10-3-2019

Leadership and Behavioral Integrity in the Restaurant Industry: the Moderating Roles of Gender

Anthony Gatling

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, anthony.gatling@unlv.edu

Denise H. Ramirez Molintas

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, denise.molintas@unlv.edu

Timothy T. Self

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, timothy.self@unlv.edu

Cass Shum

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, cass.shum@unlv.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/hotel_fac_articles

Part of the [Work, Economy and Organizations Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Gatling, A., Ramirez Molintas, D. H., Self, T. T., Shum, C. (2019). Leadership and Behavioral Integrity in the Restaurant Industry: the Moderating Roles of Gender. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism* 1-20. Taylor & Francis.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2020.1672249>

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Article in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Hospitality Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

Leadership and Behavior Integrity in the restaurant industry: The moderating roles of gender

Anthony Gatling, DBA
Assistant Professor
William F. Harrah College of Hospitality
University of Nevada Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 456013
Las Vegas, NV 89154-6021
anthony.gatling@unlv.edu

Denise Holly Ramirez Molintas
PhD Student
William F. Harrah College of Hospitality
University of Nevada Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 456013
Las Vegas, NV 89154-6021
molintas@unlv.nevada.edu

Timothy T. Self, PhD
Assistant Professor
William F. Harrah College of Hospitality
University of Nevada Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 456013
Las Vegas, NV 89154-6021
timothy.self@unlv.edu

Cass Shum, PhD
Assistant Professor in Hospitality Organizational Behavior
William F. Harrah College of Hospitality
University of Nevada Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 456013
Las Vegas, NV 89154-6021
cass.shum@unlv.edu

Leader behavior integrity and follower trust in the restaurant industry: The moderating role of
gender

Abstract

This study examined the effect of follower's gender on the relationship between leaders' enacted behavioral integrity (objective manipulation), follower's perception of leaders' behavioral integrity (subjective behavioral integrity), and subsequent trust in the leader. It is proposed that female followers are more sensitive to and have stronger trust reactions to leaders' behavioral integrity. Data was collected from 257 supervisors working in the restaurant industry using a scenario experiment. Results indicated that females have a stronger perception of the leaders' behavioral integrity relationship and a stronger trust in the leader than their male counterpart. Theoretical and practical implications of the findings were discussed.

KEYWORDS leader enacted behavioral integrity, gender, perception of behavioral integrity, trust in the leader

Introduction

One of the challenges for hospitality leaders is to build trust with a diverse group of followers (Walker, 2016). The number of women working in the service industry has increased tenfold in the last 3 decades. In 2017, there were 29.11 million women working in the service industry, compared with 2.58 million in 1977. In today's workforce, there is a 50/50 division between genders (U.S. Department of Labor, 2017). Such increased diversity in gender is not unique to the US, as it is also witnessed in Turkey (Pinar, McCuddy, Birkan, & Kozak, 2011), China (Yap, Ineson, Tang & Fong, 2015; Yi, Ribbens, Fu, & Cheng, 2015), and the United Arab Emirates (Al Ariss & Guo, 2016). However, women and men have different social roles (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989) and expectations (Bellou, 2011). Despite research on how leaders with different gender can influence follower's perception (Eagly & Johnson, 1990) and "glass-ceiling" effect of gender and leadership (e.g., Remington & Kitterlin-Lynch, 2018), there is surprisingly little amount of research on the effect of followers' gender on the leader-follower relationship (see Zhang, 2013 for an exception).

Interestingly, building trustful leader-follower relationships is important to the hospitality industry as it can be related to important followers' attitudes and performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Lolli, 2013). One way leaders can establish and maintain trust with followers is through perceptions of behavioral integrity – defined as "the perceived pattern of alignment between an actor's words and deeds" (Simons, 2002, p. 19). Research has evidenced the effect of leader's behavioral integrity on follower's trust – defined as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party" (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995, p. 712) in hospitality settings (e.g., Gatling, Shum, Book & Bai, 2017; Leroy, Palanski & Simons, 2012; Simons, Friedman, Liu & McLean Parks, 2007). Despite the usefulness of these studies, there are two

major limitations:

First, previous studies have measured behavioral integrity and trust using a survey design. Although survey studies have the advantage of external validity, they cannot prove causality (Fong, Law, Tang and Yap, 2016). It is possible that the previously demonstrated behavioral integrity-trust relationship suffered from reverse-causality – followers who trust their leaders are more likely to rate their leaders as having a high level of behavioral integrity. More importantly, previous studies have confused the difference between leaders' enacted (objective) behavioral integrity – defined in the present study as behaviors consistent with the leader's conduct – and follower's perceived (subjective) behavioral integrity – which are follower perceptions of the leader's behavior. In a seminal study of behavioral integrity, Simons (2002) suggested that behavioral integrity has both objective and subjective components. Although recent studies have focused on replicating existing findings (Davis & Rothstein, 2006; Moorman, Blakely & Darnold, in press), calls have gone out in the hospitality setting for experimental studies which can better shed light on the effect of leader's behavioral integrity on follower's trust (e.g., Gatling et al., 2017).

Second, leaders' enacted behavioral integrity is just one component of behavioral integrity (Simons, 2002). Simons and colleagues (2007) demonstrated that follower's characteristics can change the perception of behavioral integrity. Considering that women and men have been found to have a different focus (Ayman & Korabik, 2010), gender can change the perception of behavioral integrity. Understanding the effect of gender on subjective behavioral integrity perception further adds to the behavioral integrity literature by showing the factors underlying the peculiar nature of behavioral integrity. It adds to Simons et al. (2007) study on the effect of ethnicity on behavioral integrity perception by showing gender also change followers'

sensitivity to leaders' enacted behavioral integrity.

Third, males and females react differentially to their leaders' actions (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). As such, despite the usefulness of prior studies on the effects of leader's behavioral integrity, the universal approach may underestimate the effect of follower's gender on followers' trust reactions to their leaders' enacted behavioral integrity (i.e., the leaders' behavioral integrity–follower's trust relationship). Investigating the differential effect of leader's behavioral integrity on male and female follower's trust helps to shed light on how leaders should work with followers of different genders.

The purpose of this research is to understand the differential effect of followers' gender on the perception of and (trust) reaction to leader's behavioral integrity. Figure 1 illustrates the conceptual model). Specific objectives of this study were to:

1. Test the effect of a leader's enacted behavioral integrity and follower's trust.
2. Examine the effect of follower's gender on their perception sensitive to leaders' enacted behavioral integrity
3. Investigate the moderating effect of follower's gender on leader's behavioral integrity on follower's trust.

Figure 1. Conceptual model

Literature review

Behavioral integrity and follower's trust in the leader

One of the key duties of a hospitality leader is to build trust with their followers (Gill, 2008). A manner in which leaders may foster follower trust is enacting behavioral integrity (Simons, 2002). Behavioral integrity is a leader's capacity to "walk-the-talk" and to maintain follower confidence regarding the actions a leader will take. (Objective) Behavioral integrity includes leaders' behaviors such as word-deed argument, value-action arguments, and keeping promises. Indeed, there is substantial empirical support on the relationship between a leader's behavioral integrity and the level of follower's trust (e.g., Simons, 2002; Simons, Friedman, Liu & McLean Parks, 2008; Simons & Parks, 2000).

Mayer et al. (1995) argued that integrity, together with perceived ability, and benevolence, are antecedents to trust. Theoretically, a follower must believe that the leader's future action will benefit, or at least not hurt them in order to trust their leader (Molina-Morales and Martinez-Fernandez, 2009). Simons (2002) elaborately explained the theoretical links between behavioral integrity and trust, emphasizing that a leader's (enacted) behavioral integrity may lead to a follower's sense of assurance regarding the actions that the leader will take based on his or her words. With this sense of assurance, a follower is less likely to believe the leaders will hurt them. This, in turn, includes their likelihood for them to become vulnerable to the leader or to trust the leader. Accordingly:

Hypothesis 1. Leader's enacted behavioral integrity is positively related to follower's trust in the leader.

Gender roles in hospitality

Traditional social roles of males and females (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989) change males and

females' behaviors (Gursoy, Geng-Qing & Karadag, 2013) and expectations (Bellou, 2011). Studies have consistently assigned agentic and communal characteristics to men and women, respectively. Friendliness, sensitivity and a collaborative-nature are considered as important female characteristics; assertiveness, competitiveness, and strength are considered as important male characteristics (Eagly & Crowley, 1986; Mesch, Brown, Moore, & Hayat, 2011). These characteristics not only change female and males' behaviors but also change their reactions to workplace factors. For example, females tend to place greater importance on engaging in communal, benevolent behaviors than males do (Frame, Roberto, Schwab, & Harris, 2010). On the contrary, men place more importance on aggressiveness, competence, and performance (Frame et al., 2010).

Gender also has an effect on the leaders' career trajectory. Carvalho, Costa, Lykke, and Torres (2014) study asserts that while women were more educated than men, they hold a lower proportion of executive jobs in the travel sector in Portugal. This was supported by Blayney and Blotnicky (2010), and Remington and Kitterlin-Lynch (2018) who showed that women are facing more difficulties in accessing hospitality leadership positions. Specifically, Blayney and Blotnicky (2010) found women not only have fewer chances to reach top-level positions, they are also stuck at smaller, lower-starred properties. The effect of followers' gender in hospitality further highlights the problem of using survey design to understand the impact of leader's behavioral integrity and trust. Manipulation of leader's behaviors in an experimental design isolates (objective) leader's enacted and (subjective) follower's perceived behavioral integrity. It also avoids the oversampling of male leaders. Both problems are common in survey studies. Thus, the current study provides a more robust examination of leader's behavioral integrity in the hospitality setting.

Follower's Gender and Perception of Behavioral integrity

Although leaders' word-deed argument, value-action arguments, and promise-keeping actions constitute (enacted) behavioral integrity, Simons (2002) suggests that there are both objective and subjective component in behavioral integrity. Kannan-Narasimhan and Lawrence (2012) even stated that "a leader might align with words, but the perceiver might not perceive it as such." (p. 166). For example, Simons and colleagues (2008) found that African American followers are more likely to rate their leaders as having a high level of behavioral integrity when the leaders share the same ethnicity. This demonstrates followers' perception of leaders' behavioral integrity combines both the leader's objective demonstrations and a follower's subjective perceptions of the leader's behavioral integrity.

Research has demonstrated that males and females have different expectations of their leaders. Bellou (2011) stated that female followers expect their leaders to be more people-oriented. Since males are hierarchical, independent, dominant, and logical (Eagly 1987; Williams and Best, 1990; Konrad, Ritchie, Lieb and Corrigan, 2000), they expect their leaders to be more task orientated (Bellou, 2011). Their differential focus changes the leadership behaviors that they paid attention to. In particular, leaders can exhibit both task-related and people-related behaviors (Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004). While word-deed agreement and enacting values are considered as people-related behaviors, performance-related behaviors are considered as task-related behaviors (Judge et al., 2004). Female followers expect their leaders to be people-oriented (Bellou, 2011), thus they are more likely to pay attention to leaders' people-related behaviors, such as behavioral integrity. Female followers' relational approach makes them more sensitive towards leaders' enacted behavioral integrity. On the other hand, as male followers expect their leaders to be task-oriented (Bellou, 2011), they are less likely to pay attention to leaders' people-

related behaviors. As such, it is expected that female followers will be more sensitive to (objective) leaders' enacted behavioral integrity than male followers.

Hypothesis 2. Follower's gender moderates the relationship between (objective) leaders' enacted behavioral integrity and (subjective) follower's perception of leader behavioral integrity such that the relationship is stronger for female followers than for male followers.

The moderating role of follower's gender

In addition to the perceptual differences, previous literature has also shown that followers' gender may influence hospitality leader-followers interactions. For example, Zhang (2013) showed that females and males differ in their use of upward influence tactics on their supervisors with different genders. Doyle, Findlay, and Young (2012) suggested that female followers are more likely to report that they learn from their boss than men. Research has also shown differences in trust dynamics based on gender (Buchan, Croson & Solnick, 2008; Haselhuhn, Kennedy, Kray, Zant & Schweitzer, 2015).

Females tend to value communal and benevolent behavior while males place more value on performance (Frame et. al, 2010). This value may change followers' reactions to leadership behaviors. Given their higher vulnerability compared to male counterparts (Hollander, 2002), female followers are more likely to value leader's behavioral integrity. Considering leaders with high behavioral integrity have a high level of word-deed alignment, females may use leaders' words and values to judge whether interacting with the leader is risky. This, in turn, may cause female followers to react strongly towards leaders' who behave with integrity.

Because of their physical strength, males are less vulnerable in social interactions (Hollander, 2002). Their values make them more likely to value aggressiveness (Frame et al.,

2010) and performance (Bellou, 2011). They are more likely to trust leaders based on their competence or ability to achieve results (Berkery, Morley and Tiernan, 2013), instead of their word-deed alignment. In other words, male and female followers trust their leaders based on different characteristics – male followers trust leaders who can achieve results (i.e., revenue growth, cost control, earnings growth) while female followers trust leaders based on the process through which leaders achieve results (i.e., behavioral integrity behaviors). The value differences change the relationship between leaders' behavioral integrity and male follower's trust in the leader. Accordingly:

Hypothesis 3. Follower's gender moderates the relationship between leader's enacted behavioral integrity and follower's trust in the leader such that the relationship is stronger for female followers than for male followers.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited to participate in the 20-minute experiment via Qualtrics panel, an online survey platform, in exchange for redeemable points (at a value of \$1). Specifically, Qualtrics sent email to potential participants, who were pre-registered as online survey panelists with basic demographic information (e.g., age, gender, race, industry), with the study information, length of the survey, point value, and a link to the survey. Participants who were interested were directed to two screening questions, including (1) Do you work in the restaurant industry, and (2) "Are you a supervisor of at least 1 or more individuals". To ensure that the participants could conceive and visualize our fictional scenario (e.g., Goffin & Anderson, 2007), only participants who fulfill the two above criteria were allowed to work on the survey.

Procedure

This study used a two-factor scenario experiment in a between-subject design. After the screening process, which included verification of working as a supervisor in the restaurant, participants answered questions on their demographics. Then, participants were randomly assigned to one of the two conditions (High leader's behavioral integrity vs. Low leader's behavioral integrity), where they were told to imagine they work for a restaurant general manager. They read a scenario about a typical week of that restaurant general manager. The participants then rated the general manager's behavioral integrity and their trust in this leader.

Measures

The survey contained three main sections: (1) a section on participants' demographic characteristics, where participants report their gender, age, race, education and income level; (2) a section where leader's behavioral integrity was manipulated, (3) a survey section where participants rate the perception of leader's behavioral integrity and the extent to which they trust this hypothesized leader (i.e., the restaurant general manager).

Demographic Variables

Participants reported their gender (1 = male, 0 = female) and their age by selecting the age group they belonged to (i.e. 18-24, 25-31, 32-40, 41-50, 51-60, over 60). They also indicated their ethnicity by choosing "White", "Hispanic/ Black", "Native American", "Asian", and "Other". They indicated their highest education level by choosing "High School", "Associate's Degree", "Bachelor's Degree", and "Master's or above".

Manipulation of leader's behavioral integrity

Leader's behavioral integrity was manipulated through the restaurant general manager's behaviors. The manipulation is summarized in Appendix A. In the high behavioral integrity scenario, the general manager keeps his promise, and is honest and committed. In the low

behavioral integrity condition, the general manager does not “walk his talk” and refuses to admit mistakes. To ensure the comparability, the two scenarios shared the same background and settings and had similar lengths. These scenario scripts were evaluated by three hospitality researchers to ensure face validity and reality.

Perception of leader’s behavioral integrity and trust in the leader

Participants rated the perception of the general manager’s behavioral integrity using Simons and colleagues (2008) eight-item behavioral integrity scale on a five-point Likert scale (1 = “*strongly disagree*” and 5 = “*strongly agree*”). A sample item states “My leader practices what he/she preaches”. Participants also rated the extent to which they would trust the general manager using Simons, et al. (2008) three-item trust scale on a five-point Likert scale (1 = “*strongly disagree*” and 5 = “*strongly agree*”). A sample item states “I would not mind putting my well-being in my leader’s hands”.

Results

Sample characteristics

After excluding missing data, the final sample consisted of 257 supervisors working in the restaurant industry with 130 and 127 participants randomly assigned to high and low integrity condition, respectively. As detailed in Table 1, 62.3% of them were male; 75.5% had an age between 25 to 40 years old; and 62.2% were Caucasian.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

Characteristic		Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	62.30%
	Female	37.70%
Age Group	18-24	6.90%
	25-31	45%
	32-40	30.50%
	41-50	14.10%
	51-60	3.10%
	Over 60	0.40%
Race	White	62.20%
	Hispanic/ Black	22.00%
	Native American	6.60%
	Asian	7.30%
	Other	1.90%
Education	High School	8.50%
	Associate's Degree	12.30%
	Bachelor's Degree	51.50%
	Master's or above	13.50%

Behavioral Integrity and Trust in Leaders

To test the distinctiveness of two output variables (behavioral integrity perception and trust in leaders), a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using Mplus 7.3 (Muthen & Muthen, 2015). Table 2 illustrated items' factor loading. The initial 2-factor measurement provided a good fit to the data ($\chi^2_{[43]} = 70.38$; RMSEA = .049, CFI = .98, SRMR = .03). It also had significantly better fit to the data than a one-common-factor measurement model ($\chi^2_{[44]} = 79.26$; $\Delta \chi^2_{[44]} = 79.26$; $p < .01$; RMSEA = .06, CFI = .98, SRMR = .03). Additionally, the two measurement scales (behavioral integrity and trust) had good reliability with Cronbach's alpha of .90 and .79, respectively. `

Table 2. Factor loadings of outcomes measures

Factor	Indicator	Description	Standardized loading	Composite reliability
Perceived behavioral integrity				
	BI_1	There is a match between my leader's words and actions.	1	0.9
	BI_2	My leader delivers on promises.	1.23	
	BI_3	My leader practices what he/she preaches.	1.243	
	BI_4	My leader does what he/she says he/she will do.	1.122	
	BI_5	My leader conducts himself/herself by the same values he/she talks about.	1.149	
	BI_6	My leader shows the same priorities that he/she describes.	1.168	
	BI_7	When my leader promises something, I can be certain that it will happen.	1.244	
	BI_8	If my leader says he/she is going to do something, he/she will.	1.222	
Trust in leader				
	T_1	I would be willing to let my leader have complete control over my future in this company.	1	0.79
	T_2	I would not mind putting my well-being in my leader's hands.	1.084	
	T_3	I would feel good about letting my leader make decisions that seriously affect my life.	1.127	

One-way ANOVA was used to test the effect of the experiment condition (i.e., leader's behavioral integrity behaviors) on perceived behavioral integrity. Table 3 summarizes the means and standard deviants for each condition. F-test results showed that there is a statistically significant difference between experimental condition on perceived behavioral integrity ($M_{\text{high behavioral integrity}} = 3.95$, $M_{\text{low behavioral integrity}} = 3.07$, $F(1, 263) = 55.49$, $p < .01$). It shows that followers are more likely to rate their leaders as having a high level of behavioral integrity when the leader uses more behavioral integrity behaviors. This provides support to our successful manipulation of behavioral integrity as well as supports Simons (2002) suggestions that behavioral integrity has both objective (i.e., the leader's enacted behavioral integrity) and subjective (i.e., follower's perception) components.

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Condition

	Low leader's behavioral integrity behaviors				High leader's behavioral integrity behaviors			
	female followers		male followers		female followers		male followers	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Perceived behavioral integrity	2.63	1.35	3.36	0.93	4.22	0.69	3.83	0.60
Trust in leader	2.42	1.38	3.32	0.99	3.96	0.72	3.83	0.56

Hypothesis 1. Leader's enacted behavioral integrity is positively related to follower's trust in the leader.

Supporting Hypothesis 1, behavioral integrity condition had a main effect on follower's trust in leader ($M_{\text{high behavioral integrity group}} = 3.95$, $M_{\text{low behavioral integrity group}} = 3.07$, $F = 55.49$, $p < .01$). The results confirm that followers are more likely to trust their leaders when their leaders enact behavioral integrity.

Hypothesis 2. Follower's gender moderates the relationship between (objective) leaders' enacted behavioral integrity and (subjective) follower's perception of leader behavioral integrity such that the relationship is stronger for female followers than for male followers.

Hypothesis 2 suggests that follower's gender moderates the effect of (objective) leader's enacted behavioral integrity and follower's (subjective) perception of leader behavioral integrity. ANOVA results provided support to the hypotheses that male and females rate their leaders' behavioral integrity differentially ($F = 22.09, p < .01$). As shown in Figure 2, females are more sensitive to their leader's behavioral integrity behaviors – they are more likely to give more extreme rating to leaders who enacted low behavioral integrity ($M = 2.63$) and those who enacted high behavioral integrity ($M = 4.22$) than their male counterpart ($M_{\text{high behavioral integrity group}} = 3.83$, $M_{\text{low behavioral integrity group}} = 3.36$).

Figure 2. Effect of Follower's Gender and Leader's Enacted Behavioral Integrity on Follower's Perceived Behavioral Integrity.

Hypothesis 3. Follower's gender moderates the relationship between leader's enacted behavioral integrity and follower's trust in the leader such that the relationship is stronger for female followers than for male followers.

Hypothesis 3 suggests that the relationship between leaders' enacted behavioral integrity and follower's trust in leader differ in gender groups. There was a significant interaction between gender and enacted behavioral integrity on trust ($F = 18.30, p < .01$). Supporting Hypothesis 3, Figure 3 shows that the relationship between leaders' behavioral integrity and followers trust is stronger for females ($M_{\text{high behavioral integrity group}} = 3.96, M_{\text{low behavioral integrity group}} = 2.42$) than males ($M_{\text{high behavioral integrity group}} = 3.83, M_{\text{low behavioral integrity group}} = 3.32$). This indicates that females are more likely to trust their leaders based on their objective enacted behavioral integrity than their male counterpart.

Figure 3. Effect of Follower's Gender and Leader's Enacted Behavioral Integrity on Follower's Trust in Leader

Discussion

Theoretically, this study makes four major contributions. First, by demonstrating the casual nature of the relationship in an experiment, it extends various field studies which showed a positive relationship between leader's behavioral integrity and follower's trust (e.g., Gatling et al., 2017; Leroy et al., 2012; Simons et al., 2007). Second, by showing that enacted behavioral integrity and perceived behavioral integrity is positively, but not perfectly, correlated, it provides a direct test to Simons' (2002) argument that behavioral integrity has both subjective and objective components. Third, in line with Simons et al. (2007) findings, this study shows that even if leaders are consistent in their enacted behavioral integrity, their followers can have different perceptions. While Simons et al. (2007) study focused on ethnicity, this study shows that follower's dispositional characteristics (in term of gender) can change their sensitivity to leader's enacted behavioral integrity. Fourth, consistent with Zhang's (2013) study on upward maintenance tactics, this study shows that female and male followers interact with their leaders differently. Specifically, the results demonstrate that female followers are more likely to trust their leaders based on leader's behavioral integrity.

Conclusion and Implications

The purpose of this study was to understand the role of follower's gender on the relationship among leaders' enacted behavioral integrity, follower's perception of leader behavioral integrity, and their trust in leaders. Specifically, the objectives were 1) to test the effect of leaders' enacted behavioral integrity on trust, 2) to examine the effect of follower's gender on the subjective perception of the leader's behavioral integrity, and 3) to investigate the moderating effect of follower's gender on the relationship between leader's enacted behavioral integrity and follower's trust. The results of this study demonstrated that leaders who exhibit a

high level of behavioral integrity are more likely to be trusted by followers. Results from the scenario experiment also showed that follower gender changes follower's perception of and (trust-related) reaction to leader enacted behavioral integrity. The major take-a-way as indicated by a stronger effect of enacted behavioral integrity on perceived behavioral integrity, is that this study shows that females are more sensitive to leader's enacted behavioral integrity. Finally, compare to their male counterparts, female followers are more likely to trust leaders who enact a high level of behavioral integrity. Such findings yield important practical implications.

Practical Implications

The study also sheds light on managerial practices. One key finding is that leader's enacted behavioral integrity is a predictor of follower's trust in their leaders. Since trust in the leader is often linked to trust in the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2010), it is imperative that organizations put protocols in place to monitor the behavioral integrity of their leaders by utilizing 360-feedback with a specific focus on perceptions of leader integrity. Specifically, organizations can include the behavioral integrity measures as listed in Table 2 in employees' annual organizational climate surveys. The aggregated responses from all followers, fellow leaders, and senior leaders can be used as a measure of leader's behavioral integrity. These steps will help organizations examine the extent to which leaders own up to their mistakes, blame others for errors, and seek to cover up unethical behavior.

Additionally, organizations may consider using performance appraisals that not only measure business results, but that also measure the leaders' behavioral integrity. Typically, performance appraisals tend to focus exclusively on whether tangible outcomes, such as targets, goals, or other results-based measures, are achieved. Ongoing behavioral observations related to "how" results are obtained can be useful in determining whether goals are met in a sustainable

and ethical manner. In addition to the 360-feedback survey as suggested above, senior leaders should be explicit when communicating codes of ethics, particularly with leaders suspected of having integrity issues with followers and should closely track complaints involving corruption, kick-backs, financial statement fraud, and harassment. This is particularly important for the restaurant industry where margins are tight and the emphasis on performance goals can impair leaders' integrity (Welsh and Ordóñez, 2014)

Organizations should provide leaders with coaching in handling integrity-related issues that impact company values or principles. Specifically, organizations may provide its leaders with behavioral integrity coaching by using relevant examples of ethical issues that have occurred in the recent past. Higher-up managers should provide coaching to their subordinates in formal settings, such as annual evaluation meetings together with follow up coaching as integrity-related situations arise (at all levels of the organization). Simulations designed with content-focused ethical dilemmas aimed at reinforcing organizational values or principles, as well as potential consequences related to a lack of moral judgement can be very useful in enabling stronger commitment to behavior integrity. In terms of values or principles, organizations should seek to expand definitions of ethical principles such as integrity to include descriptions of factors such as honesty and promise-keeping. Organizations can coach leaders on how to make decisions when confronted with ethical dilemmas, such as admitting mistakes. They should not punish leaders who "tell the truth" as such punishment may discourage leader's behavioral integrity and hurt follower's trust. Additionally, to develop new leaders through social learning, formal mentoring programs could be created by pairing leaders who are known for high behavioral integrity with new supervisors. Quarterly roundtables could be used to bring mentor/mentee pairs together to examine case studies and to share learnings and experiences.

The results also showed that gender plays a significant role in judging leader's behavioral integrity – females are not only more sensitive, but also have stronger reactions to leader's (enacted) behavioral integrity. As such, in examining the abovementioned employee engagement data, it may be a good idea to look at the gender differences and take additional action (training, accountability, etc.) if needed. Within the context of supervisor diversity education, it is recommended that organizations call their leaders to pay attention to the perceptual differences in the way female followers experience behavioral integrity with the use of role-play and case studies. Facilitators can invite male and female employees to talk about their expectation of the supervisors' behavioral integrity. They can use hypothetical situations, drawn from actual incidents involving integrity issues (internal or external), to stimulate responses and understand followers' expectation. Such open discussion can showcase the fact that female followers have been found to be more idealistic about ethical behavior and more aware and sensitive to ethical issues (Davis & Rothstein, 2006). The leaders can also benefit from such discussion by adjusting their leadership behaviors based on employees' expectations.

Given the established effect of trust and turnover (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), hospitality firms may find these results helpful in identifying ways to reduce voluntary turnover, especially among female employees. This study suggests a lack of behavioral integrity has a greater impact on trust in female followers than on male followers. It may explain why female employees are less likely to trust the leaders and to have a higher level of voluntary turnover when they are working with leaders with low behavioral integrity. Organizations should monitor divisions, regions, districts, and areas to detect patterns of voluntary female turnover, as well as female representation rates across all levels of the organization. Managerial education focusing on the importance that building trust through keeping promises, being consistent, and communicating

values toward employees can be especially important to departments with more female followers, such as housekeeping. Given the importance of leader's behavioral integrity in the eyes of female followers, a zero-tolerance policy should be reinforced – supervisors, regardless of their level and performance, should be warned and even terminated if they were caught lying, and/ or engaging in fraudulent activities. A strong commitment increasing the behavioral integrity of leaders throughout an organization may require additional time and resources, however, the benefits of stronger trust in the leader will likely outweigh the investment (cf. Gatling et al., 2017).

Limitations and future research

The primary strength of this study is the use of randomized experimentation, which is more effective than surveys to demonstrate the causality of the relationship (Schneider, Carnoy, Kilpatrick, Schmidt & Shavelson, 2007) and controls for known and unknown sources of errors (Kirk, 1982). The use of restaurant supervisors further enhance the validity of the findings.

However, the study is not without limitation: First, the use of restaurant sample as well as a scenario in restaurant settings limits the generalizability of the research findings to other hospitality segments. Second, the use of online convenience sample may limit the sample characteristics to the relatively younger population who are familiar with technology. Third, the use of a scenario experiment may threaten the external validity of our findings. Future studies may replicate the findings using a stratified sampling in a quasi-experimental design.

In this paper, it is proposed that female and male have different characteristics, work values, and expectation. However, these differences were not tested in this study. Thus, it is suggested that future research extend our model by understanding the underlying mechanisms through which gender changes the behavioral integrity – trust relationship. Additionally, future research may

Follower Gender, Behavioral integrity, and trust

investigate the roles of other followers' dispositional characteristics on the behavioral integrity – trust relationship. Generational differences would be especially interesting as current trends show an increase in deferred retirements and a hospitality workforce of three major generations (Baby boomers, Gen X, and millennials) (Kalrgyrou & Costen, 2017). Their differential values and expectations (Gursoy, Geng-Qing, & Karadag, 2013; Kim & Agrusa, 2011) can change follower's reactions to leader's behavioral integrity.

References

- Al Ariss, A., & Guo, G. C. (2016). Job allocations as cultural sorting in a culturally diverse organizational context. *International Business Review*, 25, 579-588.
- Ayman, R., & Korabik, K. (2010). Leadership: Why gender and culture matter. *American Psychologist*, 65, 157.
- Bellou, V. (2011). Do women followers prefer a different leadership style than men? The *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(, 2818-2833.
- Berkery, E., Morley, M., & Tiernan, S. (2013). Beyond gender role stereotypes and requisite managerial characteristics: from communal to androgynous, the changing views of women. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 28, 278-298.
- Blayney, C., & Blotnicky, K. (2010). The impact of gender on career paths and management capability in the hotel industry in Canada. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 9, 233-255.
- Buchan, N. R., Croson, R. T., & Solnick, S. (2008). Trust and gender: An examination of behavior and beliefs in the Investment Game. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 68, 466-476.
- Carvalho, I., Costa, C., Lykke, N., & Torres, A. (2014). Women sitting on the glass roof: Critical perspectives on the tourism sector. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento*, 5, 35-37.
- Davis, A. L., & Rothstein, H. R. (2006). The effects of the perceived behavioral integrity of managers on employee attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67, 407-419.
- Dirks, K. T. & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in Leadership: Meta-Analytic Findings and Implications for Research and Practice, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 611–628.

- Doyle, W., Findlay, S., & Young, J. D. (2012). Workplace learning issues of hotel employees: examining differences across management status and gender. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 11*, 259-279.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological bulletin, 100*, 283-308.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin, 108*, 233.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*, 543-558.
- Eisenberger, R., Karagonlar, G., Stinglhamber, F., Neves, P., Becker, T. E., Gonzalez-Morales, M. G., & Steiger-Mueller, M. (2010). Leader–member exchange and affective organizational commitment: The contribution of supervisor's organizational embodiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 1085.
- Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2016). Impact of behavioral integrity on organizational identification. *Management Research Review, 39*, 672-691.
- Fong, L. H. N., Law, R., Tang, C. M. F., & Yap, M. H. T. (2016). Experimental research in hospitality and tourism: A critical review. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 28*, 246-266.
- Frame, M. C., Roberto, K. J., Schwab, A. E., & Harris, C. T. (2010). What is important on the job? Differences across gender, perspective, and job level. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*, 36-56.

- Gatling, A., Shum, C., Book, L., & Bai, B. (2017). The influence of hospitality leaders' relational transparency on followers' trust and deviance behaviors: Mediating role of behavioral integrity. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 62, 11-20.
- Gill, A. S. (2008). The role of trust in employee-manager relationship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20, 98-103.
- Goffin, R. D., & Anderson, D. W. (2007). The self-rater's personality and self-other disagreement in multi-source performance ratings: Is disagreement healthy? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 271-289.
- Gursoy, D., Geng-Qing Chi, C., & Karadag, E. (2013). Generational differences in work values and attitudes among frontline and service contact employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 40-48.
- Haselhuhn, M. P., Kennedy, J. A., Kray, L. J., Van Zant, A. B., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2015). Gender differences in trust dynamics: Women trust more than men following a trust violation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56, 104-109.
- Hollander, J. A. (2002). Resisting vulnerability: The social reconstruction of gender in interaction. *Social Problems*, 49, 474-496.
- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of applied psychology*, 89, 36.
- Kannan-Narasimhan, R., & Lawrence, B. S. (2012). Behavioral integrity: How leader referents and trust matter to workplace outcomes. *Journal of business ethics*, 111, 165-178.
- Katou, A. A. (2015). Transformational leadership and organisational performance: Three serially mediating mechanisms. *Employee Relations*, 37, 329-353.
- Kirk, R. E. (1982). *Experimental design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

- Kalargyrou, V., & Costen, W. (2017). Diversity management research in hospitality and tourism: past, present and future. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29, 68-114.
- Kim, H. J., & Agrusa, J. (2011). Hospitality service employees' coping styles: the role of emotional intelligence, two basic personality traits, and socio-demographic factors. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30, 588-598.
- Konrad, A. M., Ritchie Jr, J. E., Lieb, P., & Corrigan, E. (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 126, 593.
- Leroy, H., Palanski, M. E., & Simons, T. (2012). Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 255-264.
- Lolli, J. (2013). Perceptions of the importance and preparedness of interpersonal communication skills of the entry-level hospitality leader: Implications for hospitality educators. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 13, 354-373.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of management review*, 20, 709-734.
- Mesch, D. J., Brown, M. S., Moore, Z. I., & Hayat, A. D. (2011). Gender differences in charitable giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16, 342-355.
- Molina-Morales, F. X., & Martínez-Fernández, M. T. (2009). Too much love in the neighborhood can hurt: How an excess of intensity and trust in relationships may produce negative effects on firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30, 1013-1023.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Darnold, T. C. (in press). Understanding how perceived

- leader integrity affects follower trust: Lessons from the use of multidimensional measures of integrity and trust. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. doi: 1548051817750544.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. (2015). *Mplus user's guide. Seventh edition*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Pinar, M., McCuddy, M. K., Birkan, I., & Kozak, M. (2011). Gender diversity in the hospitality industry: an empirical study in Turkey. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30, 73-81.
- Remington, J., & Kitterlin-Lynch, M. (2018). Still pounding on the glass ceiling: A study of female leaders in hospitality, travel, and tourism management. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 17, 22-37.
- Schneider, B., Carnoy, M., Kilpatrick, J., Schmidt, W. H., & Shavelson, R. J. (2007). *Estimating causal effects using experimental and observational designs* [White Paper]. Retrieved September 1, 2015 from <http://www.aera.net/Publications/Books/Estimating-Causal-Effects-Using-Experimental-and-Observational-Designs>
- Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13, 18-35.
- Simons, T. L., Friedman, R., Liu, L. A., & McLean Parks, J. (2008). The importance of behavioral integrity in a multicultural workplace. *Cornell Hospitality Report*, 8, 6-16.
- Simons, T., Friedman, R., Liu, L. A., & McLean Parks, J. (2007). Racial differences in sensitivity to behavioral integrity: attitudinal consequences, in-group effects, and "trickle down" among Black and non-Black employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1-31.
- Simons, T., & Parks, J. M. (2000). *The sequential impact of behavioral integrity on trust*,

commitment, discretionary service behavior, customer satisfaction, and profitability.

Cornell University, Center for Hospitality Research.

U.S. Department of Labor (2017, February 8). *Employed persons by detailed industry, sex, race, and Hispanic or Latino ethnicity*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat18.htm>

Walker, M. (2016). Hospitality in Jeopardy: Organizing Diverse Low-Wage Service Workers. *SAGE Open*, 6, 1-11.

Welsh, D. T., & Ordóñez, L. D. (2014). The dark side of consecutive high performance goals: Linking goal setting, depletion, and unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123(2), 79-89.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study. *Cross-cultural research and methodology series* (Rev. Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Yap, M. H., Ineson, E. M., Tang, C. M., & Fong, L. H. (2015). Chinese Hospitality Students' Perceptions of Diversity Management. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 27, 60-68.

Zhang, R. (2013). Employee gender vs. supervisor gender: Gender interaction effects in employees' upward influence behavior in hotels. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12, 355-375.

Appendix A

Study 1 Experiment Scenarios

The following paragraphs describe a typical week in the life of a restaurant supervisor. Please read through this information carefully, and then answer the questions about this material as directed.

Background information:

Dave Jones is the general manager for a casual dining restaurant company. Although Dave does receive some direction from the regional director of operations, Dave has a significant amount of control over the team. For instance, Dave sets customer satisfaction goals for his restaurant and he realizes the connection between customer satisfaction, loyalty, and restaurant sales, which is positively linked to manager bonuses.

The team consists of Dave Jones and four other managers (Victoria, Nguyen, DeAndre, and Jake), all of whom have worked for Dave for at least 6 months.

Monday:

Like usual, Dave presides over the Monday morning meeting with the team. Here are some selected quotes that Dave made during the meeting:

“You all know that we need to meet our customer satisfaction goals this month, but I want to say once again that we must make our customer satisfaction goals the right way. We never compromise our values here.”

“Victoria, I know that you have been having a hard time trying to get your servers to follow our steps of service and demonstrate consistently friendly attitudes toward customers—I promise that I will clear some time on my schedule this week to help you with motivational tactics.”

“It's much easier to keep a current customer happy than to find a new customer, so I want to make sure that all of our managers are spending time building relationships with our existing customers. OK? That includes me.”

Tuesday:

Team member Victoria sends the following email to Dave: “Dave, as you mentioned in yesterday's meeting, we need to set up a time to discuss tactics improving customer satisfaction. I have a server meeting scheduled for this Saturday so can you meet with me on Thursday—as you know, this is really important.”

Dave responds with this email: “Victoria, Thursday is very busy for me, but I will make time for the meeting. See you then.”

Wednesday:

High behavioral integrity condition

Dave spends the entire lunch period building relationships with customers.

Just after lunch, Nguyen, another team member, walks into Dave's office and asks, "Dave, I've got a great opportunity to increase our customer satisfaction scores before the quarter ends this week. Sandy, a friend of mine from college, just called and she is bringing a party of 30 in this weekend. I told her about needing a strong weekend of customer satisfaction reports and she said that she could collect all guest check survey from the members of her party and that she would personally call them in from different cell phones and give all excellent ratings! This could seal the deal on our bonus this quarter. No one would have to know and you can pretend you didn't hear what I just said." "Our families need this bonus, given the downturn in the economy."

Dave answers Nguyen's question, saying, "Nguyen, while I understand the financial impact of not making the numbers this quarter, we cannot engage in fraudulent activity."

Nguyen responds, "But it won't be us calling in the surveys"

Dave replies, "To have knowledge of such activity and to turn our heads would be just a wrong as calling them in ourselves."

Low behavioral integrity condition

Dave begins the lunch period building relationships with existing customers, but after 30 minutes, an old co-worker stops in the office. They spend the next two hours chatting about old times. It is very apparent to the rest of the team that Dave is not spending time with customers. Just after lunch, Nguyen, another team member, walks into Dave's office and asks, "Dave, I've got a great opportunity to increase our customer satisfaction scores before the quarter ends this week. Sandy, a friend of mine from college, just called and she is bringing a party of 30 in this weekend. I told her about needing a strong weekend of customer satisfaction reports and she said that she could collect all guest check survey from the members of her party and that she would personally call them in from different cell phones and give all excellent ratings! This could seal the deal on our bonus this quarter. No one would have to know and you can pretend you didn't hear what I just said." "Our families need this bonus, given the downturn in the economy."

Nguyen asks, "So what should I tell her?"

Dave turns away and pretends to have a private conversation with himself, "Let me think about this for a second. None of the managers would be calling in the surveys. It's none of our business what process customers use to call in surveys. We really do need a great weekend of customer satisfaction to earn our bonuses."

Dave then turns to Nguyen and says, "I didn't hear what you said. Did you say that we were going to have a great week of customer satisfaction?"

Nguyen replies, "Yes I did! Dave responds, "Excellent!"

Thursday:

Dave wakes up on Thursday morning and checks email. Dave's boss, the VP of operations, has asked Dave to prepare a brief summary about Dave's leadership of the team for an executive meeting. Specifically, Dave is being considered for a promotion and his boss really supports him. Dave knows that this project could be a convenient excuse for skipping the meeting with Victoria.

High behavioral integrity condition

Dave calls Victoria on her cell phone, saying, "Victoria, I am on my way. I had a request from my boss to do some work, but I will do it tonight. This meeting is a priority and I made a promise to you."

After she hangs up, Victoria calls DeAndre, another member of the team. Victoria says, "DeAndre, can you believe it? Dave had something come up, but is still coming to the meeting. This always happens."

DeAndre responds, "Yes, that's pretty typical for Dave. No doubt about it—Dave Jones models what it means to be honest and committed." After the meeting, Dave spends all afternoon and most of the evening finishing the summary for his boss.

Low behavioral integrity condition

Dave calls Victoria on her cell phone, saying, "Victoria, I am sorry to break my promise, but something just came up and I can't make the meeting."

After she hangs up, Victoria calls DeAndre, another member of the team. Victoria says, "DeAndre, can you believe it? Dave isn't coming to the meeting. This always happens."

DeAndre responds, "Yes, that's pretty typical for Dave. Dave spends all morning working on the summary, but is still able to go home early."

Friday:

Dave drags into the office and would give anything to avoid working the dining room.

High behavioral integrity condition

Still, Dave knows that connecting and engaging customers is a priority for the team, and spends the rest of - the lunch period with customers.

Dave spends Friday afternoon analyzing customer satisfaction data and preparing for next Monday's meeting.

Low behavioral integrity condition

Dave then mutters, "Hey, I'm the boss. Status does have its privileges," and then heads out to the local coffee shop to read the newspaper.

Dave spends Friday afternoon analyzing customer satisfaction data and preparing for next Monday's meeting.