

Rochester Institute of Technology

RIT Digital Institutional Repository

Theses

1996

Assessment of changes in the decision making environment in a 210 room, Rochester, NY hotel: A 1996 Case study

Nikhila Sridhar

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.rit.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Sridhar, Nikhila, "Assessment of changes in the decision making environment in a 210 room, Rochester, NY hotel: A 1996 Case study" (1996). Thesis. Rochester Institute of Technology. Accessed from

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the RIT Libraries. For more information, please contact repository@rit.edu.

**ASSESSMENT OF CHANGES IN THE DECISION MAKING ENVIRONMENT
IN A 210 ROOM, ROCHESTER, NY HOTEL: A 1996 CASE STUDY**

**by
Nikhila Sridhar**

**A project submitted to the Faculty of the School of Food, Hotel and Travel
Management.**

**at
Rochester Institute of Technology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
August 1996**

ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
School of Food, Hotel and Travel Management
Department of Graduate Studies

M.S. Hospitality-Tourism Management
Presentation of Thesis/Project Findings

Name: NIKHILA SRIDHAR Date: 08/30/96

Title of Research: ASSESMENT OF CHANGES IN THE DECISION MAKING ENVIRONMENT
IN A 210 ROOM, ROCHESTER, NY HOTEL: A 1996 CASE STUDY

Specific Recommendations: (Use other side if necessary.)

Thesis Committee (1) DR. EDWARD B STOCKHAM (Chairperson)

(2) _____

OR (3) _____

Faculty Advisor: DR. EDWARD B STOCKHAM

Number of Credits Approved: _____

8-30-96 Stockham Edward

Date Committee Chairperson's Signature

12/10/96 Richard Marecki

Date Department Chairperson's Signature

Note: This form will not be signed by the Department Chairperson until all corrections, as suggested in the specific recommendations (above) are completed.

cc: Departmental Student Record File - Original
Student

ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
School of Food, Hotel and Travel Management
Department of Graduate Studies

M.S. Hospitality-Tourism Management
Statement Granting or Denying Permission to Reproduce Thesis/Project

The author of a thesis or project should complete one of the following statements and include this statement as the page following the title page.

Title of thesis/project: Assessment of Charges in
the Decision Making Environment
in a 210 Room Rochester, N.Y. Hotel:
2 1996 Case Study

I, Nikhil Sridhar hereby (grant, deny) permission to the
 Wallace Memorial Library of R.I.T., to reproduce the document titled above in
 whole or part. Any reproduction will not be for commercial use or profit.

OR

I, _____, prefer to be contacted each time a
 request for reproduction is made. I can be reached at the following address:

5/3/99
 Date

 Signature

ASSESSMENT OF CHANGES IN THE DECISION MAKING ENVIRONMENT IN A 210 ROOM, ROCHESTER, NY. HOTEL : A 1996 CASE STUDY.

Nikhila Sridhar

ABSTRACT

This case study was done to measure changes from 1994 to 1996 in the decision making environment of a local, 210 room hotel in Rochester, NY. This study is considered to be a developmental research project using a longitudinal approach. The data collected in this case study were compared to the results of Koo who conducted the same study in 1994. This case study also compared differences between two Rochester, NY hotels, Hotel A and Hotel B, in 1996 that are owned and operated by the same corporation.

The instrument used in this case study was the psychometric, critical incident questionnaire, "Organizational Team Survey," developed by Boone and Kilmann in 1988. It was later adapted by Barnard in 1992, in a research study on "Decision Environments of Small Firms." The Organizational Team Survey is composed four parts. Part 1 of the survey asked the employee of a work related decision that they were involved in recently. These were then classified as operational and strategic. Operational being short term decisions and strategic being long term. Part 2 of the questionnaire displayed thirty two randomly placed questions that could be clustered into the following categories that make up the structures and the processes of effective decision making.

1. Multiple Inputs and Alternatives
2. Problem Identification and Organization
3. Rewards for Good Decisions
4. Use of Group Efforts
5. Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics

6. Resource Adequacy

Part 3 of the questionnaire asks for ranking the top five problem areas in the hotel. Part 4 of the survey includes the demographic information about the employees.

The survey was conducted in the two hotels in early spring. All currently working employees were asked to complete a survey when they received their paychecks.

Participation was strictly voluntary and individual confidentiality was maintained.

The data was analyzed using X-SPSS. Significant differences between 1994 and 1996 survey samples, as well as the two hotels for 1996, were determined using group t-Tests.

There were significant differences in Factor 4-Use of Group Efforts and Group 5-Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics. There was an increase in the mean of Factor 5 resulting in the increase of Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics which signifies increased hierarchy in 1996. The decrease in the means of Group efforts also signifies the decrease in team work among the employees. Hotel B had a greater Factor 5 than Hotel A showing the higher level of hierarchy in Hotel B.

1. Type of position
2. Sex of employee
3. Type of employment
4. Age of employee
5. Number of years working in hotel industry
6. Number of years working in the surveyed hotel
7. Number of years in the current position
8. Department of employment

The ranking of this year changed considerably from that of 1994 in certain factors and their categories due to the lack of quality training in the hotel which was discontinued in 1994. The factors are more significant in the new recruits due to large turnover and

improper training. The hotel should run more tests to find the impact that the absence of training has on the work environment of the hotel. These would then convince the mangement to reinstate the quality training program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Stockham for his guidance through the duration of my project. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the faculty and staff at the School of Food, Hotel, and Travel Management for their help and guidance throughout my study here at RIT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE:

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii

CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION

Introduction and Background.....	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Purpose.....	3
Significance.....	4
Procedure and Methodology.....	4
Sample.....	5
Instrument.....	5
Administration.....	7
Data Analysis.....	8
Hypothesis.....	8
Assumptions.....	8
Scope and Limitations.....	9

	PAGE:
Long Range Consequences.....	9
Definition of Terms.....	9
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Empowerment.....	10
Decision Making.....	12
Team Environment.....	15
Management Theory.....	17
CHAPTER III: TABULATION AND ANALYSIS	
Strategic and Operational Decisions.....	29
Ranking of the Five Problem Areas.....	33
CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
The Six Factors.....	34
Top Five Problem Areas.....	37
Closing Remarks.....	37
REFERENCES.....	39.
APPENDIX A	
Detailed Tables for T-tests (tables 1 through 8).....	42
APPENDIX B	
Organizational Team Survey.....	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NUMBER:

PAGE:

1. Comparison of factor means by type of position.....	20
2. Comparison of factor means by sex of employee.....	21
3. Comparison of factor means by type of employment.....	22
4. Comparison of factor means by age of employee.....	23
5. Comparison of factor means by years in hotel industry.....	24
6. Comparison of factor means by years in current position.....	25
7. Significance of six factors in department between two hotels.....	26
8. Significant differences with regard to position.....	27
9. Significant difference with regard to employment.	28
10. Summary of decisions provided.....	29
11. Ranking of five problem areas.....	33

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

If the quality revolution is to impact customer service in the market place, the challenge of today is to improve customer service within the work place. During the past few years, a number of articles have declared the demise of the total quality movement or, at a minimum, suggested and reported that companies are rethinking TQM. The organizational “near death experiences” that during the last decade bluntly motivated a focus on quality and customer service may have predisposed managers to a style of “management by crisis”. Management thinkers of today like Peter Senge (1990) are developing such tools as “shared vision,” “mental models,” and team learning, which create a competitive advantage by producing teams of aligned individuals that in turn, align with other teams to support core competencies. Simply put, TQM focuses on customer requirement, starts with the internal customer and is completed when the external customer is satisfied.

The measurement of variables in the work environment is important because they can affect individuals directly and indirectly through physical features, organization structure and policy, supra personnel factors and social climate (Moos, 1986). TQM, if administered by trained professionals and structured by a prescribed program, brings back the American work ethic. Applying the concept, “do it right the first time,” will guarantee improvement. TQM stresses the analysis of the work process to prevent the problems. To measure gaps and processes that support effective decision making in an organization, a critical incident questionnaire, “Organizational Team Survey” developed by Larry W. Boone and Ralph H. Kilmann (1988), can be used.

This questionnaire was used in 1992 By Janet Barnard in her research on “Decision Environments of Small firms experiencing different rates of growth”. Her research uses Boone and Kilmann’s “Organizational Team Survey” to show empirically how decision making variables work together to affect organizations success (Barnard, 1992).

Barnard’s research show that the organizational team survey detected differences in the means of the two groups surveyed across the empirically derived 6 factors that affect team decisions made in an organizational environment (Stubblebine, 1995).

Joanna Liu used an adapted version of the survey in her 1993 pilot study to measure the decision making environment in the meeting planning industry. “The survey found four significant differences by using two sample t-tests of a .95 confidence interval between the means of the respondents concerning the 6 factors in the decision environment. The first one was between the respondents working for corporation and the respondents working for independent meeting planning companies regarding factor 5 - Bureaucratic blocks and politics. The second significant was also concerning factor 5 and was found respondents working as meeting planners and respondents working as CEO’s. The third one was concerning factor 6 - Resource adequacy and was found between respondents working as meeting planners and respondents who work for independent meeting planning companies and the thirty only general respondents (Stubblebine, 1995).

Young Yee Koo (1994) used the same psychometric instruments to measure decision making structure and processes in two local hotels in Rochester. The hotels in this study conducted corporate TQM training in 1994. The significance of her findings was that the overall non trained personnel had a more positive approach than the trained personnel, in the areas of TQM, teamwork, decision making and guest complaint. In her comparison

between hotel A and B, she found that in hotel B the means of the non trained personnel in factors 1 (inputs), 2 (problem), 3 (rewards) were significantly higher than the trained personnel. In hotel A, the only mean that trained personnel were higher than the non trained personnel was on factor 6 (resource). (Koo. 1994).

Donald Stubblebine in 1995, used the same instrument to measure decision making processes and structures in a hotel in Rochester. His findings show the differences in the processes and structures that support the organizational decision making from 1994 to 1995. As the independent variable is the demographic information, the differences were found in the hierarchical levels of the organization. There was a decline in the six factors as there was an absence in the quality training which were last done in 1994.(Stubblebine). Terry Ovenshire also conducted a pilot study in 1995, using the Organizational Team Survey to measure the decision making environments in the health care industry. The factors were viewed as neutral apart from rewards, teamwork, and politics which were unfavored by the group.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

In the period from 1994 to 1996, can changes be detected in the perception of the structures and processes that support effective decision making in a local hotel?

PURPOSE

The purpose of thesis case study is to identify the perceived differences among employees at a local hotel. This study is considered to be a longitudinal developmental research using Boone and Kilmann's "Organizational Team Survey" which identifies six factors that

affect the decision making processes and structures. The change in the decision making structure and processes will be analyzed in the period ranging from March 1994 to March 1996. Differences between to hotels in the year 1996 will also be analyzed as a part of the process to understand the changes in the decision making processes. This case study will also analyze the change that has occurred in the three years that it has been studied using the results of Koo (1994), Stubblebine (1995).

SIGNIFICANCE

The measurement of the decision making structures and processes are important because the service nature of the hospitality firm relies strongly on these six factors (input, problem, reward, group, resource, and politics). The contribution of the case study is valuable as it shows how and industrial survey instrument can be used to measure perceptions of employees at different hierarchical levels over a three year period.

METHODOLOGY

This case study detects the changes over time in the structures and process that support the team decision making environment in one local hotel. It is a developmental research using a longitudinal approach conducted in a present perspective.

The Organizational Team Survey will be used to survey the impact of the six factors (input, problem, rewards, teamwork, politics, and resources) that affect the employees decision making in the workplace. The data received from the questionnaire will be analyzed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program.

PROCEDURE

SAMPLE

The sample for this research are employees currently working in the hotel. The set includes employees at all hierarchical levels.

INSTRUMENT

“The Organization Team Survey” a psychometric critical incident questionnaire developed by Boone and Kilmann (1988) will be used to evaluate the structure and the processes that support effective decision making in the hotel. The survey is composed of four parts.

Part one of the survey deals with asking the employees to think and write briefly about a work related decision that the employee was involved in.

Part two, consists of the critical incident questionnaire consisting of 32 questions which are divided into six factors, that impact the effectiveness of decision making in the workplace. The six factors are:

1. Inputs : Multiple inputs and alternatives (.68)
 - Availability and use of information from many sources
 - generation and consideration of many possible solutions to problems
 - willingness of decision makers to try new ideas and take some risks
 - freedom to disagree with management
 - management support to carry out decisions
2. Problems : Problem identification and organization (.69)

- accuracy of problem identification
- establishments of clear objectives as a basis for decisions
- efficient problem solving skills of decision makers
- accuracy of information from all parts of the organization
- the ease of getting things done by decision makers

3. Rewards : rewards for good information (.63)

- relationship between rewards and new ideas.
- effectiveness of performance measures
- Motivational outcomes of the reward and recognition system

4. Teamwork : use of group efforts (.62)

- use of individuals vs. groups in decision making
- regulation of decisions by a few powerful people or upper management
- opportunity for input from others

5. Politics : Bureaucratic blocks and politics (.72)

- degree that “red tape” and the policies and procedures will control decisions.
- resistance to change because of costs
- political activity associated with decisions in the organization

6. Resources: resource adequacy (.67)

- access to and reliability of equipment used by decision makers
- adequacy of physical resources to support the decision making process

The Cronbachs alpha values are included which measure the internal consistency of the items in each factor. (Kilmann, Boone 1988).

The six factors constitute the dependent variables of this research. The independent variables are the demographic information of the employees, who are answering the questionnaire.

Part three of the questionnaire deals with giving the employees twelve problem areas within the hotel and they will be asked to select the top five problem areas, and then rank them in the order of 1 being the most problematic area and 5 being the least.

Part four of the questionnaire deals with the demographics of the employees answering the questionnaire. Questions in this survey is different from the ones of the previous survey, in the fact that the questions dealing with the training programs , used in the two previous studies was eliminated, as the hotel has discontinued the quality training program since 1994.

ADMINISTRATION

The questionnaire was administered to all the employees as they came to pick up their pay checks. It was done on a voluntary basis and confidentiality was maintained.

The instrument was administered in the same manner as the previous two surveys by Koo(1994) and Stubblebine(1995). The only differentiating factor is the elimination of questions in regard to the training program.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data will be statistically analyzed using group t - tests to find the mean differences between the original survey and the new survey. SPSS program will be used to tabulate the data for analysis. Tables were created to report the results of the data analysis.

HYPOTHESIS:

The expected hypothesis of this study is that the structures and processes that support organizational decision making will differ from 1994 to 1996 and between hotel A and hotel B. The total number of rooms in Hotel A is 305 and that of Hotel B is 210. What that means is:

Hypothesis :

Ho : Factor Means 1996 = Factor Means 1994

Ha . Factor Means 1996 \neq Factor Means 1994

Ho : Factor Means Hotel A 1996 = Factor Means Hotel B 1996

Ha : Factor Means Hotel A 1996 \neq Factor Means Hotel B 1996

ASSUMPTIONS

Even though there is a change in the makeup of the sample due to associate turnover, the decision making environment has remained the same. It is also assumed that the only quality training that the employees had, was in 1994 and since then been discontinued.

Another assumption was that the participants are represented from all hierarchical levels in the hotel, from the general manager to the part time employees. It is also assumed that all that participants can read and understand English.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This is a case study that looks at the changes in the decision making processes and structures at one full service hotel located in Rochester, NY. Current results will only be compared with the 1994 data for the hotel. Data was not collected for the hotel in 1995 because of a general manager change that year. The only limitation with this research is the fact that it covers one hotel with all employees currently on its payroll.

LONG RANGE CONSEQUENCES

If, due to the studies and analysis of this research, changes in the processes and structures of the decision making environment of a local hotel can be detected, another valid instrument used to obtain information in the hospitality field would be introduced. Other hotels looking to identify changes in their decision making process can also use this tool.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

LONGITUDINAL STUDY: Measures the rate of change in a sample, conducted over a period of time.

SELF DIRECTED TEAMS: A self directed team is an intact group of employees who are responsible for a whole work process on a segment that delivers a product or a service to an internal or an external customer.

T - test . Used to determine if there is a statistical difference between two means.

CRITICAL INCIDENT (PSYCHOMETRIC)QUESTIONNAIRE . A technique of mental measurement that can be compared to a snapshot of how the participant feels about the situation at a given time.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

As this study is in its third year, there is a change in the focus of the literature review. As the workplace is more empowered and team oriented, the research will be a more update version of the study conducted by Koo and Stubblebine.

Most of the research has been done in the industrial field. The service industry has already adapted some of these techniques and concepts.

The study will review the literature in the following topics:

1. Longitudinal study
2. Decision making
3. Workplace environment
4. Self directed teams
5. Empowered teams
6. Management theory

Most of the management literature on empowerment deals with participative management techniques such as management objectives, quality circles, and goal setting by subordinates as the means of sharing power or delegating authority. The pitfall of defining empowerment from a management practice perspective is so common that often employee participation is simply equated with empowerment. The management

team at any level in the organization identifies need to create a new tomorrow and moves quickly to develop a new strategic approach to empowerment.

In order to understand the concept of empowerment, the definition of the word is of utmost importance. Despite the popular usage of empowerment in the organizational science, it has been widely used without an agreed upon definition in terms of empowerment. Power is primarily understood as a relational concept used to describe the perceived power or control that an individual or an organizational sub unit has over others.

If empowerment is considered in terms of relational dynamics, it becomes the process by which a leader or manager shares his or her power with subordinates. The emphasis is primarily on the notion of sharing authority. Bruke's (1986) definition of empowerment is "to empower," thereby implying the grant of power and delegation of authority. The Websters dictionary similarly describes the word to empower as "to authorize or delegate or give legal power to someone." From the extensive management literature the idea of delegation and decentralization of decision making, results with power being central pivot.

Team management and empowerment is not a new management tool. Many industries tried the approach nearly twenty years ago but virtually none survived. This was because of their own success. It had more to do with human nature than business acumen. The leaders of the self managed teams did not know how to manage the teams as the only management style they were familiar with in hierarchical organization. The managers felt threatened by the success of the teams and did all they could to shut down the team environment.

The structure of the teams is a flattened pyramid with no fixed authority and is characterized by direct communication. Teams achieved their visions with the help of sponsors who do not view themselves as leader's but part of the team. Teams have strong commitments which are the main core in successful empowerment.

A more developed view of empowerment is a motivational construct which emphasizes as personal efficacy. In the vast literature, dealing with psychology power and control are used as motivational and or expectancy belief states that are internal to individuals. Power in this motivational sense refers to an intrinsic need for self determination or a belief in self efficacy. In fact, the Oxford dictionary defines the word empower as "to enable." In contrast to the earlier definition of empowerment as delegation (of authority and resource sharing), enabling implies motivating through enhancing personal efficacy. In the management literature on power and empower often both meanings are fused together and their relationship to one another is not clear. In McClelland's research (1989), the concept of empowerment is a big step towards enabling rather than delegating processes. Enabling implies creating conditions for heightening motivation for task accompanied through the development of a strong sense of efficacy. There are various other conditions of empowering besides delegation or participation. Therefore empowerment is defined as a process of enhancing feelings of self efficacy amongst organizational members.

DECISION MAKING

The future environment in which organizations will function will be highlighted by rapid technical turnovers and multiple interdependencies among environment elements making decisions even more complex than they are at present. Researchers observe that turbulence will become the hallmark of the future and that a managers foremost task will involve quick adaptation to ensure the organizations survival. It will necessitate improving the

internal decision making environment for all participants. Yet success in many businesses is a consequence of broad organizational decision processes, not the result of isolated individual decisions. Using “organizational team survey” to identify the decision making process in an organization, researcher’s found two interesting results of the questionnaire: It indicates the theoretical model to be a series of related but separate steps in the decision process and secondly the identification of several factors which relate to the non rational of decision making in an organization. Multiple inputs and problem identification include fundamental principles of good management. It involves the establishment of clear objectives, provision of management support and recognizing effective lines of communication and authority. Larry W. Boone and Ralph H. Killman state that organizational decision making process are closely interrelated that they cannot be considered independent. For example, managers should consider their establishment of objectives, identification of problems, establishment of authority and distribution of accurate information as closely linked practices. Bureaucratic blocks and politics in the organization hampers effective decision making environment. Manager’s need to be more aware of the important effects they exert on all organizational decisions through the environment they create for such activities. Managers may benefit by considering the balance of skills and resources their employees need to effectively handle is the problem they constantly address. Management must appreciate of the need to develop a complete package of structures and processes which form the environment conducive to the environment of effective decision.

The early attention of well known writers (Bernard, 1938; Simon 1947) to the decision making task of management focused their theory and research on three areas of decision making, that is, circumstances (Simon 1947, Lindbloom 1965; Vroom and Yetton 1973,

Taylor 1984), cognitive style (Driver and Row 1979) and behavior of participants in the decision making process (Moorehead and Montanari 1986).

The literature on organizational decision making offers a number of multi step cyclical frameworks which are purported to represent in the decision making process. (Steers 1988, 411-417) summarizes three basic models to decision making.

- diagnosis of the problem
- establishment of objective
- appraisal of results.

These models however fail to address the dynamics of decision process or recognize distinctive variables in a company's life. There is a need for more comprehensive view of the various factors that effect company's decision making. Organizational elements work interdependently and there is no uni-dimensional quick fix that will enhance an organizational effectiveness (Kilmann 1984).

(Dass 1983, 171-191) stresses the need for empirical evidence of how decision making variables work together to effect organizational success. This can be achieved by a systematic or philosophical approach to the relationship of workers and their employers. Utopians such as Robert Owens launched the dialogue of social experimentation in the early 1800's by building communities where work was seen as a cooperative venture. Some industrialists such as George Pullman and N. Nelson built entire communities for their employees. In some cases factories were built around communities designed for their workers.

Although many of these efforts were essentially paternalistic and at best designed to establish management control, they served as the basis for continued interest in the ideas of “industrial betterment” and as experiment in demonstrating industrial peace. The early rhapsodizing about “industrial democracy” was mooted by economic dislocations caused by the financial panic of the early 1890’s and the 1896 depression. Firms using alternative methods fared no better than others in their fight for survival. Although management continued to experiment with a variety of practices, the dominant discourse became more traditional: the new approach emphasized rationality and science. Because of increased unemployment the efficiency efforts overwhelmed standards of decency. The “drive systems” became a dominant way to motivate workers.

TEAM ENVIRONMENT

Based on an “alternative” philosophical premise many practices now associated with high performance, such as self managing work teams, flexibility, in job assignments, performance incentives, external contracting and greater concern about company culture, environment and commitment of employees were evident in the early years of industrialization. Evidence of self managing teams, which are now seen as an innovative approach were evident in the 1870’s in the internal contracting method used in such places like Columbus Iron Works.

There are several advantages to team building including greater productivity, more effective use of resources, better problem solving success and higher quality products and services. It is often assumed that if we call any group of employees a team, they will automatically function as a team, and the organization will reap in their benefits. In reality, it just does not happen that way. Groups must go through a change process to begin functioning as a team. Assistance will have to be provided in self awareness, decision

making, establishing a mission and in identifying training needs for the team. Team development is an on going process, not a single day's event. It involves hard work and dedication from all sides of the organization for the success of the team spirit. Teams are designed to alter the way an integrated unit functions together.

Teams decrease hierarchy in the organization as all levels of the organization are involved in the team formation. Rather than individual recognition the whole team is recognized for their efforts and productivity is increased due to the increased morale among individuals of the organization. The sharing of information among team memberships is only beneficial for the company but also for the individuals in the teams.

Communication is an essential criteria for the success of a team. Communication should come from all levels of the organization to instill confidence in the team about management support. Teams cannot be successful in all organizations. It is essential for team culture to prevail in the organization where employees and management are willing to undergo change for their common benefit. It should not be considered as a threat but as the road to success. The influence the team will have on the company must be weighed before contemplating the paradigm shift.

Essential criteria for the formation of teams is the recognition of the vision and mission statements. The dedication of all members of the team toward the common goal or mission is the driving force behind the success of the team and the organization. Teams should work towards long term goals and they should be cross functional in order to understand different aspects of the company. A team is not just a group of people working together but a cohesive group with the same mission and goals. Their method of achieving their goal need not be the same, but the understanding between the team members that the

entire teams aim is attaining the team goal. Training is an important aspect for the success of the team, each member should undergo continuous training which in turn results in continuous improvement.

Team leader does not tell the members of the team what is right or wrong, what to do or not to do, instead asks them for their input and brainstorms with the team members for the best solution to the problem. More than a leader he is a facilitator who brings the team together and brings order to the team meetings. The failure of the teams is not due to the team concept but lack of clear understanding of the duties of the teams and goals of the team.

MANAGEMENT THEORY

Every walk of life has its own language, every profession its own short hand provided such terminology's illuminate rather than confuse. Management is no different, and to cope with the rapid changes two words have entered corporate life in recent times: chaos and paradox. To many, these are frightening concepts, yet we needn't run away from them or hide under a blanket and hope they will go away. They won't. Managers of the future will recognize and deal effectively with chaos and complexity not through rigid formulae or fixed management theories but by working flexibly in managing a number of paradoxes. A paradox is defined as a seemingly contradictory statement that may nonetheless be true". There is an overlap between management theory and TQM. This can be seen in the vast literature of Deming, Juran, Crosby, Schmidt, and Finnigan, to name a few.

Many theories and fashions come and go in the field of management. Companies are faced constantly with the choice between following fashion, sticking to tradition, or challenging

both while seeking new perspectives. In the field of strategic management, three strategic styles have dominated the last three decades. (James Moncrieff and Janet Smallwood).

- “The planning style” in which a predictable future is based on analysis of the probable.(1970).
- “A visioning style” in which an unpredictable future is based on the analysis of the probable. (1980).
- “A learning style” in which an unknown future unfolds and is encountered on the basis of understanding of the actual.(1990).

Each of these styles emerged as a development of a contemporary management theory in response to economic and social conditions. Each of these styles had their pitfalls and some organizations were able to learn from their experiences. They found that to succeed, they had to understand the present and respond to changes in the competitive environment as it occurred. There are three organizational skills that are essential for the future: Sensing, awareness, responsiveness.

Many management thinkers like Senge, Anasoff, and Mintzberg, have different views on management theory. Senge sees organization as a non linear system changing through learning. Ansoff holds that strategic choices can be made in highly rational, analytical, and intentional ways. Mintzberg, on the other hand, points out many strategies that simply emerge but all share an unquestioned assumption that successful organizations are systems tending towards states of stable equilibrium in the societal and political environment. In other words, Success depends on being “in control” or at-least in achieving control faster than rivals. As Hamel and Prahalad state in their latest book, “Competing for the future, success depends on getting the future first and to do this you must know a little more than the rivals about that future and be a little more in control”

CHAPTER III

TABULATION AND ANALYSIS

The results found were the the comparisons of the means compiled from the Organizational Team Survey conducted by in 1994 to those found in 1996. Comparisons were also conducted between the means in two hotels in the year 1996. The significant changes that have occurred between the six factors that measure the structure and processes that support effective decision making were looked at with regards to the demographic information. The t-tests that were reported were with a significance of 0.01, This level of significance was taken into consideration due to the low sample size.

Based on the position of the employee (Table 1), there was a significant difference in the means among associates regarding factor 4 - Use of group efforts. The P-value was 0.014 with a t - value of 2.52. P-value is significant at the 0.05 level. The mean for factor 4 dropped from 2.8533 in 1994 to 2.5595 in 1996 displaying a degree of freedom at 89.67. Among the rest of the factors and their categories, in factor 5 - Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics, the mean value increased from 3.1050 in 1994 to 3.4048 in 1996 with a degree of freedom at 88.96. The t-value being -1.85 and p-value of 0.067, which is significant at the 0.10 level. Factor 2 - Problem Identification and Organization had a significance at the 0.10 level, t-value of this category was at 1.68 and p-value was 0.097. Degree of freedom was 84.55. Among the rest of the factors and their categories, there was no significance. The range of p-values for this demographic topic went from 0.014 to 0.464. Detailed information regarding Table 1 can be seen Appendix 4.

TABLE 1**COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY TYPE OF POSITION**

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEANS	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
PROBLEM	1994	50	3.3262			
	vs.			1.68	84.55	0.097*
ASSOCIATES	1996	42	3.0794			
TEAMS	1994	50	2.8533			
	vs.			2.52	89.67	0.014**
ASSOCIATES	1996	42	2.5595			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

In the second category regarding the sex of the employee (Table2), there were no significant differences in the means of the values among males in the factors and their categories. There was a significant difference in the means among the females in factor 4 - use of group efforts with a decrease in the mean from 2.932 in 1994 to 2.6090 in 1996, with a t-value of 1.98 and a p-value of 0.053, significant at the 0.05 level. The degree of freedom being 54.75. The other significance was at the factor 5 - Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics with a difference in mean from 3.1848 in 1994 to 3.5481 in 1996. T - value is - 1.87 and p-value is 0.067, significant at the 0.10 level with a degree of freedom of 60.89. No significance in other factors and their categories. P-value ranged from 0.053 to 0.990. Appendix 5 contains details for all factor t-tests.

TABLE 2**COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY SEX OF
EMPLOYEE**

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEANS	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
POLITICS	1994	45	3.1848			
	vs.			-1.87	60.89	0.067*
FEMALE	1996	26	3.5481			
TEAM	1994	45	2.9312			
	vs.			1.98	54.75	.053**
FEMALE	1996	26	2.609			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

Based on the type of employment (table3), there was a significant difference in the means between full time employees of the two different years. In factor 4, there was a decrease in the mean from 2.9474 in 1994 to 2.5667 in 1996, with a t-value of 3.07 and a p-value of 0.003, significant at the 0.01 level. Degree of freedom was at 86.90. The other factors with a significant difference was factor 5 with the mean increasing from 3.2456 in 1994 to 3.5625 in 1996. The degree of freedom was 86.68 and t-value was -1.87 and p-value was 0.065, significant at the 0.10 level. Among the rest of the factors and their categories, the values didn't show significance. The p-value ranged from 0.003 to 0.729. A detailed list of all factors can be seen in Appendix 6. There were no significant differences in part time employees.

TABLE 3
COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEANS	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
POLITICS	1994	58	3.2456	-1.87	86.68	0.065*
	vs.					
FULL TIME	1996	40	3.5625			
TEAMS	1994	58	2.9474	3.07	86.9	0.003***
	vs.					
FULL TIME	1996	40	2.5667			

*Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

Based on the age of the employee, table 4 shows three significant differences in the age group 25 and under, apart from factor 4 - Use of Group Efforts, where the t-value was at 2.02 and p-value was 0.051, significant at the 0.10 level. The degree of freedom was 36.12.. There was a decrease in the mean from 2.8274 in 1994 to 2.4583 in 1996. The rest of the factors and their categories did not show significance

In the age group, 26 to 35, factor 5- Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics shows a t-value of -2.09 and a p-value of 0.043, significant at the 0.05 level. Degree of freedom was 42.87. There was an increase in the mean from 3.3468 in 1994 to 3.8158 in 1996.

Factor 4 - Use of Group Efforts, has a significance in the 36 to 45 age group with a t-value of 2.03 and a p-value of 0.057, significant at the 0.10 level. Degree of

freedom displayed at 17.97 with an increase in mean from 3.25 in 1994 to 3.7167 in 1996.

Detailed analysis can be seen in Appendix 7

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY AGE OF
EMPLOYEE

FACTORS		SAMPLE	MEANS	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
TEAM	1994	28	2.8274	2.02	36.12	0.051*
	vs.					
25 and Under	1996	16	2.4583			
POLITICS	1994	31	3.3468	-2.09	42.87	0.043**
	vs.					
26-35	1996	19	3.8158			
TEAMS	1994	10	3.25	2.03	17.97	0.057*
	vs.					
36-45	1996	10	3.7167			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

Based on the number of years in the hotel industry (table5), there is s significant difference in the factor 4 and factor 5 for the employees who have worked under one year in a hotel.

Based on factor 4 - Use of Group Efforts, there was a decrease in the mean from 3.0556 in 1994 to 2.50 in 1996. T-value was at 2.96 and p-value was at 0.006 significant at the 0.01 level. Degree of Freedom was displayed at 30.84.

Another significant difference was in factor 5 - Bureaucratic Block and Politics, with a t-value of -2.74 and p-value of .011 significant at the 0.05 level. Degree of Freedom was at

28.31. There was an increase in the mean from 2.7361 to 3.3929 in 1996. The range of the p-value for this demographic topic was from 0.006 to 0.710. Complete list of t-tests can be seen in Appendix 8.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY YEARS WORKING IN THE HOTEL INDUSTRY

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEANS	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
TEAMS	1994	18	3.0556			
	vs.			2.96	30.84	0.0006***
UNDER	1996	28	2.5			
POLITICS	1994	18	2.7361			
	vs.			-2.74	28.31	0.011**
UNDER 1	1996	28	3.2929			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 6 displays the significant difference in factor 4 - Use of Group Efforts displaying a t-value of 2.30 and a p-value of 0.025 significant at the 0.05 level. Degree of freedom was at 72.26. A decrease in the mean from 2.8604 to 2.5375 in 1996 was seen.

Factor 5 - Bureaucratic blocks and Politics also shows a significance with a t-value of -1.93 and a p-value of 0.058 significant at the 0.10 level with a degree of freedom at 68.59. There was an increase in mean from 3.0811 to 3.4438. Table 6 compares the factor means by years in current position.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION

		SAMPLE	MEANS	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
PROBLEM 1 TO 3	1994	28	3.3274	1.47	5.58	0.195
	vs. 1996	6	2.75			
POLITICS UNDER 1	1994	36	3.0811	-1.93	68.59	0.058*
	vs. 1996	40	3.4438			
TEAMS UNDER 1	1994	36	2.8604	2.3	72.26	0.025**
	vs. 1996	40	2.5375			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

Based on the departments between two hotels in 1996, there was a significant difference in the food and beverage department based on group 3 - Rewards and Recognition. The mean was higher in Hotel A than the mean of Hotel B ranging from 2.7867 in hotel A to 2.533 in hotel B with a t-value at -2.41 and a p-value of 0.021 significant at the 0.05 level. The range of this category varied from 0.021 to 0.833.

TABLE 7

SIGNIFICANCE OF SIX FACTORS IN DEPARTMENTS BETWEEN THE TWO HOTELS

FACTORS	DEPT	HOTEL A MEAN (n)	HOTEL B MEAN (n)	T- VALUE	P-VALUE
PROBLEM	F & B	3.4677 (31)	3.5000 (15)	-0.21	0.833
REWARDS	F & B	2.7867 (31)	2.2533 (15)	-2.41	0.021**
POLITICS	ADMIN	3.5000 (14)	3.8500 (15)	-0.91	0.385
POLITICS	ROOM	3.2750 (20)	3.4524 (21)	-0.66	0.513
POLITICS	F & B	3.3387 (31)	3.4000 (15)	-0.24	0.813
RESOURCES	ADMIN	3.0476 (14)	3.5333 (15)	-1.15	0.281

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

There was a significant difference in the value of management employees in table 8 with regard to factor 4 - Use of Group Efforts and factor 5 - Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics.

In factor 5, the mean was a high of 3.0816 in hotel A to 3.404 in hotel B with a t-value of -2.05 and a p-value of 0.043 significant at the 0.05 level.

There was a change in factor 1 inputs with management with a higher mean of 3.1307 in hotel A to 3.6375 in hotel B with a t-value of -2.1 and a p-value of 0.053 significant at the 0.10 level. There were no other significant differences in other categories and their factors.

The p-value ranged from 0.043 to 0.0731. Detailed analysis can be seen in Appendix 1.

TABLE 8

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN SIX FACTORS WITH REGARD TO POSITION IN TWO HOTELS

FACTORS		SAMPLE	MEANS	T - VALUE	P - VALUE
INPUTS	HOTEL A	22	3.1307		
	vs			-2.1	0.053*
MGT	HOTEL B	10	3.6375		
GROUPS	HOTEL A	22	2.3864		
	vs			-0.35	0.731
MGT	HOTEL B	10	2.4833		
POLITICS	HOTEL A	49	3.0816		
	vs			-2.05	0.043**
ASSOCIATES	HOTEL B	42	3.404		

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

With regard to employment table 9, there were significant differences in part time employees regarding factor 4 - Use of Group Efforts with a decrease in the mean from 2.9848 in hotel A to 2.4697 in hotel B with a t-value of 2.23 and a p-value of 0.039. With regard to factor 5, a significant difference was also seen among the part time employees with a lower mean in Hotel A of 2.8864 to 2.2727, with a t-value of -1.77 and a p-value

of 0.092 significant at the 0.10 level. There were no significant changes seen among the full time employees in any categories.

TABLE 9
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN SIX FACTORS WITH REGARD TO
EMPLOYMENT IN TWO HOTELS

FACTORS		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
GROUPS	HOTEL A	11	2.9848	2.23	0.039**
	vs.				
PART- TIME	HOTEL B	11	2.4697		
POLITICS	HOTEL A	11	2.8864	-1.77	0.092*
	vs.				
PART TIME	HOTEL B	11	2.2727		

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

Strategic and Operational Decisions

Strategic decisions given in the survey are long term options taken to fulfill the need for a hotel as a whole. The operational decisions tend to be short term, quickly rectified answers to problems that occurred at a particular moment in time. The number of people who answered this part of the questionnaire were 27 out of a possible 52. Twenty two answers were operational of the appropriately answered questions and 5 were strategic.

The data from part 1 is listed in table 11 which separates the strategic and operational decisions made by the participants within each department. The four different department categories are Executive Office, Rooms Division, Food and Beverage, and Engineering and Security.

TABLE 10: SUMMARY OF DECISIONS PROVIDED

ROOMS (N = 8)

OPERATIONAL

- Reduced room rate by 50% but did not give in to guest's demand for a free room due to a mix up during checkout.
- Comping a taxi ride from the airport as the guest's could not fit into the van.
- Comped the presidential suite for an important group.
- Found a substitute for an employee who was unable to work due to personal reasons.
- Apologize to the guests for an unclean room by sending in a fruit basket.
- Change the format of how a group room was to be cleaned in the morning.
- Use best judgment to purchase supplies for a party.
- Understood the necessity for a new computer in the department.

FOOD AND BEVERAGE (9)

OPERATIONAL

- Comped a meal for an unhappy guest.
- Opened another room as the guest exceeded the guaranteed number.
- Comped pastries and juice to a group as they were displeased with the room set up.
- Use of a regular broom as the push broom was broken in order to complete work in the scheduled time.
- Gave the day off to the employee even though it was a busy weekend.
- Comped a drink as dinner took very long.
- Comped a meal as dinner took very long.

Strategic

- Group decision to change color theme in the restaurant.
- Understood the need for new equipment and supplies for customer satisfaction.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE (9)

OPERATIONAL

- Comped a room for a group as they were unhappy with the room setup.
- Comped a suite and two connecting bedrooms for a large wedding group in house, due to revenue generated.
- Comped a guest with a meal for a late pickup.
- Evicted a guest without reimbursement due to constant complaints from other guests regarding the individual.
- Cut the price of the ballroom by half for a group as the demand was low and food beverage was also a requirement for the group.
- Comped breakfast as there was a delay in the wake up call.
- Accepted an out of town money order from a guest during check in.

STRATEGIC

- Addressing the GM regarding an issue involving a manager and late reviews.
- Changed the amount of revenue the restaurant gets as credit.

ENGINEERING (1)

STRATEGIC

- Restructured working hours due to unhappy employees.

Table 11
Ranking of Problem Areas between the years, 1994 and 1996

	1994 (N=78)	1996 (N=52)
Variable	Mean	Mean
Staff Turnover	1.391 (4)	1.793 (1)
Motivation	1.747 (3)	1.559 (2)
Finance	2.402 (1)	1.315 (3)
Adequate training to do job	1.264	1.189 (4)
Guest complaint	0.667	1.144 (5)
Supplies and materials	1.276 (5)	1.126
Company policies	1.195 (2)	1.000
Equipment	1.092	1.000
Good knowledge	0.506	0.541
Computer	0.264	0.532
Safety in working place	0.747	0.523
Paper work	0.402	0.568
Human resources	0.149	0.261

There was a change in the rankings from that of 1994 starting with the number one problem area being staff turn over displaying a mean of 1.793. The table signifies the T-tests stating the increase in politics with a decrease in use of group efforts. The next problem area was motivation followed by finance, adequate training, and guest complaint.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There was a marked difference in many instances between 1994 and 1996 in Hotel B and between hotel A and hotel B in the year 1996, based on Boone and Kilmann's six factors that constitute the structures and processes that support organizational decision making.

The Six Factors

We reject the null hypothesis in 16 instances where significant differences can be seen in the comparison between 1994 and 1996 and between Hotel A and Hotel B in the year 1996. This can be further divided as twelve significant differences between 1994 and 1996 and four significant differences between Hotel A and Hotel B.

The Differences between Hotel A and Hotel B in Factor 1.

Factor 1 - Multiple Inputs and Alternatives also has a significance difference among management in the two surveyed hotels. There is an increase in the input level and the level of finding alternative solutions to problems among the management in hotel B to that of hotel A. This gives a logical explanation to the prevalence of a rigid hierarchy in hotel B to that of hotel A.

Differences in Factor 3 between Hotel A&B

Factor 3 - Rewards For Good Decisions shows a significant difference between hotel A and hotel B. There was a decrease in the mean in hotel B, signifying the need for a better reward system in hotel B in the Food and Beverage department. One that measures the effectiveness of the performance and is acknowledged as useful to the employees that are

appraised. A decrease in mean for this factor shows a decrease in motivation to do work. The employees in hotel A get better recognition and reward for their work than the employees of hotel B

Differences in Hotel A & B regarding Factor 5

There was a significant difference between the two hotels. The differences that were registered shows the resistance faced by the employees in hotel B. Hotel A had a better effect on factor 5 - Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics. This implies a longer lasting effect on the training than that of hotel B.

Factor 4 - Use of Group Efforts, showed significance between 1994 and 1996

1. Females
2. Full time employees
3. Age (25 and under)
4. Age (36 - 45)
5. Number of years (under 1)
6. Current position (under 1)

There was a significant decrease in the means as compared to 1994. This is a bad sign as there is a negative environment with the absence of teams and group work. This works adversely with the employees as they are unhappy with their working environment. The lack of teams can be attributed to the absence of TQM training, which was discontinued in 1995.

The decrease can be seen in the younger employees with more frequency as they were not exposed to any form of training. Contrary to this, there is an increase in the team and

group efforts among the 36 to 45 age group. This signifies the impact that training had on the older employees.

Factor 5 - Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics, shows seven strategic differences in the areas between 1994 and 1996

1. Females
2. Full time employees
3. Age (25 and under)
4. Age (36 - 45)
5. Number of years (under 1)
6. Current position (under 1)
7. Department (Room)

There is an increase in factor 5 in each instance showing an increased resistance to change from 1994. This is logical as there is a decrease in team and group efforts from 1994. This clearly shows the impact that lack of training has on the employees and management as it resulted in increased hierarchy among management and employees.

At the same time, there is still a decrease in resistance among 36 to 45 age group. This is a result of the training that occurred in the previous years.

There were no significant differences among other factors and their categories between the two years.

Factor 5 - Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics shows significant difference in two categories i.e. between associates and part time employees with an increase in mean in both instances

among the employees of hotel B to that of hotel A. This shows the rigid lines of top level management in hotel B.

TRAINING IN QUALITY TOPIC AREA

The training in quality topic areas that has occurred in the surveyed hotel has been nil. At the time of the original survey in 1994, a great number of respondents had just completed a total quality management training program. The hotel has not done any follow up on total quality management training since. Therefore the lack of training resulted in the poor results of factor 4 and 5. Therefore continuous training is a must for the achievement of quality.

CLOSING REMARKS

In conclusion, the perceived difference among employees at the surveyed hotels were identified using Boone and Kilmann's "Organizational Team Survey". The six factors that affect the decision making structures and processes detected a change from 1994 to 1996. Therefore the hypothesis stated that the decision making will differ from 1994 to 1996 holds true in factor 4- Use of Group Efforts and Factor 5- Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics. In the second hypothesis that the decision making differs from hotel A to hotel B in Factor 1- Multiple Inputs and Alternatives, Factor 3- Rewards for Good Decisions and Factor 5- Bureaucratic Blocks and Politics. No significance is proven in other factors and their categories.

Since 1994 is the benchmark year for this case study, I strongly suggest the continuation of the TQM program in the surveyed hotel as its absence could cause further decline in the employees motivation to work and thereby possibly result in poor customer satisfaction which is the main criteria for the success of any hotel. Further study should be done using

the “Organizational Team Survey”, as the results might persuade the management to reinstate the quality training program.

REFERENCES

- Ames, B.C. and Hlavacek, J.D. (1989). Market driven management: Prescriptions for survival in a turbulent world. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Ansoff, H.I. (1979). Strategic management. London. McMillan.
- Barnard, Janet (1992). Successful CEO's talk about decision making. Business Horizons, 35.5. 70-74.
- Boone, Larry W; Kilmann Ralph H.(1991). The context of decision making in organizations: A Factor Analysis. Advances in information processing in organizations, 4, 147-160.
- Bourgeois C.J., III. (1985). Strategic goals, Perceived uncertainty and economic performance in a volatile environment. Academy of Management Journal, 28: 548-573.
- Cole, R.E., Bacdayan, T., and White, J.B. (1993). Why improving quality doesn't improve quality (or whatever happened to marketing?). California Management Review, 35(3):68-81.
- Crosby, P.B.(1979). Quality is free: The Art of Making Quality Certain. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Dale, Dauten. (May, 1996). Common Sense meaning behind empowerment facade. Chicago Tribune, 6-9.
- Dean, J.W., Jr., and Bowen, D.E.(1994). Management theory and total quality: Improving research practice through theory development. Academy of Management Review, 19.
- Dean, J.W., Jr., and Evans, J.R.(1994). Total Quality: Management organization and strategy. St.Paul, MN: West.
- Dess, C.G., and Beard, D.W.(1984). Dimensions of Organizational task environments. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29: 52-73.

Galbraith, J.R., and Kazanjian, R.K.(1978). Strategy implementation: Structure, Systems, and Process. St.Paul, MN: West.

Garvin, D.A.(1988). Managing Quality: The Strategic and Competitive Edge. New York: Free Press.

Gehani, R.R.(1993). Quality Value Chain: A meta Synthesis of Frontiers of Quality Movement. Academy of Management Executives. 7:29-42.

Gleick, J. (1988). Chaos: The making of a new science. London: William Heinemann Limited.

Hamel, G. and Prahalad, C.K. (1994). Competing for the future. Boston MA: Harvard.

James Moncrieff and Janet Smallwood. (July 1994). Ideas for the new millennium. Financial Times. 13-17

Juran, J.M., Gryna, Frank. M. (1993). Quality planning and analysis. McGraw-Hill, Inc. New York.

Mintzberg, H. and Waters, J.A. (1985). 'Of strategic deliberate and emergent.'" Strategic Management Journal, 6, 257- 272.

Peter Rodgers. (1996). Can caring companies beat the cold blooded cost cutters. The Independent. 23- 25.

Pojidaeff, Dimitri. (1995). The core principles of participative management. Journal for Quality and Participation. 44-47.

Reed, Richard; Lemeck, David J.; Montgomery, Joseph C. (1996). Beyond Process: TQM content and firm performance; Total Quality Management. Academy of Management Review. 173-174.

Rowe, Jeff. (1995). New on the book shelf: A guide to help leaders understand those they lead. The Orange County Register. Business: D 11

Senge, P.M. (1990) The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday Currency.

Stacey, Ralph. (1996). Management and the science of Complexity: If organizational life is non linear, can business strategies prevail? Research- Technology Management. 8- 10.

Stuart, Paul. (1996). Principled approach to Modern Paradoxes. The Herald (Glasgow). 27-28.

Wellins, Richard S. (1992). Building a self directed work team. Training and Development. 24- 28

Zenger, John H. (1991). Leadership in a team environment. Training and Development. 47-52.

APPENDIX 1

COMPARISON OF t-TESTS OF SIX FACTORS WITH REGARD TO POSITION IN HOTELS A & B IN 1996 : MANAGEMENT

FACTORS		SAMPLE	MGT MEAN	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
INPUTS	HOTEL A	22	3.1307		
	vs. HOTEL B	10	3.6375	-2.1	0.053*
PROBLEM	HOTEL A	22	2.9286		
	HOTEL B	10	3.4167	-1.89	0.075*
REWARDS	HOTEL A	22	2.52		
	HOTEL B	10	3.08	-2.46	0.023**
GROUPS	HOTEL A	22	2.3864		
	HOTEL B	10	2.4833	-0.35	0.731
POLITICS	HOTEL A	22	3.7619		
	vs. HOTEL B	10	3.9	-0.38	0.706
RESOURCES	HOTEL A	22	3.0758		
	HOTEL B	10	3.3333	-0.73	0.474

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 1 (CONT'D)

ASSOCIATES

FACTORS		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
INPUTS	HOTEL A	50	3.0816	-2.05	0.043**
	HOTEL B	42	3.4048		
PROBLEM	HOTEL A	50	3.4267	2.53	0.133
	HOTEL B	42	3.0794		
REWARDS	HOTEL A	50	2.9429	0.92	0.361
	HOTEL B	42	2.7857		
GROUPS	HOTEL A	50	2.8833	2.44	0.017**
	HOTEL B	42	2.5595		
POLITICS	HOTEL A	50	3.0816	-2.05	0.043**
	HOTEL B	42	3.4048		
RESOURCES	HOTEL A	50	3.2867	-0.23	0.817
	HOTEL B	42	3.3254		

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 2

COMPARISONS OF t-TEST OF SIX FACTORS WITH REGARD TO EMPLOYEE STATUS IN HOTEL A & B IN 1996: FULL-TIME

FACTORS		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
INPUTS	HOTEL A	71	3.1496	-0.44	0.658
	HOTEL B	40	3.2156		
PROBLEM	HOTEL A	71	3.1524	0.17	0.865
	HOTEL B	40	3.1292		
REWARDS	HOTEL A	71	2.7333	-0.76	0.447
	HOTEL B	40	2.855		
GROUPS	HOTEL A	71	2.6644	0.77	0.446
	HOTEL B	40	2.5667		
POLITICS	HOTEL A	71	3.3567	-1.26	0.213
	HOTEL B	40	3.5625		
RESOURCES	HOTEL A	71	3.1528	-1.02	1.94
	HOTEL B	40	3.3167		

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 2 (COTD)

PART TIME					
FACTORS		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
INPUTS	HOTEL A	11	3.6705	1.63	0.12
	HOTEL B	12	3.2045		
PROBLEM	HOTEL A	11	3.8788	2.67	0.016**
	HOTEL B	12	3.1667		
REWARDS	HOTEL A	11	3.3091	1.39	0.181
	HOTEL B	12	2.8727		
GROUPS	HOTEL A	11	2.9848	2.23	0.039**
	HOTEL B	12	2.4697		
POLITICS	HOTEL A	11	2.884	-1.77	0.092*
	HOTEL B	12	3.2727		
RESOURCES	HOTEL A	11	3.8485	1.94	0.072*
	HOTEL B	12	3.3636		

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 3

MEANS AND T-VALUES OF SIX FACTORS WITH REGARD TO GENDER

FACTORS		FEMALE (n)	MEAN	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
INPUTS	HOTEL A	37	3.0777	-0.84	0.403
	HOTEL B	26	3.2548		
PROBLEM	HOTEL A	37	3.0648	-0.55	0.586
	HOTEL B	26	3.1731		
REWARDS	HOTEL A	37	2.7086	-0.24	0.813
	HOTEL B	26	2.7615		
GROUPS	HOTEL A	37	2.7117	0.61	0.542
	HOTEL B	26	2.609		
POLITICS	HOTEL A	37	3.4167	-0.73	0.471
	HOTEL B	26	3.5481		
RESOURCE	HOTEL A	37	3.1712	-1.2	0.237
	HOTEL B	26	3.4103		

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 3 (COTD)

FACTORS		MALE	MEAN	T-VALUE	P-VALUE
INPUTS	HOTEL A	45	3.3361	1.05	0.297
	HOTEL B	26	3.1683		
PROBLEM	HOTEL A	45	3.4	1.93	0.059*
	HOTEL B	26	3.1154		
REWARDS	HOTEL A	45	2.8933	-0.17	0.866
	HOTEL B	26	2.9231		
GROUPS	HOTEL A	45	2.7029	1.54	0.128
	HOTEL B	26	2.4808		
POLITICS	HOTEL A	45	3.1944	-1.23	0.223
	HOTEL B	26	3.4519		
RESOURCES	HOTEL A	45	3.3043	0.31	0.761
	HOTEL B	26	3.2436		

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 4

COMPARISON OF t-TESTS OF SIX FACTORS BY POSITION IN HOTEL B FOR 1994 vs 1996

GM/DIR/MAN/SUP

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	21	3.5417	-0.4	14.31	0.692
	vs. 1996	10	3.6375			
PROBLEM	1994	21	3.3833	-0.14	15.95	0.893
	vs. 1996	10	3.4167			
REWARDS	1994	21	2.8952	-0.82	21.03	0.423
	vs. 1996	10	3.08			
TEAMS	1994	21	2.9048	1.51	15.16	0.153
	vs. 1996	10	2.4833			
POLITICS	1994	21	3.2381	-1.81	15.19	0.09*
	vs. 1996	10	3.9			
RESOURCE	1994	21	3.3968	0.18	21.15	0.861
	vs. 1996	10	3.3333			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 4 (COTD)

ASSOCIATES

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	50	3.2969			
	vs.			1.21	83.9	0.231
	1996	42	3.1101			
PROBLEM	1994	50	3.3262			
	vs.			1.68	84.55	0.097*
	1996	42	3.0794			
REWARDS	1994	50	3.0375			
	vs.			1.47	82.3	0.145
	1996	42	2.7857			
TEAMS	1994	50	2.8533			
	vs.			2.52	89.67	0.014**
	1996	42	2.5595			
POLITICS	1994	50	3.105			
	vs.			-1.85	88.96	0.067*
	1996	42	3.4048			
RESOURCE	1994	50	3.4354			
	vs.			0.74	83.76	0.464
	1996	42	3.3254			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level

APPENDIX 5

COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY SEX OF EMPLOYEES

FEMALE

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	45	3.425	0.87	42.84	0.388
	vs.					
	1996	26	3.2548			
PROBLEM	1994	45	3.2778	0.59	38.13	0.562
	vs.					
	1996	26	3.1731			
REWARD	1994	45	2.96	0.92	41.93	0.363
	vs.					
	1996	26	2.7615			
TEAM	1994	45	2.9312	1.98	54.75	0.053*
	vs.					
	1996	26	2.609			
POLITICS	1994	45	3.1848	-1.87	60.89	0.067*
	vs.					
	1996	26	3.5481			
RESOURCE	1994	45	3.4493	0.2	50.85	0.839
	vs.					
	1996	26	3.4103			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 5 (COTD)

MALE

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUT	1994	33	3.1705	0.01	53.52	0.99
	vs. 1996	26	3.1683			
PROBLEM	1994	33	3.3602	1.37	54.87	0.176
	vs. 1996	26	3.1154			
REWARDS	1994	33	2.8937	-0.16	55.97	0.877
	vs. 1996	26	2.9231			
TEAMS	1994	33	2.6814	1.42	56.66	0.162
	vs. 1996	26	2.4848			
POLITICS	1994	33	3.2197	-1.07	55.95	0.291
	vs. 1996	26	3.4519			
RESOURCES	1994	33	3.3636	0.59	55.78	0.556
	vs. 1996	26	3.2436			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 6

COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

FULL TIME

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUT	1994	58	3.3705	1.03	70.76	0.305
	vs. 1996	40	3.2156			
PROBLEM	1994	58	3.2673	0.99	75.32	0.327
	vs. 1996	40	3.1292			
REWARDS	1994	58	2.9055	0.32	73.61	0.751
	vs. 1996	40	2.855			
TEAMS	1994	58	2.9474	3.07	86.9	0.003***
	vs. 1996	40	2.5667			
POLITICS	1994	58	3.2456	-1.87	86.68	0.065*
	vs. 1996	40	3.5625			
RESOURCES	1994	58	3.3736	0.35	86.61	0.729
	vs. 1996	40	3.3167			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 6 (COTD)

PART TIME

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	20	3.2105	0.02	23.06	0.984
	vs. 1996	11	3.2045			
PROBLEM	1994	20	3.4333	0.96	21.45	0.384
	vs. 1996	11	3.1667			
REWARDS	1994	20	3.0632	0.58	23.94	0.565
	vs. 1996	11	2.8727			
TEAM	1994	20	2.6167	0.71	28.88	0.483
	vs. 1996	11	2.4697			
POLITICS	1994	20	2.9211	-1.26	27.97	0.217
	vs. 1996	11	3.2727			
RESOURCES	1994	20	3.463	0.36	19.55	0.724
	vs. 1996	11	3.3636			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 7**COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY AGE OF EMPLOYEE
25 AND UNDER**

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	28	3.3241	0.91	36.64	0.367
	vs. 1996	16	3.1406			
PROBLEM	1994	28	3.1282	-1.11	39.51	0.276
	vs. 1996	16	3.3438			
REWARDS	1994	28	2.92	-0.42	38.9	0.674
	vs. 1996	16	3.0125			
TEAM	1994	28	2.8274	2.02	36.12	0.051*
	vs. 1996	16	2.4583			
POLITICS	1994	28	3.1071	-1.58	39.02	0.122
	vs. 1996	16	3.5			
RESOURCES	1994	28	3.5432	0.55	30.64	0.589
	vs. 1996	16	3.4167			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

INPUTS	1994	31	3.2106	0.42	32.3	0.679
	vs. 1996	19	3.1053			
PROBLEM	1994	31	3.3118	1.47	32.55	0.15
	vs. 1996	19	3.0351			
REWARDS	1994	31	2.8194	1.03	33.44	0.309
	vs. 1996	19	2.6			
TEAM	1994	31	2.7188	0.81	46.5	0.425
	vs. 1996	19	2.5702			
POLITICS	1994	31	3.3468	-2.09	42.87	0.043**
	vs. 1996	19	3.8158			
RESOURCES	1994	31	3.4167	0.3	41.3	0.768
	vs. 1996	19	3.3509			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

(COTD)

APPENDIX 7

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	10	3.5	-0.15	17.77	0.884
	vs. 1996	10	3.5375			
PROBLEM	1994	10	3.3889	1.08	14.14	0.299
	vs. 1996	10	3.0167			
REWARDS	1994	10	3.0182	0.2	15.41	0.847
	vs. 1996	10	3.94			
TEAM	1994	10	3.25	2.03	17.97	0.057*
	vs. 1996	10	3.7167			
POLITICS	1994	10	3.05	-0.21	16.83	0.834
	vs. 1996	10	2.125			
RESOURCES	1994	10	3.3636	-0.1	18.98	0.925
	vs. 1996	10	3.4			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

INPUTS	1994	5	3.7	-0.12	3.79	0.907
	vs. 1996	3	3.7917			
PROBLEM	1994	5	3.5667	-0.13	3.52	0.904
	vs. 1996	3	3.6111			
REWARDS	1994	5	3.64	-0.13	2.97	0.906
	vs. 1996	3	3.7333			
TEAM	1994	5	2.8333	0.56	3.27	0.612
	vs. 1996	3	2.5556			
POLITICS	1994	5	2.75	-1.54	4.19	0.196
	vs. 1996	3	2.5833			
RESOURCES	1994	5	3	0.69	5.53	0.52
	vs. 1996	3	2.7778			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 7 (COTD)

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	4	3.125	0.19	2.24	0.863
	vs. 1996	3	3			
PROBLEM	1994	4	3.75	1.18	2.8	0.328
	vs. 1996	3	3.1111			
REWARDS	1994	4	2.6		2.86	1
	vs. 1996	3	2.6			
TEAMS	1994	4	2.4583	-0.13	3.59	0.902
	vs. 1996	3	2.5			
POLITICS	1994	4	3.375	1.26	4.6	0.267
	vs. 1996	3	2.75			
RESOURCES	1994	4	3.1667	-0.38	4.45	0.723
	vs. 1996	3	3.4444			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 8
DETAILED COMPARISON OF FACTOR MEANS BY YEARS IN HOTEL
INDUSTRY
UNDER 1

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	18	3.4514	1.52	32.76	0.139
	vs. 1996	28	3.1429			
PROBLEM	1994	18	3.2708	0.38	25.27	0.71
	vs. 1996	28	3.1786			
REWARDS	1994	18	3.2111	1.38	32.07	0.176
	vs. 1996	28	2.8929			
TEAM	1994	18	3.0556	2.96	30.84	0.006**
	vs. 1996	28	2.5			
POLITICS	1994	18	2.7361	-2.74	28.31	0.001***
	vs. 1996	28	3.3929			
RESOURCES	1994	18	3.4706	0.71	38.49	0.482
	vs. 1996	28	3.3214			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

1 TO 3

INPUTS	1994	20	3.425	1.2	15.63	0.249
	vs. 1996	31	3.0481			
PROBLEM	1994	20	3.35	0.64	17.54	0.532
	vs. 1996	31	3.1923			
REWARDS	1994	20	3.0778	0.63	17.46	0.535
	vs. 1996	31	2.8923			
TEAM	1994	20	2.8175	1.26	26.28	0.217
	vs. 1996	31	2.5385			
POLITICS	1994	20	3.3452	-1.26	27.93	0.219
	vs. 1996	31	3.6923			
RESOURCES	1994	20	3.5167	1.31	19.82	0.206
	vs. 1996	31	3.1538			

APPENDIX 8 (COTD)**4 TO 7**

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	22	3.0227			
	vs. 1996	2	3.375			
PROBLEM	1994	22	3.1288			
	vs. 1996	2	3.5			
REWARDS	1994	22	2.6			
	vs. 1996	2	2.1			
TEAM	1994	22	2.6818			
	vs. 1996	2	2.5			
POLITICS	1994	22	3.3095			
	vs. 1996	2	3.375			
RESOURCES	1994	22	2.9091			
	vs. 1996	2	3.5			

8 TO 11

INPUTS	1994	10	3.3	-1.6	7.87	0.149
	vs. 1996	3	3.7083			
PROBLEMS	1994	10	3.3889	1.16	2.39	0.347
	vs. 1996	3	2.7222			
REWARDS	1994	10	2.6727	0.69	2.69	0.545
	vs. 1996	3	2.2667			
TEAM	1994	10	2.7333	-0.07	3.02	0.947
	vs. 1996	3	2.7778			
POLITICS	1994	10	3.725	0.28	2.51	0.802
	vs. 1996	3	3.5			
RESOURCES	1994	10	3.6667	0.82	4.24	0.456
	vs. 1996	3	4			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

APPENDIX 8 (COTD)
12 AND OVER

FACTOR		SAMPLE	MEAN	T-VALUE	DF	P-VALUE
INPUTS	1994	8	3.5781	-0.34	7.47	0.744
	vs. 1996	5	3.725			
PROBLEMS	1994	8	3.7083	0.99	5.55	0.365
	vs. 1996	5	3.4			
REWARDS	1994	8	3.25	0.24	5.52	0.82
	vs. 1996	5	3.12			
TEAM	1994	8	2.875	0.96	9.19	0.359
	vs. 1996	5	2.6333			
POLITICS	1994	8	2.9063	-1.29	7.14	0.237
	vs. 1996	5	3.7			
RESOURCES	1994	8	3.9167	1.39	9.82	0.194
	vs. 1996	5	3.2667			

* Significant at the 0.10 level.

** Significant at the 0.05 level.

*** Significant at the 0.01 level.

