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ABSTRACT

Essential Management Competencies in the Timeshare Industry
by

Yun-Kyung Choi

Dr. Gail Sammons, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Hotel Management
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to identify the essential competencies for general managers in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Competencies were seen as knowledge, skill, ability that is needed by the timeshare/vacation ownership general managers to successfully accomplish his/her daily work.

The competencies were identified, verified, and validated by a group of general managers in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry who participated in a one-round modified Delphi study and a feedback loop. Through this process, the investigator managed to approach consensus among the participants and generate adequate information on the required competencies for general managers in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry.

The modified Delphi study allowed the investigator to: rank order among the proposed competencies according to mean responses from Round I questionnaire; identify additional competencies that were not included in the Round I questionnaire; and identify 22 essential competencies for general managers in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. The findings of this study showed that a number of the 22 essential
competencies fall under Sandwith's (1993) competency domain (i.e. leadership, interpersonal, and administrative).

The results of this study help to improve hospitality industry academics' and practitioners' understanding of essential competencies needed for general managers in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The current and future success of an enterprise is a reflection of the effectiveness of the senior management team, its vision and leadership, and the combined knowledge and skills of the organization's workforce. Identifying the key competencies of a critical management or specialty, which will enable enterprises to meet the demand of the future is determined as a key responsibility of senior business executives, human resource practitioners, educationalists, public administrators, and government leaders (Pickett, 1998). Heffernan and Flood (2000) state in their study that one new human resource theme is that competencies can help organizations to manage jobs with the changing environment and technology. Despite the fact that the competencies concept is the key to future success, it is still relatively new to the hospitality industry.

The concept of competency has no single origin and has been around for centuries. Many years ago, the concept of competency was through apprentices who learned skills by working with a master and who were awarded with certifications once they reached a certain level of success. With the Industrial Revolution more studies were done on work, jobs, and the skills needed for them (Horton, 2000). During this time, many studies focused on aptitude tests in order to determine who would be a successful employee at a certain job. However, this concept changed during the 1970s. In 1973, David McClelland's article in the Harvard Business review stated that...
behavioral traits and characteristics are much more effective than aptitude tests in
determining who is and who is not successful in job performance (McClelland, 1973).
The work of McClelland will be further discussed in the following chapter.

In the hospitality industry, competencies can be used as the tool to manage job
proficiency with the changing environment, as well as to understand the different job
positions. By studying those who have been successful in their jobs an employer can
gain knowledge about the jobs and careers within the hospitality industry (Ladkin &
Juwaheer, 2000). Thus, many studies on competencies were conducted for different
management levels. These former studies focused on identifying the essential
competencies for different segments of the hospitality industry. The different segments
include hotel, food and beverage, club management. While several different segments
of the hospitality industry have been active in determining essential competencies there
was one segment that was left out; namely, timeshare/vacation ownership.

Despite the fact that the timeshare/vacation ownership segment is generating six
billion dollars in sales for the hospitality industry, the literature on it is very limited
(Woods, 2001). There are now more than five hospitality chains active in the
timeshare/vacation ownership industry. The number of hospitality chains jumping into
this industry is estimated to increase year after year (Baumann, 2000). At this point, one
might question if a separate study on timeshare/vacation ownership competencies is
warranted, since this industry is much like the hotel segment of the hospitality industry.
To the guest, there might not be a difference between the lodging and the
timeshare/vacation ownership industry. The main services of the two industries are
basically alike. However, a close look into the timeshare/vacation ownership industry
shows that there are clear differences in both front and back-of-the-house operations. According to industry experts, operations such as housekeeping, maintenance, front-office systems, staffing, and amenities are among the factors that distinguish the timeshare industry from the lodging industry (Baumann, 2000). Thus, in order to understand the timeshare/vacation ownership industry clearly, in-depth studies need to be conducted.

Problem Statement

Hoffman (1999) stated in his study that the purpose of defining competencies is to improve the performance of employees at work places. Former studies state that defining competencies is essential in order to distinguish extraordinary employees from the average. In order to keep well-skilled employees long term, the timeshare/vacation ownership organizations needs to know essential competencies for every job position and department. The process of determining essential competencies is even more important for jobs in the rapidly growing timeshare segment.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the essential competencies for general managers in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Since this study is using the essential competencies list of hotel GMs as a base, it will also determine whether these essential competencies are consistent between the hotel segment and the timeshare/vacation ownership segment of the hospitality industry. Finally, this study
will focus on the essential competencies of timeshare/vacation ownership GMs that are not included in the hotel managers’ competency list.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The objective of this literature review is to provide a better understanding of the existing essential competencies required for managers in the hospitality industry. The literature review will explore the following: the definition and history of the timeshare/vacation ownership industry; the role of the GM; the history of competencies; and former studies on hospitality management competencies. Finally, this chapter will demonstrate how this study will supplement and enhance previous research in the hospitality field.

The History of Timeshare

Timeshare can be defined as shared membership in a resort condominium, which allows members to use the space for certain periods of the year. Thus, it is important to understand that timeshare is not about purchasing a property but purchasing holidays in a certain resort area (Carty, 1995). The timeshare industry, also known as vacation ownership industry, first appeared in Europe in the 1960s. Alexander Nette, a Swiss gentleman originally applied the timeshare method to condominiums in Ticino, Italy. Nette was unable to sell the condominium because of a downturn in the economy at the time. In desperation and fearing failure of this project, Nette came up with the idea of
selling the condominium units as shared ownership, rather than whole ownership (Trowbridge, 1981). At this time, the concept of a timeshare was to purchase a share of a holiday resort, which allowed the share owner to use the property on a regular basis. This idea evolved into the development of Hapimag Company, which today is one of the largest in the European timeshare industry (Haylock, 1994).

The concept of a timeshare that we are most familiar with today was developed in 1967 at Superdevoluy in the French Alps. The prices of the villas in the French Alps were very expensive, making it difficult for people to purchase a villa on their own. The solution became clear—combine their finances and share a joint ownership. Through this method, hoteliers at Superdevoluy sold ownership of French Alps villas for a pre-agreed period of time (Haylock, 1994).

Timeshare Development in the United States
In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the concept of timeshare began to spread internationally. Florida was the first state to adopt the concept of timeshare in the United States. During the mid 1970s, the United States endured a gasoline shortage that resulted in long lines at the pump. This spurred a recession in the condominium whole ownership industry in the United States. As a result, many condominium owners were unable to sell their products. Much like Nette had done, developers began selling partial ownership, or timeshared ownership, as a vacation option for travelers to Florida. Through this method, property developers in Florida sold the right to use condominiums for a certain time a year to potential clients. While clients were given the right to enjoy
a Florida condominium, property developers were selling the same condominium at least 50 times over a year (Haylock, 1994).

However, the timeshare system in Florida soon developed problems. The problem arose when developers became interested in recouping their losses only. As a result, once the developers sold enough to pay for their projects, they typically left town. This left the partially sold resort with no management and the owners with timeshares that quickly became unusable (Haylock, 1994).

Another problem for the timeshare industry was that clients were not enjoying the benefit of being able to use the condominium at the same time each year. In other words, they were not being given a choice. This problem was solved when a private swap system was put into the timeshare method. Through this swap method, clients were allowed to trade weeks and destination with other members of the timeshare. In 1974, a company named Resort Condominiums International (RCI) was founded to professionally conduct the swap between clients of timeshares. However, consumers began demanding more flexibility in how they could use their purchase. The industry answered this concern with what became known as “floating weeks”. This system entitled the owner access rights within a specified range of weeks, within a calendar year, rather than using the same week each year. The innovation offered the consumer a higher degree of week or unit flexibility that heretofore did not exist under a fixed system (Gurnik, 1998; Trowbridge, 1981).

Despite the fast growth of timeshares during the 1960s and 1970s, many hospitality firms did not consider timeshare as the new potential market of success (Upchurch, 2002). In 1984, that image changed when Marriott entered the industry
through its purchase of American resorts in Hilton Head, South Carolina. The new company was an immediate success. Marriott brought considerable brand-name recognition and adherence to strong business ethics to the industry. Thereafter, other hospitality chains followed Marriott into the timeshare/vacation ownership industry: Hilton in 1992, Disney and then Starwood, which entered the industry through the purchase of a Vistana Resorts. In the late 1990s, Hyatt, and Cendant Corporation, entered the industry through the purchase of land and a vacation whole-ownership company named Fairfield Communities. The entrance of these hospitality chains added credence to the timesharing concept and allowed it to gain widespread acceptance in the hospitality industry (Pryce, 1999). By 2002 Marriott had become the largest timeshare developer in the United States; amassing $540 million in sales in 2001, $900 million in 2002, and $1.05 billion in 2003 (Vacation Ownership, 2004, p.8-9).

With hotel companies entering the timeshare industry, the forms of timeshare evolved. One significant change was the different segments within the timeshare industry. For instance, Marriott, one of the leading hotel chains in the timeshare industry, offers three different timeshare segments. Each segment has its own type of amenities, facilities, target market, and price range (Woods, 2001).

In 1992, Disney developed a timeshare product whereby owners purchased points from what was called the “Disney Vacation Club”. These points could then be converted into timeshare rights at various times during the year. Owners under this system purchased points, which gave them a predetermined equivalent value of timeshare resort usage rights. Thus, a vacation-club owner could purchase enough points for a single unit villa, a two-bedroom villa, or three-bedroom villa for “X”
number of days. This concept has further evolved into the accumulation of points going directly to the consumer, rather than through a vacation club. Today, purchasing points that can be converted to vacation time is the most common method by which timeshares are sold. The Point purchase form of timeshare can also be used for cruise line experiences, hotel stays, golf packages, or other appealing recreational and leisure experiences using their point structure to do so (American Resort Development Association [ARDA], 1999; Baiman & Forbes, 1992; Suchman, 1999).

Under a vacation club points system consumers simply purchases enough points to satisfy their annual vacation needs. From the consumer’s perspective, this system offers the maximum amount of flexibility, while in contrast this system is quite complex for the developer to manage relative to inventory management (Gurnik, 1998; Sherles & Marmorstone, 1994). From the developer’s perspective, a very robust reservation management system must be in place to track factors such as: unit size, length of stay, location availability, seasonal issue, point allocation, and remaining point allocation. Basically, the point type of interval schedule, still sometimes referred to as a vacation club, offers the consumer the highest degree of vacation options in contrast to either a fixed or float type of interval arrangement (Burlingame, 1999, 2001).

Today, there are about 1590 timeshare resorts in the United States and 5400 timeshare resorts throughout the world in more than 100 countries (Resort Condominiums International [RCI], 2005). Among the almost 1600 timeshare resorts, 36% of them are located in Florida; 12% in California; 12% in South Carolina; 7% in Colorado; 7% in Hawaii; 6% in North Carolina; 6% in Nevada; 5 % in Texas; and 4% in
Arizona (ARDA, 2003). Thus, it can be said that most of the timeshare units in the United States are located in resort areas (Woods, 2001).

Development for Future Success in the Timeshare Industry

Regardless of the success of the timeshare industry, it faces challenges just like the lodging industry (Woods, 2001). Woods conducted a study to ascertain the challenges that the timeshare industry faces. For his study, Woods sent out surveys to American Resort Development Association’s (ARDA) Board of Trustees, asking them to rank potential challenges, based on a 5 point Likert-type scale (1=very important to 5=not important). Through this study, the author found that the most important challenge was the “industry reputation” (with a mean score of 1.82) and the least important challenge was “international sales” (with a mean score of 4.49). Woods’ (2001) findings underscored that the timeshare industry is facing challenges in labor and management shortages, just like the lodging industry. His research showed that the timeshare industry has challenges in human resource management and management development.

The Role of a Hospitality General Manager

The common perceptions of hotel GMs are people who work long hours, have a high degree of mobility, are highly sociable, and are committed to their jobs and to the hotel industry. Usually the hotel GM holds the key executive position in the hotel industry (Ladkin, 1999). Conrad Hilton was asked how many people are needed to run a hotel successfully and his answer was short and simple. To run a successful hotel
Conrad Hilton said only one person is needed, the GM (Nebel, 1991). Therefore, in many cases the GM position is considered to have a greater effect on the success of a hotel than any other position (Woods, Rutherford, Schmidgall, & Sciarini, 1998).

Despite their important role in the hospitality industry, little research has been conducted regarding the role of hotel GMs, and even less for timeshare/vacation ownership GMs. Studies by Nebel, Lee, and Vidakovic (1995) and Woods et al. (1998) focused on the hotel GMs' career path. Tas (1988) was the first to look into GMs' competencies in the hospitality industry. No academic studies have been contributed regarding timeshare/vacation ownership GMs.

Competency Model

In defining competency models past studies have used several different methods. Among them, the input-based and the output based methods were commonly used by scholars in the United States, as well as overseas. The input-based approach has been widely used among scholars in the United States to understand the concept of competency. It focuses on defining the inputs needed to demonstrate competent performance. The output-based approach, widely used by United Kingdom scholars, was to see competency as a set of performance and standards.

Input-based Approach

McClelland's Model

In the early 1970s, a former Harvard psychologist, David McClelland, proposed the idea of testing competence rather than intelligence. McClelland was asked by the United States Foreign Service to find new research methods that could predict human
performance and reduce the bias of traditional intelligence and aptitude testing, hence the notion of measuring competencies was born (Mirablile, 1997). In his 1973 study, McClelland strongly argues that testing intelligence does not relate to an individual’s success in a certain job or school. Backing up his statement with studies conducted in the 1960s and early 1970s, McClelland states that intelligent tests can be valid yet not valid, for determining the success of an individual at a certain job. As an example, McClelland (1973) stated that good grades from college could be one factor helping an individual get a job, but so does white skin color. McClelland (1973) suggested six ways to test the competence rather than of intelligence of an individual for success in accomplishing a job.

First, McClelland (1973) points out that the best testing is criterion sampling. He states that it is essential that a tester observe the certain field carefully in order to find out what the workers in that certain fields are doing to accomplish their job. For example, the author states that in order to know who will be a good policeman, the tester has to follow a policeman day and night and write down the activities performed, and use that list in screening applicants. The important factor in this approach is that criterion sampling involves both theory and practice.

Second, “Test should be designed to reflect changes in what the individual has learned” (McClelland, 1973, p.8). McClelland states that it is difficult to find a human characteristic that cannot be modified by training or experience. Thus, it is wiser to select tests that are valid in the sense that scores them on change, as the person grows in experience, wisdom, and ability to perform effectively on a certain job.
Third, individuals to be tested should be informed clearly about how to improve on the characteristic tested, and this information should be made public and explicit. By publicly showing how improve on a characteristic test those taking the test are less likely to lie, thereby producing more accurate results (McClelland, 1973). Prior to McClelland, testers were focused mainly on the result. In other words, testers cared less about why an item worked than that it worked. For example, if playing the piano was critical for success as a pilot, former testers focused on the fact that candidates could play the piano. But the tester had to be very careful to keep this fact a secret. Arguably, people who want to become pilots could lie at their test, informing the tester that they were capable of playing the piano. Thus, having public discussion about how to improve can lead to fewer false results and better qualified candidates.

Fourth, McClelland (1973) identified that tests should assess competencies involved in clusters of life outcomes. One danger of following the criterion sampling for tests is that the test can become too specific. In other words, a tester can end up with hundreds of specific tests for dozens of different occupations. Thus, McClelland recommended clustering competencies together based on similarities.

The fifth guideline suggested is that tests should involve operant as well as respondent behavior. Tests that are structured to test an individual’s intelligence are often structured ahead for a certain situation, which demands a response of a certain kind from a test taker. In order to avoid this issue, the tests should include operant as well as respondent behavior (McClelland, 1973).

Finally, “Tests should sample operant thought patterns to get maximum generalizability to various action outcomes” (McClelland, 1973, p. 12). To avoid the
problem of defining hundreds of competencies for a certain job occupation, one should focus on defining thought codes. Focusing on thought codes will allow a wider range of applicability to a variety of action possibilities.

Boyatzis Model

Boyatzis, a colleague of McClelland’s, continued studies on competencies to provide a clearer understanding of the model. In this process the author focused on the essence of competencies, asking “what enables a person to demonstrate the ‘specific actions’ that lead to ‘specific results’?” (Boyatzis, 1982, p.12). After Boyatzis’ study, competencies became widely known in the management field. In his study, Boyatzis found a set of competencies that consistently distinguished superior managers across organizations and functions. Competencies became “underlying characteristics of an individual that is causally related to effective or superior performance in a job” (Spencer & Spencer, 1993, p.9).

The common finding of the two previous studies is they used an input-based approach to define competency. The focus of an input-based approach lies in the content of the training needed by learners that will lead to competent performance. The input-based approach starts with developing underlying characteristics and attributes that competent performers possess (Hoffinan, 1999). The five underlying characteristics of competencies can be defined as: motives, traits, self-concept, and knowledge.

Motives are defined as the things a person always thinks about or wants that cause action. Motivated employees tend to be more focused, set achievable goals, take responsibility in accomplishing the goals, and take feedback as a step of improvement (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).
Traits are physical characteristics and responses to a situation or information. An employee who possesses mainly positive traits is likely to contribute to an organization’s success. The authors state the some people don’t “blow up” at other workers and do act “above and beyond the call of duty” to solve problems under stress (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

Self-concept reflects a person’s attitude, values, or self-image. Self-concept can be either positive or negative. A positive image, such as self-confidence, can be a belief within a person to be effective in most cases. An employee’s positive self-concept is more likely to lead the organization to success (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

Self-efficacy generally refers to a person's belief in his/her ability to successfully perform a specific task (Bandura, 1982). Self-efficacy is known to be part of self-concept. This definition of self-efficacy is very similar to Spencer and Spencer’s (1993) definition of self-concept. Despite the different view on self-concept this study employed Spencer and Spencer’s (1993) definition of self-concept to explain input-based approach of defining competency.

Knowledge is the information a person has for a certain content area or job. Although knowledge is an underlying characteristic of competencies, it is very complex. Usually a knowledge test does not predict an employee’s work performance. This is due to the fact that a knowledge test does not measure skills and knowledge as used in the actual workplace. Knowledge tests can tell an employer what the employee can do, not what he or she will do (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

Skills determine one’s ability to perform a certain physical or mental task. For example, a physical skill for a dentist is to fill a tooth without damaging the nerve.
Mental skills competencies need to include both analytic thinking and conceptual thinking (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

Spencer and Spencer (1993) state that among the five characteristics, skill and knowledge competencies are visible characteristics of people while self-concept, trait, and motive competencies are more hidden characteristics of people.

Skill and knowledge are the easiest to be developed in employees, while self-concept, trait, and motive were the hardest to develop. Skill and knowledge are compared to the surface while trait and motive are compared to the core personality of an employee (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

In a business organization, it is relatively easy to develop knowledge and skill competencies through training. Motive and trait competencies are more difficult to assess and develop. Thus, it is best to hire employees who already possess these competencies (Spencer & Spencer, 1993).

*Output-based Approach*

Different from the United Stated scholars Boam and Sparrow (1992) and Burgoyne (1993), United Kingdom scholars, used a different approach to understand the concept of competency. “This new approach known as the “output-based approach” measures the output of learning. Training and assessment of performance was the thrust of this approach” (Hoffman, 1999, p.284). In other words, this approach was to see competency as a set of performance and standards. Despite the differences, the input and output-based approaches of defining competency share a common goal: Making the demonstration of competent performance a behavioral and hence observable measure of human performance (Hoffman, 1999).
Katz’s Domain Model

In order to identify the essential competencies needed for effective administration, Katz (1955) determined that it depends on three basic personal skills: technical, human, and conceptual. In his study, Katz identified that technical skills imply an understanding of a specific kind of activity, particularly on involving method, processes, procedures, and techniques. These technical skills involve specialized knowledge, analytical ability within that specialty, and facility in the use of the tools and techniques of the specific discipline. Due to the age of specialization the technical skill is required of the greatest number of people (Katz, 1955).

Katz (1955) identifies human skill as the ability of an executive to work effectively as a group member and build cooperative effort within the team he/she leads. Therefore, the main attribute of human skill is working with people. A person with high human skill is aware of his or her own attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs about other individuals and groups. It is also important to understand that people with high human skills create an atmosphere of approval and security for subordinates to feel free to express themselves. High human skills must become a natural, continuous activity in order to be effective.

Conceptual skills involve one’s ability to see the enterprise as a whole (Katz, 1955). Conceptual skills include recognizing how the various functions of the organization affect the outcome of the organization. One must also be able to see business as a whole; the community, political, social, and economical forces of the nation as a whole.
Although each of these skills is important for every administrator at every level, it is clear that there are skills considered to be more essential than others for a specific level of administrator. Technical skills are considered to be more essential for and administrators at entry level; while conceptual skills are considered to be more essential for the top level administrators. Most important, human skills are considered to be essential for every level (Katz, 1955).

Sandwith's Domain Model

Following Katz's study, others researched this model and determined that with the fast changing environment, the job of managers and leaders simply could not be confined to the original three categories (Sandwith, 1993). In 1993, Sandwith developed a domain competency model, in which he expanded Katz's model. Sandwith broadened the human skills dimension of Katz's (1955) model to include three categories, which work as a link between the conceptual/creative domain and the technical domain (Sandwith, 1993). Sandwith (1993) identified the categories within his domain competency model as: conceptual/creative domain, leadership domain, interpersonal domain, administrative domain, and technical domain.

The conceptual/creative domain refers to the cognitive skills associated with comprehending important elements of the job. The most common conceptual skill is that of understanding one's role in an organization, and how it relates to others. The creative dimension has been added to the conceptual domain to reflect a better understanding of brain-mind functioning and creative thought of managers.
The leadership domain provides a strategic link between the conceptual domain and the other domains. Sandwith (1993) argues, “While conceptual/creative domain is concerned with comprehending phenomena and generating ideas for action, it is leadership that turns thought into productive action” (Sandwith, 1993, p.47). Successful leaders do not just get individuals involved, but keep them involved by empowering them.

The interpersonal domain consists of competencies that focus on the skills for effective interaction with others. Supervisors must possess interpersonal competencies in all of their dealings with others (Sandwith, 1993).

The administrative domain has evolved to relate the activity of both the interpersonal and technical domains. The administrative domain contains competencies that refer to the personnel management and financial management aspects of organizational life, which are indirectly related to the technical operations of the organization (Sandwith, 1993).

Technical domain competencies involve having the knowledge and skills associated with production standards, work processes and methods, equipment, machines, facilities, new technologies, etc. The technical domain is very similar to Katz’s technical domain model (Sandwith, 1993).

As shown in the previous studies, competency was determined in various ways. It is important to understand that the competency list, with essential competencies, is more than a wish list. It must contain a methodology that demonstrates the validity of the competency model’s standard. A competency model must also identify and validate the behaviors that imply the existence of underlying motives, traits, and attitudes. In
addition, when developing a competency model it is important that managers understand that competency lists need to be futuristic (Dalton, 1997).

Competencies in the Hospitality Industry

There have been some in-depth studies conducted on competencies. Yet, little has been done to determine the competency use in the hospitality industry. In the hospitality industry, job competencies are defined as those activities and skills judged essential to perform the duties of a specific job position (Tas, 1988).

Tas (1988) published one of the first studies on the hospitality competency model. This study was conducted to identify the most important competencies for hotel general managers. Based on previous literature, Tas gathered 36 competencies for management trainees in the hospitality industry. A total of 75 general managers of hotels, with 400 or more rooms, responded to the survey distributed by the author. Each survey participant was asked to rank the 36 competencies (1=not important 5=essential). The author calculated the mean score of each of the 36 competencies and determined that competencies with a score of 4.5 or higher were considered to be essential. The result of this study showed that 6 out of 36 competencies are held essential. The six essential competencies center primarily on human-relations skills, while technical skills were rated to be moderately important to the job. Another 18 competencies with a score of 3.50-4.49 were determined to be considerably important. These 18 competencies focused on the management processes of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. The remaining competencies dealt with financial management, law, food sanitation and safety, room reservation, and maintenance of guest-room standard (Tas, 1988).
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Following Tas’s 1988 study, two more important competency studies were published during the mid 1990s. Okeiyi, Finley, and Tindall (1994) sought to determine the essential competencies for entry-level food and beverage managers from the point of view of educators, employers, and students. In this study, the authors surveyed directors and managers of 40 foodservice operations in 11 cities across the United States together with students and educators of 200 colleges and universities in the US, offering four-year baccalaureate degrees in hospitality management. Like the Tas’s (1998) study, participants were asked to rank the competencies based on a 5 point Likert-type scale. The findings of this study showed that 10 out of 35 competencies rated above 4.0 and were considered to be essential in the food and beverage department. The competencies were: human relations, leadership skills and supervision, oral and written communication, customer relations, professional conduct/ethics, time management, energy management, conflict management, recruitment, and training.

Tas, LaBrecque, and Clayton (1996) conducted a study on property management competencies. Tas et.al (1996) used Sandwith’s competency domain model to build a competency list for their study. In this study, the authors identified 50 potential property-management, layout, and design competencies recommended for hotel-management trainees. For this study, 305 hotel properties were selected for the survey. The findings showed that interpersonal and leadership competencies ranked above a mean score of 4.5, and were shown to be essential.

While the previous studies focused on determining management competencies regarding a certain level of management, Kay and Russette (2000) looked into whether essential competencies are transferable from one functional to another and management
levels to other areas and levels. Different levels of managers in the functional areas of
food and beverage, front desk, and sales were selected to be participants in this study.
The result of this study showed that 86 essential competencies and 55 competencies
were identified to be important to more than one functional area and management level.
Only 18 out of 55 competencies were considered critical for all six combinations of
functional and management levels. This study is considered to be important, since it
was the first study that attempted to compare essential management competencies
among different hospitality areas and management levels.

Perdue, Ninemeier, and Woods (2000) conducted the first study determining
competencies needed for club managers. Through this study, the three authors tried to
determine the competencies essential for successful club management. The findings of
this study were going to be used to review the subject matter addressed in the Club
Manager Association of America (CMAA) education programs and Certified Club
Manager (CCM) exam. One hundred and forty participants, who were non-retired
members of CMAA, ranked a total of 127 competencies based on a 5 point Likert-type
scale (1=not important, 5=critical). The result of this study showed that 10
competencies were determined to be important and most frequently used: budgeting,
financial statement, professional behavior, control of food and beverage operations,
employee relations, chief operating officer; general manager, supervision tactics,
implementing labor-cost controls, calculation of actual food and beverage costs,
communication principles.

Perdue, Ninemeier, and Woods (2001) conducted another study to identify
competencies required for future club managers’ success. Questionnaires were mailed
out to club managers who are: CMAA members were within two years of eligibility for
gaining CCM status (n=810); CMAA members who had earned their CCM designation
within the prior two years (n=208); and CMAA members who had been recertified as
CCMs (n=478). Participants of the study were assigned a priority to each competency
domain based on this value to the club manager’s job at that future time. The ratings
were based on a Likert-type scale (1=highest priority, 9=lowest priority). Among the
1,496 members 369 responded for the survey resulting a response rate of 24%. The
outcome of this study identified that the top nine competencies fall in just three domains,
namely, accounting and finance (three competencies), human and professional resources
(five competencies), and marketing (one competency). On the other hand, the
competencies of least value were identified to involve technical matters.

Perdue, Ninemeier, and Woods (2002), conducted a follow-up competencies
study to compare present and future competencies required for club managers. Through
this study the authors identified that the same four competency domains were in the top
four of both the present and future competency domain. The same four competency
domains were: management, club accounting and financing, human and professional
resources, and food and beverage management.

Hospitality competency studies are not limited to those hospitality organizations
located in United States. With the world becoming smaller day by day, more hospitality
companies are expanding their business outside the US. Globally, their success abroad
depends largely on the availability of qualified international managers, who are able to
export, translate, and maintain their companies’ operational standards and service
consistency. Kriegl (2000) conducted a study to determine the most important skills that
international hospitality managers should have. In this study, the author sent a survey to 100 hospitality managers, who were alumni of Cornell University's School of Hotel Administration and working outside the US. Of the 100 surveys sent out, 51 were usable. The competencies were ranked by the candidates based on a 5 point Likert-type scale. The result of this study showed that cultural sensitivity and interpersonal skills were ranked most essential.

Nath and Raheja (2001) wrote an article that stated the importance of competencies in hospitality Human Resource (HR) functions. In the article, the authors state that acknowledging the right competencies are essential for both the organization and the employees. HR competencies look at attitude, skills, and the knowledge an employee possesses through observable and measurable behaviors and outcomes. Thus, possession of the competency enables an individual perform the required function much better than others who do not possess the relevant competencies. Based on this statement, Nath and Raheja (2001) believed that in the hospitality industry, competencies are mostly used in the HR functions. Other authors agreed with this statement noting that the development of a competency model can be guidance and measure of consistency for different HR practices (Chung-Herrera, Enz, & Lankau, 2003). Since competencies are used as a guideline to determine the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitude of an employee, it provides a common linking through all HR systems (Nath & Raheja, 2001). Nath and Raheja (2001) showed in their study how competency plays an important role in the five main HR systems. The authors defined in their research: compensation, selection, performance management, training, and career and succession planning.
Traditionally, compensation is based on quantification and setting of pay for the specific skill requirement for a job. A problem with the traditional approach was that compensations were generalized among employees with different job functions. However, creating compensation based on competencies will help to create individual compensations based on different job competencies. Thus, creating compensation based on competencies will help to attract and retain the best and most talented employees (Nath & Raheja, 2001).

Selection in an organization is done with factors such as skill requirements, based on job description and job specification. A problem with this traditional method is that the job descriptions and specifications do not prioritize skill requirements for the job, which results in a long period for new employees to learn the job. However, selection processes based on competencies have an advantage, since it allows for prioritization of critical competencies which help organizations to pick the right employee. It also provides candidates with a clear and realistic picture of the expected job (Chung-Herrera et al., 2003). By selecting the right employee, the organization can cut out unnecessary training costs and lower the employee turnover rate (Nath & Raheja, 2001).

A performance management system is used in the organization to look at what an employee has accomplished in the past, to determine the employee's future potential and has a reward orientation. In other words this is a “pay for performance” method. Further, Nath and Raheja (2001) state that the formal “pay for performance” approach can be changed to “how of performance” and “what of performance” with the help of competencies. Thus, looking at competencies with the job performance gives the performance management system a longer time frame, as it looks at performance in the
present and future time frames. The new system also focuses on the entire aspect of
performance, since it includes the result, process, and competencies.

In their study Nath and Raheja (2001) state that training traditionally focuses on
general requirements that can be implemented across different jobs. However, by
developing competency-based training, an organization can have training systems that
take into account the developmental needs of an individual to take a future role. In
addition, competency-based training provides input to decide on the most effective
developmental options.

Nath and Raheja (2001) state that, traditionally career and succession planning is
based on the situation created. The authors state that by this traditional career and
succession planning approach, it is typical that only vertical movements are viewed as
promotions. However, the competency-based approach identifies the competency
requirement for critical roles, assesses the employees’ competencies, and evaluates
possible job-person matches. Thus, the advantage of this approach is that it allows for a
planned career movement and that career progression can be tied to organizational
requirements (Nath & Raheja, 2001).

Chapter Summary

In conclusion, this chapter illustrated that studies on competency models have
been conducted in the management field over the years. With the increase of research,
the acceptance and use of competency models continue to grow. Competency models
are used for many different functions in the business world, and their value grows as the
amount of research increases. These competency models are used to determine the
organizational goals and objectives of the industry. Competency models are also recommended to be used for specific organizational functions. One of the suggestions in the literature was that competency models should be used for the different HR functions in an organization; including selection of employees, using competency based compensation for employee satisfaction, effective training models based on competencies, career development, and performance management. While researchers in a variety of industries have been active in conducting studies on competency models, the hotel industry has been comparatively slow in conducting and applying competency models into specific jobs. Most of the competency models used in the hospitality industry were used in identifying competencies for a management level position, rather than a certain job classification.

Among the competency studies done in the hospitality industry, the timeshare segment has been visibly left out. With hotel chains entering the timeshare segment an in-depth study on competencies needs to be conducted. Relevant to the present research, no former study looked into the essential competencies of timeshare/vacation ownership GMs. In order to determine the essential competencies of timeshare GMs, the competencies studies of the hotel segment can be used as a foundation. The result of this research will provide valuable literature enhancing the timeshare/vacation ownership segment.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, the methodology used for this study will be presented. It identifies the participants, questionnaire, development and procedure, sampling, and implementation of the survey instrument. This chapter concludes with a chapter summary.

Delphi Method

The Delphi method was first used by Dalkey and Helmer in 1953 at the RAND Corporation to solve future military issues. The objective of the Delphi method is to gain the most reliable compromise opinion of a group of experts. The expert opinion is achieved by a series of intensive questionnaires interspersed with controlled opinion feedback (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). The Delphi method has been used to develop environmental forecasts, which are then used as assumptions upon which plans can be based (Preble, 1984). Since its first use in 1953, the Delphi method was used in various fields. Some fields in which the Delphi has been used include, but are not limited to: Information Systems (Brancheau & Wetherbe, 1987; Dickson, Leitheiser, & Brancheau, 1984), Operations management (Green & Price, 2000; Malhotra, Stelle, & Grover, 1994; Pesh, 1996), Economic trends and societal change (Masser & Foley, 1987), Technology

Advantages and Disadvantages of the Delphi Method

Like all studies, the Delphi study has its strengths and weaknesses. Table 1 indicates the strengths and weaknesses of the Delphi study. Although this study could be conducted using a traditional survey method, gathering information from sample of members of timeshare/vacation ownership industry by use of questionnaire or interview, it was judged that the modified Delphi method with timeshare/vacation ownership experts, was a stronger methodology for this study.

Despite the disadvantages of the modified Delphi study, this method of study was selected over the traditional survey method due to the following reasons:

1. This study is an investigation of essential competencies for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Since there were no former studies done on this matter, it requires knowledge from people who understand the function of the job well. Thus, a modified Delphi study answers the study questions more appropriately.

2. Among the various group-decision analysis, such as nominal group technique and social-judgment analysis, the Delphi study is most desirable in that it does
not require the experts to meet (Rohrbaugh, 1979). Thus, for this study, a modified Delphi study is the most appropriate since the participants of this study are not from one destination and it would be difficult for the experts to gather at one physical location and time.

3. The modified Delphi study is flexible in its designs and open to follow-up interviews, which allows gathering richer data for the study (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymity.</td>
<td>Time consuming (multiple rounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple opinions.</td>
<td>Higher cost due to multiple rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate confrontation.</td>
<td>Anonymity can result in carelessness on the part of respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates group domination and pressure by individuals with more status.</td>
<td>Poor selection of the panel can result in inaccurate study result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates geographical barriers to participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group responses can be described statistically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to measure agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Selecting Panel of Experts

As mentioned previously, a modified Delphi study does not depend on a statistical sample that attempts to be representative of any population. It is a group-decision mechanism, requiring qualified experts who have a deep understanding of the
issues. Therefore, one of the most critical requirements is the selection of qualified experts (Okoli & Pawlowski, 2004).

To identify participants for this study, University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV) faculty members and members at Cendant Timeshare Resort Group were asked to nominate GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson (1975) stated that 10 to 15 participants might be enough with a homogeneous group. Okoli and Pawlowski (2004) also agree on keeping the participant number fewer than 20. For this study, a total of 15-18 participants were projected. However 28 potential participations were nominated. This number exceeds the ideal participation number of a Delphi study. However, the participation rate was expected to be less than 100%, thus the investigator decided to include all 28 potential participants in this study.

Survey

Round I Questionnaire

The purpose of this research was to identify essential competencies for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. For the initial survey a list of competencies was developed based on the past literature of hospitality management competencies. The questionnaire was developed to identify the level of importance for each competency. The questionnaire was divided up into three parts.

The first section of the questionnaire examined the importance level of a GM’s competency in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. The participants of this study were asked to rate 58 competencies based on the degree of importance for a general manager position. The questions were developed based on Sandwith’s (1993)
competency domain model. As Murray and Hammons (1995) stated, a Likert-type scale has been the most common tool used to quantify views in a Delphi study. Thus, a 5 point Likert-type scale was developed for this study (0 = not applicable, 1 = not important, 2 = slightly important, 3 = neutral important, 4 = moderately important, 5 = extremely important).

The second section asked respondents to provide essential competencies that were not included among the 58 previously mentioned competencies. After providing additional competencies, participants were also asked to rank each competency based on the same 5 point Likert-type scale.

The last section of the questionnaire asked the participants to provide some demographic information. The demographic information included the level of education, gender, size of the property, and tenure as a general manager.

Feedback Loop Questionnaire

The questionnaire for the feedback loop was developed based on the participants’ responses to the initial survey. Fifty-eight competencies were re-organized, based on its mean rating beginning with high-mean-rating-competencies. For the feedback loop, participants were asked to carefully look over the mean rating and complete another 5 point Likert-type scale (0=Not applicable, 1=not agree, 2=slightly agree, 3=neutrally agree, 4=moderately agree, 5=extremely agree) based on the level of their agreement with the mean rating of the initial questionnaire. In addition, the participants were again asked to provide competencies that were not among the 58 original competencies.
Data Collection Procedure

Pilot Study

To assist in question development, a pilot study was conducted on September 29th 2005. The pilot study was given to three UNLV faculty members. Based on the result of the pilot study, some of the questions were rewritten, excluded, or modified. The final outcome of the pilot study was a list with 58 management competencies. All 58 competencies were developed based on the Sandwith’s (1993) competency domain model.

Round I

The request for participation letter and the questionnaire were reviewed by professors of the Hotel Management Department at UNLV for validity, wording, and formatting. A protocol explaining the study was submitted to the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS). Approval was given by OPRS to conduct a study on human subject. (Appendix A)

The informed letter (Appendix B) and the Round I questionnaire (Appendix C) for this study were e-mailed out on October 18, 2005 to 28 participants. Participants were given eight days to return the completed questionnaires to the investigator by fax. A total of eight completed questionnaires were returned. Based on these eight results the feedback loop questionnaire was developed. On October 24, 2005, the 28 participants of the initial questionnaire were in Las Vegas for a Resort Manager conference. At the Resort Manager conference nine GMs completed the initial survey. At the end 17 Round I questionnaires had been completed. Since these nine GMs participated in the
Round I questionnaire after the feedback loop questionnaire was developed, they did not participate in the feedback loop questionnaire.

**Feedback Loop**

The feedback loop questionnaire was developed based on the eight results of the initial questionnaire. On October 24, 2005, the printed informed letters (Appendix D) with the feedback loop questionnaires (Appendix E) were distributed to the participants while they were in Las Vegas. Each participant was given 30 minutes to finish the feedback questionnaire. Once finished, the participants were asked to return his/her feedback questionnaire to the investigator.

Among the eight participants of the first round, one participant notified the investigator that he/she would not attend the conference in Las Vegas. For that one participant, the feedback loop survey was e-mailed out on October 24, 2005. The participant was given five days to return the survey to the investigator by fax. That participant never returned his/her feedback questionnaire.

**Chapter Summary**

The purpose of the modified Delphi study was to explore the essential competencies needed for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. The study involved a pilot study, one round of questionnaires, and a feedback loop. The results of both the pilot study and the Round I questionnaire accompanied the following round. At the end of the modified Delphi study, the investigator identified essential competencies for general managers in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. The findings are stated in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the results of the modified Delphi study that was undertaken to identify the essential competencies for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. It includes the demographic information regarding the 17 participants of the study. The chapter concludes with a presentation of data and an analysis of the results on the Round I questionnaire and the feedback loop of this study.

Round I

Demographics

The request for participation letter and the questionnaire were e-mailed out on October 18, 2005 to 28 GM in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Participants of the modified Delphi study were asked to rank 58 competencies based on a 5 point Likert-type scale. Participants were also asked to list essential competencies that were not included among the 58 competencies, and complete four demographic questions. Round I of the modified Delphi study closed at the end of October 24, 2005. Among the 28 potential participants, 17 participants returned their questionnaire to the investigator. In other words, this study resulted in a 60.7% participation rate.
Table 2 indicates that among the 17 participants, two participants declared themselves as assistant GMs, while the other 15 participants identified themselves as GMs.

Table 2  
**Job Position of Round I Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant General Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that among the 17 participants of the Round I questionnaire, that 12 participants were females (70.6%); four participants were males (23.5%); and one participant refused to define his/her gender (Table 3).

Table 3  
**Gender of Round I Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants of this modified Delphi study were asked to identify their length of time as a GM. The longest time spend as a GM was 25 years, while the shortest time spent was six month. The average time spent as GM was 16 years and six months.

Participants were asked to indicate the size of their properties based on five choices. It was found that 52.9% of the participants work at a property that has 100 or fewer units. The other half was divided up into properties with 101-249 units (29.4%), and 750-999 units (17.7%). Table 4 displays these results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Size</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 or fewer units</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-249 units</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-399 units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-749 units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-999 units</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last demographic question asked the participants about their level of education. Participants were given six choices from which to select. As shown in Table 5, the majority of the participants had some college experience (47.1%) or a college degree (47.1%); one participant completed high school (5.9%). Among the 17 participants, two participants stated that they completed training at a technical or vocational school besides earning a college degree. This additional training is not included in table 5, since only the highest education level completed is presented.
Table 5

Completed Education Level of the Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed education level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than High school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical or vocational school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essential Competencies

In the Round I questionnaire of the modified Delphi study, participants were given 58 competencies and were asked to rank them based on a 5 point Likert-type scale (0=not appropriate, 1=not important, 2=slightly important, 3=neutral important, 4=moderately important, 5=extremely important). Using Microsoft Excel for each competency, a mean rating was calculated for each competency in order to define whether a competency is essential or not. Based on the Tas's (1988) study, the results were categorized according to the following scale:

- essential: Over 4.50,
- considerably important: 3.5-4.49,
- moderately important: 2.5-3.49.

According to the mean score, it was found that 22 competencies were essential; 35 competencies were considerably important; and only one competency was moderately important. None of the 58 competencies had a mean score less than 2.94. In
the Round I questionnaire all 17 participants did not state initial competencies that are considered essential for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. The results are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6**  
*Essential Competencies for GMs in the Timeshare/Vacation Ownership Industry.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can manage owners’ problem effectively</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains positive owners relations</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain ethical standards</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain professional at work</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively motivates employees</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify operational problems</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can effectively manage life-threatening situations</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can maintain effective working relationship with employees</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage within budget</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively develops staff members</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can appraise employee performance effectively</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively delegates responsibility</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can effectively select personnel for key positions at property</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands capital budget for property</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manages employee grievances effectively</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducts effective interviews with prospective employees</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively delegates authority</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can effectively explain reasons for company/property policies</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective oral communication skill</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively manages work-home life balance</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can establish organizational objectives</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can provide solid reasons for owner to maintain ownership</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N=17*
Feedback Loop

For the feedback loop, participants were asked to carefully look over the result of the Round I questionnaire and complete another 5 point Likert-type scale (0= Not applicable, 1=Not agree, 2= Slightly agree, 3= Neutrally agree, 4= Moderately agree, 5= Extremely agree) based on the level of their agreement with the result. In addition, participants were asked again to provide competencies that were not listed among the 58 competencies in Round I questionnaire.

The participants of the feedback loop were eight GMs, who returned their Round I questionnaire result to the investigator by noon on October 24, 2005. A mean rating of the Round I questionnaire was calculated based on the eight participants’ responses. The result of the eight participants’ Round I questionnaire found that 39 competencies are essential for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry.

A total of five feedback loop questionnaire results were returned to the investigator. This resulted in a 62.5% participation rate. After calculating the mean rating for each competency, the results of the feedback loop were categorized according to the following scale:

- extremely agree: 5,
- moderately agree: 4.50-4.99,
- neutrally agree: 3.50-4.99.

Table 7 indicates that the participants of the feedback loop extremely agreed with the results of 28 competencies, moderately agreed with the results of 13 competencies, and neutrally agreed with the results of 17 competencies. None of the 58 competencies had a mean rating of less than 4.00.
Table 7

Feedback Loop Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can manage owners' problems effectively</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain professional at work</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains positive owners relations</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can maintain effective working relationship with employees</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively motivates employees</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage within budgets</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain ethical standards</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can appraise employee performance effectively</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively delegates responsibility</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively delegates authority</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively develops staff member</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively manages work-home life balance</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can identify operational problem</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain effective federal, state, and local sanitation and safety regulations</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can effectively manage life-threatening situations</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage employee grievances effectively</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct effective interviews with prospective employees</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective oral communication skills</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can establish organizational objectives</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to prioritize organizational objectives</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of departmental responsibilities</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains good understanding of FFE maintenance/repair</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively manages preventive maintenance at property</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands strategic Human Resource planning</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can effectively explain reasons for company/property policies</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can effectively select personnel for key positions at property</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands how to effectively manage labor costs</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands capital budget for property</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can plan long-term operational strategies</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can develop budgets for each department</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of prediction future revenues and expenses</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively manages cash flow</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls theft effectively</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can develop reliable revenue-and-expense tracking system</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of employment law</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can maintain effective security policies/procedures</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially responsible</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can provide solid reasons for owner to maintain ownership</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can effectively help others plan their career</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=8, Mean*=Mean rating of the feedback loop
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Additional Competencies

During the feedback loop questionnaire, participants of this modified Delphi study were asked again to state essential competencies that were not included among the 58 competencies. Only one participant stated that “adapting to changes” is essential for a GM in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. This competency was stated from one participant during the feedback loop questionnaire.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented demographic information of the participants, identified the results, and analyzed the data collected for this modified Delphi study. Essential competencies for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry were identified. In addition, this chapter presented the results of the feedback loop, in which participants were asked to identify their agreement level with the Round I result. Last, it presented an additional competency that was stated by one participant.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, the overall study process and findings are summarized. It also includes discussion of the analyzed data of this modified Delphi study. Finally, the limitations of this study, as well as recommendations for future research are presented.

Discussion of Results

Summary of the Study

In 1984, the hospitality industry included the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. With Marriott Hotel’s success in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry hospitality chains such as Hilton, Disney, Starwood, Hyatt, and Cendant Corporation entered the industry (Woods, 2001). As of 2003, there were 75 companies that were operating timeshare operations. Despite its popularity among hospitality chains, a small amount of research has been completed in the timeshare/vacation ownership segment. None of the former studies on the timeshare/vacation ownership industry included management competencies.

The purpose of this study was to supplement and enhance the literature in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry; to identify the essential competencies for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. In order to achieve the stated objective,
this study chose a modified Delphi method over a traditional survey. Through the modified Delphi method, this study expected to collect more in-depth results about management competencies.

A total of 28 potential participants were selected for this modified Delphi study. The participants were nominated by UNLV faculty members and members of the Cendant Corporation. The 28 potential participants were nominated because of his/her expertise in the industry. Participants of the study were asked to: rank 58 competencies based on a 5 point Likert-type scale; state additional essential competencies; and provide demographic information.

Among the 28 nominated participants, 17 GMs participated in the initial questionnaire. The result of the initial questionnaire found that 22 competencies rated a mean score of 4.5 or above and was determined to be essential competencies to the GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry.

For the feedback loop, the 58 competencies were re-ordered based on its mean rating. Participants were asked to finish another 5 point Likert-type scale, stating their agreement level on the initial questionnaire's result. The result of the feedback loop found that: the participants extremely agreed with the mean rating of 28 competencies; moderately agreed with the mean rating of 13 competencies; and neutrally agreed with the mean rating of 17 competencies.

**Demographic Information and Essential Competencies**

Among the 17 participants of this modified Delphi study, most were identified to be GMs or Assistant GMs. Among the 17 participants; 12 participants were identified to be females, 4 participants to be males, and one participant refused to answer the question.
Their experience as a GM in the industry varied from six months to 25 years. A majority of them completed some college-level courses or had completed college education. Two of the participants completed technical or vocational school, in addition to their college degree. As to the property size it was clear that most of the participants worked in a property that had less than 249 units.

This study identified 22 competencies as essential for a GM in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. It was also determined that a number of essential competencies fall under Sandwith’s (1993) competency domain (i.e. leadership, interpersonal, and administrative).

Implications

The 22 competencies identified as essential in this study could form the basis for decision making in curriculum development for schools of hotel and restaurant administration. These 22 essential competencies fall under the leadership, interpersonal, and administrative domain of Sandwith’s (1993) competency domain model. Thus, schools should focus on developing academic programs that enhance these attributes of its students.

The newly identified essential competencies may constitute a foundation for the development of job descriptions and training programs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Like the universities, the management of the timeshare/vacation ownership industry should focus on developing training programs that: enhance leadership; interpersonal skills; and administrative skills of future employees. In
addition, employees of the timeshare/vacation ownership industry can use this study’s results as a foundation for career development.

Limitations

This study was conducted using a modified Delphi approach, which allowed the investigator to select 17 experts in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Therefore, the results are based on the opinions of the 17 experts. This limits the ability to generalize the results of this study to the entire timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Among the 17 experts, more than half (12) of the participants were females. Female GMs of the timeshare/vacation ownership industry could have a different view regarding competencies from the male GMs. Therefore, this is another factor that makes it hard to generalize the results of this study.

In addition, the participants of this study were GMs from the western region of the United States and Hawaii. The timeshare/vacation ownership resorts in the western region of the United States tend to have different characteristics from their counterparts in the southern or eastern part of the United States. The timeshare/vacation ownership resorts in the western part of the United States are mainly located in ski resorts, while the resorts in the southern part are near beaches. Thus, there is a possibility that the results of this study are not applicable for the GMs in resorts located in the non-western regions of the United States.

For purpose of this study, the investigator chose to have a panel of experts that consisted of fewer than 20 people. In order to run any statistical test, this study would need a sample of 30 or more respondents. With fewer than 20 participants, statistical
tests were not preformed. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the statistical significance of the result.

The feedback loop was developed based on eight participants of the Round I questionnaire. It is hard to find a correlation between the result of the feedback loop questionnaire and the Round I questionnaire, since the participation number for the two questionnaire is different. Therefore, the result of the feedback loop questionnaire has to be looked at separately from the result of the Round I questionnaire.

Last, the results of this study are not present-focused. In other words, the essential competencies of a GM in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry could be different in the year 2010. Therefore, to have an accurate list of essential competencies, continuous studies are needed.

Recommendation for Future Research

The results of this exploratory research have suggested the applicability of the framework for investigating the essential competencies for GMs in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Based upon this study, it is recommended that further systematic and rigorous studies should be undertaken to establish essential competency lists for management in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. For example, a large sample combined with sophisticated statistical tests could substantially improve practical utility. In order to achieve this goal, future studies will find this study useful.

A replication of this study with a larger number on the panel of experts, or a panel of experts that are not limited to one geographical area of the United States, can
result in a more accurate generalization of findings. In addition, with regard to the selection of the panel of experts future researcher(s) should pay close attention to having an equal number of both genders. This will allow the researcher(s) to have more accurate and generalization of finding. A replication of this study for different management levels in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry could be conducted as well. For example, studies that would determine an essential competency list for mid-level or entry-level management. In that case, this study would be a framework for those future studies.

Conclusion

Based on the result of this study, a similarity was found between the timeshare/vacation ownership industry GMs and the lodging industry GMs. The results of this study identified 22 essential competencies that fall within the leadership, interpersonal, and administrative domain of Sandwith’s (1993) competency domain model. The result of this study showed a strong similarity to the lodging industry GMs’ essential competency list. Both GMs’ in the timeshare/vacation ownership industry and the lodging industry had essential competencies that fall within the leadership and interpersonal domain. However, the timeshare/vacation ownership industry differs from the lodging industry by requiring competencies that fall within the administrative domain. Therefore, it can be concluded that the timeshare/vacation ownership industry is similar yet different from the lodging industry.

The result of this study, will add valuable information to the limited literature of the timeshare/vacation ownership industry. Based on the results of this study,
timeshare/vacation ownership managements and universities will be able to develop educational and practical training programs that focus on the three domains. In addition, employees will be able to make career developments based on the result of this study. In order to achieve more accurate results, future researchers should attempt to eliminate the limitations stated in this study.
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HUMAN SUBJECT APPROVAL
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Social/Behavioral IRB — Expedited Review
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NOTICE TO ALL RESEARCHERS:
Please be aware that a protocol violation (e.g., failure to submit a modification for any change) of an IRB approved protocol may result in mandatory remedial education, additional audits, re-consenting subjects, researcher probation, suspension of any research protocol at issue, suspension of additional existing research protocols, invalidation of all research conducted under the research protocol at issue, and further appropriate consequences as determined by the IRB and the Institutional Officer.
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TO: Dr. Gail Sammons, Hotel Administration
FROM: Office for the Protection of Research Subjects
RE: Notification of IRB Action by Dr. Paul Jones, Co-Chair
Protocol Title: Management Competency in the Lodging Industry
Protocol #: 0509-1716

This memorandum is notification that the project referenced above has been reviewed by the UNLV Social/Behavioral Institutional Review Board (IRB) as indicated in Federal regulatory statutes 45 CFR 46. The protocol has been reviewed and approved.

The protocol is approved for a period of one year from the date of IRB approval. The expiration date of this protocol is November 1, 2006. Work on the project may begin as soon as you receive written notification from the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS).

PLEASE NOTE:
Attached to this approval notice is the official Informed Consent/Assent (IC/IA) Form for this study. The IC/IA contains an official approval stamp. Only copies of this official IC/IA form may be used when obtaining consent. Please keep the original for your records.

Should there be any change to the protocol, it will be necessary to submit a Modification Form through OPRS. No changes may be made to the existing protocol until modifications have been approved by the IRB.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond November 1, 2006, it would be necessary to submit a Continuing Review Request Form 60 days before the expiration date.

If you have questions or require any assistance, please contact the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at OPRSHumanSubjects@ccmail.nevada.edu or call 895-2794.
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4505 Maryland Parkway • Box 451037 • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-1037
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APPENDIX B

INFORMED LETTER, ROUND I

Dear General Manager,

My name is Yun-Kyung Choi (Kelly Choi). I am a graduate student at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Currently, I am in the process of writing a master’s thesis paper in the hospitality industry with Dr. Gail Sammons.

You are invited to participate in this study regarding management competencies. Through this study we hope to learn the essential competencies of general managers in the Timeshare/Vacation ownership industry. You were selected as a possible participant of this study because of your expertise in the industry and recommendation of Dr. Gail Sammons and Dr. Robert Woods.

With this cover letter you will find a questionnaire. It will take about 10-15 minutes of your precious time. Your responses will be used to understand general manager’s competency needed in the Timeshare/Vacation ownership industry. The result of this study will be analyzed and return to you to seek your approval. Thus, please provide your information at the bottom of this page. Any information obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will not be disclosed.

Please return the finished questionnaire via fax to (702) 895-4872.

If you have any questions, please contact Kelly Choi at (517) 214-3043 or choikell@hotmail.com.
Thank you very much for your time

Sincerely,

Yun-Kyung Choi

The information below will be used for the second questionnaire asking your approval of this study's result. **This information will not be used in the study.**

Please check which method you prefer to receive the second questionnaire (fax or e-mail).

Name:

Name of your property:

_Fax, Fax No.:

_E-mail, E-mail address:
APPENDIX C

ROUND I QUESTIONNAIRE

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
Competencies for Timeshare/Vacation Ownership General Managers

According to Morris (1973) and Tas (1988), job competencies are defined as those activities and skills judged essential to perform the duties of a specific job position. Identifying essential competencies needed for a management position helps an organization to prepare for the future. This is a panel of expert study on competencies for General Managers in the Timeshare/Vacation Ownership industry. We are asking you as an expert in this field to help us identify the essential competencies required for successful job performance at your job level.

Your response will remain anonymous. Your choice to participate will only require about 10-15 minutes of your time. We will analyze your responses and then seek your approval of the results. Results are available for you. Please return survey with business card if you wish to receive result of the study. Your assistance in this project will help both your company and the industry.

Yun-Kyung Choi
Master's student, UNLV
choikell@hotmail.com

Gail Sammons, Ph. D. CHA
Associate Professor, UNLV
gail.sammons@unlv.edu

Robert H. Woods, Ph.D.
Professor, UNLV
robert.woods@unlv.edu

Below is a list of competencies. These are derived from studying hospitality managers. There has not been a study of timeshare managers conducted. Please indicate how important you believe these competencies are for general managers in a Timeshare/Vacation Ownership Property. For the following 58 questions, please circle the corresponding number to your answer from the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Neutral Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Can establish organizational objectives
4. Can develop budgets for each department
6. Can develop reliable revenue-and expense tracking system
8. Maintain professional at work
10. Can maintain effective working relationship with employees
12. Maintain effective federal, state, and local sanitation and safety regulations
14. Manage employee grievances effectively
16. Manage within budgets
17. Maintain customer standards
For the following questions, please fill in a circle corresponding to your answer from the scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Neutral Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Can appraise employee performance effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Effective written communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Effective oral communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Effectively delegates authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Understanding of predicting future revenues and expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Maintains environmentally-friendly property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Can maintain effective security policies/procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Effectively develops staff member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Understands strategic Human Resource planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Understanding of compensations policy/procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Can prepare property financial statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Effectively guides HOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Excellent working relations with sales department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Can provide history of timeshare industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Can discuss different types of timeshare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Understanding of timeshare sales law/regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Can effectively help others plan their career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Understands how to effectively manage labor costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Knowledge of cleaning/maintenance needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Understand property accounting systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Understand capital budget for property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify other essential competencies and rate in importance.
Demographic Information

What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Less than high school
- Completed high school
- Technical or vocational school
- Some college
- College degree
- Graduate degree

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

How long have you been a General Manager?

- Months
- Years

What is the size of your property?

- 100 or fewer units
- 101-249 units
- 250-399 units
- 400-749 units
- 750-999 units
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APPENDIX D

INFORMED LETTER, FEEDBACK LOOP

Dear General Manager,

On October 24th 2005 you received a research questionnaire asking you to:

a) Review the competencies identified by the investigator and

b) Mark your position on each competency based on a 5 point Likert-type scale

I thank you for your participation. Your respond is most valuable to my research that is focused on identifying essential competencies for General Managers in the Timeshare/Vacation ownership industry.

I have enclosed another questionnaire. In this questionnaire you are asked to carefully look over the mean rating of each competency. After careful considering the mean rating please circle your new rating based on the level of your agreement with the mean rating. In addition, please provide essential competencies that were not included in the previous questionnaire.

If you have questions please contact Kelly Choi at 517-214-3043 or choikell@hotmail.com. Once I again thank you very much for your time and assistance with this investigation.

Sincerely,

Kelly Choi
## FEEDBACK LOOP QUESTIONNAIRE

Below you will find the Mean rating of the expert panel. After considering the Mean rating please circle your new rating in the column entitle "Your new rating" based on the level of your agreement with the Mean rating. In addition, please provide essential competencies in the column entitle "Excluded essential competencies" that are not included in the list below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Mean Rating</th>
<th>Your New Rating</th>
<th>Excluded Essential Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can manage employees' problem effectively</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintain professional at work</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Maintain positive owner relations</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Can maintain effective working relationship with employees</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Positively meet employee's needs</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Manage within budgets</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Maintain ethical standards</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can appraise employee performance effectively</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Effectively delegates responsibility</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Effectively delegates authority</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Effectively develop staff members</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Effectively develops work/home life balance</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Can identify operational problems</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Maintain effective federal, state, and local sanitation and safety regulations</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Can effectively manage life threatening situations</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Manage employee grievance effectively</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Conduct effective meetings with prospective employees</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Effective oral communication skills</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Can maintain effective security policies/procedures</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Effectively manage preventing maintenance at property</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Effectively manages cash flow</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Maintain good understanding of PPE maintenance/repair</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Can effectively maintain budget for property</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Understand capital budget for property</td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Can establish organizational objectives</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Can plan long-term operational strategies</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Can develop budgets for each department</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ability to prioritize organizational objectives</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Understanding of predicting future trends and applications</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Understands strategies Human Resource planning</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Understanding of compensation policy/plans</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Can effectively explain reasons for company/property policies</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Can effectively assist in monitoring financial health of property</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Understands how to effectively manage labor costs</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Can develop reliable revenue and expense tracking system</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Understanding of employment law</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Maintains environmentally-friendly property</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Can create effective security plan/procedure</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Understanding of benefits/polices/productions</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Can provide solid reasons for owner to maintain ownership</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Can effectively help others plan their needs</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Effective written communication skills</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Understanding of department responsibilities</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Socially responsible</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Can prepare property financial statements</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Knowledge of cleaning/maintenance needs</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Effectively utilizes property engineering options</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Can develop effective energy-management program</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Understanding of funds that influence financial decisions</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Can provide history of company</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Effective computer skills</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Can effectively educate owners/guests with local events and activities</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Can provide history of timeshare industry</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Effectively guides HOA</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Can discuss different types of contracts</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Excellent working relations with sales department</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Understanding of common/adeqate law/regulations</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Food and Beverage management skills</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCE


59

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


VITA

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Yun-Kyung Choi

Local Address:
9050 West Warm Springs Rd. #2076
Las Vegas, Nevada 89148

Home Address:
1-702 Sang- A Apt., O-gum-dong, Song-Pa-Gu
Seoul, Korea

Degrees:
Bachelor of Arts, Hospitality Business, 2003
Michigan State University, East Lansing

Thesis Title: Essential Management Competencies in the Timeshare Industry

Thesis Examination Committee:
Chairperson, Dr. Gail Sammons, Ph.D., CHA
Committee Member, Dr. Robert H. Woods, Ph.D.
Committee Member, Dr. David Corsun, Ph.D.
Graduate Faculty Representative, Dr. Daniel McAllister, Ph.D.