taken was to ask the manager about documents which he felt were important and what he was going to do with them. This produced somewhat limited results and so relatively little account was taken of the mail record in the analysis of results.

3. Hotel Background Questionnaire

The hotel background questionnaire was conducted during the preliminary meeting with the manager and is shown in Appendix 10. The purpose of the questionnaire was to be able to make some comparison between the characteristics of the situations in which the action occurred.

4. Personal Details Questionnaire

This is shown in Appendix 11. The aim of the questionnaire was to
collect the personal details and career background of those being observed so that they might be compared against subsequent similarities or differences in managerial work activities. For reasons of diplomacy, the questionnaire was administered on the first morning of observation and was the last of the questionnaires used at that time. Care was taken with regard to the category of salary, which it was believed might be highly confidential and with regard to educational qualifications towards which those less qualified might have sensitive feelings.

5. Personal Goals Interview

This was a semi-structured interview which aimed to get the manager to discuss at some length the results he hoped to achieve and what he believed was expected of him by the company. The aim was to allow the manager to talk about his 'aims and ends' in the job. The questionnaire was conducted on the first morning of the observation period and this information was supplemented by comments which emerged during the week of observation. The broad outline document for the interview is shown in Appendix 9. The emphasis at the beginning of the interview was on what the manager perceived as being the aims of the company with regard to the hotel, secondly what they hoped to achieve personally and thirdly how the manager perceived the options with regard to time usage. It was hoped that this would help to frame the work of managers within their overall goals and link to the concept of 'agendas' developed by Kotter (1982).
6. The Managerial Wheel

This was the methodology used by Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987) to assess the demands from the role set upon the manager. Hales (1987), says of the method that:

"Each member of a manager’s role set ... was interviewed and asked to express his/her role demands of the manager on a "wheel".... Each spoke of the wheel represented a particular role demand, expressed in the respondent’s own terms and in as detailed and concrete a way as possible. Respondents could label as many spokes as they needed to express their range of role demands." (Hales, 1987, p.27)

Hales and Nightingale (1986) see the key advantages of the method as being that it combined in depth exploratory interviewing with a structured method of recording and that the wheel seemed to assist respondents in conceptualising their role demands of the manager.

The wheel used in this study is a slight adaptation of that used in the studies of Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Hales (1987), and is shown in Appendix 12. Whereas the original method involved identifying all the representative groups in the role set and then interviewing someone from each, in this study the wheel was used only with the manager’s immediate superiors, the area manager and the managing director, and with his immediate
subordinates, the direct management team. The earlier studies indicated that there appeared to be an element of diminishing returns in using the wheel with a large number of respondents, in the sense that those who were hierarchically more distant from the manager were less likely to be influential in the passing of demands. Whereas the earlier studies asked participants to grade the strength of each demand and then quantitatively ranked them, in this study respondents were asked to indicate which five of their expectations they deemed most important. It was felt that this would give a picture of those functions subordinates deemed most important without the quantitative imprecision of the earlier method. Finally, the manager was asked to complete the wheel himself, on his own perceived expectations of his role demands. The use of the 'wheel' acted as a method by which qualitative data could be collected on the demands passed to the manager by those in the immediate role set. This information was subsequently used to help to place the work of general managers within its contextual determinants.

7. The Self Assessment Record

This was given to the manager to complete at the end of the period of observation, and is shown in Appendix 13. The questionnaire asked the manager to indicate how he believed that he usually spent his time. In part, the aim was to test the widely held contention that managers were poor at estimating their own use of time (Burns, 1957; Pheysey, 1972, Ley, 1978) and in part it aimed to establish the managers own perceptions of
their use of time.

6.6 TACTICS AND IMPLEMENTATION

The research involved the observation and questioning of 6 hotel managers over the period of one working week each and was conducted in 4 phases:

i) Gaining Access

ii) The Preliminary Visit

iii) The Observation Period

iv) Data Analysis

1) Gaining Access

The readings which appear in Doing Research in Organizations (Bryman, ed., 1988) refer on a number of occasions to the problems of obtaining access to organizations for the purposes of research. Bryman, and Crompton and Jones refer to the problems of access and how this tends to limit organisational research, while Buchanan, Boddy and McCalman in the same volume note the importance of organisational 'gatekeepers' in giving access. These observations led them to the belief that organisational researchers have to take what is available and adapt accordingly, rather than be very rigid in their approach and methodology. This pragmatic stance is echoed on several occasions throughout the text. They note that in most instances research which involves
the cooperation of the organisation is likely to be restricted and that it is important that these limitations are negotiated so that the researcher is not compromised in conducting the research and arriving at conclusions.

In the present study it was found advantageous to contact companies at the highest possible level, rather than to directly approach the managers. This had the advantage that once outline permission was granted there was less chance of subsequent withdrawal, but had the disadvantage that the research was more likely to be viewed as a head office imposition with the subsequent result that the researcher might be seen as an agent of management. The process of obtaining access took a number of months. However, when permission for the study was finally obtained the dates for the conduct of the research were so imminent that it prevented time for a preliminary study. The ways in which the participating organisation limited the research were primarily in terms of the number of units it was possible to visit and the nature of the sample. Also the company requested that the following reports be undertaken by the researcher:

i) A short report to each participant outlining the findings of their observation week.

ii) A short overall review of the findings to each participant.

iii) An overall report to the company on the findings of the research.

iv) A copy of the finished thesis.
It was agreed with the company that its name should remain anonymous and that the names of individual managers or hotels would not appear in the reports and that there could be a bond of confidentiality between the participant and the researcher. Overall it was not felt that any of these were unduly inhibiting restrictions for an essentially qualitative piece of research.

ii) The Preliminary Visit

Each manager had a letter from head office requesting their participation and a preliminary visit from the researcher to explain the details of the study and to elicit support. During the preliminary visit the researcher outlined the aims of the research, the process of observation and completed the hotel background questionnaire. These visits lasted from one to three hours. The intention was to establish a relationship with the manager prior to the period of research, so that the research could commence as quickly as possible on the first day.

It was felt important that the researcher develop a rapport with the manager. The pre-observation visit and the use of the first hour of the observation period as an interviewing time were both used for this purpose. The perceived credibility of the researcher was important if the manager was to undertake something approximating normal behaviour and for the manager to talk openly to the researcher. Factors which may affect this perceived credibility may be simple factors such as dress or
demeanour or more important factors such as discretion and perceived empathy with the situation. However, the process of establishing credibility may be a 'double edged sword' as the type of discussion which helps establish credibility may well occur at the expense of normal work patterns. Also, there may be some advantage in appearing a totally ignorant by-stander. However, the latter approach seemed likely to inhibit the manager in entering into more detailed discussions with the researcher.

iii) The Observation Period

The period of the research was 5 working days, and this was in all but one case Monday-Friday, the last case being Tuesday-Saturday. These fitted in with the working week of the manager, although, some managers came into the hotel on days off. The research was conducted in the Spring and this was considered to be a comparatively busy period for the managers. There were seen to be two particular problems about the observation period:

a) The researcher as an 'agent of management' - This problem stems from achieving access at a senior level and does make the process of observation more 'political' (Benyon, 1988). Bryman (1988) had noted that:

"One of the chief difficulties seems to be that, in spite of researchers' protestations to the contrary, they are often seen as instruments of management who are there to evaluate or spy on their subjects and will report their findings back
The extent to which this is the case depends upon the researcher establishing credibility and a relationship of trust. Although confidentiality of information and identity were assured in the study, it remained obvious to managers that they would be readily identifiable to management in the results. However, the extent to which this changed the pattern of work was debateable for two reasons; firstly that the pattern might be determined by the demands made upon the manager and was therefore discretionary only to a limited degree, and secondly that managers who feel secure in their post may be unconcerned about identification by senior management.

b) **Obtrusiveness** — Despite the fact that writers such as Webb et al. (1966), Mintzberg (1970) and Lawrence (1984) had suggested that problems of obtrusiveness may have been exaggerated, this was a key problem during observation in this study. Problems of obtrusiveness have been largely ignored by those investigating the area, and yet it remains a major problem. Unless the researcher is undertaking interpretive research solely dependent on the explanations and interpretations of the actors, presumably he/she will wish to be relatively unobtrusive. This is difficult, especially during office based activities, where the office may be no larger than ten feet by ten, and when the manager is alone. To some extent then, there had to be a balancing between obtrusiveness and understanding.
Although the researcher took care to explain to each manager that he wished their behaviour to be as normal as possible and only wished to enter into a limited amount of conversation about most events, interaction occurred because the researcher wished a greater understanding of events and the actor wished to discuss them. Eye contact seemed critical in reducing the number of these interactions; when eye contact was not present, conversations were less likely to begin. Due to its obtrusiveness the observation method excludes researchers from situations which are personal or confidential. In practice, this tended to be disciplinary interviews, which were comparatively rare. On average, the researcher was excluded from one event during each week of observation. However, the level of obtrusiveness did raise questions with regard to the Hawthorne Effect and in one hotel it was suggested by members of the senior management team that the process of observation may have changed the normal work patterns of the manager. In this case some of the management team felt that the manager had adopted a more open and participative managerial style during the period of observation, than was normal. Lastly, in part, the acceptance of problems of obtrusiveness accounted for the inclusion of the category of 'with researcher' in both the 'mode of work' and 'participants' categories in the recording document.

iv) Data Analysis

In terms of data analysis the intention was that the study should
be inductive so that conclusions were drawn from the data both
during its collection and its analysis. Bryman (1988a) had noted
that:

"in line with their preference for a research strategy which
does not impose a potentially alien framework on their
subjects, qualitative researchers frequently reject the
formulation of theories and concepts in advance of beginning
their field work .... By and large, qualitative researchers
favour an approach in which the formulation and testing of
theories and concepts proceeds in tandem with data
collection." (Bryman, 1988a. p.68)

As such this study did not begin from the establishment of fixed
hypotheses which were subsequently tested but from three open
fields of inquiry:

a) What was the nature of managerial work in hotels?
b) In a given situation was it fundamentally similar or
different?
c) What determined the nature of that work?

The approach of the study and the size of sample restricted the
use of inferential statistics in the analysis of the data. Hence,
the intention was to use analytic generalisation rather than
statistical generalisation in its analysis. As Yin (1984) pointed
out, survey research depends on statistical generalisation for
its analysis, whereas case study type approaches depend on
analytic generalisation. One is not necessarily better nor more 'scientific' than the other. Similarly, this research followed the work of Bresnen (1988) who said:

"I was relying upon the ability to make analytical generalizations (Yin, 1984, p.39). The intention, then, was to select a sufficient number of cases (in the event five) such that sufficient grounds were available for making useful comparisons and contrasts, and drawing analytical inferences." (Bresnen, 1988, p.36)

In this study this involved the collection and sifting of qualitative data, the aggregation and compilation of quantitative data and the formulation of concepts with appropriate categories and descriptors. In the main observation period the structured recording document allowed the collection and subsequent analysis of the quantitative data while the qualitative data and verbal description of events gathered on the same page had to be sifted and then applied to the relevant areas of analysis. This was a time consuming process.

The data analysis was carried out in 4 interrelating phases:

i) **The analysis of work activities and functions** - this aimed to identify from the data broad patterns of the work of managers. This section used the quantitative and qualitative data from the observation form and to a much lesser extent the mail record.
ii) **The analysis of similarities and differences** - this aimed to describe rather than quantify the similarities and differences among the patterns of managerial work analysed in the description of managerial activities and functions and used the data collected from the observation form together with that from the goals interview, the managerial wheel and the self assessment questionnaire.

iii) **The analysis of the work environment** - the study intended to show the patterns of managerial work within the context in which the work has occurred. As Bryman (1988a) suggested:

"Qualitative researchers invariably seek to go beyond pure description and provide analyses of the environments they examine." (Bryman, 1988a, p.63)

However this has not generally been the case with those operating within the field of studies of managerial work where there have been few attempts to link the work of the manager into the context in which it occurred. This section used the data collected in the hotel background and personal details questionnaires, the goals interview, the managerial wheel as well as the qualitative data from the observation form.

iv) **Formulation of appropriate descriptors and concepts** - As Glaser (1978) noted, the intention of the qualitative researcher is to allow the categorisation process to develop from and during the research and then to be refined to higher levels of abstraction at a later time. The study aimed for conceptual development within two distinct areas, firstly the development of
descriptors to describe the work of hotel managers and secondly a broader based conceptual development of the determinants of managerial work.

6.7 SUMMARY

The study adopted the approach of Redding (1984) that scientific methodology could be viewed along a continuum from the natural to the social sciences with each method being appropriate to different situations and research topics. The extent of knowledge regarding the work of managers, and in particular that of hotel managers, was such that there was a greater need for description and exploration of the phenomena than there was for the testing of specific hypotheses. The process of exploration and description of managerial work lent itself to the use of an inductive approach and an emphasis on the collection of qualitative data. This approach also allowed the use of a small scale intensive sample in which the number of variables affecting the participants were reduced so that the study involved one level of manager, from one company and from similar types and size of establishment. This helped to overcome the problem of comparing like with like which was seen as a weakness of earlier studies.

Gaining access was problematical and time consuming. Companies were approached at a high level and this had the advantage of ensuring access lower down the hierarchy, but was disadvantageous in that the researcher was more likely to be perceived both as a
'nuisance' and as an agent of management. Once access had been gained it was followed by a preliminary visit to each of the participants. The purpose of this visit was to establish some rapport with each manager, to explain the process of the research and to assure them regarding the confidentiality of the findings.

In the process of observation the study had to make the choice between the positivist and interpretive paradigms and this linked directly to whether the primary source of the meaning of actions would be those of the actor or the researcher. The study chose to use mainly the meanings and interpretations of the researcher as interpretive approaches, which depended on the views of the actors, seemed difficult to implement without severe disruption of 'normal' work routines. However, in practice this was balanced through interaction between the researcher and the actor during observation, so that the actor's interpretations of events could be ascertained. The effect of this was that there was only a limited attempt to remain unobtrusive.

The study used structured non-participant observation as a primary method and an observation form adapted from Martinko and Gardner (1984). The form noted action in a structured fashion, allowed for a narrative description of events and the collection of the actors meanings. Each event was further categorised on the basis of the LOS system of Luthans and Lockwood (1984) and a system of discretion, demands from above, demands from below and critical incidents which was designed specifically for this
The major observational instrument was supplemented by the use of interviews, questionnaires and the managerial wheel to ascertain the participants perceived view of the job and the demands and expectations of those within the immediate role set. This was further supplemented by questionnaires aimed at ascertaining and understanding the context within which the work took place. The study recognised that an accumulation of methods into a mixed methodology did not necessarily overcome the problems involved in any single method. However, this method seemed to offer a way of observing the work of managers, while allowing a certain amount of interaction with the participants and offered rather less distortions than the other major methods used in isolation. It allowed also for investigation of the context in which managerial work was conducted.

There was an acceptance overall that the observation and analysis of qualitative data was problematical (Mintzberg, 1973; Martinko and Gardner, 1984, 1985). However, in the analysis stage the study looked for patterns which emerged from both the quantitative and qualitative data as a basis on which to develop descriptors to describe the work of hotel managers and as a basis for conceptual development with regard to the determinants of managerial work.
7.1 INTRODUCTION

As Willmott (1987) and Stewart (1989) have noted there have been few attempts to place the work of managers within the context in which the action occurred. In order to do this it was necessary to:

1) establish the outline history and language hotels;
2) have some understanding of the nature of hotel and service operations and how these may differ from the manufacturing situations to which management studies and studies of managerial work have traditionally addressed themselves;
3) ascertain the specific characteristics of the organisation in the research;
4) determine the features of the specific hotels in the study;
v) determine the personal background characteristics of the
managers under investigation;
vi) understand the nature of each manager's goals at work and
how they perceived the expectations of the company.

It was surmised that all these factors might influence the nature
of managerial work and that they would collectively make a
representation of the environment in which the work was
conducted.

7.2 THE HISTORY AND LANGUAGE OF HOTELS

The history and the development of the industry has been
influential in the way that it has shaped the structure and
organisation of hotels and hotel companies. This section
discusses the development of the hotel industry in Europe and
America and the language which has developed to describe its
operation.

History - Commentators such as Winslet (1955), Lundberg (1959)
and Medlik (1978) linked the history of hotels with that of the
inn, tracing their development back to Roman times. Inns of some
description certainly existed before Roman times but it has been
difficult to separate their purpose from that of brothels. The
Roman post houses, established along the main trading routes of
the Roman empire, were the first network of establishments
developed primarily to provide food and accommodation to
travellers. History then seems vague on the development of the
industry until Norman times and the use of Norman castles and monasteries as places of rest for travellers. Medlik (1978) then noted the development of inns in Europe in the Middle Ages and how they were well established by the sixteenth century.

The origin of the hotel, as opposed to the inn, is more disputed. Medlik (1978) noted that the word 'hotel' originated from the French term 'hôtel garni', referring to large French houses which had apartments to let, and emerged some time after 1760. However, American authors such as Lundberg (1959), tend to claim the 'modern hotel' as an American invention usually tracing it back to the development of the Tremont House hotel in Boston in 1829. White (1961) suggested that the first purpose built modern European hotel may have been the Hotel Baur au Lac in Zurich in 1838. Certainly, changes in patterns of travel and transport in the nineteenth century brought the start of the hotel industry both in Europe and America. However, the major thrust of development of purpose built hotels did not occur until the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, with many of the best known London hotels opening in the period 1890-1910. In the twentieth century hotel development has become more internationalised and has followed changing patterns of leisure, business and travel.

The origin of the European hotel was substantially different from its American counterpart and this has been subsequently reflected in their different approaches to hotel operation and views of the
role of the general manager. Whereas the European hotel developed
from the 'country house' and were organised to suit the needs of
the rich and powerful, American hotels took a more egalitarian
and profit orientated stance (Lattin, 1977). This is typified in
the opening of the Statler hotels in the early part of the
twentieth century under the slogan 'a room with a bath for a
dollar and a half'. American hotels were therefore more
commercial constructions, in the sense of having a clear and
openly declared profit motive. White (1968) noted that:

"It was an American claim that there is as big a difference
between the old inn and the modern hotel as between a broom
and a vacuum cleaner; that the luxury hotel is as much an
invention as the sewing machine and that it was an American
invention." (White, 1968, p. 129)

European hotels partially replaced the 'country houses' and
acquired many of their staff. As such it is unsurprising that
much of their internal organisation reflects that of the the
traditional 'country house'. In turn, this led to hotel managers
being expected to play the role of 'mein host' to their guests,
catering to and understanding their particular whims and
requests. This has remained a continuing tradition of European
hotel management, whereby meeting guests and being highly
involved in operational affairs are still regarded as important
and valid roles for hotel managers. The relative classlessness
and the distinct profit motive of American hotels led them to
adopt more common business methods to the operation of hotels.
They developed professional managers to replace the owner/manager and 'mein host' and significantly changed the way that the role of hotel manager was conceived. In the American model the manager was expected to be more administrative and office based and was held to be more concerned with ensuring the efficient operation and profitability of the unit.

Language and Status - The development of the internal organisation of the modern European hotel is demonstrated in the language which is typical of its operation and which seems to have two main points of origin, the English country house and the French restaurant or kitchen. The French influence is shown in the way that terms such as 'maitre d'hotel', 'aboyeur', 'commis' 'mis en place' are still commonly used even in relatively modest hotels. Although the term might now be considered old fashioned, a hotel is often referred to as a 'house', for instance, a manager might ask the head receptionist if the 'house is full tonight?'. The titles that are acquired by those working in hotels also owe much to the country house; the chambermaid, the housekeeper, the cook or chef, and recently some major international hotels have reintroduced butlers. This debt to country houses is further reflected in the status differentials of those working in the establishment, with those who meet or greet the customer acquiring more status than those who do not. Lastly, the terminology used to describe the customer is largely that of the 'guest', rarely the 'customer' or even the 'client'.
Although the hotels in the study retained much of the language of
the country house the influence of the Americanisation and
increased professionalism of the industry was reflected in their
internal organisation. Each of the managers was referred to as a
'general manager' rather than the more traditional description of
house or hotel manager and each hotel had an accountant, accounts
clerks, personnel staff, credit controllers, all positions which
emerged from the move away from traditional hotel organisation to
the more American type of business framework. However, most of
the managers also believed that they retained important 'mein
host' and operational roles.

Overall, the hotels in the study showed in the terminology of
their operation and their internal organisation the influence of
both the traditions of the European household and the American
style 'modern' hotel. This had considerable implications for the
roles that the manager undertook and the way that the company
viewed the managerial position and the demands which it made upon
the manager.

7.3 THE NATURE OF HOTEL OPERATIONS

Traditionally management theory has been directed to those in
manufacturing industry and there has tended to be an assumption
in much management literature that the average worker is working
on a production line. Therefore it has been viewed that the
concerns of the manager are those of the control of stocks,
industrial relations, conflict management etc. and that
communication with the customer takes place through the marketplace. The way that service industries differ has attracted attention during the last decade, and a number of authors have noted how they vary substantially in conceptualisation, structuring and operation (Mills and Möberg, 1982; Normann, 1984; Bowen and Schneider, 1988). Hotels have certain characteristics which separate them from manufacturing situations and, in part, from other sections of the service industries. These defining characteristics may be seen to influence the nature of managerial work in hotels.

**Continuous Operation** - The most influential characteristic of hotels on the nature of managerial work is that they are a twenty-four hour operation during which the customer is continuously on the premises (Nailon, 1968, 1981). This means that delegation of authority is essential. Clearly, it is impossible for the manager to be on the premises for even a half of the time of operation and therefore he must make important decisions with regard to whom and what is delegated. This produces a distinct pattern for managerial work, the times at which it occurs and the pressures under which the managers feel.

**Cost & Quality Control** - The second defining characteristic of hotels is the need for cost and quality control and the difficulties this imposes in a service situation. The intangibility of the product, the nature and speed of product delivery coupled with the fluctuations in demand and the high
level of wage costs as a percentage of sales mean that there is a high need for cost and quality control in hospitality situations (Capper, 1948; Mars and Mitchell, 1976; Medlik, 1978; Nevett, 1985; Uttal, 1987).

The labour intensive nature of hotels (Medlik, 1978, 1980; Fitzsimmons and Sullivan, 1982) cause managers to be very aware of labour costs, often on a day to day basis. The control of labour costs are seen by many hotel companies as a key strategy by which to maximise profitability. However, the reduction in labour costs is likely to have an immediate and direct influence on the quality of service offered and so managers may have to make a choice between quality and cost reduction.

As 'service' is widely deemed to be an essential element of the product, the control of the quality of product delivery is clearly important in hotels. Yet, service encounters are very difficult to control, firstly because they usually occur away from direct supervision, secondly because of their 'one-to-one' nature and thirdly because of the inherent unpredictability of guest requests and reactions. This 'contact dependent' nature of hotels (Lundberg, 1958; Medlik, 1980; Merricks and Jones, 1986; Schaffer, 1987; Newton and Reynolds, 1988) leads to a simultaneous need for control of the service encounter and for flexibility in the face of unpredictable demands. Shamir (1978) noted:

"that the high dependence of hotels on their customers, the
relative heterogeneity, unpredictability, sensitivity and reactivity of these customers, plus the diversified, personal and immediate nature of the service that have to be provided by hotels, all present hotels with two major demands - a demand for flexibility on the one hand and a demand for a high degree of control and coordination on the other." (Shamir, 1978, p.291)

This conflict between the need for flexibility and control has also been commented upon by Mars and Mitchell (1976) and Worsfold (1989b) in their view that managers adopt ad hoc management styles to cope with the unpredictability of situations.

The Product and Product Delivery - Both the nature of the hotel product and the way in which it is delivered are distinctive features of hotels. The idea that a hotel produces a product in a similar way to manufacturing is rather misleading. The hotel cannot be said to produce a room for consumption in the way that manufacturing industry produces a good. However, hotels clearly produce the meal which together with the room and the quality of service make up the total consumer product. This has been defined as being essentially an intangible service (Cassee and Reuland, 1983; Heskett, 1986; Schaffer, 1984, 1987; Merricks and Jones, 1986), although it might be more accurate to describe it as a product with intangible elements. A better description of the nature of the hotel product might be that it cannot be readily stored for periods of longer than 24 hours after it has been
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produced for consumption and so is highly perishable (Lattin, 1958; Kotas, 1975, Sasser et al, 1978; Fitzsimmons and Sullivan, 1982).

All the services of hotels are produced and consumed in very quick succession (Nailon, 1981; Newton and Reynolds, 1988). The outcome of this is what one of the managers in the study referred to as a 'now' business. Things happen quickly and there is generally no second chance to sell a product. If the room is not sold on that particular day, the sale is lost forever. This differs from most manufacturing situations where it is possible to hold stock and therefore the speed of product delivery does not generally have to be so rapid.

**Homogeneity** - There is substantial homogeneity in the product on offer in the marketplace among a number of leading hotel chains (Heskett, 1986; Merricks and Jones, 1986; Buttle, 1986; Sasser et al., 1978) and the managers in the study had some difficulty in differentiating their product from that of other similar organisations except on the basis of price or peripheral facilities such as health clubs. This could be why a number of authors have stressed the importance of the entrepreneurial aspect of the hotel manager's role (Ley, 1978; Arnaldo, 1981).

**Internal Characteristics** - Hotels also have a number of internal characteristics which may differentiate them from manufacturing operations and which help to shape their patterns of operation. In particular, these tend to be concerned with staffing and staff
relationships. Whyte (1948) and Mars and Mitchell (1976) noted the triadic relationship which exists between staff, management and guests, and a number of authors (Whyte, 1948; Shamir, 1978; Nailon, 1981; Saunders, 1981) have noted the hierarchical structuring of hospitality situations. Both Whyte (1948) and Saunders (1981) used status as a key organisational concept in hotels, and this can be linked to the work of White (1968) into the history of the industry. As White (1968) noted:

"born thus out of drunkenness and harlotry it is hardly surprising that inns and innkeepers were held in such poor repute through the centuries." (White, 1968, p.9)

Yet despite this hierarchical and status differentiation there is a need for high levels of interdependence between departments if the product is to be delivered successfully (Whyte, 1984; Dann and Hornsey, 1986).

In terms of staff conditions the industry is known to be one of low pay, long hours and little unionisation (Boella, 1974; Mars and Mitchell, 1976; Medlick, 1978, 1980). From this emerges an 'individual orientation to work' (Mars and Mitchell, 1976) whereby payment packages tend to be negotiated individually around the concept of a 'total payment package'.

Relationship with the Environment - Finally, a number of writers have explained the sensitive nature of the hotel with its environment (Lattin, 1958; Witzky, 1964; Powers, 1978; Slattery
and Olsen, 1984; Cassee and Reuland, 1983) and the subsequent sensitivity of hotel operations to changes in demand. Hotels are perceived as having a very close relationship with their local and national environments politically, economically and environmentally. These are then seen to influence location, success or failure and how hotels are managed. In particular, older hotels often play a social role within their community both as an employer and as a meeting place.

7.4 THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ORGANISATION IN THE RESEARCH

The organisation was a large multi-national hotel corporation with its headquarters in Great Britain. It had grown through organic growth and takeover since its inception as a catering organisation in the nineteen thirties. The organisation controlled 743 hotels worldwide as well as being diversified into areas such as industrial catering, airline catering, motorway service areas, roadside catering and a number of other secondary areas.

Philosophy and Policies

The company philosophy was closely related to the organisations' founder. The current chief executive is the son of the founder and the organisation was highly paternalistic in its pattern of development, senior management and stated beliefs. In his autobiography the founder says:
"I am by nature patriarchal and paternalistic. I do not think that paternalism is a bad thing. Paternalism means a fatherly attitude and employees being cared for, valued, and noticed, however big the organisation may be." (The Autobiography of the 'Founder', 1986, p.60)

The company prints a statement of its philosophy at the beginning of its annual company report. The company philosophy, as stated, is:

- To increase profitability and earnings per share each year in order to encourage investment and to improve and expand the business.
- To give complete customer satisfaction by efficient and courteous service, with value for money.
- To support managers and their staff in using personal initiative to improve the profit and quality of their operations whilst observing the company's policies.
- To provide good working conditions and to maintain effective communications at all levels to develop better understanding and assist decision making.
- To ensure no discrimination against sex, race, colour or creed and to train, develop and encourage promotion within the company based on merit and ability.
- To act with integrity at all times and to maintain a proper sense of responsibility toward the public.
- To recognize the importance of each and every employee who
contributes towards these aims.

The two dominating policies of the organisation related to centralisation and control of costs. The organisation was highly centralised in the way in which it operated. The founder stated this belief, saying:

"An organisation cannot grow and develop without strong central direction and support. Thus .... the activities of our numerous individual units were backed by strong central services: finance, personnel management, training and marketing." (The Founder, 1986, p.115)

Most aspects of each hotel's operation were subject to central approval or control. The product was designed centrally, both in terms of the design of the overall hotel unit, the choice of facilities, its decor and the nature of food on offer. Accounting and other operational systems were centrally designed and operated and decisions on capital expenditure were exclusively the domain of head office. The basic staffing structure and conditions of employment were shaped centrally and marketing was primarily centralised in head office. Hence managers had to work within a very clearly defined company framework, they were not free, for instance, to redecorate in different colours, to change staff uniforms, to substantially alter menus or to change prices without consultation with the area director and head office. In general, managers were expected to consult head office about any
issue which was likely to change the product, its price or mode of delivery. The effect of this was to limit manager's area of decision making primarily to decisions relating to the daily operation of the unit.

The process of centralisation is likely to be linked with a desire for uniformity of product and/or close control of operations. In the case of this company it was primarily the latter. The company was strongly cost, rather than market, led. The approach of the company throughout its history was to use the control of costs, coupled with careful budgeting as the cornerstone of its strategic approach. Hence, each manager was set an annual budget and target figures in each area of the operation and performance was monitored weekly. This was applied particularly rigorously in the area of staffing costs, as these were the highest cost item for the business and reflected the organisation's attitude towards staff and in particular trade unions. The company publicly stated that they did not believe in the concept of the 'two sides of industry', their view being a strictly unitarist one that matters regarding staff were the concern of the company not a trade union. Staff were therefore not encouraged to join trade unions and the company was known to adopt a hostile stance toward trade union organisation.

The Organisation of the Company

Hotels were the dominant operation of the company and these were divided into 4 divisions:
a) Those overseas or with an international market.
b) Those in the United Kingdom which were at the upper range of the three star or four star category and were perceived as having a market of more senior managers or company directors.
c) Those which were part of a chain operation, with a uniform name, which had developed around road networks.
d) A division which involved smaller hotels, resort hotels and inns.

As such the group was represented in all sectors of the United Kingdom hotel market and was highly diverse. An abbreviated organisation chart for the organisation is presented in Appendix 14.

The organisation of the division in which the six hotels of the study were incorporated is shown in Appendix 15. As can be seen the general manager reported to an area director who in turn reported to the managing director. As each area director covered approximately 14 hotels there was only infrequent contact between the manager and the area director, and not surprisingly, almost no contact with the managing director. The manager had indirect lines of responsibility to the wide range of functional specialists who operated from the head office; these included those in marketing, design, health and safety, personnel, training, food and beverage, housekeeping etc and they were used by each manager on a number of occasions.
7.5 THE HOTELS IN THE STUDY

The parameters of the study agreed with the company were that the study should cover 6 reasonably similar hotels. The hotels were therefore to come from the same division, were to be of roughly equivalent quality, were to have between eighty and one hundred and twenty rooms and each manager was to have been in place for at least 3 months. All the hotels were to be located in England. The hotels which were chosen by the company for the study actually fell into 2 distinct categories; three hotels were modern and held a company brand name and 3 were older established hotels each with an independent name from that of the parent company, although the product was clearly branded within the hotel. The results of the hotel background questionnaire are shown in Appendix 16.

Age - The hotels ranged in age from just 18 months to nearly 150 years old and age was directly related to location. The three newer hotels were each placed on the edge of a town and close to a major road network, the three older hotels were each situated in or very close to a town centre. The age of the hotel appeared to influence managerial attitudes and the subsequent shape of managerial work. Those managers in the newer hotels found that they had relatively little involvement with community affairs, and did not perceive the hotel as holding any particular value to the local community, other than as a source of employment. However, those in the older hotels viewed them as being a central
institution of the community and this was subsequently reflected in the manager's involvement in community affairs. This represented a significant difference between the hotels and indicated how a variable connected with the context of the work altered the use of managerial time.

**Quality** — In terms of quality the hotels were rated either four star or three star. However, the perception of the company, in the way that they placed them within the same division and priced them similarly, rated them of similar quality. Four of the hotels were ranked with four stars and two with three stars, although one of the three star ratings was more due to the oddities of the rating system than actual quality. In terms of branding, the company name was clearly established on all products within the hotels such as menus, stationary, marketing information etc. Even where the hotel did not carry the company name, the ownership of the hotel was made abundantly clear to the guest.

**Size** — Appendix 16 shows that the size of the hotels were within the range 82-120 rooms. This size was chosen so as to give a roughly comparable sample while allowing some choice for the company. The managers in the study felt that the hotels were compatible in terms of size and managerial status. There did not seem to be any perceived difference in status whether the hotel was old or new, or whether it had 80 or 120 rooms. The managers considered this type of hotel to be medium sized, and in terms of career development most of the managers saw it as a stepping stone between the smaller units in which they had held their
first general manager's position and their next move into a larger or more prestigious hotel.

**Revenue Generation** - The core profit making area for each of the hotels was the sale of bedrooms. In this respect the average room rate achieved for the sale of each room, coupled with the level of occupancy were the key variables. Managers saw average room rate as one of the key measures of their job and were keen to maintain high average room rates realising the relationship between average room rate and overall profitability. Average room rate was more closely linked to the location of the hotel than to its 'star' rating or any other factor and it varied from forty seven to fifty nine pounds. It was higher in summer than winter and on weekdays than weekends. The importance of average room rate influenced the mix of guests in the hotel. Managers were most reluctant to give discounts, particularly during weekdays, even for comparatively large groups or conferences and did not encourage tour groups. Generally managers perceived having tour groups as bad business, firstly because it reduced average room rates and secondly because it caused a 'mix' of business in the hotel which was difficult to control and operate.

Occupancy followed distinct patterns both during the week and at weekends and did not appear to be subject to the rapid troughs and peaks associated with the hotel industry. During the week occupancy was consistently very high, between 80-100%, but was lower and rather more variable at weekends, usually between 40-
70%. The high rate of weekday occupancy had a number of influences on the managers. It meant that they were able to keep a steady full-time staff, use relatively few part-time employees and have flexibility in dealing with those who required a discount. Further, it added stability to the pattern of work in that the managers knew that they did not have to worry too much about filling the hotel on weekdays and that the level of business would be reasonably predictable from day to day. However, managers did keep a very close eye on occupancy projections for the week in operation and the following 3/4 weeks. Indeed, this was virtually the only use made of the desk top computer, and this was checked several times daily by most managers. The reason for this was that there were sometimes very rapid swings, and overbooking situations needed careful control as these could pose difficulties for the manager. A manager could sell as much as 25% of his rooms from one day to the next. The high rate of weekday occupancy also had the effect of reducing the need for managers to physically go out and sell the business and its services. The attitude of most managers being that there was little point in this activity when weekday occupancy ran at such a high level and that the responsibility for the marketing and selling of 'weekend breaks' lay largely with head office marketing staff.

While the sale of rooms represented the major area of revenue generation, this was supported by a number of other hotel 'facilities', of which the two most important were the sale of food and beverage and of conference and meeting rooms. Each of the hotels had a restaurant and a separate bar, while two of the
hotels had secondary restaurants. Managers spent a considerable amount of time on the planning and general overseeing of food and beverage outlets, although it was recognised that these were of secondary importance in producing revenue and in maintaining profitability. However, each of the hotels had at least 2 main conference rooms and a number of meeting rooms and conference/meeting business was deemed critical by all the managers because it sold rooms and food and beverage to high-spending clientele. Managers realised that failure to sell conference space would certainly mean a reduction in overall profitability. All three of the newer hotels had health and fitness clubs which were run by a subsidiary of the main hotel company and were open to non-residents on a membership basis. In two of the hotels these clubs caused a number of problems for the manager in terms of customer complaints and general maintenance. Managers had a slightly ambivalent attitude toward the clubs, accepting that they were a useful additional facility for the hotel but feeling also that they had no expertise within the area and had limited jurisdiction in running their affairs.

Staffing - The number of staff in each hotel varied with the size of hotel, the percentage wage cost on which the manager was expected to operate and the availability of staff. The hotels used primarily full-time staff and the percentage of part-time staff was substantially less than would be the norm for the industry. In general, the older hotels had slightly more staff than the newer ones, although this was partly linked to higher room rates. In the main the relationship between rooms and staff
was roughly one room per 0.7 members of staff; with a range from 1:0.53, where the unit was very understaffed to 1:0.87 in the oldest of the hotels. The managers were expected to work on a wage percentage as a cost of sales of between 19%-25%. Where wage costs were 21% or below the managers seemed to find this a particular pressure, although there was little evidence that it significantly altered the nature of their work. In terms of managerial staff the hotels had a clear and well established management team, the size and shape of which was a matter of company policy. The management structure of each unit was:

General Manager

Deputy General Manager

Personnel & Accountant
Training

Food & Beverage

Engineer

However, the degree of decision making responsibility of each of these roles varied substantially from unit to unit. This was particularly the case with the deputy managers whose roles varied from being treated by the manager as a second in command and being involved in most major areas of decision making to a position in which they were considered almost a trainee and were rarely involved in the making of decisions. The other positions carried relatively little decision making power except over immediate operational matters. Of these, that of the engineer was
generally of much less status. Two other positions also commanded some status in the hotel and would be represented at most management meetings, those of chef and conference manager. The chef was quite powerful in most units in terms of control of the kitchen, although his influence did not usually extend beyond this area. The conference manager’s position reflected the importance of the post in terms of unit profitability and the capacity of this area to generate serious problems.

7.6 The Managers: Personal Details and Background

The ‘personal details’ questionnaire is summarised in Appendix 17. The aim of the questionnaire was to establish the background of the individuals in terms of personal details and work experience.

Age & Sex – The managers were all male and aged between 27 and 40 years of age. Although the company had no policy of recruiting only male managers, and indeed a female manager from another hotel was met during the study, managers in the company were predominantly male. The industry, as Guerrier (1986) commented, is dominated by males and it will take a long time for this dominance to be altered. In terms of age, twenty seven was considered to be young for a manager in this type of hotel. This manager had the most participative style with employees and had a closer relationship with his deputy and the rest of the management team than the other managers. He was also the newest
of the managers and faced the most significant number of problems. The other managers were in the age range 30-40 which was more typical for this size and type of hotel. While age alone is unlikely to be a major criterion on the way that managerial work is conducted, it is inevitably linked with experience and these two variables together may well be influential.

Marital Status & Place of Domicile - The managers were similar in terms of marital status and place of domicile. All but one of the managers were married, and all but one lived away from the hotel. Given that live-in accommodation was a norm for the industry, this was rather different than expected. Managers generally felt that it was better to live away from the hotel, firstly because it gave them a chance to enter the property market and secondly because they did not become bound to the problems of the hotel on a continuous basis. Neither marital status nor place of residence seemed to make a major impact on the nature of managerial work.

Qualifications - In terms of qualifications, the younger managers were academically better qualified than the older managers, although this may have been due more to opportunity than ability. The recent proliferation of courses at HND and degree level mean that there are now far more opportunities to attain a higher level qualification prior to entry into the industry. This was reflected in the qualifications of the two youngest managers. Whereas the youngest of these had a degree, the other had a 'diploma', however they went to the same educational institution and did very much the same course, but the elder of the two
undertook it before its conversion to degree status. Of the other managers two took OND's, one a MHCIMA qualification and the oldest had no qualifications at all. The trend seemed to be toward the employment of better qualified managers, but it is difficult to anticipate exactly how this will influence the nature or conduct of managerial work although it may create different conceptions of the job and this may change patterns of managerial work.

Pay - None of the managers were heard to complain about their level of wages. Two managers each earned in the range twenty to twenty five thousand pounds, whereas those who were more experienced tended to earn in excess of twenty five thousand pounds before a bonus. Some of the heads of department and deputy managers expressed concern at their wage levels and the number of hours they had to work; however these did not appear concerns of the general managers. The reason for this could be that managers saw themselves as, at least partially, in control of their work hours and that the remuneration was deemed fair for the job. There was some disagreement between the managers and the senior management of the company about the way in which the bonus was calculated and the company was accused of changing the 'goal posts' after bonus targets had been agreed.

Career Stability & Progression - The company did offer considerable security of tenure. It was unusual for a manager to be sacked and this would be usually because of gross misconduct
rather than poor results. The feeling among the managers was that poor performance was likely to lead to greater pressure and control from head and area office or a move to a different hotel rather than any threat of dismissal. The company liked managers to move around the group, although no great pressure was put on them to do so, unless it was felt that their performance was not quite satisfactory. Managers, then, felt quite secure in their posts.

However, the pattern of the industry and of the managers careers was one of rapid job change. Each of the managers had occupied between 7-12 different jobs and it was not unusual for managers to change jobs every three years or quicker, particularly during the early stages of their career. The manager who had been in post 4 years was considered by other managers to have been there for a long time. Although the rate of job change amongst the managers had been rapid this was largely within the confines of the company. The two youngest managers had not worked for anyone else, while the others had spent the majority of their careers with the company with occasional short breaks away from it. This meant that each of the individuals was very well socialised in the philosophy, policies, practices and politics of the company. This is viewed as being critical in the way that managerial work was shaped and conducted, and in the subsequent similarities in work patterns which emerged.

**Personality** - In terms of personality, there did not appear any
superficial evidence that the company tried to choose any particular personality type of manager. Although this study did not use a 16PF or similar personality inventory, observation and acquaintance indicated that the managers had very different personality characteristics. The manager at unit D was clearly an extrovert in his dealings both with staff and clients, while manager C was much more introverted in personality. The general characteristics of the managers could then be seen to be widespread and suggests, once again, that there may be little substance in a traits type approach to managerial work and leadership, given that these managers were operating at similar levels of effectiveness. Similarly, there was little evidence in this study that personality directly influenced the work or work pattern that the manager undertook, suggesting that work was largely controlled by factors external to the individual.

7.7 MANAGERIAL GOALS

'Goals' referred to what the individual wanted to achieve in the position for themselves and for the company. Studies of managerial work have taken little account of what managers wished to achieve, and how they subsequently did this. Certainly the terminology which Kotter (1982) referred to as the 'managerial agenda' has been little developed. Hence there was comparatively little knowledge, but considerable levels of assumption, about the ends and goals of managers. In the present study a semi-structured interview was used to ascertain the goals of managers and how they perceived those of the company with regard to their
The aim of the questionnaire was to investigate the aims of managers so that subsequent patterns of work might be associated with particular managerial goals. The assumption was that a manager's goals would influence the work that he eventually undertook.

Central Goals - The terminology in which the managers couched their goals varied, but a number of central themes emerged from the questionnaire. These included the aims of:

- high profitability
- better product and service standards
- high levels of delegation
- senior staff development
- low levels of complaints.

The group used a standard measure of profitability entitled 'hotel profit contribution' (HPC), which was net operating profit expressed as a percentage of sales. The major aim of all the managers was to improve their HPC percentage and this was seen as a more important figure than raw net operating profit. Managers recognised that it was relatively easy to cut standards to achieve short term profit, but it was much more difficult to keep standards and profitability high, which was the aim, to a varying degree, of each of the managers. Most managers genuinely wanted to give as good a product and service as possible within what they perceived as the constraints of staffing, the company and
the infrastructure of the establishment. Delegation referred to delegation to their deputies and other members of the management team and was connected with the overall goal of being able to concentrate on the work which they believed to be important. This linked with the area of staff development and most of the managers saw it as a measure of success that their deputies and other members of the management team should move on to better jobs. Lastly, head office used the number of complaints which were received about an establishment as a measure of the success of the manager. Head office was perceived by the managers to be very sensitive to complaints, hence a low level of head office complaints became a major objective for all the managers.

Measures of Success - When asked about their key measure of success the managers varied somewhat. Although three cited high HPC as their own personal goal, the rest used other measures, as well as profitability, as the key goals. Two of the more experienced managers spoke of success in terms akin to 'peace of mind', the ability to be able to leave the establishment knowing that nothing was likely to go seriously wrong in their absence. The last manager commented that ways of measuring personal success were inevitably the same as those of the company because that was how the managers were measured. The managers differed substantially as to whether they were proactively free to follow these goals. Three of the managers saw their work as being highly planned and essentially proactive, while two others saw themselves as essentially reactive to events around them. The last manager felt that this varied very substantially from week
to week.

**Perceived Demands** - The managers viewed the demands of the company as being concerned primarily with short term profitability. This was measured on a weekly basis through the return of sales and cost performance figures to regional office, on a monthly basis by a meeting with the area director and on a six monthly basis by a more detailed appraisal and target setting meeting. At the latter each manager was given budgets in each of the key operating areas of wages, variable operating expenses, gross profit on rooms, food and liquor, an overall sales target and targets relating to HPC, room rate and occupancy. These were used as the key criteria against which performance was measured. The other area about which the managers felt that the company were concerned was 'standards', which they saw as being measured by the number of complaints which head office received about the hotel and to a lesser extent by the subjective opinion of the area director and other senior staff collected during visits to the hotel.

Overall there was a general pattern in the goals which managers were attempting to achieve, these were largely those of profitability, delegation and senior staff development. The first aim was relatively unsurprising in a commercial environment but the latter two may well reflect the nature of the industry and of the particular company. The relative importance of delegation represents an acceptance that the business operates on a
continuous 24 hour basis. If the unit was to be a success and if the manager was to feel comfortable in the job, then he must have faith in his subordinates to conduct the operation in his absence. This was reflected also in a desire to develop the senior management team and this fitted with the philosophy of the company to promote from within.

7.8 **SUMMARY**

Hotels provide a specific working environment which has been shaped through history and the demands of operation. The modern history of hotels was shown to derive from two main sources the early European hotels, with their origins in the ‘country house’, and the American hotel developed as a more commercial entity. English country houses gave the modern hotel much of its current language and shaped the status, the relationships and to some extent the dress of those within the unit. The American model was responsible for the more recent additions to the internal structure of the hotel as well as the way in which head office used costs as the major unit of control. This duality in the history of hotels left managers with two distinct sets of roles, those of the European school relating to mein host and the standards of service and product, and those of the American school relating to the control of costs and the achievement of profit.

While history left its mark in shaping the roles of the general manager, the operating nature of hotels impose certain
characteristics on the situation. Hotels are a continuous process operation with high labour costs. This, together with the inherent intangibility of certain elements of the product and the rapidity between production and consumption meant that there was a constant requirement for control. Coupled with this the permanent presence of the customer on the premises added a demand for flexibility. The manager was therefore caught in a dilemma between the need for cost and quality control and rigidity in operations on the one hand and flexibility to meet the demands of the customer on the other.

The organisation in which the action occurred was a large, patriarchal catering operation which had diversified into hotels at an early stage in its history. The organisation was centralised in its structure and approach and used the central control of costs as its major thrust toward profitability. The six hotels which took part in the study were all of roughly equivalent size and standard. They were of two distinct types those which were newer and bore a brand name and older style hotels. Each had a high level of occupancy and a similar internal organisation. Although the managers were heavily controlled in their decision making powers by those in head and area office, the managerial structure of each hotel allowed managers the opportunity to concentrate on administrative rather than operational affairs.

The managers varied in age from 27 to 40, were mostly married and
lived away from the hotel in their own houses. The younger of the managers tended to be better qualified academically than the older ones. The managers appeared to have few complaints about their wage levels and believed that the company offered them considerable security of tenure and this was reflected in the length of time that each had worked for the company. The outcome of this relative career stability and the policy of promotion from within was that each of the general managers was thoroughly socialised in the operating policies and practices of the company.

The managers perceived the company as using cost and profit targets as the main measures of managerial success. Therefore it was unsurprising that the managers viewed their primary goal as being one of improving profitability. However, this was coupled with the area of delegation. The managers could be on the premises for only a limited amount of time and therefore they saw it as important for themselves that they were able to delegate with a reasonable degree of certainty to those immediately below them. 'Peace of mind' therefore was a clear aim of most managers.

Managerial action occurred within a distinct environment which directly influenced the nature of that action. General factors such as the history of the industry and its normal operating characteristics shape a particular managerial pattern. This broad form was then further developed through the structure and demands of the company in which that position was set. Into this situation the manager brought his own background, personality and
goals. These factors cumulatively shaped the situation in which managerial work occurred and largely the nature of that work.
CHAPTER 8: DEMANDS, ACTIVITIES AND FUNCTIONS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The work of each manager was assessed in terms of his role demands and the subsequent activities and functions which he undertook. The role demands were assessed by using the 'managerial wheel', while the manager's activities and functions were noted through observation and discussion with each of the six managers in the study. Each event was recorded in terms of an activity and was later allocated to the range of functions. Demands were considered in terms of those from above, from below and those perceived by the manager; while activities were divided into patterns of working hours and events, the mode and location of work, contact patterns and form of initiation of events. Functions were divided according to the predetermined categories of the LOS system of Luthans and Lockwood (1984).

8.2 ROLE DEMANDS

Introduction

Stewart's (1976, 1982) analysis of managerial work in terms of demands, choices and constraints was furthered by the work of
Machin (1981, 1982) and Hales and Nightingale (1986) both of which concentrated on the demands faced by the manager. The latter studies placed the work of the manager within the perspective of the demands of the role set and made the assumption that the job was highly influenced by role demands. However, the later work of Hales (1987) cast some doubts on this assumption as he could find little relationship between the demands of the role set and subsequent managerial activity. This study considered demands from 3 sources:

   i) Demands from Below
   ii) Demands from Above
   iii) The Manager’s Perceived Demands of the Job

The Method

The role set was limited to those immediately below the manager, that is the most senior members of the management team in the hotel, and those to whom he was directly responsible: the area directors and the managing director. Others were not included as their contact with the general manager was so limited as to make their demands on the position of little importance. The questions which were asked of the respondents were; 'how do you view a general manager's job?'; 'what do you believe that a general manager does and should do?'; 'what are the roles of a general manager?'; 'what demands do you make on a general manager?'. The questions were deliberately depersonalised so the informant was
asked to think about a general manager in a hotel of that type and size, rather than being specific about an individual. The replies were attached to a spoke of the wheel and at the completion of the interview the respondent was asked to indicate which five items were the most important. The intention of the "managerial wheel" was to draw forth a range of answers and to get the interviewee to think about the job in the widest possible terms. In some cases this worked well, in others respondents used standardised managerial terms such as planner, communicator, delegator etc. and despite some probing of their meaning of these terms this generally proved less illuminating. In the analysis stage the responses from each source of role demands were aggregated and common items identified. The total number of discrete items were listed and the number of times each mentioned calculated. A similar approach was followed for the perceived items of importance.

**Role Demands from Below**

**Range**

The managerial wheel was used individually with the 3 or 4 most senior members of the management team in each hotel. The 20 respondents produced a total of 398 items which were reduced to a list of 61 discrete areas. The number of times each of these areas was mentioned was then calculated. Of the 61 items all but 12 generated more than a single response, suggesting that they had some degree of common currency. Those items mentioned only
on a single occasion included both the more obvious such as innovation/entrepreneurship and the more obscure such as being eccentric, being a manipulator, responsibility for pricing etc.

**Points of Commonality**

These were judged by those items which were mentioned by more than 10 respondents. There were 11 items which came into this category and were: communications with management and staff; the training and development of the management team; the organisation and control of the management team; liaison with head and regional office; control of the business - costs/sales etc; delegation; motivation; customer contact; forward planning; sales calls and public relations. Of these the 3 items mentioned most often were:-

* - control of the business (18)
* - sales calls (17)
* - customer contact (15)

**Perceived Items of Importance**

The interviewees were asked to 'tick' the 5 items on the wheel which they considered to be the most important elements of the general manager's job. Those items which were mentioned most frequently included:-
* - sales calls
* - control of the business
* - the training and development of the management team
* - customer contact
* - maintaining a good working atmosphere/morale of the staff
* - leadership and motivation
* - maximisation of profit

There was a considerable level of agreement amongst those immediately below the general manager in the hierarchy as to the demands and expectations they had of the general manager's job. Although they generated a large number of items, only a few of these were mentioned by a single individual. Certain items were clearly seen to be of major importance; the control of the business, customer contact, the generation of sales and the development of the management team. Interestingly the maximisation of profit was mentioned by only 7 respondents, while pronounced importance was given to the control process.

The way in which 'the Wheel' was administered allowed respondents to talk freely about the role of the general manager and this brought forth some interesting comments and analogies. Among these were the idea that the role was an umbrella one - "a big umbrella over all of us. If it rains, it rains on him"; "that the general manager was only as good as the people around him"; and that "I don't think I would spend long in that seat". All the respondents seemed to have a limited idea of the practicalities
of the role, particularly how the general manager spent his time while in the office. This seemed to be especially noticeable among the deputy general managers.

Role Demands from Above

Range

This involved just 3 interviews; with the managing director for the group and with the 2 area directors directly responsible for the hotels in the study. This was clearly a very limited sample, but was effectively the sum of those above the manager with whom he had regular contact. The demands from above varied somewhat in perspective, whereas the managing director talked in terms of 'development of the business', the area managers were more concerned with the 'achievement of targets and objectives'.

Points of Commonality and Importance.

The managing director viewed the role as one of 'developing the business' and 'developing the people'. This was perceived as requiring :-

* - an understanding of the market
* - the achievement of broad unit targets in line with the 'mission statement'
* - high levels of interaction with guests and staff
* - keeping down staff turnover
reducing guest complaints.

The area managers, alternatively, emphasised the achievement of standards and targets in terms of:

- financial control
- staffing costs and turnover
- setting and maintaining standards
- training
- sales
- hard work

The demands from above differed in perspective with level, the managing director seeing the role of the general manager as being one of developing the long term aspects of the business whereas the area directors viewed the role in terms of the achievement of shorter term targets. In terms of the relative importance of these expectations some form of contact with the area director would be quite frequent, at least 2/3 times per week, whereas that with the managing director might only occur a few times per year. The effect of this was to make the demands from the area directors much more immediate than those of the managing director. The two sets of demands from above were not directly conflicting but presented general managers with differing time scales in which to achieve their objectives.
Managers Perceived Role Demands of the Job

Range

The 6 respondents generated a total of 102 items which were reduced to 37 discrete areas. Of these most generated more than a single response with only 12 items being mentioned by a single respondent. These tended to be the more obscure roles such as political dexterity, attending company meetings, competitive awareness or were roles more associated with the personality characteristics required of general managers such as caterer, diplomat, arbitrator etc.

Points of Commonality

These were judged to be those items which were mentioned by 4 or more respondents. These were:

- achieving targets/ensuring gross profit
- developing and training the management team and subordinates
- public relations/upholding the image of the company
- ensuring return on investment
- selling and marketing
- communication with staff - up and down
- guest relations/communications
- motivation
- short term planning
* - control of the operation/business
* - maintenance of the hotel

**Perceived Items of Importance**

Managers were asked to 'tick' the 5 items on their wheel which they considered to be the most important aspects of their job. Four of these were mentioned by at least 3 of the 6 respondents;

* - control of the business
* - the training and development of subordinates
* - ensuring gross profit
* - the need to be an entrepreneur/self starter

Delegation, selling, guest liaison/communications and short term planning were mentioned by 2 respondents; while the need to achieve guest satisfaction, internal communications, the upkeep of the law, decision making, maintaining standards, leadership, care for subordinates and political dexterity were each mentioned by a single respondent.

In the general managers' wheels the two central items were control of the business and the training and development of staff. However, the general managers also attached importance to items such as the maximisation of profits, upholding the image of the company and the need to be self motivated. Overall there were considerable similarities in the perceived views of the role amongst the managers.
Summary

The managerial wheel was used to assess the demands and expectations of the role from those above and below the manager in the hierarchy and the manager's own self perception of that role. This helped to reinforce the perspectives gained on the organisational demands of the company and the manager's individual goals identified in earlier interviews and questionnaires. The use of the managerial wheel brought forth two major themes, that of the similarity in the relative perceptions of those involved and of the width of the role. In general those below the manager, those above him and his own perceptions of the role were very similar. The major areas which appeared throughout the use of the 'wheel' were the need to control the business and the training and development of staff. These were supported by the need to produce sales and to maximise profitability through the achievement of short term budgets and targets. As well as this the role brought forth a large number of descriptors emphasising the width of the role, and this was emphasised in its description in terms of an 'umbrella' role. Managers therefore appeared to be faced with a very wide role, with certain elements dominating expectations.

The use of the managerial wheel did help to assess both the expectations and the demands of those above and below the manager with regard to that particular role. The intention of the wheel
was to give a view of the demands which were passed from subordinates and superiors to a focal manager and to let the manager assess the role that he occupied. The methodology achieved this, but only in the most generalised sense. For although the use of the wheel did help to give a clearer idea of the particular managerial role, and how it was perceived by the manager, it did not allow a detailed analysis of the extent or influence of role demands on the conduct of the position. In order to get a more detailed view of the demands which were faced by managers it was necessary to consider these within the context of the work at a later stage in the research.

8.3 WORK ACTIVITIES

Introduction

The activities of the managers were divided between hours of work and number of events; mode and location of work; and contact patterns and form of initiation of events. Where appropriate the activities observed in this study are compared to those of other studies of managerial work in the hospitality industry (Nailon, 1968; Ferguson and Berger, 1984; Koureas, 1985; Hales, 1987) and with other, more general, studies of managerial work. However, such comparison was difficult due to the diversity of sample and methodology in the earlier studies.
The Hours and Events of Managers

Hours

The managers worked an average of 56.11 hours in the five days under observation (Appendix 18). However, this did not represent a complete working week as it was quite usual for a manager to work a few hours on one of his two days off. An estimate of a 60 hour working week therefore would be more realistic. The range among the managers was from 42.22 - 67.02 hours for the observed period. The lowest figure was probably distorted as it was the week leading up to a statutory holiday and so the unit was relatively quiet, while the manager undertaking the 67 hours was relatively new to the unit, only having been in post for about 3 months, which may have increased his perceived need to spend time at work.

The hours of work undertaken by managers in this study were substantially higher than those indicated in earlier studies:

* - Burns (1957) - 41 1/2
* - Horne and Lupton (1965) - 44
* - Stewart (1967) - 43/44
* - Mintzberg (1973) - 40 1/2

Four of the managers worked a 'straight shift', typically arriving at work at 8.00 a.m and leaving at 6.30 p.m. Additionally, they would be present for an average of one evening
during the week. The split shift system is a feature of the hotel industry and it was interesting to note that the other two managers worked a split shift on two or three occasions each week. This would involve arriving in the office at 8.30 a.m staying until 3.30 or 4.00 p.m, then returning to the hotel from around 6.30-9.00 p.m. Only one of the managers did a duty management shift during the period under observation and the others indicated that they undertook duty management only when they were short of staff on the management team.

Events

The early diary studies of Burns (1957) and Stewart (1967) noted managers as undertaking 25 events per day, however this result was probably more a product of the methodology than a realistic assessment of the number of discrete events that a manager undertook during the course of a day. The imposition that the diary method placed upon the manager meant that it would be difficult for a manager to have kept a very detailed diary and to have continued with his normal work. Also, some studies chose to classify events as lasting five minutes or longer which had the effect of substantially reducing the number of events which were noted during the course of day. For instance, Nailon (1968) notes 27.7 events per day and Mintzberg (1973) just 21. In this study an event was described as a discrete activity which had a duration of one minute or longer. This made the results more in line with the work of Guest (1956), Ferguson and Berger (1984) and Martinko
and Gardner (1984) who all observed managers or supervisors averaging much larger numbers of events per day:

- Ferguson and Berger (1984) 86
- Guest (1956) 563
- Martinko and Gardner (1984) 80-200

The managers in this study averaged 123.6 events per day. The range is shown in Appendix 18 as an average of between 111.2-134.8 events per day. The total number of events observed for each manager varied from 556 to 674. Managers undertook an average of 11.15 events per hour of work.

The number of events undertaken and their sequence during a day tended to follow a particular pattern. Mornings tended to be busier in terms of the number of events undertaken and it was not unusual for a manager to undertake 20 or more events during a busy hour early in the day and to have completed 80 events before lunch. Afternoons tended to be slower than the mornings, as much of the routine work was completed early in the day. Figure 2 shows a typical pattern of events during a day taken from manager B.

Overall, the number of events undertaken by a manager did not accord with the hours worked. The manager who worked the most hours undertook the smallest number of events. However, the general pattern of events during a day was remarkably similar among the managers.
The results of this study bear considerable similarity to that of Ferguson and Berger (1984) and Martinko and Gardner (1984). Ferguson and Berger's (1984) results appear lower because they chose to observe their restaurant managers for only eight hours per day, however their hourly average of 10.75 events per hour bears comparison with the average of 11.15 events per hour in this study. Similarly the range of events per day indicated in the Martinko and Gardner (1984) study was in line with those discovered here. The reasons for the discrepancy with the study of Guest (1956) could be that he was concerned with supervisors rather than managers and that he noted all events irrespective of their time duration.
The Mode and Location of Work

Mode of Work

Mode of work has been used throughout studies of managerial work as a key measure of the way that managers undertake their work and the activities that they use to achieve their goals. It represents how the work is done rather than the nature of the work being undertaken and answers the question — how do managers work? rather than, what do they do? This study used the categories developed by Mintzberg (1973) as the basis upon which to develop a categorisation scheme which allowed the activities of managers to be measured in terms of time duration and frequency of occurrence.

The picture painted by previous research into the activities of managers in the hospitality industry was that managers spent roughly 20% of their time on desk work, perhaps 40% on unscheduled meetings/contacts, 20% on scheduled meetings, 10% on the telephone and the other 10% on a diverse range of activities. This did not differ substantially from the viewpoint of Lawrence (1984). However, it was substantially different from the research of Mintzberg (1973) which had shown managers as spending almost 60% of their time in scheduled meetings. The research connected with the hospitality industry had shown the work to be much less controlled by meetings and more flexible than that indicated by Mintzberg (1973) with a much higher percentage of unscheduled meetings and contacts. Appendix 19 indicates the results of the
current research in terms of the percentage time and number of events in the categories: telephone calls, scheduled meetings, unscheduled meetings, desk work, short contacts, tours, operational work, other and with researcher.

**Telephone Calls**

The telephone took an average of 11.94% of the manager's time, with a range from 7.77%-16.4%. Certainly the managers spent quite substantial amounts of time on the telephone. The results represented nearly six and three quarter hours per week on the telephone, more than one hour twenty minutes per day. A much higher percentage of calls were made by the manager than were received by him mainly because the secretary shielded the manager from incoming calls. The importance of the telephone was reflected by an analysis of the number of events involving the use of the telephone. An average of 22.64% of events involved the telephone and in only two cases did the percentage of events exceed 25% or represent less than 20%. These results indicated both an extensive use of the telephone and considerable uniformity of telephone usage. Clearly, the telephone represented an important part of the manager's work. One ex-general manager encountered during the course of the study commented that his greatest relief in giving up the job was that he did not have to face the telephone all day.
Scheduled Meetings

Scheduled meetings were one of the key areas of difference in the work of the managers. Scheduled meetings seemed to be very much at the discretion of the manager, and the number of scheduled meetings which the manager attended varied substantially according to how he chose to work. Those managers with more participative styles tended to have a greater number of scheduled meetings than those with more autocratic styles. The number of scheduled meetings that the managers attended varied from 5, just one per day, to 20, exactly 4 per day. The differences in terms of time taken up in scheduled meetings were equally large, from just 3.29% of the total time at unit C to 39.83% at unit D. This reflected very different styles of management, one being open and communicative, the other more autocratic and closed. The extent of the differences among these managers was reflected in the diversity of results obtained for time spent in this category of activity in earlier studies; Mintzberg (1973) - 59%, Lawrence (1984) - 30%, Ferguson and Berger (1984) - 29%, the two managers observed by Hales (1987) 34% and 8.3%. In the particular situation of this study the manager could largely choose how many scheduled meetings he would attend, conduct or initiate and so they represented an area which was particularly discretionary in nature.
Unscheduled Meetings

In this study unscheduled meetings were separated from 'short contacts' and defined as meetings of 3 minutes or longer. There was much greater consistency among the managers with regard to the amount of time spent in unscheduled meetings compared to that in scheduled meetings. This may have been because scheduled meetings were generally initiated by the manager whereas unscheduled meetings were more frequently initiated by others. Managers spent an average of 23.38% of their time on unscheduled meetings and they represented 19.1% of events. Appendix 19 shows the range of time spent in unscheduled meetings to be from 17.07% - 29.36%. Unscheduled meetings occurred with staff, guests and others external to the establishment.

In other studies the results in terms of percentage of time spent in unscheduled meetings were:

* - Ferguson and Berger (1984) - 35
* - Lawrence (1987) - 33
* - Hinrichs (1976) - 20
* - Kurke and Aldrich (1983) - 12
* - Mintzberg (1973) - 10

The presence of guests on the premises may explain why the results of Ferguson and Berger (1984) are so much higher than those of Mintzberg's (1973). This would also help to explain the differences in this category between the domestic services...
manager and the restaurant manager in Hales' (1987) study. But, the result might be explained by the difference in level of those being studied, the work of Hinrichs (1976) noted how the percentage of time spent in various activities may change with level in the hierarchy. Overall, the results of this study were more in line with those of Lawrence (1984) and Ferguson and Berger (1984) when the amount of time spent in 'short contacts' was added to the total.

Short Contacts

Short contacts were fleeting interactions which occurred between the general manager and staff, guests or others external to the hotel. Although these were excluded or subsumed as a category in other studies it was felt that the category of 'unscheduled meetings', in which these events would have been placed, was both imprecise and linguistically misleading. The category of 'short contacts' was added to give expression to a particular activity through which it was believed general managers would conduct certain communicative aspects of their work. Short contacts represented an average of 28.55% of all the events which the managers undertook. The majority of short contacts were with staff rather than with guests and as would be expected they were not very time consuming, averaging only 7.47% of time usage among the managers. These results added some substance to the conclusion of Nailon (1968) that the general manager's job involved a large number of fleeting contacts.
Desk Work

Desk work was perceived by managers as being a very time consuming nuisance. Previous research both inside and outside of the hospitality industry had led to the belief that the manager would spend around 20% of his time on desk work. (Mintzberg, 1973 - 22%; Kurke and Aldrich, 1983 - 26%; Ferguson and Berger, 1984 - 17%). This proved to be the case, with the average among the managers being 17.93%. However, it did appear that the manager had some considerable discretion in this area. There was substantial variation between manager D who spent 10.52% of his time on desk work and managers C and F who both spent more than 28% of their time on it. Although this might be explained in terms of the demands placed upon them in the particular week, there was no evidence to suggest that managers C and F were observed on weeks which were particularly burdened with paperwork. The results seem to suggest that a comparatively large area of desk work may be at the discretion of the manager.

Tours

The category of tours is shown in brackets in Appendix 19 as each separate event in the tour was logged independently in the 'embedded' column of the observation sheet. Tours were found to consist of a number of other activities, and did not usefully stand as separate events. Also, during a tour a manager would become involved in other situations and it was impossible to decide where a tour ended and another discrete event began. Given
A traditional role of the hotel manager to be that of 'mein host' it might have been expected that general managers would spend a substantial amount of time on tour. Nailon (1968), for instance, had described managerial work in hotels as being involved in much movement about the establishment in order to gain information, control and supervise. However, the managers in this study were found to spend relatively little time on tour. On average they undertook less than 3 tours per day and these occupied a total of less than 45 minutes. These results fit well with those of Ferguson and Berger (1984) and Hales (1987) shown in Appendix 4. Most managers conducted a short tour of the hotel on arrival in the morning, sometimes one mid-afternoon and then another just before they left in the evening. For the rest of the day they left their office only for a specific purpose.

Operational Work

Operational work was only commented upon by Hales (1987) and elsewhere there appeared a widespread assumption that managers do not undertake operational activities. Although Hales (1987) found that to be the case with the domestic services manager, the restaurant manager that he observed spent a significant proportion of his time in operational work. The amount of time spent on operational work among the managers in this study varied quite substantially from 2.19%-12.14%, averaging 7.02%. At the bottom end of the range this represented just over 15 minutes per day on operational work and at the top end, about 1 hour and a
quarter. The two managers who worked a split shift system, managers E and F, spent longer on operational work than the others. However, all the managers undertook a certain amount of non-managerial operational work and this took a number of forms; helping to serve or clear in a restaurant or bar, clearing and resetting conference rooms, hoovering public areas, helping in reception during a busy period etc. However, the amount of time spent in operational work was much less than several managers suggested that they undertook during the preliminary interview. A recurring theme during this interview was how they were 'operational' or 'liked to get their hands dirty' or had a 'hands on' approach.

Other and With Researcher

The managers spent an average of 5% of their time in the week under observation discussing the research with the researcher. Appendix 19 indicates that this was substantially higher during the first week of observation, but was then reasonably constant. This is rather less than the figure of 12.08% quoted by Lawrence (1984), the only other researcher to include this category. Certain events did not fit into any of the categories and these 'other' events accounted for roughly 6% of time and 2% of events. They included a wide variety of events such as conducting a minor repair on their car, watching a video produced by a local school, lunch alone, trips to the toilet, reacting to a fire alarm etc.
The Location of Work

The Office - The location in which work occurred was compared to the studies of Horne and Lupton (1965), Stewart (1967), Mintzberg (1973) and Kurke and Aldrich (1983) and to the work more specific to the hospitality industry of Nailon (1968) and Koureas (1985). The most commonly used measure of the location of work has been the amount of time that the manager spent in his office. This might have been expected to be lower in the hospitality industry than in other industries due to the contact dependent nature of the industry. The percentage of time that managers spent in their office was:

* - Horne and Lupton (1965) - 52%
* - Stewart (1967) - 51%
* - Nailon (1968) - 43%
* - Kurke and Aldrich (1983) - 42%
* - Mintzberg (1973) - 39%
* - Koureas (1985) - 37.5%

The results shown in Appendix 20 indicated that managers in this study averaged 46.99% of their time in their office, and more than half of their events occurred there. The range of time spent in the office varied from 39%-57%. This result is somewhat higher than that indicated in the Nailon (1968) and Koureas (1985) studies but seemed to fit with the general pattern of managers in most industries spending between 40-50% of their time in their office.
Food & Beverage – Of the other areas of the hotel, more time was spent in food and beverage than elsewhere. This averaged 15.2% of time and was akin to the 17.2% found by Koureas (1984). The range of time spent in this area was comparatively narrow and reflected two issues. Firstly, that a certain amount of formal entertaining occurs, and this usually took place in the restaurant or bar and secondly that the complexity of these areas means that they tend to generate more problems than elsewhere in the operation. Rooms, the other main division, were a comparatively simple operation compared to food production and service.

External – The amount of time spent outside of the hotel varied very substantially from 25% for manager D, who was new to the job and keen to establish himself in the local community, to no time at all for manager F. The number of times the managers left the hotel was 3, 4, 2, 8, 5, 0 respectively for each of the managers. The majority of these meetings were for community rather than direct business purposes and reflected the low emphasis that managers gave to the function of selling the hotel.

Other Areas – Of the other areas, managers spent only small amounts of time either in accounts or the offices of members of the management team. Almost 10% of events and 5% of time were spent in reception and reservations and this reflected the complexity of these areas and their potential to generate problems. Managers also recognised the importance of the
reservations function in maintaining high occupancy rates. Only one manager spent much time in housekeeping or rooms, where manager B spent 11.9% of his time. However, this was mainly because he shared his office with a secretary and therefore needed to use a guest room for any confidential meetings. Most of the hotels were set in their own grounds and most managers spent some time each day in the grounds of the hotel.

Contact Patterns and Form of Initiation of Events

Contact Patterns

Previous studies had indicated that managers spent roughly half of their contact time in interaction with those internal to the organisation and half of it with those who are external to it. (Mintzberg, 1973; Kurke and Aldrich, 1983; Koureas, 1985). The only major exception to this was the work of Nailon (1968) who found that 62% of the manager's time was spent interacting with those external to the establishment. This study defined internal contacts as those with staff who worked in the hotel, and external contacts as all others. The results supported the majority of the other studies with the managers, on average, spending almost 50% of their interaction time with both internal and external participants. There was also a great deal of similarity among the managers in this respect. Appendix 21 shows the range as being quite small, from 42-57% for the amount of time spent with both internal and external contacts. Although time was divided very equally, the internal events were much
greater in number, some 69% of contact events involve those internal to the organisation compared to just 31% with those external to it. So although time in contact was divided equally between internal and external participants, many more events were with internal contacts than with external ones, suggesting that internal contacts tended to be shorter in duration.

**Internal Contacts** - Internal contacts were divided between those with individual members of the management team, two or more of the management team, the manager's secretary and all other subordinate staff. The results are shown in Appendix 22. Of the time spent in contact with internal participants the majority was spent with a single member of the management team. This was similarly reflected in the events analysis. All the managers used meetings with individual members of the management team as the major way in which they gathered and disseminated information. This was supplemented in all cases with both scheduled and unscheduled meetings with several members of the management team. The number of these meetings changed with the management style of the manager and varied in number from 6 to 17 in the week under observation. The managers had a similar number of meetings with other members of staff as they had with individual members of the management team, although these tended to be much less time consuming. Each manager had their own secretary but this did not represent an important focus of the manager's work.
External Contacts - Appendix 22 shows external contacts as divided between guests/clients, colleagues, head/area office staff, other external contacts and the researcher. Given the 'mein host' traditions of European hotel management it might have been anticipated that the managers would spend a high proportion of their time with guests. The results of Nailon (1968) indicated that hotel managers spent 26% of their total time in this manner. However, in the present study the managers spent just 10.5% of their total time with guests or potential clients. This figure varied surprisingly little among the managers, the highest being manager F who spent 13% of his time with guests and the lowest being manager B who spent just 6%. Most guest contacts were relatively fleeting in nature, and as suggested earlier the managers did not put any great emphasis on the selling function and so quite small amounts of time were spent with prospective clients.

The particular geographical and organisational position of the hotel manager meant that he had no-one of equivalent rank on the premises. So, any contact with colleagues occurred either through the use of the telephone or by a visit from a general manager from another hotel or vice versa. Not surprisingly then, contacts with colleagues were not very frequent or time consuming. Head office and area office staff took up an average of 7.3% of the manager's time. These contacts occurred primarily over the telephone, managers had few visits from those above them in the hierarchy. Other external contacts covered a wide range of
people; local dignatories, suppliers, trade association members, local newspapers and advertisers, company representatives etc. These took up an average of 12.17% of the manager's time and were quite important for some of the managers. The range in this area was from 5% to 26% of time, and this represented an area in which the work of the managers' varied considerably.

**Time Alone** - The amount of time that managers spent alone had been relatively ignored in previous studies, and seemed important. Only Hinrichs (1976) and Kotter (1982) mentioned this aspect of managerial work, the former putting the percentage of managerial time spent alone at 49% and the latter at 24%. The results of this study fall in line with those of Kotter (1982) with the managers spending almost 25% of their time alone. Appendix 21 shows that there was substantial variation among the managers with a range from 13% to 39% of time. Managers C and F respectively spent 39.45% and 38.32% of their time alone and these figures were much higher than had been anticipated.

**Form of Initiation of Events**

Earlier studies of managerial work had tended to interpret only the form of initiation of contacts and this was used as the basis upon which to describe the manager as reactive or proactive. Ferguson and Berger (1984) saw 52% of interactions as being self initiated, whereas Mintzberg (1973) noted this figure at only 32%. Both of these presented the manager as being a highly reactive figure. This study chose to classify each event as
either self or other initiated. Although this proved a problematic process it did give a more complete view of the form of initiation of events than other studies. In terms of initiation almost 70% of the events appeared to be initiated by the manager and this was roughly mirrored in the time allocation to self initiated events.

The work of Larson et al. (1986) suggested that researchers needed to be much more careful with the use of the terms 'reactive' and 'proactive'. As the later breakdown of events into discretion, demands from above, demands from below and critical events suggests, these two terms are extremely broad and open to wide interpretation. However, the results of this research do suggest that the work of managers may not be as reactive as had been previously supposed.

8.4 THE FUNCTIONS OF MANAGERS

The assessment of the functions of managers was made by using the Leader Observation Study (LOS) document devised by Luthans and Lockwood (1984). However, the study adjusted that document to the needs of the situation so that the category of motivation was removed and discipline was linked with staffing, in their place were added the categories of operational work and other, so that 12 functions were maintained in the categorisation scheme. These all appeared to be readily observable. Both control and planning, which were expected to be the functions most difficult to
observe, were found to be easily identifiable as discrete activities, and there was remarkably little difficulty in applying this revised list of functions to the work of managers. Less than 4% of events were allocated to the 'other' section suggesting that the list was very comprehensive in covering the functions of managers. The most dominant functions of the managers in the study were:

- Interacting with Others
- Information Exchange
- Monitoring/Controlling
- Planning/Coordinating
- Paperwork

Interacting was defined by Luthans and Lockwood (1984) in terms of two categories, interacting with others which referred to those external to the organisation, and information exchange. Information exchange emerged from the results presented in Appendix 23, as the major function in terms of events, occupying nearly 20% of events, but was not very time consuming taking only 8.5% of time. By contrast, interacting with others/outsiders took nearly 29% of time, but only 18.5% of events. These results present the managers as being highly concerned with the process of interacting with others both inside and outside the establishment and represented the way in which the manager gathered and disseminated information.
In an organisation with a strong working philosophy of control it was unsurprising that monitoring/controlling took up nearly 10% of time and 17% of events. Planning/coordinating occupied less events but was rather more time consuming, occupying 10% of events and 12% of time. As with the work of Snyder and Glueck (1980) and Larson et al. (1986) this study found that planning could be readily observed as a discrete activity of managers and that it was an activity which managers undertook on a regular basis as was seen in activities such as the planning of future promotions, the calculation of future financial returns, the development of one year and five year plans etc. Lastly, paperwork occupied 11% of events and almost 13% of time.

The less dominant functions of the managers included operational work which occupied just 7% of events and 5% of time. This figure differed marginally from the one presented in the mode of work category due to the greater variety which the LOS system offered as a system of classification. The idea that managers spend a large amount of time socialising and politicking to maintain their position in the organisation was not borne out in this study. Although it seemed likely that the opportunity for such activity was less where managers worked in geographical isolation from each other and from their superiors. Nailon (1968) commented on the relatively small amounts of time that managers spent on staffing issues and this is reiterated in this study, with managers spending just under 5% of their time on staffing and discipline and very little time on the training function.
Formalised training was extremely limited except in unit D. The managers had to deal only rarely with interdepartmental conflicts, and these were not very much in evidence. Certainly conflict resolution was not a major activity for any of the managers. Other, non-classifiable activities, occupied the remaining 4% of events and nearly 10% of time.

8.5 SUMMARY

The 3 main headings used to assess the work of the managers were demands, activities and functions. In each case the data was collected in a slightly different way. Demands were gathered through the use of the managerial wheel, activities were noted during the observation process, while functions were determined from the data at a later time.

While there were certain differences in emphasis, the demands that the managers' faced from above and below tended to show certain recurrent themes including an emphasis on control, customer contact and the training and development of the management team. Interestingly, the managers own perception of their role also tended to place emphasis on these areas. However, these perceived role demands were only partially reflected in the observed activities and functions of the managers.

In terms of activities managers worked with a distinct pattern of work both in terms of pace and times of occurrence. The working week averaged 60 hours with each day tending to follow a similar
pattern, being busy with a large number of events during the morning and slower involving less activities in the afternoon. In terms of mode of work managers showed consistency in some areas and inconsistency in others. However, for most of the managers work was dominated by a large number of short contacts, unscheduled meetings and telephone calls while the amount of time spent on desk work and scheduled meetings was more variable.

The focus of operations was the manager's office. This acted as the central operational point for the hotel and managers' spent almost half of their time there. This linked with the surprising amount of time that managers' spent alone, with two of the managers spending almost 40% of their time alone. Time in contact with others was split almost equally between those internal to the establishment and those external to it. However, managers rarely left the hotel and undertook very few selling activities either with guests within the hotel or external to it. Internal communications were dominated by unscheduled meetings with individual members of the management team.

The functions of the managers were dominated by those of interaction, both internally in the exchange of information and externally with those outside the establishment. Of the other functions the most important were those of monitoring/controlling, planning/coordinating and paperwork each occupying more than 10% of the manager's time. Of those which proved less important were socialising/politicking, staffing,
training and the management of conflict.

Overall the manager's job appeared to follow very similar patterns of role demands, activities and functions. Role demands seemed to hold a number of central themes among most respondents regardless of level and these themes were continued in the way that the managers' themselves perceived their role. However, the emphasis placed on certain aspects such as staff development and customer contact was not reflected in the subsequent pattern of managerial activity and functions. The managers' activities centred around their office and involved a comparatively large number of unscheduled meetings and short contacts with those internal and external to the establishment. Not surprisingly, then, interaction and information exchange appeared as the dominant functions of managers, supported by a strong emphasis on control and planning.
9.1 INTRODUCTION

The limited amount of research conducted into managerial work in the hospitality industry led to certain conclusions about the characteristics of that work and the activities and functions of managers. This held managerial work to be frantic, fragmented, reactive and verbal. For instance, Ferguson and Berger (1984) comment on the characteristics of managerial work in terms of reacting, carrying on, juggling and full-time watching, while those who used Mintzberg's (1973) roles noted managers adopting the roles of leader, entrepreneur and disseminator. These conclusions were generally in line with those of the major studies conducted in other situations and with other groups of managers.

Two of the questions that this study sought to answer were:

a) what is managerial work like in the hospitality industry?
b) is that work fundamentally similar or different in a given position within one company?

With regard to the first of these questions this study found a somewhat different set of the characteristics, patterns and functions of managerial work than that previously suggested and in answer to the second question viewed the work of participants as having considerably more similarities than differences. Overall, the study saw managerial work as being:

* - Patterned
* - Office Based
* - Informational
* - Controlling
* - Similar

The managers' work followed clear patterns both in terms of its order, where it was conducted and the type of activities undertaken. The managers developed a patterned existence so that each day took a similar shape to the previous one. The number of hours worked, the number of events undertaken and the order in which these occurred were patterned by each manager in a similar style. Work was relatively calm, ordered, predictable and consistent rather than being characterised by unrelenting pace, brevity, variety and fragmentation.

The office based nature of the work linked with the processes of interaction, information processing and control. The office acted
as 'base camp' for each of the managers' and was the point from which the operation was directed and from which activities were initiated. The office was the hub of the information process, into which was fed external and internal information and out from which came instructions regarding the direction of the unit. Information processing represented a major part of the managerial job and occurred through interaction with superiors, the management team, other subordinates and those outside the hotel. The informational processes were linked with those of financial and operational control, in that information was largely used for this purpose. Control of costs and operations represented the central managerial concern in each unit, and the control process was achieved primarily through the analysis of business information and by interaction with the management team.

Overall the patterns of work that the managers developed were similar rather than different and this had the effect of making work immediately recognisable in each different situation. The managers largely placed their emphasis on the same activities and functions generally at similar times of day and had similar concerns and objectives. Clearly, there were individual differences in approach and style to the work, but these were dwarfed by the degree of similarity in its pattern and functions.

9.2 WORK PATTERNS

The work of Carlson (1951), Guest (1955), Brewer and Tomlinson
(1964) and Mintzberg (1973) presented a view of managerial work as being characterised by constant work at a high pace, job interruption, reactivity, variety, discontinuity and fragmentation. The view of this study followed that of Snyder and Glueck (1980) who saw that such an analysis evolved from the way in which the data was collected and analysed. They commented:

"Our feeling is that by viewing the managerial activities as discrete events and not attempting to relate them one to another Mintzberg did not grasp the importance of or the purpose for the activities he observed...... If one intends to understand managerial work, it is absolutely essential to view managerial activities in their totality. One must not focus on the individual activities alone because this will inevitably lead to a different view of reality. The key to understanding managerial work is understanding the way in which managerial activities are interrelated and the true purpose of those activities." (Snyder and Glueck, 1980, p. 71/72)

By considering the working day in total as an evolving sequence of events which developed in a fluid manner, rather than as a set of discrete phenomena, a very different view of managerial work emerged. This saw managerial work as highly patterned, relatively calm and very consistent in its form and shape. Snyder and Glueck (1980) used the metaphor of the jigsaw puzzle, saying:

"Mintzberg appears to look at the activities as if they are only pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. If one attempts to describe
what the puzzle looks like by counting the number of pieces it contains, measuring each one, and grouping them according to size, one will, in all probability, never put the puzzle together. The puzzle is not just pieces, it is a set of pieces that fit together to form a whole. Only when each piece is connected with each other piece in the correct manner can one see the puzzle the way it is meant to be seen." (Snyder and Glueck, 1980, p.75)

This created a very different view of the characteristics of managerial work. Work was found to follow clearly identifiable patterns, it was shaped to be adaptable and flexible and was conducted in a relatively calm and ordered manner.

**Shaped for Adaptation**

The work of the managers in the study followed distinct and recognisable patterns so that it became easy to predict the pattern of the day and the work by the time that two or three managers had been studied. The pattern of work was so constructed that it allowed for a wide range of events during the day without upsetting the fundamental flow and was therefore shaped to be adaptable and flexible to a wide range of circumstances.

Appendix 24 shows the outline of a typical day from manager B and indicates the pattern of work and its variety. The common shape
which emerged was:

* - Arrive at desk, either deal with a problem which had been left from the previous day or some paperwork
* - Tour of the hotel
* - Back to office to deal with paperwork and immediate problems
* - Attend departmental managers meeting
* - Return to office for a series of short meetings with different members of the management team
* - A short tour of the hotel
* - Lunch
* - More meetings with members of the management team or someone external to the hotel
* - Deal with problems which have arisen that day
* - Tea
* - Finish off paperwork or work on planning some future event
* - Tour of hotel
* - Chat to members of the management team on a social basis
* - Check that everything is organised for evening
* - Go home

This pattern allowed for the essential administrative demands of the job and the operational control of the establishment, in the form of regular management meetings and the resolution of day to day problems, to be dealt with in the mornings. This left lunch free for meetings and the afternoon for financial control, planning or dealing with more complex problems or paperwork. The latter part of the day then became available for a more
informal/socialising approach before a final check on the establishment before departure. This pattern was adopted by each of the managers and acted as a blueprint or 'production model' around which there could be quite considerable adaptation, rather similar to a basic model in a range of motor cars. This is quite similar to the analogy presented by Marples (1967) that:

"the manager's job can usefully be pictured as a stranded rope made of fibres of different lengths - where length represent time - each fibre coming to the surface one or more times in 'observable episodes' and representing a single issue." (Marples, 1967, p.287)

Such a pattern of work allowed for 'adaptability' to unusual occurrences and 'flexibility' in the way that work was conducted. For instance, manager B spent 26% of his time with external contacts, manager D spent 40% of his time in scheduled meetings and manager C spent 57% of his time in his office. All these variations could be achieved without changing the basic shape of the working day. Similarly, as the description of manager B's day in Appendix 24 indicated, there can be a huge variety in the events encountered on a single day. On the day in question these included events concerning engineering, sales, construction, personnel, food and beverage, basic administrative tasks and housekeeping. Hence, the manager's job although patterned in its basic shape was simultaneously 'wide ranging'.

The 'rope' then, was certainly multi-stranded but its final
composition and shape was relatively fixed. While the strands needed to intertwine in certain patterns to give the finished product there could be differences in the colour or patterns of the rope. Overall managerial work developed a common pattern which allowed the manager to be adaptable and flexible in dealing with a wide range of events.

**Ordered and Calm**

The work pattern allowed for high levels of flexibility and adaptability because the structure of the working environment acted as a shield against most immediate pressures and managers faced few direct time constraints from either internal or external sources. Most immediate operational matters were dealt with by members of the management team and managers' diaries carried few appointments, while head /regional office administration accounted for less than 10% of the manager’s time. This lack of immediate demands coupled with the fact that the management team and the manager’s secretary acted to filter out interruptions allowed work to be conducted in an ordered and calm fashion, to the extent of becoming 'becalmed' on certain occasions. The pace of managerial work was therefore constant but far from hectic.

Although the number of activities undertaken averaged 11.15 events per hour, this did not represent the hectic view of managerial work presented by Guest (1956), Mintzberg (1973) and
Ferguson and Berger (1984). The figures need to be presented in the terms of the modal length of time of an activity, rather than the mean, as the process of 'averaging' gave a distorted view of the pace and speed of managerial work. Given that the modal length of time of an activity was two minutes, the manager could comfortably undertake eleven events in an hour. So although the majority of activities were brief it would be wrong to construe this as representing undue pace or fragmentation in the work. The term 'fragmentation' suggested managerial work to be a series of relatively unrelated and discrete 'jigsaw pieces' whereas this study found the flow of events during the course of a working day could be better represented as a 'relatively controlled fluidity'. Events flowed and merged into one another in a smooth rather than erratic manner allowing the conduct of work to be both orderly and calm.

Although certain periods of the day were seen to consist of many, brief activities, other periods had times for planning and reflection and longer periods of uninterrupted activity. Managers undertook far more activities in the mornings than they did in the afternoons so that most events which needed immediate attention were dealt with in the mornings. Similarly, the managers faced rather more interruptions during the middle part of the morning than at other times. This created a situation in the afternoons when some managers had relatively little to do, and work became almost 'becalmed', so that managers' appeared to be looking for work. Interestingly, this was a situation in which they were clearly uncomfortable. Certainly it seemed as if work
could have been completed in shorter periods of time and this meant that it appeared to be conducted in a relatively relaxed manner.

The air of ordered calm was aided by the fact that the manager had a well structured management team and a secretary. Therefore the work of the manager could be viewed as occurring within a 'shielded environment'. The management team worked to protect the manager from most of the routine operational problems while his secretary acted as a filter of both internal and external communications. This 'shield' meant that the number of direct operational demands and interruptions were restricted and left the manager with the opportunity to conduct his work having had many immediate pressures 'filtered out'.

Managerial work was conducted in such a way that it allowed for flexibility and adaptability to a wide range of events and circumstances while retaining a basic pattern. The work was neither frantic nor hectic and the managers had plenty of time to undertake their work in a calm and orderly fashion, while the shielded nature of their immediate environment had the effect of limiting the number of interruptions.
9.3 OFFICE BASED

The office acted as the base from which managerial work was conducted. This gave it an importance beyond that represented by the time spent in it and number of events stemming from it and this was different from what may have been expected. The 'European' model of hotel management (Nailon, 1968) had suggested that hotel managers spent a very large percentage of their time within the operational departments of the hotel. However, in this study the office was the locale from which managerial work was conducted and into which communications were fed and directions given. It thereby acted as the centre of operations and roughly half of most manager's time was spent there. Campbell et al. (1970) had also noted that:

"The managerial job - on the average - is conducted in one's own office." (Campbell, 1970, p.88)

In terms of managerial work the office was important as this was where major decisions were taken and from where decisions were delegated to other members of the management team and in this way it acted as a hub of communications and as a base for certain kinds of activity. The office also acted as a territory for the manager and gave him an area in which he could spend time alone. The office therefore acted as a territory, a hub of communication, a base for certain activities and a place in which to spend time alone and thus represented both a symbolic and functional base for the conduct of managerial work.
The Office as Territory

The office acted as a symbolic base for managerial work and was thus important in establishing territorial and managerial prerogative. In this way the exclusivity of the office acted to formalise the position and role of the manager. In their study of Chemco, a large manufacturing company, Nichols and Benyon (1977) observed that:

"experienced managers know that 'the office' is their territory. Desks, chairs, secretaries, coffee (and biscuits), telephone calls: these are all part of their world - not the world of the shop floor." (Nichols and Benyon, 1977, p.121)

This process was reinforced by the presence of the secretary who filtered out interruptions or communications she deemed unnecessary. The physical arrangement of the office and the secretary appeared to have a direct influence on demands from those below the manager in the hierarchy. Where the secretary sat in an ante-chamber she worked as a form of protection for the manager and staff were much less likely to pass her. Where, as in one case, the manager shared his office with the secretary there was no such barrier between him and the staff, and his number of interruptions increased significantly. Also, where the manager's office had two doors, one directly into the corridor and the other into the secretary's office the barrier occurred to
a lesser degree. So although each of the manager’s professed an 'open door' policy, in effect this was limited both by the perception of the office as the manager’s territory and by the presence of the secretary to screen out those communications or events which she deemed unnecessary. The effect of this was that members of the management team did not come into the office unless they wanted advice on a problem or wished to pass on information. Staff below management level rarely entered the office. The office therefore became an exclusive managerial domain from which managerial work was conducted.

The Hub of Communications

Managerial work was highly office based and so the office acted as the hub for both internal and external communications. External communications connected with the management of the hotel and communications from head/regional office came into the office and were then dealt with by the manager or delegated. Communications from outside and above were considered much more important than those from subordinates. These requests and directions were less likely to be delegated and led to office based activities. These included the reporting of figures, giving the results of a particular sales drive, telling head office about food and beverage promotions etc. Requests from subordinates that could not be dealt with by the management team were similarly passed into the office. These demands from below were more likely to make the manager leave the office, either to deal with a guest, to 'sort out' a particular problem, to see
another member of staff etc. So, the amount of time spent in the office was a reflection of the centralised and control based nature of the particular organisation and the demands which it placed upon its managers.

Office Based Activities

The type of activities which the managers undertook and their office based nature seemed to indicate that managers had moved away from supervising activities, as Nailon (1968) suggested, to more American styles of hotel management. This seemed to dispel the idea of the manager acting primarily as mein host or supervisor as they were clearly more concerned with the financial control of the operation. This led to the office being used as the base for most scheduled and unscheduled meetings and for nearly all paperwork.

There was some logic in the manager spending large amounts of time in his office as this had the effect of making him 'available' to deal with problems as they arose. In particular, he became 'available' to other members of staff and to take telephone calls and these two activities took almost one third of his time. The office based nature of the job also reflected in the small amount of time spent with guests and this was a further reflection of the emphasis by the company on control. In general, managers were more concerned with the control of costs, than they were with meeting guests. This is reflected in the
surprisingly low figure of only ten per cent of their time being spent with guests or potential guests.

**Time Alone**

Managers were isolated both hierarchically and geographically. Hierarchically they stood alone within the establishment and therefore any contact with peers had to be via the telephone or very occasional meetings. Geographically the hotels were separated both from one another and from head office. The amount of time spent alone, the lack of colleagues in immediate proximity and the geographical isolation from head office caused most of the managers to describe the job as 'lonely'. This was a key feature of the job and was mentioned by most managers during the course of the study. Hence, managers appeared to view their position as isolated both literally and metaphorically.

On average, almost a quarter of time was spent alone, and although there were substantial variations among the managers, it did appear that a large proportion of the job could be done alone. This was reflected in the way that two of the managers spent almost 40% of their time on their own. This does not square with a picture of fragmented and hectic work. As Stewart (1967) noted:

"one measure of a manager's time to think and plan is the amount and length of time he has to himself." (Stewart, 1967, p.71)
Although the amount of time spent alone varied very substantially from manager to manager, it did appear as if it were possible for a manager to spend very large portions of his time alone, if he so wished. Previous studies had tended to interpret the data about managerial interaction as showing the interactive nature of managerial work and this may have distorted viewpoints about its characteristics. Certainly, a job which has the capacity to be successfully completed with such a high proportion of time alone, is different from the portrait painted by earlier researchers into managerial work in the sense of the degree of fragmentation, the number of interruptions, the pace of work, its discontinuity and the concept of the hotel manager as 'mein host' and leads to a view of managerial work as more office based and isolated than previously presented.

9.4 INFORMATIONAL

The manager acted as a cog in the total informational process of the organisation. Each piece of information was not an isolated and discrete event but was a part of the total process of managerial action which involved an evolving and interlinking flow of information and interaction. Tsui (1984) saw that:

"the activities of the focal manager and the expectations of the constituents create a complex social environment in which the dynamic reciprocal influence process develops and continues." (Tsui, 1984, p.31)
Within the hotel the manager acted as the focal point of the informational process and held much crucial information. Were he not present someone else would have had to have taken the focal role with regard to information collection and exchange. Mintzberg (1973) noted that:

"To his subordinates, to the observer, and to the man himself, the manager clearly occupies the central position in the movement of a certain kind of information within his organization. In effect, the manager is his organization's "nerve center"...... This reflects two features of the manager's job - his unique access to external information and his all embracing access to internal information." (Mintzberg, 1973, p.66)

The internal concerns of the organisation and the external demands from outside demanded almost equal attention. In this respect the pattern among the managers was remarkably consistent and suggested that the external environment impinged on the manager to a substantial and quantifiable degree. Hence a picture emerged of managers' being a central focal point in the informational processes of the organisation and as having two points of focus with regard to information exchange, the internal and external environments of the hotel.
Internal

The pattern of internal information exchange was dominated by unscheduled meetings, short contacts and the use of the telephone. There were very few formal, scheduled meetings, very few entries in the manager's diary and much scope to deal with events as they arose. The process was a continuously evolving pattern in which one interaction or piece of information led into another either by intent, chance or coincidence. Managers acted at the centre of this interactional and informational process because of their hierarchical position and their access to information. This fitted with the findings of both Ley (1978) and Arnaldo (1981) who in their work on hotel general managers noted the role of information disseminator as one of the most dominant of Mintzberg's (1973) roles.

The passage of internal information occurred mainly by verbal interaction between the manager and various members of staff in short contacts and unscheduled meetings. Much general information was passed through short contacts with a variety of staff. Kotter (1982) noted, of general managers, that:

"Most of their time with others was spent in short and disjointed conversations. It was rare to see a discussion of a single question or issue last more than ten minutes. And it was not at all unusual to see five minute interactions that covered ten unrelated topics." (Kotter, 1982, p.81)

Short contacts of less than three minutes were the major form
information exchange and interaction with non-managerial staff. These averaged 28.5% of the managers' events and so represented an important form of interaction and information exchange for managers. For the most part, such exchanges were multi-issued and tended to be connected with the giving of immediate instructions and information about operational issues. Many of the short contacts with staff would occur while the manager was 'on tour'. Typically managers would undertake two or three tours per day and this was the major time at which the manager came into contact with non-managerial staff, who were generally reluctant to enter the office.

Unscheduled meetings were the way in which communications occurred most frequently with the management team and these were predominantly held on a one-to-one basis in the manager's office. These meetings were used for delegation and operational control and acted to inform members of the management team about the manager's requirements and about current events in the hotel. Delegation to a competent management team was a key aim of several of the managers and the low level of communication with other subordinate staff suggested why this should be the case. The manager spent only 10% of his time communicating with staff below the level of department head, and in the case of two of the managers this was only 6%, compared to an average of 17% on a one to one basis with managerial staff. In terms of time, this amounted to roughly two hours per day. Only two of the managers held and attended a scheduled daily department heads briefing and apart from these, meetings with two or more of the management
staff were infrequent.

**External**

The external environment was made up of head office and regional office staff, guests, colleagues and other external contacts and represented a major area of concern for the managers. Managers spent half of their communication time with those external to the hotel. Similarly, in terms of the results from Luthans and Lockwood's (1984) LOS categories shown in Appendix 23, 'interacting with others' accounted for an average of nearly 29% of all the managers' time and was by far the largest single category. One manager spent more than 40% of his time in this way. This interaction was essential for a number of reasons; firstly it was the way in which organisational information was passed to the unit and the way for the manager to maintain his political stature within the organisation; secondly, a certain amount of business depended on personal contact between the manager and the guest/client; thirdly, if as some managers supposed, the hotel was important as a symbol in the local community, then the manager needed to be seen to be interested and involved in community affairs and fourthly, the manager had to maintain some contact with suppliers to ensure prices and delivery.

The form of information transference from head office and regional office to the individual hotels tended to be primarily one way and written. Far more information was passed from head
office to the manager than vice versa and so the general passage of information was 'in' from head office and 'out' to staff. Because of the geographical isolation of the units from each other, and from head office and regional office, and the infrequency of visits from their staff, there was relatively little opportunity for politicking or socialising either with superiors or with peers.

Contacts between the manager and guests were generally short and polite. In the main, managers tried to avoid getting 'caught' by guests while outside of their offices and this was achieved by the speed at which all the managers walked. Maintaining a fast pace of walking served two functions firstly that it made the manager appear to be busy and secondly it prevented interruptions particularly from guests and subordinate staff. The other external contacts included suppliers and a wide range of contacts within the community. The pattern of these external contacts varied substantially with the type of hotel. For instance, those in the newer hotels generally had less involvement with community affairs, and they did not perceive their hotels as holding any particular value to the local community, other than as a source of employment. Alternatively, those within the older hotels clearly saw the hotel as an integral part of the local community, and this was subsequently reflected in their activities. In each of the older hotels the managers held positions within the local chamber of trade, hoteliers association, round table etc. and felt that the hotel was perceived to be important for the local community, beyond its role as an employer. Manager D said that:
"the manager of this hotel is expected to be part of the institution of this town."

The external environment has been widely viewed as a source of threat or instability to managers which they try to balance or prevent from disturbing their normal activities (Sayles, 1964; Shamir, 1978; Stewart, 1981). There was little evidence in this study to suggest that managers undertook contacts with the external environment with this express purpose. However, managers clearly wished to maintain a pattern of work and any threat to that pattern would be considered a 'nuisance', but such 'threats' were as likely to come from internal functioning as from external interventions.

Managers sat at the point in the organisational hierarchy where the internal and external environments interacted. They used their position to collect information from the internal and external environment, process it and distribute it. The flow of communication and information was, then, primarily one way. Further they used information exchange to maintain a fluid and controlled pattern of work. This was well expressed by Sayles (1964) in terms of a 'moving equilibrium'. He saw managers as:

"seeking a dynamic type of stability, making adjustments and readjustments to both internally generated and externally imposed pressures. By these responses to variations in the environment, he hopes to maintain a moving equilibrium."

(Sayles, 1964, p.163)
9.5 CONTROLLING

While work followed distinct and organised patterns which involved spending time alone, in interaction and information exchange, these explained the managers' pattern of work rather than their functions or the 'raison d'etre' of their work. The managers' primary goal was the achievement of targets and this was completed mainly through a process of operational and financial control. Braverman and other writers who might be associated with a 'labour process' school of thought such as Storey (1981), Salaman (1982), Anthony (1986), Knights and Willmott (1986) and Willmott (1984, 1987) have collectively tended to view management as essentially a process of control. Braverman (1974) said:

"Control has been the essential feature of management throughout its history." (Braverman, 1974, p.90)

and Hales (1988) noted that critiques of studies of managerial work from a labour process perspective had suggested that:

"by emphasising superficial differences in managers' behaviour and conceptualising managerial politics in terms of informal, individualistic manoeuvre, the studies remain blind to the common raison d'etre of all managers, namely control." (Hales, 1988, p.1)
The literature connected with the hospitality industry also propagated the view that control was necessary because of the dual prongs of the uncertainty of customer behaviour and the need for standardisation of product (Shamir, 1970; Mars et al., 1979; Mars and Nicod, 1984; Nevett, 1985). In this case the rationale for control lay not in the need to contain uncertainty but in the strength of head office demands to achieve 'cost' targets which could be met only through tight, office based control of expenditures. Although the job contained elements of uncertainty created by the guest, this was largely accounted for in the adaptive and flexible pattern of the work and therefore caused only very limited conflict with the standardised nature of the product and the centralised form of control.

In this organisation managerial agendas appeared to be set by head office rather than by individual managers' themselves as suggested by Stewart (1982, 1989) and Kotter (1982). The outcome of this was that the goal of the managers became not the achievement of profit per se, but the achievement of company set budgets and targets which were used as the daily measures of the success of the business. Managerial work therefore became strongly directed to the satisficing of those above the manager in the hierarchy as demands from above were deemed substantially more important than demands from below.
The Process of Control

**FIGURE 4: THE PROCESS OF CONTROL**

Company Head Office - Company wide strategies and philosophies. Specific operational targets for each division.

Divisional Head Office - Specific financial targets for each hotel in the division.

General Manager - Financial control of operation to ensure achievement of targets in each budgeted area. Operational control to achieve quality of product and service.

Hotel Management Team - Operational control to ensure performance in line with the quality and financial objectives of the manager.
The process of control is shown above in Figure 1. Although information passed both upward and downward through the hierarchy, control was essentially a one way, downward process. This began in head office with the setting of company wide philosophies and strategies which were then interpreted by the divisional managing directors and translated into numerical operating targets. These were divided into financial targets for each hotel with specific budgets allocated to the areas of sales, gross profit, wages, variable operating expenses, fixed operating expenses, hotel profit contribution, cash contribution, room occupancy and average room rate as shown in Appendix 25.

The process of control then operated through the senior managers setting budgets and targets for the general manager who was subsequently obliged to control the performance of those below him to meet these company controlled standards. Each unit had sales targets and cost budgets which were set on a six monthly basis and against which the weekly performance of the hotel was measured by the regional manager and divisional managing director. The managers viewed the key immediate variables as being wage costs, variable operating costs, HPC (hotel profit contribution) percentage and sales turnover. In order to achieve these the managers monitored the performance results which arrived on their desks each morning and those which were fed back to them from head office on a weekly basis. This process of monitoring and subsequent correction represented a major element in the manager's job and was the key constituent in making it a primarily an office based activity. This is well expressed by
Sayles (1964) who said:

"the major use of the manager's time is taking action to remedy emerging problems, as defined by his monitoring. For this reason, he needs a method of distinguishing data that indicate all is proceeding as well as can be expected and evidence that his intervention is required." (Sayles, 1964, p.174)

Areas of Control

The managers were primarily concerned with monitoring and controlling two distinct areas, the quality of product and service and the financial performance of the operation. These were responses to different types of demand placed upon them, the former being a response to demands from below and from guests and the latter being to demands from above. Similarly these two activities occurred in different locations, the former being outside of the office and the latter being primarily office based. These demands required different types of response from the manager and were given different priorities.

The work of Venison (1983) suggested that hotel managers had an important function of control via the process of 'being there'. This involved the observation of live action and the subsequent correction of activities or events which were deemed incorrect. This was given less importance by the managers both in terms of
time allocation and perceived importance than the broader office based control of financial information. The reasons for this were that this approach represented a response to demands from below the manager in the hierarchy or from guests, both of which were perceived to be of lesser importance than demands from above. Also, the deputy manager and the department heads shared this control function with the manager and some managers' did not want to appear to be overly 'interfering'. Lastly, time 'on the floor' of the hotel was likely to be more interrupted and bring more problems to the surface than office based time.

The second area of control was concerned with the control of the performance of the unit in terms of achievement of budgets, forecasts and targets. Nichols and Benyon (1977) observed this in terms of:

"a bureaucratic system - a system of control. It programmes, monitors and processes the 'performance' of labour, including that of the labour of superintendence, which itself is concerned with programming, monitoring, and processing in order to control." (Nichols and Benyon, 1977, p.38)

It was this area to which the managers gave primary importance as it represented the way their performance was judged by those higher up the hierarchy. The managers were particularly concerned with the control of costs as they perceived that sales were largely beyond their control and that the sales function was largely that of head office. Head office provided all the sales
and marketing literature and dictated the style and timing of promotions. Although each hotel had a sales executive, this person had to be shared with 5 other hotels and was perceived to be outside the control of the individual manager. Hence managers' believed that while they could directly influence costs they had little control over sales and this was also reflected in the emphasis given to cost based targets by the regional managers.

Methods of Control

The methods used for control relate to the concept of management as a labour process, Braverman (1974) said:

"management has become administration which is a labor process conducted for the purpose of control within the organisation." (Braverman, 1974, p.267)

Within such a definition management became synonomous with the control process which used a number of methods which included monitoring of performance, much interacting with others, planning, paperwork, information exchange, staffing/discipline and dealing with conflicts. Hence, although the direct activity of control did not quantitatively take as much time as some other activities, much control was embedded within other areas of activity and in particular, financial control, planning and the managerial style adopted by the manager. Also, as Nailon (1968: p.101) pointed out, the amount of time spent on a function does
Financial Control - The process of financial control took place through the constant monitoring of the results of the unit. The managers felt that the company was primarily interested in immediate results and so time spans of operation and judgement were very short. Manager E said:

"This is a 'now' company and a 'now' business"

Contrary to expectations, the time perspectives of managers in the company appeared to get shorter rather than longer higher up in the hierarchy. Manager E continued:

"time perspectives in this company appear to get shorter as you go up the line."

Whereas each of the managers was content to think in time spans of one year or longer those in regional and head office were most interested in results on a week to week and month to month basis. Performance results were posted weekly to regional office with rolling projections for the next four weeks. If any of these results were outside the allocated budget or forecast the manager would expect a telephone call from the area director asking for an explanation. To ensure that weekly and monthly targets were progressing on schedule each of the managers had a weekly meeting with their accountant who kept the best data with regard to staffing and operating costs. On a monthly basis each manager had
a performance review meeting with the area director. This system of regular weekly and monthly control by those higher up the hierarchy ensured that the manager maintained daily monitoring of cost and sales figures within the unit.

The daily monitoring of the performance of the unit involved the managers in an early morning call to the accountant to check the takings from the previous day and the progress towards that weeks' target and regular checks throughout the day on their computer screen with regard to immediate occupancy levels. Occupancy level was a key variable as higher occupancy allowed the manager some leeway with regard to costs which were estimated as a percentage of turnover. Hence, if occupancy were down, costs in percentage terms went up. This was coupled with a regular review of the latest performance figures and corrective action to adjust those deemed 'out of line'. This corrective action would usually take the form of instructions to departments heads to adjust operations accordingly. This might mean, for instance, reducing the number of staff, implementing a cost cutting measure or controlling wastage.

The constant pressure for better cost related results led managers into a dilemma between quality and costs. At some point managers' realised that the process of cutting costs influenced the quality of the product. This could be in terms of slower service through less staff, non-replacement of equipment, the dropping of certain services such as portering, or relatively minor issues like the removal of table linen to cut down on
laundry costs, or the stopping of the late night taxi service to take staff home. Manager E expressed a commonly held knowledge among the managers that:

"its the easiest thing in the world for the general manager to cut, cut, cut. What is more difficult is to achieve longer term quality and profitability."

There was then a dilemma between keeping to company based cost targets and the desire to provide a good quality product.

Planning - Planning also acted as a method of control in the way it anticipated future events so that they would not subsequently upset the pattern of work or adversely affect operating results. Planning and coordinating, although linked together by Luthans and Lockwood (1984) and in the results of this research, were distinctly different types of control activity. Coordination was a form of operational control which involved the organisation of the unit and the bringing together of the disparate activities so that they met the standards of the manager and the company. Planning involved consideration for some future event and was more likely to be concerned with financial control. In part, the difference was one of time scale, coordination being primarily concerned with the immediate and planning with the future.

Mintzberg (1973) had contended that planning was a vague objective of managers, but not an activity which they actually
undertook. However, there was ample evidence both through recently prepared documents and through observation that managers did plan and that this was a recognisable and observable activity. Each of the managers had recently prepared a five year plan for their unit, and these were substantial documents running to over one hundred pages. Other examples of planning were for:

* - future food and beverage promotions
* - 'pushes' on certain sectors of the market
* - the improvement of training in the unit
* - different staff accommodation
* - changes in systems of operation
* - the introduction of a creche
* - a particularly busy week 6 weeks hence
* - the loss of business from a biannual show in the off year

These were all foci for planning activities involved with the future operation of the unit and occupied significant amounts of the managers' time. Most of them were concerned with the control of the disruptive effects of some future occurrence. Some managers spent rather longer than others on planning, but there was considerable uniformity about the results. Planning was an activity which managers undertook on a regular basis and was important to their control of the operation.

Managerial Style - Control was also influenced through the style that the manager used in the decision making processes within the hotel. Only in one hotel was there a deliberate attempt to
actively encourage the management team in decision making. In the
other hotels decision making was the prerogative of the manager,
with relatively little consultation. Hence leadership styles
could be seen to be toward the autocratic or paternalistic end of
the continuum. This was in line with the culture of the
organisation. The manager's work was conducted 'through' the
management team rather than 'with' them and there was little to
suggest that managerial work in this context was a team based
activity. The methods of achieving results and the process of
control within the unit were both essentially singular and
this partially accounted for the length of time spent alone.

Summary - The essence of the general manager's job was in the
control process, in particular the need to control operating
costs and to balance these against income. Income was largely
viewed as given, over which the managers perceived they had only
a limited amount of control and therefore their major
responsibility was seen to be to meet cost targets set by the
company. As these were set in percentage terms this became a
balancing act, so that costs were constantly in line with sales,
which was achieved by an office based approach to the monitoring
of performance indicators.
9.6 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Early studies of managerial work (Carlson, 1951; Hemphill, 1959; Brewer and Tomlinson, 1964; Copeman, 1971) were concerned with identifying similarities in managerial activities and functions, and this was continued in the work of those whose approach was influenced heavily by Mintzberg (1973), (Ley, 1978; Lau et al., 1980; Shapira and Dunbar, 1980; Kurke and Aldrich, 1983). This led Whitely (1985) to note that:

"although there are notable exceptions, studies .... place primary emphasis upon the description of similarities among managers' work behaviors." (Whitely, 1985, p.345)

The differences noted among managers in early studies had tended to be related to their level and function (Martin, 1956; Burns, 1957; Kelly, 1964). However, Stewart (1967, 1976, 1982) developed the belief, through the concept of managerial 'choice', that managers differ significantly in both the conduct and content of their work, even when occupying similar positions in the same organisation. Hales (1981) summarised Stewart's position saying:

"Stewart's basic concern is with .... investigating empirical differences in the way that different managers perform ostensibly similar jobs, in terms of responding to demands, constraints and making choices ..... Managerial job holders .... differ in terms of their perception of, response
to, negotiation of and selection between the demands, constraints and choices surrounding their jobs." (Hales, 1981, p.117)

More recently the work of Kotter (1982), and to a lesser extent Stewart et al. (1980) and Larson et al. (1986) have tried to show managerial work in terms of a range of differing behaviours and functions.

**Similarities**

The managers in this study did work remarkably similarly, while exhibiting a range of behaviours, activities and functions. While it was possible to find individual differences in both behaviour and activities among the managers, the total of the pattern of work, the informational and interactional nature of that work and its controlling function presented a picture of managerial work which was fundamentally similar. This similarity can be seen by viewing the results of the study as a series of patterns rather than as a number of discrete or unique events/behaviours. For instance, with regard to the location of their work all of the managers spent the largest proportion of their time in their office with the next most important category being either 'external' to the hotel or 'bars/restaurants'. There were exceptions to this situation, but they were 'exceptions' and the overall pattern of the location in which managerial work occurred was similar.
Stewart et al. (1980) used the work of Kotter and Lawrence (1974) to show four stages of managerial behaviour ranging from a situation in which:

i) the pattern of the day was a response to immediate problems and issues;

ii) much time was spent in daily contact and sharing of information;

iii) operational management was largely delegated to established subordinates;

iv) the manager separated himself from most of the administration and day to day affairs of the business (Stewart et al., 1980, p.78-80).

If this is used as four descriptions of managerial activities, rather than as a scale or continuum, the managers could be seen to fit into each of the descriptions in a similar fashion. Each of the managers was concerned with the resolution of critical events which occurred on a daily basis and time was set aside in the pattern of work for this, much time was spent in daily contact and information exchange, the majority of operational management was delegated to a management team and each manager did separate themselves away from the day to day activities of the operation in order to give themselves time to interact with outsiders, plan and control the operation. Overall, the managers followed a very similar pattern of work in terms of their daily activities and functions, and similarities were far more evident.
during observation than were differences.

**Differences**

The managers did however differ, and this was more noticeable in the way in which they chose to do the job, rather than in the work itself. Each manager adopted a slightly different approach to their work. Manager A had a very office based, controlling approach coupled with a high level of external interaction. He did not hold departmental manager meetings and in consequence spent an above average amount of time with management staff on a one to one basis. Manager B had a more 'people' orientated approach which was reflected in high levels of staff and external interactions. His work was less office based, less controlling and more interactional within the unit and this caused him to have a high number of daily events.

Manager C was most comfortable when alone in his office working on some future project. He was the most office based of the managers, spent a high proportion of his time on desk work and spent the greatest amount of time alone. This linked with a relatively low level of interaction with outsiders but a heavy emphasis on planning and control. He did not have departmental managers meetings and had very few scheduled meetings of any description. Manager D was the youngest and most outgoing of the managers. He liked to spend time talking to his management team and building a network of external contacts and clients. He had daily briefings with the management team which lasted up to 45
minutes, substantially longer than elsewhere. He spent the highest amount of time of all the managers in scheduled meetings and in contact with others and subsequently the lowest amount alone. The location of his hotel was relatively close to head office and this resulted in his having more contacts with head office staff than some of the other managers. He was the most participative of the managers in seeking the opinions and advice of members of the management team and also worked the longest hours, and this may not have been a mere coincidence. The process of participation used managerial time and therefore there may have been a necessity to work slightly longer hours in order to maintain an open communicative pattern and retain the 'normal pattern' of work of a general manager.

Manager E had a more insular style spending a greater proportion of his time within the hotel with relatively few external contacts or meetings. He worked on a split shift system which meant that he spent a number of evenings in the hotel and this reflected in the amount of time he spent with guests. The split shift system also meant that he spent more time in the kitchen and the restaurant than other managers. He did not have a daily management team meeting but he did have the highest level of unscheduled meetings, most of which were with members of the management team. Manager F liked to spend time with external contacts while maintaining an insular, office based approach to the control of activities within the hotel. Short, daily management meetings allowed him the opportunity to exchange basic
pieces of operational information and to limit the number of other contacts that occurred with management staff during the course of the day. The results of manager F bore some comparison with manager C, these were the two oldest of the managers, and they both spent a much higher proportion of their time alone than did the other managers. For manager F this emerged in an office based approach in which desk work occupied a larger than average proportion of time.

The amount of time that the manager chose to spend alone or in contact with others was the central factor which differentiated the managers in the approach they took to the job. This was particularly reflected in the number of scheduled meetings and the amount of time spent on desk work by each of the managers'. However, its influence was not such that it caused fundamental changes in either the pattern of work or the nature of that work. The pattern and nature of the work of each manager, on each working day, was remarkably similar despite the differences in approach.

9.7 SUMMARY

Managerial work was different in its patterns, characteristics and functions than that which had been presented in earlier studies. The idea of the manager's job as being frantic, fragmented and filled with interruption seemed largely an outcome of the way in which previous researchers had viewed their data. This study took the approach of trying to find the overall
patterns of the work rather than viewing it as a series of unique, disconnected events. In this way the process of managerial work was fluid, patterned, office based, informational, controlling and very similar among the managers.

Each working day followed a similar pattern for each of the managers. This distinctive pattern was shaped for adaptation so that unusual or critical events could be accommodated without disrupting the essential flow of the work. The pattern allowed work to develop each day in a relatively controlled and fluid fashion, work was not highly fragmented but flowed from one situation into another. The pattern allowed sufficient space for flexibility to changing circumstances and for the wide ranging nature of the tasks with which the manager had to deal. Within this pattern work was completed in a calm and orderly manner, to the extent that there was often relatively little for the managers to do in the afternoons.

The managers' job was highly office based and they spent nearly half of all their time within their office. The office acted as the centre of communications within the hotel, it was where the manager accepted information from head office and outside the hotel and from where he distributed it to the management team and the staff, and to a much lesser extent vice versa. The office was the manager's territory and gave him a 'shielded environment' in which to conduct certain tasks such as financial control and planning. It was also where the manager spent time alone and this accounted for a quarter of most managers' time. This, coupled
with the hierarchical and geographical isolation of the post, caused managers to describe the job as lonely.

The general manager held a key position in the passage of information in the organisation acting as the bridge between the internal information processes of the hotel and those external to it, including head and regional office. The internal passage of information was mostly achieved through short contacts and one to one meetings with members of the management team. External information tended to flow from head office to the hotel and came mainly in the form of written requests. These were either delegated to appropriate members of the management team or dealt with directly by the manager. Managers maintained a wide range of other external contacts, however they spent relatively little time guests.

The process of financial and operational control was a central element in the manager’s job and was influenced by the control led nature of the corporate culture of the organisation. Control was predominantly concerned with the achievement of company established cost targets and budgets rather than with operational supervision. This fitted with the patterned and office based nature of the work. The emphasis on constant and immediate results meant that managers were forced into a daily monitoring of the performance indicators of the hotel so as to achieve weekly targets.
The similar pattern of work adopted by each of the managers, their office based approach to the control process and the importance of information processing all presented a picture of work that was highly similar for each of the managers. Although each adopted slightly different approaches to the job, these were a matter of style and interpretation around an essentially similar framework. Overall, the work of the managers was very similar.
10.1 INTRODUCTION

Those operating within the labour process field, and notably Willmott (1984, 1987), had suggested that managerial work needed to be understood within the context in which it operated. The work of Dalton (1959), Sayles (1964) and Nichols and Benyon (1977) had all noted the political and informal aspects of managerial and supervisory work without a more detailed consideration of its other determinants. Although other authors (Stewart, 1967; Campbell et al., 1970; Mintzberg, 1973; Marshall and Stewart, 1981; Kotter, 1982) had referred, in passing, to the determinants of managerial work, this had never formed a central part of their research. The effect of this was that an understanding of managerial work emerged which emanated from a consideration of the job in isolation from other factors. Hales (1986) saw:

"a more general reluctance on the part of many of the studies to locate managerial work practices carefully within the
broader context of the function of management in work organizations." (Hales, 1986, p.103/104)

This research attempted to understand managerial work as a process which occurred within a specific context in which there were a number of major contextual variables. The four variables which most determined the nature of managerial work, were:

i) Direct Workplace Demands
ii) Unbounded Discretion
iii) Managerial Strategies and Divisions of Labour
iv) The Culture and Philosophy of the Organisation and the Industry

Within the context of his everyday work the manager faced direct demands from those above him, below him and from the work itself. Within these demands the manager had a limited freedom in which to conduct the work according to his personal preferences and this was referred to as 'unbounded discretion'. However, these workplace demands and choices were bound within specific strategies and 'managerial divisions of labour' (Teulings, 1986) and this organisational structuring of managerial tasks was influential in shaping the nature of managerial work. Most importantly, work occurred within the framework of the culture and philosophy of the industry and of the particular company. Whitley (1989) had recognised how managerial skills were industry and company specific and it appeared that industry and
organisational culture and philosophy strongly influenced both the work that the manager conducted and the method by which it was completed.

10.2 WORK DEMANDS

The situation in which managerial work was conducted created direct demands upon the manager which were described as 'work demands'. Whereas 'role' demands related to those demands which emanated from the perceived expectations of those with whom the manager had contact, work demands were explicit and were concerned with immediate workplace problems or information. Work demands were therefore the direct demands imposed on the manager in the everyday performance of the job. This study then, attempted to make a clear distinction between role demands being the 'expectations' of those with whom the manager had direct contact and analysed through the use of the managerial wheel, and direct work demands, which were the immediate requirements for action imposed on the manager in the course of his work.

The study analysed work demands in terms of the amount of discretionary and non-discretionary time that the manager had available to him. An assessment was made of each activity in terms of whether it resulted from a demand from above, demand from below, a critical event or if it was self initiated/discretionary. This established a method by which a quantitative measure could be applied to the extent of direct demands and discretion present in the job. It acted also to
present a picture of the reactivity or proactivity of the manager without using the more generic terms 'proactive' and 'reactive'. The results, shown in Appendix 26, indicate that on average 55% of the manager's time and events were essentially discretionary, while 45% were the result of direct demands.

The picture which emerged from earlier studies of managerial work had suggested that it was largely reactive and essentially driven by immediate demands (Mintzberg, 1973) or that it was strongly influenced by choice (Stewart, 1982). The work of Mintzberg (1973) described managerial work as being of 'unrelenting pace' and characterised by 'brevity, reactivity, variety and fragmentation' and this strongly suggested that the work of managers was demand driven. In this study the manager's telephone rang relatively infrequently, staff did not interrupt the manager often, and work was relaxed and conducted at the managers' chosen pace. This would not have been possible if the immediate work was placing a very high level of demand on the manager. Alternatively, Stewart et al. (1980) in their study of district administrators in the National Health Service had noted that:

"this description of the demands, constraints and choices of the jobs of district administrator and of area administrator in a single district area shows that these posts, in common with many other senior management posts, offer a wide variety of choices within a considerable array of constraints, and that the demand element is a comparatively small part of the
This study followed neither of these more extreme viewpoints but saw that the immediate demands of the workplace provided a key, if not dominating, determinant of the shape and pattern of managerial work. The direct demands which occurred during work seemed to impinge less on the manager than might have been expected from those who viewed managerial work as essentially reactive but considerably more than that suggested by Stewart et al. (1980). Overall, it accounted for an average of 45% of the managers' time and events. Managerial work was, therefore, a balance between the direct demands that the manager faced in the daily course of work and managerial discretion within the bounds of the practices and procedures of the company.

Work demands were divided into three types:

a) demands from above or external demands - those direct work demands that came from superiors or from 'outside' of the hotel;

b) demands from below - those work demands that came to the manager from subordinates;

c) critical events - those demands which emanated from the actual work situation of that particular day and demanded immediate attention.

Of these, demands from above accounted for roughly 16% of total
time, those from below for 9% and critical events for 20%. Few, if any, demands came from colleagues reflecting the geographical isolation of the position.

**Work Demands from Above and from External Sources**

Demands from above and external sources included those from head and regional office, guests, suppliers and external bodies and accounted for an average of 15.74% of the time and 10.73% of the events of managers. Of this, at least 12% of the total time of the managers was involved with work generated by head or regional office indicating that most contacts with head or regional office were seen as a demand whereas contacts with those from outside the company were largely discretionary. Demands from above tended to be mainly routine administration connected with the passage of information in the form of paperwork, completion of questionnaires, the return of performance statistics etc. Typically these might include details of sales, costs, or more specific information with regard to the success of promotions. Quite a substantial amount of material came from head office for information only, and required no direct action other than the reading of the memo. Demands from head office tended to arrive in the twice weekly mail bag whereas those from regional office tended to be communicated more often via the telephone.

Discussions with the managers during the course of the study suggested they believed they faced heavy demands from above. A common complaint of the managers regarded the amount of time that
they believed they spent on head office and regional office memos and administration. Despite these complaints about 'head office paperwork' this activity rarely took more than 12% of the manager's time, and if it did, then the extra time involved was probably at the manager's discretion. The completion of head office information was generally seen as the manager's direct responsibility and so relatively little was delegated to members of the management team.

Direct work demands from above were significant in shaping managerial work, particularly with regard to its office based nature and in the role of information disseminator. However, the extent of this work was generally less burdensome than the managers perceived and given the geographical isolation of units and the emphasis placed on control by the company one might have expected demands from above to be more persistent and frequent and hence more influential in shaping the conduct of managerial work.

**Work Demands from Below**

These were the direct demands that the manager faced from those below him in the hierarchy during the course of his work. The number and amount of time that these took varied substantially and were affected by the managerial style adopted by the manager. The average amount of managerial time spent on direct demands from below was 8.71%, with a range from 4.94% to 13.12%. This was
the least important of the areas of work demands in terms of time usage largely because the nature of these interactions tended to be short.

The number of demands from below which the manager faced, ranged from 46-130 and averaged 95 during the five days of observation. Those who held regular meetings with their management team faced less demands than those who did not, as did those who used a secretary as a 'shield'. Hence, demands from below were more influenced by the personality and style of the manager than demands from above or critical events and were therefore an area over which the manager had more direct control. The two main variables which determined the extent of the influence of work demands from below were; firstly the extent to which the manager was perceived to have an 'open door' policy and be available to staff for consultation and secondly the number of formal meetings he had with his management team. Although all the managers had what they described as an 'open door' policy, this was perceived by staff as being encouraged more by some managers than by others. In this respect, where the manager was heavily shielded by a secretary as with manager E, there appear to be fewer demands from below. Those managers who did not hold meetings with their management teams, such as managers A and C, faced a higher number of demands from below as staff had to come to them for information.

Demands from below were less important in determining the shape and nature of managerial work than either demands from above or
critical events. The reason was primarily that demands from below were considered by the managers to be less important than demands from other sources. Also, whereas demands from above were relatively inescapable, those from below were subject to the extent to which the manager made himself available to those demands. The outcome of this was that demands from below offered a much greater range of results than demands from above.

Critical Events

Critical events were work related demands which emerged from the 'nature of the situation' and included events such as customer complaints, the fire alarms sounding, a computer breakdown etc. A critical event demanded action from the manager either immediately or within the course of that working day. These events occurred with some frequency and consistency and for this reason it was decided to separate them from the routine demands from above or below. This approach of studying the critical events of managers bore some similarity to the critical incident method used by Marples (1967).

Managers spent an average of almost 20% of their time dealing with critical events. However, the figures relating to the number of events which each manager faced were somewhat misleading as one occurrence could involve a number of events. So although the managers are shown in Appendix 26 as having an average of 108 critical events per week most managers actually dealt with around
5 discrete incidents each day.

The nature of the situation, in terms of its continuous nature and the unpredictability of guest behaviour, meant that there were regular daily critical events which demanded the manager's attention. A typical example was a complaint that had been sent to head office and which had then been passed on to the manager. This meant having to make several telephone calls, to staff, to the guest and then having to report back the incident to head office and regional office. More extreme examples of critical events were the failure of the hot water system early one morning, the fire alarms sounding, several instances of severe overbooking of guests, the double booking of a major function room, dismissal of staff for theft etc.

Critical events took up a substantial amount of managerial time and were events over which the manager had little direct control and, so like demands from above were relatively unavoidable. Dealing with critical events was a time consuming activity and so managerial work was patterned by the managers so that there was sufficient 'space' in the working day to accommodate these events. However, their inherent unpredictability and nature meant that if they became too frequent or time consuming they would then upset the pattern of work which the manager normally undertook. A certain amount of 'fire fighting' seemed to be an essential part of managerial work and one which needed to be allowed for in the basic patternning of the working day. Critical
events then took about one fifth of the manager's working day and were therefore important in determining the nature of managerial work activities and functions.

Summary - Several authors, (Stewart, 1967; Mintzberg, 1973; Kotter, 1982) had suggested that managerial work was in part a function of the work itself. This study considered the work demands which the manager faced in the conduct of the job in terms of demands from above and from external sources, demands from below and critical events. Although this form of direct work demand took 45% of the manager's time, it did not appear to be the critically influencing factor in the shaping of managerial work activities and functions. If the nature of the work had placed substantial demands upon the manager in terms of what he did with his time and the functions he undertook then one would have expected that the amount of time allocated to each of these sets of demands to have been much higher. Although demands from above influenced the office based and administrative nature of the work, demands from below its informational and interactional nature and critical events its overall pattern, these factors seemed to be influential rather than critical in the determination of the shape and nature of managerial work.

10.3 UNBOUNDED DISCRETION

Stewart's (1976, 1982) perspective was that jobs offered a wide range of choices to managers and that this explained fundamental differences in managerial work. In her study of district
administrators in the National Health Service (Stewart et al., 1980) she described the conduct of the manager’s work and the work itself as being very different among the sample, and used this to justify the concept of choice as the key determinant of managerial work. Choices related to that area of the work over which the manager had discretion. She defined choices as:

"the activities that the jobholder can, but does not have to do. They are the opportunities for one jobholder to do different work from another and to do it in different ways." (Stewart, 1982, p.2)

Stewart explained 'choice' in terms of an individual personality interacting with a work role. The breadth of the managerial role was such that it inevitably offered substantial areas for individual interpretation and hence the use of the manager’s discretion. Stewart (1981) summed up her view of the influence of the individual manager on the nature and conduct of managerial work by saying that:

"the individual manager makes his job. In a few managerial jobs this statement is wholly true; in all others it is partially true." (Stewart, 1981, p.19)

In this study 55% of the manager’s time was spent on discretionary activities with a range from 49%-64%, compared to the 45% of direct work demands. Discretion was also the dominant
area in terms of the number of events, over 55% of events were conducted at the discretion of the manager and there seemed surprisingly little variety between the individual participants, the range being from 52%-65%. These results suggested that managers had a large percentage of their time which was apparently discretionary, in which they were not subject to direct demands from above, below or from critical events. However, the additional constraints imposed through the process of role demands meant that this large period of apparent discretion was not used in a totally proactive manner. The work of Marshall and Stewart, 1981; Stewart, 1982 and Gast, 1984, had questioned the ability of managers to perceive their areas of discretion and this was supported in the results of the initial 'goals' questionnaire. Gast (1984) noted that:

"individual managers, however, vary in their ability to make optimum use of available discretion. They differ in their ability to perceive opportunities for discretion and to make sound decisions." (Gast, 1984, p.358)

The work of Stewart (1976, 1982) had fostered the belief that where there was a high level of choice in the conduct of a position this would lead to substantial levels of difference in the way in which the job was performed and the functions undertaken. However, the degree of similarity in the way that managers in this study used this extensive amount of apparently 'discretionary' time could not be reconciled with such an approach. If the determinants of managerial work were half
man/half job, as Stewart (1963) had suggested, one would have expected there to be very substantial levels of difference in the conduct of the position. This was not the case.

The similarities in the use of discretionary time were then clearly caused by some other form of demand. These are described as 'role demands', rather than work demands, and they were passed to the manager in an indirect fashion through the process of socialisation into the industry, the company and the job. In this framework the concept of choice or discretion was one which was 'bounded' by the process of socialisation. Willmott (1987) talked of:

"managers as interpreting and acting out their 'functional roles' in the light of their own (minimally) autonomous cultural and ideological values."

The process of socialisation shaped both the functions of managers, in terms of what they did, and the activities of managers, in terms of how they conducted this work. Socialisation both established the framework of functions to be performed and their method of performance and so what appeared to be a situation of 'free choice' was one of highly 'bounded discretion' in which decisions about the work to be done and its method of completion were shaped by the same influencing factors. Dahrendorf (1974) had seen that:

"role expectations are not modes of behaviour about whose
desirability there is a more or less impressive consensus; they are modes of behaviour that are binding for the individual and whose binding character is institutionalised." (Dahrendorf, 1974, p.30)

These role demands were passed indirectly through superiors, peers and subordinates and related to the norms, practices, cultures and strategies of the company.

The process of socialisation while highly effective in explaining what had to be done in the job and the broad patterns for its conduct, was not, and could not be total and could not be completely separated from that of 'choice' or 'discretion'. The boundary between the areas which allowed for total discretion or 'bounded' discretion were not possible to measure. However, the degree of similarity in the functions that managers undertook and the patterns by which they undertook these functions was sufficient to suggest that discretion was largely bounded by the process of socialisation. This study then follows the work of Hales and Nightingale (1986) and Willmott (1984, 1987) in seeing a core of similarities in managerial work around which there were limited discretionary differences and these are described as areas of 'unbounded discretion'.

Unbounded discretion related to that area of the job which was 'free' to the influence of the manager's personality and personal preferences. These areas were limited but included some degree of
'freedom' in adopting personal managerial styles and a limited degree of discretion in the areas of the job which the manager chose to emphasise. The personality of the manager did not appear to alter the direct work demands or the role demands which were imposed upon him, but did influence the managerial style he adopted and this subsequently reflected in certain elements of the way that he conducted the role.

Managerial Style

a) The location of work - Managers had some discretion in choosing how much time they spent in their office. Although it appeared that the work demanded that managers spend a minimum of 40% of their time in their office, managers seemed to have some discretion above this level. Managers A and C were the most office based of the managers and they spent 55% and 57% of their time respectively in their offices.

b) Time alone/in meetings - One of the major areas of discretion in terms of managerial style related to the amount of time that the manager chose to spend alone compared to that with his staff or in meetings with those external to the hotel. The work seemed to demand that the manager spend as little as 15% of his time alone, however managers C and F spent nearly 40% of their time on their own. Those managers who spent a higher proportion of their time in contact generally spent a greater amount of time interacting on a one to one basis with their managers and had a higher level of other external contacts.
c) **The distribution of working hours** - Two managers chose to work on a split shift basis on a number of days each week. This involved working from around 8.30 a.m – 15.30 p.m, and then again from about 18.30-21.30. This allowed them rather more time to meet guests and to supervise the busy evening period of the hotel, in particular the food and beverage operation. This was an area of discretion and it appeared that managers were free to choose which option of working hours they personally preferred or believed was most suitable to their outlet.

d) **Pace of work** - The work of Ley (1978) and Ferguson and Berger (1984) had suggested that the work of hotel managers was conducted at an unrelenting pace. If this was the case then it was largely because that was the way that they chose to make it. The relatively low level of time taken up by direct work demands meant that the manager was largely 'free' to control the pace and the degree of fragmentation of their work. Work was, for the most part, conducted at an even pace and managers appeared uncomfortable with periods of very slack time and there were a number of occasions in each of the hotels when the manager appeared unsure of what to do with the amount of discretionary time available to him. Managers therefore found it more comfortable to work at a slightly faster pace.
Areas of Emphasis

e) **Amount of time on desk work/paperwork** - The time spent on desk work was not reflected in the number of desk work events, this suggested that the time spent on desk work was partially discretionary. It appeared as if managers had to spend a certain amount of their time at their desk and on paperwork, but that above approximately 12% this was largely discretionary. Two managers, C and F, both chose to spend more than 28% of their time on desk work.

f) **The number of external meetings/interaction with outsiders** - The amount of time that managers spent with those from outside the establishment and from outside the company varied substantially. Although overall the split in terms of communications tended to be about 50/50 between internal and external participants, some managers chose to emphasise external relations more than others. Manager B, for instance, spent nearly 25% of his time with 'other external contacts', compared to an average of around 12%.

g) **Operational work** - The emphasis on the achievement of specific cost orientated results and the subsequent importance of the control process meant that managers spent the vast majority of their time on managerial activities. Hales (1986, 1988) had raised the point that not all of the manager's work was necessarily managerial in nature and this was reinforced through the preliminary discussions with the managers each of whom emphasised the amount of time which they dedicated to operational
work. Each of the managers commented about how they spent time in operational departments, how they 'got stuck in' or 'didn't mind getting their hands dirty'. This was largely a myth, managers spent very little of their time on operational work. The amount of time that a manager chose to spend on operational issues was largely discretionary. It would have been possible for a manager not to undertake any operational work, and the amount of time spent on operational activities was much less than the initial impression given by managers.

h) **Staffing** - Those who adopted a more office based approach to their work tended to spend rather less time on staffing issues and rather more on planning or control activities. Manager B adopted a rather more staff orientated approach to the job, with a greater interest in training and personnel issues than some of the other managers. This was reflected in the 10% of his time that he spent in this area, compared to an average of 5%.

i) **Planning** - There was considerable uniformity and consistency in the amount of time that managers spent on planning. However, those who chose to take a more office based approach to the job tended to put extra emphasis within this area. Manager C, for instance, spent almost 18% of his time planning for the future development of the hotel.

Overall, these areas of discretion appeared to give the manager two distinct options in the way that work was conducted:
1. With a smaller amount of desk and paperwork, less time in the office, more in meetings with the management team and external individuals and marginally less time on planning and office based financial control;

2. With a higher percentage of time spent in the office, more time spent alone and on deskwork, few scheduled meetings, less time with external participants and more time on financial control and planning.

10.4 MANAGERIAL STRATEGIES AND DIVISIONS OF LABOUR

Hales (1989) raised the important question 'what form must the management process take for managerial practice to be like this? (Hales, 1989, p.3) and sought to answer the question in terms of managerial strategies and management divisions of labour. Braverman (1974) had indicated the influence of monopoly capital on divisions of labour and how this subsequently affected work behaviour and working patterns and Teulings (1986) added detail to this perspective with the concept of a managerial division of labour. Further, Teulings (1986) saw that monopoly capital would develop strategies and organise itself in particular forms and that these would in turn reflect in the nature of managerial work. Thus, Teulings (1986) provided a link between the influence of monopoly capital and the nature of managerial work in commercial enterprises and together with the work of Hales (1989) suggested that managerial divisions of work were important in creating the structural setting in which managerial work was accomplished and the subsequent nature of that work.
Managerial strategies and divisions of labour were interconnected in that managerial divisions of labour were the outcome of specific managerial strategies concerned with the processes of centralisation and control. Hales (1989) noted that the management function was:

"attempted through a panoply of impersonal, institutional arrangements which in other forms of discourse are termed 'organisational structure'. It is in this sense that I would want to echo the observations of a number of critical theorists (Clegg and Dunkerley, 1980, Storey, 1983, Watson, 1986) that organisational structures or strategies may be regarded as 'strategies of management'." (Hales, 1989, p.15)

Thus the managerial strategies adopted by the company were highly influential in structuring the managerial divisions of labour which influenced the nature of managerial work for the managers.

Managerial Strategies

Managerial strategies were difficult to observe because they operated through sets of assumptions, informal codes of practice, norms and verbal instruction, rather than appearing in any concrete written form. Hales (1989) noted that:

"therefore the term 'strategy of management' does not refer to a conscious, consistent and effective phenomenon, but rather describes broad, identifiable consistencies of assumption and
implicit philosophy within a set of arrangements whereby the management of work is attempted." (Hales, 1989, p. 21)

The managerial strategies used by the company centred around centralisation of operational practice and cost control. These two strategies critically influenced the managerial divisions of labour and the subsequent nature of managerial work. The strategy of centralisation caused the division between those concerned with ownership and strategic decisions and those involved with operational ones to be clearly established. Those in head office controlled the accumulation and distribution of capital, while those managing in the outlets were concerned with the immediate management of the operation of those units.

All major decisions concerned with the profit targets of the enterprise, its overall mode of operation, the distribution of its resources and its strategic decisions were made in head office with little or no consultation with those in the units. The concerns of those in head office and their emphasis on the accumulation of capital were echoed by Pym's (1975) description of:

"those industrial gods - performance, profit and growth - must be assuaged." (Pym, 1975, p. 690)

The strategy of centralisation influenced managerial work by limiting and effectively stipulating the bounds of the 'domain'
of the manager. The limitations in the decision making arena open to the manager effectively prescribed his areas of operation, which thereby heavily influenced the nature of the work. This was evidenced in the use of capital budgets by the company. The individual units had no 'rolling' capital expenditure budget and all capital expenditure was controlled directly by head office. This meant that managers were effectively powerless to initiate structural developments or anything other than minor repairs to their operations. This strategy had the effect of keeping the control of capital within head office and limiting the domain of the manager in his decision making and planning processes. This influenced the time perspectives of the managers toward the operation because they believed that there was little point in planning major developmental projects when the resources were not within their control. Managers were forced then to operate in short time spans and this helped to explain the criticism of some authors (Guerrier and Lockwood, 1988) that hotel managers tended to deal with the symptoms rather than the causes of problems. The general managers did not have the resources at their command to deal with a cause and therefore were only capable of dealing with immediate short term symptoms.

The second major managerial strategy of the company was that it was 'cost' rather than 'market' led. The emphasis that the regional managers and head office placed on the achievement of week by week cost targets had the effect of ensuring that the manager placed their emphasis in the managerial work process upon financial control. This then evidenced itself in their patterns
of communication and in the office based nature of the work. The way in which the manager's bonus scheme operated, and their perception of its limited value to them, also added to the emphasis on control rather than on sales generation. The cost centred and centralised approach also forced the manager into a more administrative and less sales/guest orientated role or operational role which meant that managers spent the majority of their time managing, and very little was devoted to 'other' or operational activities.

Managerial Divisions of Labour

Willmott (1987) used Giddens theory of structuration to show that managerial work was a function of structure and that this structure was the cause of the self perpetuating nature of managerial work and control. While not following the full extent of this argument, in terms of seeing structure alone as the cause, this study does follow Giddens (1979) in viewing structure as both an enabling and constraining process in managerial work.

The work of Teulings (1986) and Hales (1989) had seen managerial work as being divided in a managerial division of labour between those who were primarily concerned with the allocation and disposal of the means of production and the arrangements within which this is achieved, and those who were concerned with the process of managing within these arrangements. Hales (1989) noted that:
"in other words, to return to the assertion that organisations represent strategies of management, there are those who choose and set up the institutional arrangements whereby the management of work is attempted and those who must 'manage' within those institutional arrangements and provide feedback information on which decisions to continue or alter those arrangements are made." (Hales, 1989, p.19)

Managerial work was divided in terms of authority and function between those in head office and the general managers' in the outlets. Those in head office controlled the 'institutional arrangements' within which the work of the general manager was conducted. In part, this comprised the formal process of developing a managerial division of labour and the placement of the role of the general manager within this context. This arrangement was such that it maximised the direct link between the manager and head office to ensure a close and direct form of control. This was enhanced by the fact that the upward link in the organisational structure through the regional manager to head office was a weak one, with the regional managers being replaced up to six monthly. Therefore, the manager faced a reasonably direct line through to head office and thus allowing head office staff direct control over the operation of the hotels.

In the hotel the manager was largely protected from everyday contact with guests and non-managerial staff through the way that managerial divisions of labour were established. Within each
hotel, there was a clear managerial division of labour between the manager, the deputy, the accountant, the personnel manager and the engineer; as well as each of the departmental heads. This meant that the manager was well protected from daily and immediate operational problems and this was reflected both in the type of work undertaken and the way in which this was done. Mars and Mitchell (1976) had observed that in hotels:

"the structurally determined characteristics affect the interrelationship between managers and workers." (Mars and Mitchell, 1976, p.25)

The structuring of the workplace with a 'thick band' of managers in position below the general manager meant that he was hierarchically at least two layers removed from the operational situation and so remained isolated from both guests and non-managerial staff and from much of the everyday pressures of the work. The situation of the work then appears to present the manager with only limited direct work demands because of the way in which the managerial division of labour kept him insulated from most everyday problems apart from certain critical events. This meant that the managerial division of labour had the effect of forcing him into an administrative/managerial, rather than host/operational role and was reflected in the work that he undertook in terms of its emphasis on the office, its interactional and informational content and its controlling nature.
Hales (1989) had noted that:

"managerial divisions of labour in turn give rise to particular managerial jobs with a distinctive character in terms of both content and form (i.e. what their incumbents do and how they do it)." (Hales, 1989, p. 26)

These conclusions lend weight to this contention and that of Whitley (1989) that managerial skills were highly dependent on the structure in which they occurred. In this case the managerial division of labour and the way in which it was arranged and instituted played a major part in explaining the similarities in managerial activities and functions.

10.5 THE CULTURE AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE ORGANISATION AND INDUSTRY

Introduction

The broad shape of managerial work was determined through the culture, philosophy, structuring and strategies of the company. These were more important in determining the nature of managerial work than were the direct and immediate demands of the workplace or the limited amount of unbounded discretion that the manager was allowed. However, it was difficult to isolate the culture and philosophies of the particular company from those of the industry and society in which the action occurred.
Crompton and Jones (1988) discuss the concept of organisational culture in terms of:

"the shared norms, values and symbols which seem specific to an organisation." (Crompton and Jones, 1988, p.71)

These norms and values were passed to the general managers through a process of socialisation which occurred through the accumulated experience of role expectations and feedback. In this company norms appeared well established and were strongly communicated so that the culture took the shape described by Hofstede (1984) as being a 'collective programming of the mind' (Hofstede, 1984, p.13). In this way the company culture and philosophy acted to bound the areas of discretion within certain set modes of practice and so operated to create uniform patterns of managerial behaviour. Pfeffer and Salancik (1975) saw that:

"managerial behavior was directly influenced by role set demands. As these demands became known to the manager so his behaviour will stabilize and there will emerge a 'collective structure of behaviour' which will stabilize to 'predictable patterns'." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1975, p.141)

The Process of Socialisation

The process of socialisation occurred through the passing of role demands from numerous sources over a considerable period of time. The position taken by Machin (1981, 1982) and Hales (1986, 1987)
imputed considerable importance to the role expectations that a manager received from the role set and made the assumption that managerial work was likely to be strongly influenced by the nature of the expectations which impinged upon the manager in the conduct of the role. Hales (1981) commented that:

"any understanding of what managers do, or are supposed to do, requires looking at managers in the context of their social relationships and interactions for it is these which variously define, mould and structure what managers do, or should do." (Hales, 1981, p.130)

This study largely supported this view, and saw role demands as a major influence on managerial actions and functions. However these role demands were experienced throughout the manager's career with the company and therefore went beyond those of the immediate role set. In this way the manager became socialised into the norms of the company and managerial work thereby became largely 'an expression of the institutional order' (Willmott, 1987, p.258).

Hence, the process of socialisation occurred through role demands and from experience and feedback throughout the managers' career. In this study most of the subjects had a formal education related to the industry, had worked most of their working lives in this industry and had spent all or the majority of their working life with the same company. Such a pattern allowed for the full extent
of the socialisation process, firstly through education into the industry, secondly during the early stages of their career and thirdly through their considerable experience with the company. Past experience of role demands from above and below, and reaction to previous behaviours, thereby shaped the pattern of work. This could be seen in the relative similarity of the role demands and expectations of the senior managers and the perceived demands and expectations of the managers themselves and the subsequent similarity in the pattern and functions of work.

In this way patterns of managerial work became shaped through an industry and a particular company. The culture and the norms of the industry and the company were therefore passed on to the managers through expectations, reactions and experience. This was shown in the way one of the younger managers spent substantial amounts of time in the evening standing at the hot plate watching the food 'go out', an activity for which there appeared to be little purpose. When asked to explain this behaviour it became evident that this had been the practice of one or more of the managers with whom he had worked previously. The process of socialisation is also illustrated in the 'hours case study', later in the chapter.

The Influence of Society and Industry

Management and managerial activity occur in a wider contextual setting than merely the norms and philosophies imposed by the company. Wood (1983), for instance, noted that:
"Management is essentially a 'social' activity developed and currently practiced within the context of historically worked out patterns of economic, legal and social behaviour and institutions." (Wood, 1983, p. 104)

Certain patterns of managerial behaviour may then become embroiled in the total culture of society so that they might can be viewed as a function of that society. Redding (1984) saw that:

"while cross cultural research sees society as the key influence on managerial behaviour this has never been taken up in uni-situational approaches." (Redding, 1984, p. 13)

However, despite the work of Braverman (1974) and Hofstede (1984) there were still substantial difficulties in drawing a direct relationship between the everyday conduct of managers and the influence of the societal setting in which the work occurred. Societal influences may place themselves first upon the industry and then the particular organisation, so that within a given society patterns of managerial behaviour are filtered through the industry to the organisation and then passed to employees through the strategies and policies developed by senior management.

Although the organisation operated within the context of an industry which had established clear patterns of practice and operation, the norms and characteristics of the industry appeared to have a lesser influence in the process of socialisation than
did the culture and philosophy of the particular company. However, managerial action clearly occurred within the context of a particular industry and its norms did influence the pattern of work. The influence of the industry was shown both in the structural properties of the work undertaken and in the norms which were established, and these two factors helped to influence the pattern and nature of work. The influence of the industry on managerial work is going to be strongly reinforced where the manager has learned these practices and myths during the educational process and then had them reinforced during the period of initiation into the industry. Mars and Nicod (1984) showed this process occurring in the initiation of waiting staff and it seemed likely that managerial staff had similar experiences in being initiated into the culture of the industry. Similarly, Nailon (1981, p.2) saw the work of operational staff in the industry as being based upon craft, ritual and inherited practices.

The influence of industry norms was suggested in the similarities in certain areas of managerial work. The amount of time that managers spent on internal and external issues and participants reflected the observations of Nailon (1968) and Slattery and Olsen (1984) on the close relationship of the hospitality industry with its environment. The twenty four hour process nature of the industry called for both a hierarchical structure and for a strong tier of middle management through which the general manager could legislate for the periods he was away from
the hotel. These factors, coupled with the combined need for control and flexibility (Shamir, 1978) were reflected in the way in which work was patterned to allow the manager time to deal with critical events without disturbing the overall flow of the work.

The Company

The organisation culture and philosophy manifested itself in the formal or informal policies and strategies which subsequently influenced the activities and functions undertaken by the manager. Mintzberg (1979) observed that:

"increasingly in our research we are impressed by the importance of phenomena that cannot be measured, by the impact of an organisation's history and its ideology on its current strategy." (Mintzberg, 1979, p.587/588)

The content of this culture and philosophy was passed to the manager through the process of socialisation during the various stages of his career and informed him of the relative acceptability or non acceptability of certain practices. Hence, it was important that managers were promoted from within as their period as deputies or as departmental managers gave them time to learn the managerial norms, patterns and politics of the organisation. In consequence, by the time that most managers graduated to the position of general manager they were well institutionalised into company methods and beliefs. Also, on
taking up the post of general manager the manager was given a personal mentor, another general manager, whose task it was to advise the new manager during his early period in office. This was important in the process of socialisation as the manager could be advised on the efficacy of his modes of behaviour in the new role. In this way the desired and accepted methods, the culture and philosophy and the cultural bounds of the organisation were the passed on to managers, and were constantly reinforced by others with similarly learned beliefs. The result was a clear pattern of behaviour which owed relatively little to determinants such as the immediate demands of the situation or the manager's personal managerial preferences. So, the company established a modus operandi of managerial work. The outcome of which was that patterns of behaviour, even given wide areas of apparent discretion, were similar irrespective of the personality of the manager.

The company was a paternalistic autocracy, the founding family developed the company and shaped its culture, strategy and policies. These policies were sometimes explicit in the form of written memos, mission statements, or the core philosophy of the company but were more usually passed down in the form of stories or myths about successful and unsuccessful managers. All the subjects of study were keenly aware of what the 'company' expected. There was a clear emphasis on the control of costs as the central theme of profit generation and the central measuring instrument. This was a cost driven organisation and this directly
influenced the amount of time that managers spent in their office and on forms of paperwork control which would help them to limit their costs. It was also indicated in the relatively small amounts of time that managers spent interacting with their market, either in the form of sales visits or in direct contact with clients. Hence, as Mars and Nicod (1984) observed, managerial behaviour in the workplace was not random but emanated from sets of distinct 'ground rules' which were established within the culture of the company and passed on in its strategies and policies through the process of socialisation. These materialised in a common core of managerial work activities and functions.

10.6 THE CASE OF HOURS

The number of working hours undertaken by managers acted as an illustration of the influence of a range of determinants upon the process of managerial work. Given the position of a general manager in a hotel in a corporate environment and with a well structured management team, the case illustrated the relative influence of the direct demands of the workplace and the nature of the work, individual unbounded discretion, the structural situation of the position, the culture of the industry and the culture and strategies of the organisation. Managers worked an average of eleven hours per day and there was considerable consistency among the managers in this respect. The rationale for the length of the working day seemed to lay in one of, or a combination of, four possibilities:
i) That the characteristics of the work placed pressures on the manager to be present for long periods of time.

ii) That the managers made a discretionary 'choice' to work long hours which was connected with a high moral involvement with the unit.

iii) That the hours of work were the industry 'norm' and passed through industry 'culture', and that the managers had grown used to similar hours while working as deputy managers', department heads or in other companies.

iv) That the hours of work were an outcome of company culture, policies, strategies and managerial division of labour.

i) The amount of apparently discretionary time available to the managers and their overall pattern of work did not lead to the conclusion that the demands of the work required managers to work long hours. Most of the managers commented at some point during the study that it would be perfectly possible to complete the work in a 'normal' eight hour day. With critical events and direct work demands accounting for only 45% of the manager's time, the demands of the work itself appear to be the weakest variable in explaining the length of the working day.

ii) The large amount of apparently discretionary time suggested that managers might spend long hours in the establishment through choice and this might be linked with the high moral involvement
with the unit expressed by the managers. This was observable in their use of language, for instance when discussing the profitability of the unit they talked of 'their' profit or costs. In one incident a manager insisted that his deputy drive him to the local town, rather than go by taxi, because the cost of the taxi would have come from 'his costs'; the deputy manager could not understand why the manager did not take a taxi and claim the 'cost back from the company'. However, the idea that managers became highly involved with their units and therefore worked long hours did not entirely explain either the similarity in the number or pattern of hours worked. Had hours been purely a matter of discretion then one might have expected them to be more varied both from manager to manager and day to day.

iii) A system of belief existed in the industry, stemming from the mein host traditions of European hotel management, that the essence of hotel management was the process of being present in the hotel for long periods of time and hence that the work of hotel managers was characterised by long and unsocial hours (Boella, 1974). Industry norms seemed to place a considerable influence on the manager in this respect. Managers, during the preliminary interview were proud to comment on how hard they worked. A typical comment being:

"I come in some days at 7.30 or 8.00 a.m and won't go home until ten or eleven at night."

Although this proved to be a general fallacy, it is indicative of
the cultural influence and perceived norms that a manager developed from long experience in the industry. One might have expected that these characteristics and norms of the industry would place pressures on the manager to be present for long periods, but there was little evidence that this was the case. None of the managers, even those who worked on a split shift system, adhered to the main host tradition of hotel management. The norms of the industry then seemed to add to a myth of exaggeratedly long hours rather than be very influential in dictating the actual hours of work.

iv) Hours appeared most influenced by the philosophy of the company and expectations of senior management. These collectively created a company 'norm' for the length of the working day for a general manager. This was perceived by the managers in the form of an expectation of 'hard work', which was interpreted as long hours and was strongly reinforced through experience of working with other managers in the organisation. The attitudes of the managers was summed up by manager F who commented:

"if I was not in the hotel at 6.00 p.m on a Friday and the area director rang or called in, I would be expected to explain where I was."

The senior management of the company did expect managers to work long hours and this followed the beliefs of the founder, so that the norms were effectively part of the company culture. When
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questioned, the area directors, managing director and personnel director all felt that 60 hours was an appropriate working week for a manager and this figure was very much in line with that actually undertaken by the managers.

Clearly, it was not possible to quantify the variable influence of all the factors which contributed to the length of the working day of managers. However, the length of working hours seemed to be dictated more by the philosophy of the company and past experience of the work of other managers than the actual demands of the job. The role demands from above to be on the premises were strongly felt by managers and their past experience in the organisation had taught managers that work hours were long. Therefore, even where the content of the work changed they still continued with those hours, even if there was no obvious work to be undertaken.

10.7 SUMMARY

The determinants of managerial work were divided between the work and role demands made upon the manager in the course of undertaking the position, unbounded discretion or the areas in which the manager seemed to be able to make a 'free' choice, managerial strategies and divisions of labour and the culture and philosophy of the organisation.

Managers faced direct demands from above and below in the hierarchy, critical events which needed immediate attention and
areas of apparent discretion. The analysis of demands and discretion indicated that managers had, as Stewart (1976, 1982) had suggested, large areas of apparent discretion and that these accounted for a larger portion of managerial time than did direct demands. However, if managerial work were essentially discretionary then given the differences in the individual personalities of the managers one would have expected their work and activities to be highly differentiated. This was not the case, and so although it appeared that managers had certain areas of 'unbounded' discretion within the managerial style and areas of emphasis they chose, it appeared that discretion was largely 'bounded' through the process of socialisation.

Socialisation occurred within a specific managerial context concerned with the managerial division of labour and the strategies which the company adopted. The managerial division of labour was such that the manager was effectively insulated from most immediate issues and was therefore allowed greater time to spend on the processes of financial and operational control, which together with centralisation were the central strategic thrusts of the organisation. The process of socialisation occurred through the passage of the company culture, philosophy and norms. Managers were institutionalised into the company through a considerable period of experience before attaining the post of general manager. In this way they learned the expectations of the company through the observation of other managers who had learned the desired behaviours both through
observation and feedback of past action. On attaining the position of general manager their mentor guided them through their early period in office while head and regional office staff gave clear indications of acceptable and unacceptable behaviours. In this way a very standardised form of managerial activity and managerial functions developed within the company and effectively shaped the nature of managerial work.

Hence a central conclusion of this study was that managerial work occurred within a specific organisational process and was critically determined by the culture of the organisation in which it occurred, rather than by the immediate demands placed on the manager from the role set, by the managers personal areas of discretion or by the specific demands generating from the work. However, this was not a situation of exclusivity, immediate work demands did sometimes impinge on the manager and there were limited areas of discretion in the managerial role.
CHAPTER 11

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

11.1 INTRODUCTION

The study reported here was an exploration of the nature of managerial work and its determinants within a specific setting. The three fundamental questions it addressed were:

i) what is the nature of managerial work in hotels?
ii) is this work similar or different for managers in the same position in a given company?
iii) what are the determinants of that work?

The answer to the last of these questions offered the explanation for the findings of the study with regard to the other two. The overall conclusion of the study was that managerial work occurred within a larger, more general process of management and was critically influenced by the setting in which it occurred.
Prior to this study, the question of the determinants of managerial work had been addressed only in a limited fashion (Willmott 1984, 1987; Whitley, 1989) and not directly through research. The results of this study indicated the importance of understanding the nature of managerial work within its contextual setting and how its conduct was largely resultant upon the culture, philosophies and managerial strategies of the organisation in which it was performed.

The first of the initial questions relating to the work of hotel managers was the easiest to address as it was a question with which studies of managerial work had been previously involved and so a limited body of methods and knowledge had developed. However, only Ley (1978) and Stewart (1980) had been directly concerned with one level of manager in a single organisation. By looking for patterns in the work of managers rather than treating it as a series of discrete areas and events, this study came to different conclusions than had earlier studies with regard to the characteristics of the work of general managers. In particular, the activities and functions of these managers were found to be patterned, office based, informational, controlling and similar.

This conclusion links into the discussion regarding similarities and differences in managerial work which has been at the centre of the debate regarding managerial work for the last two decades. The study reached the conclusion that within a specified contextual framework, work at a similar level and function was far more similar than it was different despite the manager having
large areas of apparent discretion. This would seem to run contrary to the explanations of Stewart (1976, 1982) who viewed managers as having wide areas of choice in their work which manifested itself in widespread differences in managerial work and behaviour.

The results of this study show the need for future studies of managerial work to be more situation specific and concerned with the work and behaviour of managers in the organisational and cultural setting within which that work is performed.

11.2 SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Determinants of Managerial Work

Managerial work occurred within the context of a particular society, industry and organisation. The company had a clearly identifiable culture and philosophy which manifested itself in particular managerial strategies. These strategies shaped the measures of effectiveness that the company used to judge the performance of its managers as well as its managerial divisions of labour. Figure 5 illustrates this process showing how culture led to strategy which influenced measures of effectiveness and managerial divisions of labour which in turn shaped the particular functions/roles and patterns of activity that managers adopted.
The company in which the research was conducted had a clear managerial philosophy which was published annually at the beginning of its annual report to shareholders. This linked with a paternalistic culture which vested control of the organisation within the hands of members of the founding family and their close associates. This manifested itself in managerial strategies which were based around two fundamental beliefs, those of
centralisation and cost control. These two central managerial strategies largely dictated the form of both the managerial divisions of labour and the measures of effectiveness used to judge the performance of general managers.

The strategy of centralisation reflected itself both in the substantial functional organisation of head office and in each hotel. This was shown in the 'thick' band of middle managers which separated the general manager from most direct operational affairs. This particular managerial division of labour gave the manager more time to concentrate on the cost control aspects of the operation. The achievement of cost related targets was also the major measure of effectiveness as sales were considered by the general managers to be a centralised head office function largely out of their control. These strategies and divisions of labour led to the functions of the manager being critically concerned with cost control and their activities being office based, informational, administrative and managerial rather than operational.

Similarities and Differences in Managerial Work

The results of this study suggested that there did appear to be considerable similarities in managerial work at a single level and function within the same company and industry. This was most clearly evidenced in the pattern of the work and the way that each manager shaped this pattern in a similar manner. However, it could also be seen in the way in which the emphasis of both
activities and functions was broadly similar for each manager.

The study found that the wide areas of discretion apparently open to managers in the conduct of managerial work appeared to be 'bounded' through the process of socialisation into the norms of the industry and the organisation. The effect of this was that managers used this 'discretionary' time in a very similar manner to one another. However, this did not preclude some areas of difference among the managers and in particular with regard to the amount of time they spent alone and in the office and the number of managerial meetings they chose to hold.

The Work of General Managers in Hotels

The pattern of managerial work among the general managers of the hotels in the study was somewhat surprising. Before the study the researcher held a preconceived notion that the work would be very hectic, physically demanding, have long hours, constant interruption, considerable emphasis on operational affairs and this assumption had been reinforced through the work of the early studies of managerial work both within and outside the hospitality industry. Hence the discovery, on the first day of observation, that the work was relatively office based, had few interruptions and was conducted in a comparatively calm manner was a surprise which needed careful evaluation. However, this pattern was found in each of the hotels under observation and by the time that the researcher reached the third of the six hotels he was confident as to the general pattern of work that he was
likely to observe and the pattern of activities in which the manager would engage. This pattern continued in a similar manner throughout the six hotels and the greatest overall surprise was the degree of similarity in the pattern of work of the managers'.

The patterns of managerial activities adopted by the managers' were contrary to the expectations of the study in that managers developed a pattern of work which was sufficiently adaptable and flexible not to be disturbed by most daily events. The 'thick' band of middle management in each hotel allowed them to conduct an essentially office based approach which was calm, ordered, informational and primarily concerned with the control of the immediate operation and its finances. The discretionary differences among the managers did not fundamentally disturb the activities which they undertook which followed clear and distinct patterns.

With regard to the work of hotel managers the study was concerned to separate issues concerned with managerial work functions, managerial activity and 'management' as an all embracing term to encapture the total process of managerial activity within an organisation. In terms of managerial functions, this study followed and developed the work of Luthans and Lockwood (1984) and attempted to show the amount of time allocated to a set of functions by managers. The LOS document was found to be a useful research tool which would certainly benefit from further usage and development. In the main the functions that managers
undertook were determined through the strategies and managerial divisions of labour of the company. The managerial divisions of labour separated managers from most direct operational issues, other than critical events. This meant that they were free to act as the link between the hotel and those external to it and in particular, between the hotel and head and regional office. Also, they were able to concentrate on the control of costs through the analysis of daily operational information, meetings with members of the management team and by the planning of future events.

The result of the study was that the nature of managerial work was critically determined by the situation in which it occurred. For this reason it seems that in a given organisation the pattern of work among those in a similar position is more likely to be similar than different. The process of socialisation had the effect of limiting the areas of apparent discretion without totally removing them so that managers conducted similar tasks in a similar manner.

Limitations of the study

All research studies are critically limited by a number of factors, in this case these were primarily those of access and time. So although this study suggested a number of conclusions with regard to managerial work there is clearly a need for all these to be developed through further research.
This was not a comparative study in the sense of studying managerial work across a number of levels, functions, organisations or cultures. So, an obvious limitation of the study was in its ability to conclude the extent to which its results would hold in different situations. This clearly represents the next stage for this research. A major question which remains unanswered is the extent to which managerial work varies from position to position and from company to company? Also, whether there are marked similarities in the work of those companies who adopt broadly similar managerial strategies.

For although the managers in this study conducted broadly similar work in a similar manner, those at different managerial levels within the same organisation or those in other organisations would be subject to different contextual influences which may thereby cause managerial work to vary with its contextual determinants.

In some ways this research represented a step back to where it was felt that the initial researches should have begun with a single level of manager from one company. The conclusion that managers in such situations appear to conduct similar functions to a similar pattern could then have been tested across function, organisation and industry. However, although it may be possible to generalise about work at one level in one reasonably consistent contextual situation, these generalisations may not hold across function or level. Hence, the question as to whether
managerial work is fundamentally similar or different, remains partially unanswered.

11.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY, PRACTICE AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Theory

Managerial Work

The field of management studies has been in some disarray. This is typified by the debate as to its stature as a 'science', independent discipline or field of study. A major reason for this disarray has been the difficulty in integrating research in each area of study and across the field as a whole. The trend has been for research to concentrate on one area of 'management' with only limited attempts being made to integrate this with other areas.

There is now a need to integrate the many areas concerned with the managerial process in a more cohesive manner. This study links the areas of organisational culture, strategy and managerial work along the lines shown in Figure 3, so that specific strategies can be shown to influence measures of effectiveness and the work that managers subsequently undertake. Managerial work has been studied previously in isolation from both its contextual determinants and from other managerial processes with the effect that the area has become virtually an autonomous sub-field of management studies.
However, studies of managerial work offer the opportunity to provide an integrating mechanism for the area as they represent the study of the point at which each of the independent areas are operationalised. However, they have mostly failed to provide this link with the more specialised areas of management studies such as leadership, policy and strategy because they have failed to show managerial work as a part of the overall management process. It is hoped that this piece of research will begin to establish a base upon which that integrative process can proceed. In particular, this study attempts to integrate the areas of organisational culture and managerial strategy with managerial work and to show how the individual facets of the managerial function in the organisation integrate and are operationalised.

In general studies of managerial work have failed to recognise the differences between managerial work, managerial behaviour and management as a process. This study addressed itself to what the manager did, managerial behaviour and to the concept of management being a process which occurred within a specific context. The view of managerial work as frantic and frenetic came about because of the disembodied way in which previous data was analysed and the general failure to look for patterns in managerial activity. The results of this study add a different view to the ideas which had developed with regard to the activities of managers which needs greater investigation and further linguistic development.
Also, in the use of the LOS the study attempted to qualify and quantify the functions of managers. Empirical observation and investigation of the functions of managers has been difficult and the tendency has been to avoid it (Burns, 1957; Stewart, 1967). This is not helpful and although LOS is still linguistically imprecise it does represent a step forward in the move to analyse the functions of managers in a more analytical framework. It also gives some basis for replication.

The concentration in studies of managerial work on activities, functions and roles in isolation from their contextual determinants allowed the development of a particular view of managerial work and for the concept of 'choice'. This study certainly seems to mitigate against the concept of 'choice', which it saw in terms of 'bounded discretion' fundamentally limited by the contextual determinants of the situation. This would seem to argue against a personality based approach to managerial work and would lend support to more situational/contingency based approaches.

So, the results of this study would seem to fit into a contingency or situational framework as they place managerial work within a specific situation. However, the problem with these approaches has been that they have often been found wanting with regard to enlightening the management process. Their conclusions have mostly revolved around the areas leadership and leadership styles and the appropriateness of different styles to different situations. This research makes the point that the functions
that managers' undertake will be highly influenced by the strategies of the firm. Hence, firms which operate to broadly similar strategies are likely to create work for managers that is similar at similar levels. So, theoretically, there needs to be a much closer integration of managerial strategy and managerial work.

The approach of this study also has some implications for multicultural research within the field of management. Given that managerial work is a function of the total culture in which it occurs one might reasonably expect that the practice of management will vary from culture to culture. This would support some of the work of Redding (1979) and Hofstede (1984) to the effect that different cultures influenced the nature of management.

**Hospitality Management**

Conceptual development about all aspects of hospitality management has been based mostly on supposition rather than research. As the development of knowledge and concepts within an area is essentially a process of accumulation and refinement, this research adds to the limited conceptual base with regard to the work of managers in hotels.

Although the characteristics of service and hotel operations have been the subject of an increasing number of studies, the amount
of knowledge regarding managerial work in hotels is extremely limited. What this study, together with those of Nailon (1968) and Ley (1978), does provide is some conceptual basis upon which to develop ideas about the functions and activities of managers and how these link into strategies of operation in hospitality organisations. The study may also help to link studies of hospitality management more directly into other studies of managerial work.

The emphasis placed by the managers in the study on managerial rather than operational work might cast doubt on the wisdom of separating studies of hospitality management from the mainstream of management literature. However, there would need to be further research studies to identify whether the work of the hotel manager is fundamentally similar to his counterparts in other industries.

**PRACTICE**

The areas in which there are the major implications for practice are:

1. In how the manager should adapt his practice to the strategy of the company
2. In the training needs of those managers
3. In the areas of recruitment, selection, labour turnover and career development of managers
4. In the education of hotel managers in universities,
polytechnics and colleges

i) The study suggests that the manager needs to adapt both what they do and how they do it to the company in which they operate. This supports the view of Willmott (1984, 1987) and others that management may be a highly politicised process. In order to attain and maintain an adequate level of information it may be imperative for the manager to take up some political activities, as these will convey the current norms of the organisation and allow him to adjust his behaviour and tasks accordingly.

ii) While managers need to understand the basic functions of management, there is a need for the company to further communicate to managers how they wish them to behave and on what functions they wish them to concentrate. Clearly this is done implicitly through the process of socialisation but it could also be done explicitly by training. In-company training could link together specific managerial strategies and managerial functions to give managers a clearer understanding of the activities they were expected to undertake. As Marshall and Stewart (1981) suggested it did not appear as if the managers in this study had a clear idea of their areas of discretion and training might help them to better understand their work patterns and make appropriate adjustments.

iii) The company in the research had quite high levels of labour stability at general management level, with movement being within
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the company rather than inter-company. Given the importance of the manager adapting to the strategies and practices of the company this made good sense. It did not matter particularly if managers were moved frequently from hotel to hotel, but there would have been much greater problems in implementing the centralised policies and strategies of the company were there high labour turnover into and out of the company at this level. The conclusions of this study lead to the idea that managers are more likely to be seen to be successful by the company when they produce results which are in line with the measures of performance used by that company and a clear understanding of these is likely to be achieved through the process of socialisation into the norms of the company. Hence, recruitment from within and career planning would seem to be important.

iv) In terms of education, the emphasis that the managers place on managerial activities, rather than operational ones, would seem to support those colleges which place a higher emphasis on this area for higher level courses. While managers needed to be versed in the operational aspects of the hotel, they only spent a very small percentage of their time involved in them. The ability to communicate information, delegate, to deal with critical events and to be able to control the finances of the business would seem to be key areas of competence for general managers. The results of the study also suggest that there needs to be a consideration of managerial strategies earlier in courses than is currently the case.
Future Research Directions

There still needs to be further research into managerial work in terms of the demands and expectations placed on the focal manager, the functions and activities undertaken by managers, measures of managerial goals and effectiveness and the determinants of managerial work. This research needs to be supported by a wide variety of research methods and tools.

The approach of analysing activities in terms of discretion, demands from above and below and critical events offered a method by which the relative importance of demands and discretion might be measured in future studies and offered an alternative to describing managerial work as merely reactive or proactive. Also, there is a need to know more about the functions of managers in different positions and industries and there is still a need for a great deal more knowledge regarding managerial activities and functions in the hospitality industry.

The extent to which particular organisational cultures, divisions of labour and strategies directly impinge on the nature of managerial work needs to be the subject of considerably wider study than the initial implications suggested here. In hotels, there is a need to know how the structural characteristics of the situation influence positions other than that of general manager. For instance, the job of deputy manager had no secretary, no well defined individual office and therefore appeared to be much more...
susceptible to a variety of demands from below than did that of the general manager. Hence, there is a need to study the work of those in different organisational positions and levels to see how their work is influenced by their structural context.

Future research also needs to consider factors concerned with effectiveness (Stewart, 1989). This study did not address this issue and it would be interesting to see whether those who were perceived by senior managers as being less effective adopted different patterns of work from those perceived to be effective. Further, this research suggested that there cannot be one overall definition of managerial effectiveness but that this definition must emanate from investigation into the norms of the company and should be company specific. If this is the case, further observational investigation of the way that companies measure effectiveness is required.

Lastly, one hopes that this work may lead to further studies of managerial work in hospitality organisations and elsewhere using a variety of methods and tools. Although the hospitality industry has developed a field of excellent anthropological studies dating back to the work of Whyte (1948), Mars (1973) and Mars and Nicod (1984), generally research into the industry has been very limited. It is hoped that this study will offer a basis for further observation, rather than questionnaire or interview, studies of managerial work. Also, despite the potential difficulties of implementation, interpretive approaches which depend on the descriptions of the actors would seem to offer a
most promising methodological direction for future studies of managerial work.
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STUDIES OF MANAGERIAL JOBS AND BEHAVIOUR
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Level, Function
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Individual(s) → Job(s) → Related job(s) → Outcomes

Thoughts → Actions

Similarities → Differences

Job-related (e.g. Fayol's categories)

Role theory
Dynamics

Role theory
Dynamics

Criteria of effectiveness
(e.g. performance measures, boss(es)' rating)

Role theory
Demands,
constraints, choices
Relationship demands

Constructs
Values
Beliefs
Problems
Agendas
Programmes

Job-related (e.g. Fayol's categories)

Dyads
Group

Time

Timescale and measures of time

Range

Inclusive: all individual's actions or all job content, or particular aspects

Figure 1. Potential field of studies of managerial jobs* and behaviour

* 'Jobs' is used rather than 'work' as the former is a specific subject for study whereas 'managerial work' is a more ambiguous concept.
### Comparison of Activities by Percent Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Luijk</th>
<th>Burns (1957)</th>
<th>Copeman (HoD)</th>
<th>Copeman (GE)</th>
<th>Hanika</th>
<th>Brewer and Tomlinson</th>
<th>Home and Lupton</th>
<th>Stewart</th>
<th>Naillon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking (1)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>353.0(0)</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion (2+)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>(7.0)(b)</td>
<td>(34.0)(c)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision**</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainments</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Including meetings and conferences
Including inspection

(a) Table 2.95.1 time spent in informal discussion
(b) Table 2.95.2 time spent in committees
(c) Table 2.97 time spent in discussion with 2+ people
(d), (e), (f) Represents total in verbal communication using different figures
### APPENDIX 3: COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF NAILON AND KOUREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NAILON (1968)</th>
<th>KOUREAS (1985)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITIES (% time)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertaining</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Office</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Rooms</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back House</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floors</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offices</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 4: THE MODE OF WORK OF MANAGERS: A COMPARISON OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.8/11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47.7/89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.5/0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscheduled meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.8/33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled meetings</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.3/34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6/8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.6/11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.1/10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The results from Hales (1987) refer to a restaurant manager in the first column and a domestic services manager in the second.

** - Hales (1987) recorded some events in more than one category
### APPENDIX 5: RESEARCH FINDINGS ON THE COMPARATIVE IMPORTANCE OF MINZBERG'S (1973) ROLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leader</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Disturbance Handler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Disseminator</td>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Disturbance Handler</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. -</td>
<td>Resource Allocator</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5.1 THE OBSERVATION FORM FOR THIS STUDY AND THAT OF MARTINKO AND GARDNER (1984)

OBSERVATION RECORDING DOCUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>PLAN OF</th>
<th>ORGANISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**EVENT - NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION**

#### FIGURE 8.2. Field note coding form

![Field note coding form](image)
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### Appendix Z 1 Categories for Location and Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Work</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Office</td>
<td>Management Staff (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars/restaurants</td>
<td>Management Staff (2+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External to hotel</td>
<td>Other Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Office</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other management offices</td>
<td>Guest/Client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception/Reservations</td>
<td>Colleague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Head/Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary's Office</td>
<td>Other External Contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping, rooms etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The LOS Categories of Managerial Activities and Behavioral Descriptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Planning/coordinating</th>
<th>b. receiving and disseminating requested information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. setting goals and objectives</td>
<td>c. conveying the results of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. defining tasks needed to accomplish goals</td>
<td>d. giving or receiving routine information over the phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. scheduling employees, timetables</td>
<td>e. attending staff meetings of an informational nature (e.g., status updates, new company policies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. assigning tasks and providing routine instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. coordinating activities of different substitutes to keep work running smoothly</td>
<td>f. organizing the work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Staffing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. developing job descriptions for position openings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. reviewing applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. interviewing applicants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. hiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. contacting applicants to inform them as to whether or not they have been hired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. filling in when needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Training/developing</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. orienting employees, arranging for training seminars, and the like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. clarifying roles, duties, job descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. coaching, acting as a mentor, &quot;walking&quot; subordinates through tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. helping subordinates with personal development plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Decision making/problem solving</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. defining problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. choosing between two or more alternatives or strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. handling day-to-day operational crises as they arise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. weighing trade offs, making cost/benefit analyses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. deciding what to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. developing new procedures to increase efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Processing paperwork</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. processing mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. reading reports, emptying the in box</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. writing reports, memos, letters, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. routine financial reporting and bookkeeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. general desk work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Exchanging routine information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. answering routine procedural questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Monitoring/controlling performance

8. Motivating/reinforcing

9. Disciplining/punishing

10. Interacting with others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. managing interpersonal conflicts between subordinates or others</td>
<td>a. nonwork-related chit chat (e.g., family or personal matters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. appealing to higher authority to resolve a dispute</td>
<td>b. informal &quot;joking around,&quot; &quot;B.S.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. appealing to third-party negotiators</td>
<td>c. discussing rumors, hearsay, grapevine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. trying to get cooperation or consensus between conflicting parties</td>
<td>d. complaining, griping, putting others down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. attempting to resolve conflicts between a subordinate and oneself</td>
<td>e. politicking, gamesmanship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 9.1 MANAGERS GOALS QUESTIONNAIRE

GOALS INTERVIEW

Hotel General Manager

1. What does the company want you to achieve in this unit?

2. How is this measured?

3. What are you trying to achieve personally?

4. How do you measure your own success?
5. What do you view as the main elements of your job?

6. What options have you as to how you spend your time?

7. Do you consciously plan your use of time, or do events normally dictate to you?

8. What do you hope to achieve over the next 6 months?
HOTEL BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ..... 

Address ...

Age of Hotel ......

Number of Rooms .... Single Double Suites

Number of Restaurants ...

Number of Bars ..... 

Leisure Facilities ...

Number of Staff .... Full Time Part Time

Management Structure ...

Guest Profile ..... 

Occupancy .......... 

Hotel Characteristics (What separates this hotel from others ?) ...
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APPENDIX 11 : PERSONAL DETAILS QUESTIONNAIRE

PERSONAL DETAILS QUESTIONNAIRE

- Name ........
- Age ........
- Sex ........
- Marital Status ... 
- Live In/Out ........
- Salary Band ........
  0 - 15,000
  15 - 20,000
  20 - 25,000
  25,000 +

Educational Qualifications

Work Experience

Perceived Future Progression
APPENDIX 12: THE MANAGERIAL WHEEL
APPENDIX 13 : SELF ASSESSMENT RECORD

Hotel General Manager

HOW DO YOU SPEND YOUR TIME?

Please estimate how much of your time, in percentage terms, you spend on each of the following items. i.e. telephone call 29%, scheduled meetings 17% etc.

1. Mode of Work
   - Telephone calls
   - Scheduled meetings
   - Unscheduled meetings
   - Desk Work
   - Short Contacts
   - Tours
   - Operational Work
   - Other

2. Location of Work
   - Own office
   - Bars, restaurants etc
   - External to hotel
   - Accounts office
   - Other management offices
   - Reception & Reservations
   - Kitchen
   - Secretary's office
   - Health Club
   - Housekeeping/Rooms etc
   - Other

3. Participants
   - Management staff (1)
   - Management staff (2+)
   - Other staff
   - Secretary
   - Guest/Clients
   - Colleagues in other hotels
   - Head Office staff
   - Other external contacts

4. Form of Initiation
   - Self
   - Other

5. Work Functions
   - Interacting with outsiders
   - Monitoring /Controlling
   - Planning/Coordinating
   - Socialising/Politicking
   - Paperwork
   - Exchanging Information
   - Operational Work
   - Decision Making
   - Staffing
   - Discipline
   - Training
   - Motivating
   - Dealing with conflict
   - Other
APPENDIX 14: GROUP COMPANY ORGANISATION CHART

Managing Director

Chief Executive

Deputy Chief Executive

Hotels Industrial Catering Supplies Finance Building & Design

APPENDIX 15: DIVISIONAL ORGANISATION CHART

Divisional Managing Director

Regional Managers (4)

Hotels Hotels Hotels Hotels Hotels
## APPENDIX 16: HOTEL BACKGROUND SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOTEL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age/Years with co.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Rating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Rooms</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average room rate</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of bars/</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference/</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Fitness Club</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of staff</td>
<td>85/13</td>
<td>66/4</td>
<td>63/8</td>
<td>74/4</td>
<td>70/5</td>
<td>65/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time/ part time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average occupancy weekdays/weekends</td>
<td>80/42</td>
<td>90/45</td>
<td>96/68</td>
<td>74/84</td>
<td>55/90</td>
<td>65/80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERSONAL DETAILS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOTEL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single/Married</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live In/Out</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>OUT</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary (000's)</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>MHCIMA</td>
<td>OND</td>
<td>OND</td>
<td>DEGREE</td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HOURS OF WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (hours/minutes)</td>
<td>56.11</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>59.10</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>67.02</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>55.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total minutes</td>
<td>3371</td>
<td>2842</td>
<td>3550</td>
<td>3222</td>
<td>4022</td>
<td>3256</td>
<td>3335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per day (hours/minutes)</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NUMBER OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>618</th>
<th>626</th>
<th>674</th>
<th>672</th>
<th>556</th>
<th>590</th>
<th>591</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per day</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>134.8</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per hour</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 19: Mode of Work of Managers

### Mode of Work & Number/\% of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Calls</td>
<td>140.67</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>22.17</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>15.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Meetings</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscheduled Meetings</td>
<td>116.83</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>23.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Work</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>17.56</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>20.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Contacts</td>
<td>170.33</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>21.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>(13.83)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Work</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Researcher</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MODE OF WORK & AMOUNT/% OF TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Calls</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Meetings</td>
<td>739.50</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>39.83</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscheduled Meetings</td>
<td>791.33</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>23.62</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>21.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Work</td>
<td>598.17</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>28.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Contacts</td>
<td>250.67</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>(206.33)</td>
<td>(136)</td>
<td>(309)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>(381)</td>
<td>(180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Work</td>
<td>233.17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Researcher</td>
<td>163.67</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 20: Location of Work

#### Location of Work: Number/\% of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Office</td>
<td>328.33</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.95</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>54.45</td>
<td>56.10</td>
<td>58.45</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>47.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars/restaurants</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>15.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External to hotel</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Office</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other management</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offices</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception/</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>9.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary's Office</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping,</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rooms etc</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Grounds</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Work</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Office</td>
<td>1564.5</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.99</td>
<td>55.38</td>
<td>39.49</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>42.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars/restaurants</td>
<td>507.5</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>17.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External to hotel</td>
<td>337.5</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>25.04</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Office</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other management offices</td>
<td>154.83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception/Reservations</td>
<td>165.67</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary’s Office</td>
<td>41.17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping, rooms etc</td>
<td>155.83</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Grounds</td>
<td>265.33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 21: CONTACT/COMMUNICATION PATTERNS AND FORM OF INITIATION OF EVENTS

CONTACT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events in contact</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>75.82</td>
<td>78.59</td>
<td>81.16</td>
<td>74.26</td>
<td>82.19</td>
<td>74.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events alone</td>
<td>149.17</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>25.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in contact</td>
<td>2547.67</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>2871</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3515</td>
<td>2497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>75.24</td>
<td>84.27</td>
<td>80.87</td>
<td>60.55</td>
<td>87.39</td>
<td>76.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time alone</td>
<td>823.50</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>39.45</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>23.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNICATION PATTERN: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CONTACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal (Events)</th>
<th>External</th>
<th>Internal (Time)</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>323.33</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>145.67</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>35.28</td>
<td>29.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FORM OF INITIATION: REACTIVITY VS PROACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self (Events)</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Self (Time)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>441.5</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>176.67</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>29.08</td>
<td>32.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>2463.5</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>2529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>907.67</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>21.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX 22: PARTICIPANT ANALYSIS

### PARTICIPANTS & NUMBER/% OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Avg</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Staff (1)</td>
<td>136.17</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>31.79</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Staff (2+)</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff</td>
<td>130.33</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.98</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>23.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest/Client</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head/Regional Office</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other External contacts</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### PARTICIPANTS & AMOUNT OF TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Av</strong></td>
<td>574</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Staff</strong> (1)</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>18.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management Staff</strong> (2+)</td>
<td>173.67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other staff</strong></td>
<td>339.83</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary</strong></td>
<td>82.67</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guest/Client</strong></td>
<td>345.17</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleague</strong></td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head/Regional</strong></td>
<td>264.5</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office staff</strong></td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other External contacts</strong></td>
<td>420.5</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher</strong></td>
<td>250.67</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix 23: Managerial Function Analysis

#### Functions & Number/% of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interacting</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/Controlling</td>
<td>103.67</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>21.19</td>
<td>13.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Coordinating</td>
<td>62.17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialising/Politicking</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>15.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Exchange</td>
<td>122.33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Work</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making/Problem Solving</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/Discipline</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Conflicts</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FUNCTIONS & AMOUNT OF TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Av</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interacting</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>37.59</td>
<td>23.34</td>
<td>20.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/</td>
<td>406.67</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialising/</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicking</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork</td>
<td>434.50</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>24.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Exchange</td>
<td>287.33</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Work</td>
<td>169.83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making/</td>
<td>75.17</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing/</td>
<td>183.33</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>38.83</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Conflicts</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>330.50</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.30 - Checks on staffing with personnel. Logs into computer and checks reservations for that day. Writes orders.

7.50 - Works on a problem of 'dockets incorrectly posted'.

8.20 - Goes out on tour round hotel


10.05 - Leaves office for meeting with personnel manager on wage costs and how these can be reduced, training, and other staffing matters.

10.35 - Attends morning departmental managers meeting

10.54 - Returns to office. Rings supplier. Deals with a complaint which has come from head office. Rings customer re corporate rates.

11.12 - Shows architect around the hotel, grounds and building work in progress.

11.34 - Has a meeting in the bar with a representative of the local enterprise board.

11.48 - Returns to office, collects messages from secretary. Start on morning post. Has short meeting with
accountant re. credit situation. Deals with a query from a receptionist. Rings supplier and writes order.

12.18 - Goes on tour of hotel
12.24 - Returns to office. Calls guest and a member of staff.
12.43 - Lunch with local tour guides
14.20 - Tour of hotel and ground with tour guides
15.15 - Returns of office. Has meeting with housekeeper. Another meeting with personnel manager.
16.09 - Has a meeting in the grounds to discuss the erection of a marquee.
16.57 - Returns to office. Speaks to area director on the telephone. Checks bookings on computer. Has short meetings with accountant, engineer and conference manager. Rings area office, rings other hotel. Checks bookings on computer, calculates implications for profitability.
18.04 - Goes on tour of hotel
18.22 - Returns to office. Short meeting with deputy to discuss arrangement for that evening.
18.24 - Finish
APPENDIX 25 I WEEKLY RESULTS ANALYSIS FORM

HOTEL NUMBER: 136

SALES
-----
ROOMS
FOOD
LIQUOR
OTHER

TOTAL SALES

GROSS PROFIT
----------
ROOMS
FOOD
LIQUOR
OTHER

TOTAL GROSS PROFIT

WAGES

VARIABLE O.E.S. - H.L.P
----------
- LAUNDRY
- MAINTENANCE
- OTHER

TOTAL VARIABLE

FIXED O.E.S. - RATES
----------
- INSURANCE
- DEPRECIATION

TOTAL FIXED

HPC

RENT

TRADING PROFIT

ADD BACK DEPRECIATION

DEDUCT CAPITAL ADDITIONS

CASH CONTRIBUTION

RETURN ON FIXED ASSETS
REVAL. SURPLUS INC. IN NBV

NUMBER OF ROOMS
NUMBER OF BEDS
ROOM OCCUPANCY
SLEEPER OCCUPANCY
SLEEPER DENSITY
AVERAGE ROOM RATE
# Appendix 26: Demands, Choices and Critical Events Analysis

## Events Analysis: Number/%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Av.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>348.5</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.36</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Events</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand: Above</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand: Below</td>
<td>94.83</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Time Analysis: Number/%

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Events</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand: Above</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand: Below</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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