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ABSTRACT

This study was aimed at analyzing the cognition and the relationship between managers’ leadership styles and employees’ organizational commitment in the operation unit of international tourist hotels. In order to meet the features of this industry, both the theories, “situational leadership” by Hersey & Blanchard and “organizational commitment” by Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian serve as the basis of this study. From the former theory, how subordinate managers prepare for the task becomes a situational factor. Task and relationship develop as structural sides of situational leadership. In this way, managers’ leadership styles can be sorted into the following four types: selling (persuasion), telling (command), participating and delegating (empowerment). In the latter theory, “value,” “effort,” and “retention” make up the main parts to be studied.

The international tourist hotels involved in this study consisted of 58 state-qualified hotels which were evaluated and granted qualification by the government in 2004. Three hundred and thirty-one employees filled out the questionnaire. The survey instrument included: (a) leadership style inventory, (b) organizational commitment inventory, and (c) personal background data. By analyzing all the data collected, the results of this study indicate:

1. A ‘delegating’ leadership style has the highest frequency of occurrences. It is followed by ‘selling’ and ‘participating’ styles. ‘Telling’ leadership has the lowest frequency of occurrences.
2. Employees of different ages, lengths of services, major subjects, top-level leadership styles, and the locations of the hotels will show significantly different organizational commitments.
3. The more that managers belong to the selling, participating, and delegating leadership styles, the more organizational commitment the employees have. In general, the ‘participating’ leadership attracts the most employee commitment, while the ‘telling’ leadership obtains the least.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The French scholar J. Fourastie (Wikipedia, 2005) stated that the development of modern economy moved toward the trend of tertiary industries. According to the Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting, & Statistics, the number of employed persons in the service sector increased by 151,000 from October 2004 to October 2006. Service sector employees account for 67.12% of the total employed population. Thus, the service sector in Taiwan has not only met the main global trend, but has also partly solved the unemployment problem. International tourist hotels are the typical service-sector business (Huang, 1996). To
promote the hospitality industry and reach the goal of five million tourists, Taiwan’s government encourages private investment in international tourist hotels. Tourist hotels belong to a labor-intensive industry and employees can be regarded as the most important capital. For the basic workers in this business, the characteristics of their jobs are particular, their wages are at the lower levels, and their working hours are long. This results in a high turnover rate (Yang & Wan, 2000). In addition since the implementation of a new labor retirement system, the years that a worker serves for each company can be merged into his length of service for a retirement pension (Council of Labor Affairs, 2005). The new retirement system has been viewed as an important factor in accelerating employees’ turnover rate and diversifying the supply of the basic manpower. More contingency workers and part-time employees receiving professional training are expected to replace full-time employees and engage in the tourism and food service industries.

In the future, tourist hotels will have to confront the fierce competition in the external market and the threat of unstable manpower. In order to maintain a competitive advantage, the priority has become the stabilization of the backbone elements, namely, the employees of business departments. The possible causes of employees' resignation can be traced from organizational commitment (Steers, 1997). Organizational commitment is deeply influenced by the leadership style of managers (Chen, 1995). Therefore, the leadership style of a manager is able to affect subordinates' organizational commitment and organizational commitment is related to a person’s service attitude, passion, and willingness to work. All of these have become key factors in deciding the success of international tourist hotels (Brotherton & Shaw, 1996). This study used an empirical approach to explore the relationship between the managers’ leadership styles in international tourist hotels and the organizational commitment of employees.

1.2 Purposes of the Study

Although tourist hotels are a booming industry, it is not easy to maintain service quality due to the high mobility rate (Ghiselli, Joseph, & Billy, 2001). This study was made for the following main purposes:

1) To identify the general spread in leadership styles of managers of international tourist hotels and then compare the differences in leadership styles of the managers in this study.
2) To investigate the differences in organizational commitment of the employees in international tourist hotels.
3) To examine the relationship between the managers’ leadership style in international tourist hotels and the employees organizational commitment.
4) To offer the findings, as a reference, to international tourist hotels and the departments of tourism and food service at technological colleges.

1.3 Research Questions

The primary research questions to be addressed in this study are as follows:
(1) What are the leadership styles of managers perceived by their subordinate employees in international tourist hotels?
(2) What are the perceived organizational commitment of employees in international tourist hotels based on the employees' background?
(3) What is the relationship between the managers’ leadership style in international tourist hotels and the employees' organizational commitment?

1.4 Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses are developed and tested at the 0.05 level of significance for analysis:

Ho1. There are no significant differences in the leadership styles of managers of international tourist hotels by employees’ background.

Ho2. There are no significant differences in the organizational commitment of employees in international tourist hotels by employees' background.

Ho3. There is no significant relationship between a managers’ leadership style in international tourist hotels and employees' organizational commitment.

1.5 Research Procedure

Firstly, the study used individual interviews to research background and motives. The research topics, scope, and purposes were decided. The research frame was set up in accordance with information taken from the current literature. Secondly, a questionnaire was developed and a pilot study was implemented to examine its reliability as well as validity. After modification, formal questionnaires were sent to the subjects in the sample. The data from the returned and useful questionnaires were collected and analyzed using standard statistical methods. Finally, the findings, conclusions, and suggestions of this study were elucidated and made available.

1.6 Definition of Terms

Several terms and their operational definitions are described as follows:

(1) **International tourist hotel**

An international tourist hotel is built in accordance with the standards of construction and facilities of an international tourist hotel. Such a hotel is also evaluated as a certificated hotel through Taiwan’s evaluation and classification system of international tourist hotels (Tourism Bureau, 2004).

(2) **Leadership style**

Hersey and Blanchard’s (1988) situational leadership theory indicates that successful leaders adjust their styles depending on the readiness of the followers to perform in a given position. “Readiness” is based on how able, willing, and confident followers are in performing required tasks. The possible leadership styles include: (a) selling: a high-task, high-relationship style; (b) telling: a high-task, low-relationship style; (c) participating: a low-task, high-relationship style; and (d) delegating: a low-task, low-relationship style.
Organizational commitment means the degree of one’s identification with, and participation in, a certain organization. It includes three characteristics: (a) one believes in, and accepts, organizational goals and value (value commitment), (b) one is willing to make an effort (effort commitment), and (c) one has a strong desire to remain a member of the organization (retention commitment) (Porter, Steer, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974).

Manager
In this study, managers consist of the top-level leaders, middle-level managers, and lower level managers.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definition and Organization of International Tourist Hotels

2.1.1 Definition and classification system of international tourist hotels

The word “hotel” originates from Latin hospitalis “of a guest, showing hospitality,” from hospit-, hospes, “host, stranger, guest.” This is derived the Old French word hostel, a better-class of house for entertaining strangers or travelers; an inn. Consequently, an apartment or villa rented by tourists has come to be called a hotel (Medlik, 1961). At present, Taiwan’s government divides hotels into two categories: international tourist hotels and ordinary hotels.

The hotel classification system has been set up by the Tourism Bureau in order to evaluate the structure, facilities, software, and services of a hotel. The hotels assessed are granted a grade mark according to their performance. Currently, there are no unified standards of evaluation and classification (Lin, Liu, Sun, Lee, & Lin, 2000). In 2003, for the purpose of promoting tourism, Taiwan’s government accelerated the implementation of the Doubling Tourist Arrivals Plan. Thus the Tourism Bureau formulated both the new evaluation and classification system of hotels and evaluation standards of hotels. The latest system adopts stars, which are widely used throughout the rest of the world, instead of the mark of a plum previously used in Taiwan. In addition, after referring to the American AAA evaluation system, the Tourism Bureau drew up a two-stage evaluation including structure, facilities and service quality. Those which are evaluated by the two-stage evaluation and reach evaluation standards are accredited as international tourist hotels (Tourism Bureau, 2004). In 2004, there were fifty-eight qualified international tourist hotels in Taiwan (see Table 1). To meet customer’s demand and offer a high quality service, these international tourist hotels all have been equipped with a network ordering system (Wei, Rugs, Hoof, & Combrink, 2001; Yang & Wan, 2000).

2.1.2 Organization of international tourist hotels

From the viewpoint of the structure of hotels, the differences in scale of hotels, variety of business, and departmentalization, there are various types of organization. Based on the fundamental functions and work specialization, the structure of a
hotel, in general, can be grouped into two major departments including front-end business departments and back-end support departments. Business departments consist of room service section, restaurants, marketing section, and other business units. Support departments include personnel, general affairs, administration, purchasing, finance, and engineering units (Wu, 2000).

The structure of small and medium hotels is simpler. One department can deal with several business areas, and one employee can have more than one task. In contrast, international tourist hotels belong to a larger scale and have a complicated organizational structure with more levels. However, different types of management result in various levels of organization. International tourist hotels often have a higher degree of work specialization. Currently, Taiwan’s international tourist hotels have developed into two types of organization due to differing managerial styles. One is a simple structure with a low degree of departmentalization, fewer layers, and wide span of control, and the other is a taller, pyramid-like structure with a high degree of departmentalization, more layers, and more managers.

Table 1. International Tourist Hotels in Taiwan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hotels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taipei</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Grand Hotel Taipei, Ambassador Hotel Taipei, Mandarin Hotel, Imperial Hotel Taipei, Gloria Prince Hotel Taipei, Emperor Hotel, Riverview Taipei Hotel, Golden China Hotel, Caesar Park Taipei, San Want Hotel, Brother Hotel, Santos Hotel, Landis Taipei Hotel, United Hotel, Sheraton Taipei Hotel, Taipei Fortuna Hotel, Asiaworld Plaza Hotel, Royal Taipei Hotel, Howard Plaza Hotel Taipei, Rebar Crowne Plaza, Grand Hyatt Taipei, Grand Formosa Regent Taipei, Sherwood Taipei, Far Eastern Plaza Hotel, The Westin Taipei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaohsiung</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kingdom Hotel, Holiday Inn, Ambassador Hotel Kaohsiung, Han-Hsien International Hotel, Grand Hi-Lai Hotel, Howard Plaza Hotel Kaohsiung, Splendor Kaohsiung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taichung</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park Hotel, National Taichung Hotel, Plaza International Hotel, Evergreen Laurel Hotel Taichung, Howard Plaza Hotel Taichung, Splendor Taichung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hualien</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hualien Aster, Marshal Hotel, Chinatrust Hotel Hualien, Parkview Hotel, Hualien Farglory Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Sites</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Landis Resort Yangmingshan, Grand Hotel Kaohsiung, Caesar Park Hotel Kenting, Royal Chihpen Hotel, Grand Formosa Taroko, Howard Beach Resort Kenting, HiHotel, The Lalu-Sun Moon Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taoyuan, Hsinchu, and Miaoli</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Taoyuan Hotel, Ta Shee Resort, Royal Hsinchu Hotel, Ambassador Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hotel Tainan, Formosan Naruwan Hotel &amp; Resort Taitung, Tayih Landis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from the data of the Tourism Bureau, Ministry of Communications (2005).

2.2 Leadership Style

Drucker (1993) indicated that the quality and performance of managers are the key criteria in deciding organizational success. An enterprise without a manager’s leadership is not able to transmute input resources into competitive
advantage. Therefore, it is clear that the leadership style of a manager has a close relation to the development of organization. The study made by Bass (1990) shows that 45% to 65% of the total factors causing success or failure of organization are decided by leaders.

2.2.1 Definition of leadership

Leadership is defined as the ability to influence a group towards the achievement of goals (Robbins, 1993). Tannenbaum et al. (1964) considered leadership an influence of human relations. Leadership guides the followers to achieve specific goals through communication. Fiedler (1967) believed that leadership is a kind of relationship to apply power and influence to make people work together and accomplish common goals. Rauch and Behling (1984) and Hsieh (1993) all regarded leadership as the process of influencing a group to move towards the goal.

2.2.2 Theories of leadership

Since the middle of the twentieth century, various theories and literature have been developed by many scholars with different standpoints. These theories can be classified into four major perspectives as follows:

(1) Trait Theories: Stogdill (1963) and Davis (1972) proposed the personality and traits that a successful leader should have.

(2) Behavior Theories: These theories resulted from research that began at Ohio State University in the late 1940s. Halpin & Winer (1957) pointed out two dimensions initiating structure and consideration. Subsequently, many studies such as those of Stogdill (1963), Likert (1967), and Kotter (1988) also offered related behavioral theories of leadership.

(3) Contingency Theories: Fiedler (1967) first developed the contingency model of leadership. House (1971) developed the path-goal theory that extracted essential elements from the research of Ohio State University and the expectancy theory of motivation. In 1977 Hersey and Blachard also developed the situational leadership theory which used the two leadership dimensions in terms of task and relationship behaviors, and combined their degrees into four specific leadership behaviors: telling, selling, participating, and delegating.

According to the contingency theory, leaders adopt a suitable leadership style depending on the readiness of followers. The telling style is suitable for unable and unwilling followers. The selling style is effective for unable and willing followers. The participating style is useful for able and unwilling followers. The delegating style is adequate for able and willing followers.

(4) Neocharismatic Theories: These theories are mainly represented by transactional leadership and transformational leadership.

From the characteristics of international tourist hotels, the main goods provided by international tourist hotels include not only visual products such as room, restaurant, facilities for leisure and amusement, but also invisible services. The management and product outputs all are customer-driven. The international tourist hotel industry heavily depends on a great amount of manpower, while the
employees are different in ability and willingness. Therefore, it is essential for managers to utilize a suitable leadership style with which to meet a subordinate’s readiness to accomplish tasks. Considering the purpose and context of research, Hersey & Blanchard’s situational leadership theory is appropriate and utilized in this study.

2.3 Organizational Commitment

Morris & Sherman (1981) indicated that organizational commitment is able to effectively predict the employee’s performance and turnover. Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson (1989) also found that organizational commitment was a proper indicator of work performance. It is important for managers and leaders to pay more attention to the employee’s organizational commitment.

2.3.1 Definition of organization commitment

Based on various viewpoints, the definitions of organizational commitment differ. However, most scholars recognize that organizational commitment is loyalty to the organization (Price & Mueller, 1986). Most of Taiwan’s researchers agree with the concept of Porter, Steer, Mowday, & Boulian (1974); that organizational commitment is the degree of one’s identification and participation for a certain organization. There are three characteristics: (a) one believes in and accepts organizational goals and value (value commitment), (b) one is willing to make an effort (effort commitment), and (c) one has strong desire to maintain the membership of the organization (retention commitment). Organizational commitment is regarded as a mental contract connecting the individual’s identification and attribution with the organization and performing his duty (Wallace, 1995). Organizational commitment is able to facilitate voluntary cooperation within an organization.

2.3.2 Theoretical model of organization commitment

Theories of organizational commitment result from several studies conducted by Sheldon (1971), and Hrebiniaik & Alutto (1972). Buchanan (1974) and Steers (1977) made studies concerning organizational commitment and found that organizational commitment was affected by three major factors: personality, job specialty, and working experience. The outcome affected by organizational commitment includes the retention willingness, retention demand, attending rate, and work performance. Based on the related theory, Steers (1977) proposed a cause-effect relationship model (see Figure 1). From this model, organizational commitment is the intervening variable which affects a member’s value, attitude, and behavior in the organization.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

To achieve the purpose of this study, a descriptive research design was used. Documentary analysis was executed in order to understand theories and studies
concerning leadership and organizational commitment. This study made use of a questionnaire to collect data from the subjects employed in international tourism hotels. Thus, this study is classified as survey research.

Figure 1. The cause-effect relationship model of organizational commitment (Steers, 1977).

3.2 Sample

The sample of this study consists of the employees (lower-level managers) of 17 international tourist hotels from 58 qualified international tourist hotels evaluated by the Tourism Bureau in Taiwan in 2004. By using stratified random sampling, these subjects were the lower-level managers of restaurants and room services and they were selected according to four regions: northern, central, southern, and eastern. The questionnaires were sent to all 390 subjects in the sample. Three hundred and fifty-one of them responded and 331 were useful. The useful response rate was 83.2%.

3.3 Instrumentation

The study was implemented through questionnaire survey. The draft survey instrument mainly consists of a leadership style inventory and an organizational commitment inventory. The leadership style inventory, including twenty items, was based on the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Tu, 2003; Stogdill, 1963) and Supervising Behavior Description (SBD) (Fleishman, 1953). The organizational commitment inventory with twenty-five items was developed on the basis of the OCQ (Porter et al., 1974) and Organizational Commitment Inventory (OCI) (Lee, Chun, and Lin, 2000). A Likert five-point scale was used for the questionnaire.

A pilot study for the draft questionnaire was carried out in order to examine its reliability and construct validity. The results of the pilot study revealed that Cronbach’s α coefficients for the leadership style inventory and the organizational commitment inventory were 0.9437 and 0.9690, respectively, which showed a high degree of reliability. Item analysis revealed that in the leadership style inventory, only the Pearson correlation of item 19 did not reach the significant level of 0.05
and was consequently deleted. The results of factor analysis also showed adequate construct validity. However, through the pilot study and related analyses, the formal survey questionnaire involves three major parts: (a) leadership style inventory with 19 items, (b) organizational commitment inventory with 25 items, and (c) personal data.

3.4 Statistical Analysis

The study utilized SPSS for Windows to analyze the collected data. The statistical procedures for quantitative research include factor analysis, reliability analysis, descriptive statistics, t-test, one-way ANOVA, and the Scheffé test.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study are summarized in Table 2 and the findings are described as follows:

Table 2. Differences in Leadership Styles of Middle Level Managers and Employees’ Organizational Commitment by Background Variables of Employee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Background Variables of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *P<.05, **P<.01.

Table 2. (continue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>Selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **P<.01.
4.1 The Differences in Manager’s Leadership Styles by Employees’ Background

According to the statistics concerning the employees’ perception of managers’ leadership styles, the delegating (empowerment) style was adopted most, followed by the selling (persuasion) style, participating style, and telling (command) style, respectively.

4.1.1 The differences of employees’ background in manager’s leadership styles
(1) In terms of the gender, age, education level, position, and number of hotels served before, there is no significant difference in the manager’s leadership style. It showed that leadership styles used by managers were not significantly influenced by employees’ background variables.

(2) By the major subject, department serving, and length of service, there are significant differences in the manager’s leadership style. Thus, the null hypothesis 1 that there are no significant differences in managers’ leadership styles by employees’ background is rejected. Managers generally adopt a ‘telling’ style for the employees with a tourism related major subjects. Compared with employees majoring in leisure management, a ‘delegating’ style is mostly used for the employees with majors in food, tourism, and other related subjects. There are significantly more managers with selling and delegating styles for the employees serving the department of room service than those for the employees serving the department of customer service. There is no significant difference in the leadership style between front-end respondents and back-end respondents in the restaurant service. In terms of working with managers with telling leadership, the number of employees with 16 years of service or longer is higher than that of those with three service years or less.

4.1.2 The effect of top-level managers’ leadership styles on the manager’s leadership style
(1) Compared with top-level managers with a noninterference leadership style, the top-level managers with an authoritative style and a democratic style have significantly more subordinate managers with telling, participating, and delegating styles. A telling style is adopted most frequently by the managers when their top-level managers possess an authoritative leadership style. On the contrary, participating and delegating styles are adopted most frequently by the managers when their top-level managers possess a democratic leadership style.

(2) When top-level managers use an authoritative style and a democratic style: telling, participating, and delegating styles are significantly less used by the their managers. This finding coincides with the Stogdill’s study (Bass, 1990), that leaders utilize a noninterference style and seldom offer directions, supervision, and empowerment to their subordinates. Therefore, the
organizational operation is in a loose status and managers are not able to use adequate leading strategy to reach organizational goals.

4.1.3 The differences in managers’ leadership styles by employees’ region

(1) More managers adopt a telling style in the southern region than those in northern, central, and eastern regions. There may be a relationship between slow information circulation, slow pace of life, and insufficient readiness to reach goals.

(2) There are significantly more managers in the northern region who adopt a delegating style than in the central region. This may be caused by more international tourist hotels and more hotels belonging to international chains, and faster information circulation in the northern region. Furthermore, the greater resources in terms of capable employees with specialty in food and tourism, and the higher readiness of managers are other possible factors contributing to this result.

4.2 The Differences in Organizational Commitment by Employees

Background

According to the results regarding the employees’ perception to organizational commitment, the employees of international tourism hotels have a positive organizational commitment. They also show high effort but low retention commitment.

4.2.1 The differences in organizational commitment by employees’ personal background

(1) The findings showed that the organizational commitment of employees of international tourism hotels was not significantly affected by the gender, education level, department, position, and number of hotels previously served.

(2) By the age, length of service and major subject, there is a significant difference in organizational commitment. Thus the null hypothesis 2, that there are no significant differences in organizational commitment of employees by their background, is rejected. The older the employees are, the higher their levels of organizational commitment. The employees with a longer length of service also express a higher level of organizational commitment. The employees who have graduated from non-tourism programs have more effort commitment than those majoring in home economics. The graduates majoring in food and tourism management, tourism business, leisure management, and Chinese and western food & cooking do not show superior performance in effort commitment.

4.2.2 The differences in organizational commitment by top-level leadership style

(1) When the top-level leadership is a democratic style, the degree of the subordinates’ overall and effort commitments are significantly higher than those led by authoritative and noninterference leadership styles. The subordinates led by a democratic leadership style have a higher degree of
value and retention commitments than those led by an authoritative leadership style. This finding implies that a democratic style has the highest degree of overall and effort commitments for subordinates and an authoritative style results in the lowest degree of overall and retention commitments for the followers.

(2) In terms of effort commitment, the employees led by a democratic style have the highest effort commitment, followed by those led by authoritative and interference styles.

4.2.3 The differences in organizational commitment by employees’ region

(1) The employees’ degree of value commitment in the northern region is significantly higher than that in central and eastern regions. The employees’ degree of value commitment in the southern region is significantly higher than that in the central region.

(2) The employees’ degree of effort commitment in the northern region is significantly higher than that in the central region.

(3) The employees’ degrees of retention commitment and overall commitment in the northern and southern regions are significantly higher than those in the central region.

4.3 The Relationship between Leadership Style and Organizational Commitment

4.3.1 The correlation between leadership style and organizational commitment

As shown in Table 3, selling, participating, and delegating styles of managers have a significant positive relationship with employees’ organizational commitment. Therefore, the null hypothesis 3, that there is no significance relationship between managers’ leadership style and employees’ organizational commitment, is rejected. The correlation between the telling style and employees’ organizational commitment is not significant. The findings indicate that when managers use more selling, participating, and delegating leadership styles, the employees’ organizational commitment is higher. In contrast, the use of the telling leadership style does not strengthen the employees’ organizational commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Value Commitment</th>
<th>Effort Commitment</th>
<th>Retention Commitment</th>
<th>Overall Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.475**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.562**</td>
<td>.553**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.429**</td>
<td>.305**</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.503**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>.411**</td>
<td>.508**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **P< .01.

4.3.2 The differences in organizational commitment by leadership style

As shown in Table 4, when managers of international tourism hotels adopt a
participating leadership style, employees perform best in the commitments of overall, value, effort, and retention. Employees perform worst in the four types of commitment when a telling leadership style is adopted. The managers with the selling style have a higher degree of retention and overall commitment than those with the delegating style. If managers adopt a delegating leadership style, the number of employees with value and effort commitment is greater than the number of those led by a selling style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Scheffé Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Commitment</td>
<td>(1) Selling</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>579.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>193.26</td>
<td>7.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Telling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.51</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>8447.27</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Participating</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9027.04</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Delegating</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>32.17</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Commitment</td>
<td>(1) Selling</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>144.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.26</td>
<td>5.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Telling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>2793.85</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Participating</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2938.63</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Delegating</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Commitment</td>
<td>(1) Selling</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>43.44</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1665.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>555.03</td>
<td>6.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Telling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.28</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>29184.9</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>89.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Participating</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30850.04</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Delegating</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>40.52</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>(1) Selling</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95.35</td>
<td>15.49</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4883.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1627.74</td>
<td>6.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Telling</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84.90</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>80038.49</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>244.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Participating</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>99.73</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84921.70</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Delegating</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>93.66</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *P< .05.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

(1) Most managers of international tourist hotels adopt a delegating style, fewer managers adopt selling and participating styles, and the telling style is least adopted. An employee’s major subject, department, length of service, top-level leadership style, and region, have significant influence on a manager’s leadership style.

(2) The variables, including age, length of service, major subject, top-level leadership style, and region, have a significant influence on employees’ organizational commitment.

(a) The older employee and the employee with a longer length of service have a higher degree of organizational commitment. The organizational commitment of the employees majoring in food and tourism is not as high as those who majored in other fields.
(b) Under democratic top-level leadership, the subordinates have the highest degree in value, effort, retention, and overall commitments. On the other hand, under authoritative top-level leadership, the subordinates perform the least retention and overall commitments. The subordinates under noninterference top-level leadership have the least effort commitment.

(c) The degrees of value, effort, retention, and overall commitment of employees in the northern region are higher than those in the central region. The degrees of value, retention, and overall commitment of the employees in the southern region are higher than those in the central region. Compared with other regions, the employees in the central region have the lowest levels of the four types of commitment.

(3) While selling, participating, and delegating styles are utilized more often by the managers of international tourism hotels, employees have higher organizational commitment. The employees under a participating leadership style achieve the highest value, effort, retention, and overall commitments. On the other hand, a telling leadership style used by managers is not able to enhance employees’ organizational commitment. Furthermore, the findings show that a telling style leads to the lowest level of the four types of organizational commitment.

5.2 Suggestions

Some relevant suggestions regarding international tourist hotels and the related college programs are provided as follows:

(1) **Suggestions for international tourist hotels**
   
   (a) The top-level decision maker should stress the ‘leading’ function as an essential factor in influencing their subordinates. It is suggested that top-level decision makers should adopt a democratic leadership instead of an authoritative or noninterference leadership.
   
   (b) Managers ought to employ a participating leadership style. It is recommended that the leaders of restaurants and the department of room service should pay more attention to developing efficient team work and express warm concern and trust to coworkers through participating leadership.
   
   (c) Based on the findings of the study, it is imperative to establish a sound system of benefits, promotion, and development in order to increase employees’ organizational commitment, reduce labor turnover, raise productivity and improve service quality. This suggestion also meets the viewpoint of Siguaw and Ens (1999), that reasonable pay, a good benefits system, and systematic promotion are the necessary ways to maintain human resources.
   
   (d) Employees should stress professional development. According to Bluedorn (1982), job satisfaction can affect organizational commitment, which influences the motivation of retention. Therefore, it is suggested that employees should take part in various training and workshops so as
to upgrade their skills to meet changing job requirements.

(e) It is necessary to facilitate the cooperation between universities and the hospitality industry. In order to obtain capable, professional, and stable human resources, international tourist hotels ought to establish a well-designed practical training program with full professional support, effective education, and work-experience in order to cultivate well-grounded graduates with a strong willingness to serve in the hospitality industry.

(2) **Suggestions for technological universities and colleges**

(a) Educational institutions should foster the professional attitude of students majoring in food and tourism. The tourism related programs at universities should arrange suitable curricula, course design, teaching, and other educational activities to facilitate students’ learning, passion, and self-identification.

(b) Universities should continue to promote an alliance with international tourist hotels. Through further collaboration, it is expected to attain more concrete outcomes such as curricula meetings, understanding the demands of hotels, more hotels’ practitioners teaching at universities, and greater opportunities for practical training.

(3) **Suggestions for the authorities concerned**

(a) The authorities concerned should make some plans to train managers in the aspects of effective leadership. Because the products and services provided by international tourist hotels depend on good performance from all members, from CEOs to lower supervisors, effective leadership plays a critical role. Roper et al. (1999) noted that in the hospitality industry, the source of the workforce tends to be international. In order to interact adequately with employees from different countries, managers need to adopt more effective leadership.

(b) The authorities concerned should make comprehensive plans to assist vocational high school and technological college teachers to improve their skill and gain work experience in international tourist hotels so that their teaching quality and teaching material will be enhanced.

(4) **Suggestions for further research**

(a) For further research, it is suggested to bring the employees of business, leisure, and supporting departments into the sample. Furthermore, top-level managers and managers can be interviewed to ascertain their perceptions regarding the leadership style and organizational commitment. The results of the study of the upper-level managers’ perceptions could profitably be compared with the findings of this study.

(b) Considering sampling, the stratified sampling by the operating style in international tourist hotels is suggested for further study. It can then be used to compare the differences in the leadership style and organization among various operating styles in terms of individual operations, local hotel chains, and international hotel chains.
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