

5-2017

Proposing a Manager Profile that is Predictive of Employee Job-Embeddedness, Satisfaction, and Engagement

Lauren Stephens

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Hospitality Administration and Management Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Stephens, Lauren, "Proposing a Manager Profile that is Predictive of Employee Job-Embeddedness, Satisfaction, and Engagement" (2017). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 3194.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/13445733>

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

This Professional Paper has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@unlv.edu.

Proposing a Manager Profile that is Predictive of
Employee Job-Embeddedness, Satisfaction, and Engagement

by

Lauren Stephens

Bachelor of Science

George Mason University

2012

A professional paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the

Masters of Hospitality Administration

William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration

Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

May, 2017

Chair: Dr. Anthony Gatling

PART ONE

Introduction

Numerous studies have been conducted on leader-member exchange (LMX) theory and its application to organizational growth and development with a focus on the quality of relationships between leaders and their employees. There is an opportunity to expand upon the theory and its application to the hospitality industry. Understanding that this industry focuses on service delivery, which is influenced by relationships between leaders and employees, hospitality organizations can benefit from understanding what attributes of leaders contribute to high quality LMX relationships with employees.

Purpose

The purpose of the research is to propose a manager “profile” for hospitality organizations to use when hiring, training, and conducting performance evaluations for managers.

Problem Statement

The hospitality industry expects much from its leaders. Higher than average turnover and burnout is prevalent among managers, who work unconventional hours within an industry where expectations are quite high. Additionally, leaders play an integral role in creating a positive work environment for their employees. Leaders who are engaged and invested in their employees have a significant, positive effect on employee morale. However, hospitality organizations struggle with finding leaders who can inspire employees to exceed customer expectations and find fulfillment in their careers.

Objective

The research objective is to perform an exploratory study on LMX theory to propose a manager “profile” for further study. Specifically, the research will examine leadership competencies to propose moderating and mediating factors that contribute to high quality leader-employee relationships and how these factors affect employee job-embeddedness, satisfaction, and engagement.

Justifications

The research adds to the existing knowledge base on LMX theory but puts it in a perspective for employers to use when hiring, training, and evaluating management personnel. Furthermore, the research proposes behaviors and attributes of leaders that can contribute to high quality LMX relationships and why such relationships are beneficial to hospitality organizations. Ideally, the recommendations presented in this research can be used to find leaders who contribute to job-embeddedness, satisfaction, and engagement among employees.

Constraints

Since there are numerous leadership theories in existence, it is necessary to constrain the present research to examine only one in order to provide clear recommendations and actionable insights for hospitality organizations. LMX theory was selected for this research because of the emphasis it places on relationships between leaders and employees. Furthermore, there are several factors that can affect employee job-embeddedness, satisfaction, and engagement. This research focuses on the quality of relationships and specific attributes of leaders to propose a manager profile that is useful to hospitality organizations. Finally, although this research adds to the body of knowledge related to the application of LMX theory, prior research on how LMX theory can be used to create a specific manager profile is limited.

The following section of this paper (Part Two) includes a review of the existing literature, provided as justification for how LMX theory can lead to the generation of a manager profile. A discussion on this application and the rationale behind the research proposition follows. Finally, the paper concludes with recommendations for future study, as well as how to apply the findings found from this research to actual business operations.

PART TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

In Part One, LMX theory and its application to the hospitality industry was introduced. Further, the research objective was presented as undertaking a methodological approach to creating a manager “profile” for future research. Part Two now includes a review of the existing literature to propose how LMX theory can be applied in hospitality to generate this manager profile. A discussion on this application and the rationale behind the research proposition follows.

LMX Theory

LMX theory examines the exchange of tangible and intangible resources between managers and subordinates to evaluate relationship quality (Sheer, 2015). Resources are either work-related or socially-driven and emotionally-based. Relationships are categorized as high or low quality depending on the type and frequency of resources that are exchanged.

Theoretical Foundations

Early studies segmented employees into ingroups and outgroups based on their level of interaction and proximity to the leader (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Cashman, 1975). The theoretical foundations of the LMX theory measure specific dimensions of relationship quality between leaders and subordinates. The theory evolved from research conducted by Dansereau et al. (1975) who proposed that leaders have different types of relationships with their subordinates, known as vertical dyad linkages. These dyads differentiate the role behaviors of management personnel between supervision and leadership. Regarding supervision, vertical exchanges between a leader and an employee are formal and limited to the

tasks and responsibilities as specified in the employment contract (Dansereau et al., 1975). In comparison, when leadership is enacted vertical exchanges transcend the terms of the employment contract and focus more on a leader's influential nature, which is activated through interpersonal relationships with certain employees. These dyadic relationships are distinct in that members of the in-group are liked, respected, trusted, and able to influence the leader while relationships with out-group members remain purely transactional (Loi, Chan, & Lam, 2013).

The initial theory was operationalized with the introduction of scales to facilitate measurement. The LMX-7 scale measures trust, loyalty, and affect (Sheer, 2015). Taken together, these dimensions describe relationship quality and indicate whether employees are part of a leader's ingroup or outgroup. LMX-7 consists of seven questions that a subordinate answers in respect to their leader such as, "How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader?" (Sheer, 2015, p. 218). The main criticism of LMX-7 is that it does not address the fact that leaders and employees have multiple roles in the workplace (Anand, Hu, Liden, & Vidhyarthi, 2011). Furthermore, many believe that relationships are more appropriately described after examining each of the different dimensions. Using a one-dimensional approach, relationships may be seen as similar in the sense that they are both described as high-quality but dissimilar in which dimensions (trust, affect, etc.) create such quality.

Understanding this, Liden and Maslyn (1998) proposed a leader-member exchange multidimensional scale (LMX-MDM) and added a fourth dimension: professional respect (Sheer, 2015). Professional respect is apparent when leaders or employees seek advice from one another or express admiration of the other's workplace demeanor (Liden, Sparrowe, & Wayne, 1997). This additional dimension allows for a more complete description of relationships. However, some believe that the LMX-MDM scale fails to measure the actual exchange of trust, loyalty,

affect, and professional respect between leaders and employees. In contrast, the leader-member social exchange scale (LMSX) developed by Bernerth, Armenakis, Feild, Giles, & Walker (2007) addresses the exchange of attributes as a two-way process (Sheer, 2015). Their construct examines the subordinate's perception of reciprocity – that is, whether they feel that their outputs will be returned by their leader in some way (i.e., exchanged). Despite their discrepancies these LMX measurement scales all address the basic components of LMX theory, which are now addressed.

Components of LMX

The components of LMX include exchange of resources and the resulting high and low quality relationships that develop between leaders and employees. Leaders control the type and frequency of resources exchanged with employees, which then influences the nature of their relationship (Harris, Wheeler, & Kacmar, 2011). The relationships that develop over time are segmented into high quality and low quality and are characterized by the behaviors of leaders and employees (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995).

Exchange. Exchange is segmented into tangible and intangible resources related to work and social tasks. Tangible resources are related to the exchange of commodities such as compensation, development opportunities, and time, among others (Sheer, 2015). Intangible resources are related to communication exchange such as when messages or ideas are discussed between leaders and their subordinates. These resources can be exchanged for work or social purposes. It is important to make this distinction because the nature and frequency of exchanges determine whether relationships are characterized as high or low quality.

Low quality relationships. In the beginning, exchanges between leaders and employees are straightforward and simple. In this early phase of the relationship, both parties are still

assessing one another and resources exchanged are limited to only those required to perform the work (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). At this point, leaders group employees among those who they can trust and rely on and those who can simply perform work tasks. Low quality relationships exist between leaders and members of the outgroup, who are considered by the leader to be the worker bees or hired hands (Sheer, 2015). Leaders have minimal exchange with these employees—particularly communication exchange—outside of a work context. In low quality relationships, the resources that are exchanged focus primarily on completion of work (Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, & Epitropaki, 2016). Furthermore, relationships are quite formal and lack any type of interaction purely for self-interest.

High quality relationships. As relationships develop between the leader and certain employees, the frequency of exchange increases and the types of resources that are exchanged become more socially-based. In high quality relationships, the leader and employee exchange more information and resources with one another that are related to both their work and personal lives (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leaders come to rely on these employees to take on extra work assignments and provide assistance when the workload becomes overwhelming.

High quality relationships exist between leaders and members of the ingroup (Sheer, 2015). In high quality relationships, leaders and their employees have a high degree of mutual trust and respect for one another (Loi et al., 2013). There is a sense of camaraderie in high quality relationships as there is frequent communication between leaders and members of the ingroup, both related to work and related to their personal opinions, beliefs and ideals. High quality relationships produce fewer negative work behaviors among employees, such as counterproductive performance, as compared to low quality relationships (Martin et al., 2016). In

these relationships, the exchange process is inferred and employees understand that they will be rewarded by the leader in return for their support and task completion (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

Practical implications of LMX

Practical implications address how hospitality organizations can use the theoretical foundations of LMX to their benefit when hiring, training, and conducting performance evaluations of managers. Ideally, organizations can use what has been identified in the literature to seek out and develop managers who possess the skills and behaviors that promote the formulation of high quality LMX relationships.

Application to manager hiring. During the hiring process, organizations can ask questions that attempt to reveal a candidate's opinion on the importance of developing relationships and the strategies they use to build trust, rapport, and respect with their employees. Psychometric and personality assessments can be used to identify behaviors and attributes of leaders that generate positive effects among employees. Such assessments can also measure traits that influence a leader's behavioral style towards others and their decision-making preferences. Interview question types include situational, behavioral, and job knowledge (Campion, Pursell, & Brown, 1988). Regardless of the type, all questions should correlate to the specific responsibilities and tasks required of the position. Further, organizations are advised to follow a structured interview approach to ensure consistency and to minimize the risk of interviewer bias and subjectivity (Campion, Pursell, & Brown, 1988). Finally, organizations should spend as much time as is prudent in sourcing and vetting candidates in order to find those who possess traits that correlate to high quality relationships. Indeed, Loi et al. (2013) advise organizations to focus on "...the fit between self-definitions of the leader and the follower, as well as the quality

of LMX resulting from such fit” (p. 55). This same focus can be applied to manager training and performance evaluations.

Application to manager training. Through training, managers learn how to exhibit certain exchange behaviors in their day-to-day interactions with employees (Sheer, 2015). More specifically, exchange behaviors that lead to positive employee outcomes such as job-embeddedness and satisfaction. With this in mind, organizations can develop training curriculum that addresses the dimensions of relationship quality – trust, loyalty, affect, and professional respect. For example, training could help managers identify any potential biases in their judgment making process which impacts who is part of their ingroup or outgroup (Martin et al., 2016). Additionally, training could teach managers how to assign tasks and delegate authority to impart trust among their subordinates. The final practical implication of the LMX theory is in its application to manager performance evaluations.

Application to manager performance evaluation. Multiple perspectives must be obtained when evaluating managers on their progress towards establishing high quality LMX relationships with their subordinates. Multiple perspectives help mitigate potential appraisal bias and provide a comprehensive view of a manager’s ability to inspire employee satisfaction, job-embeddedness, and engagement (Martin et al., 2016). Furthermore, performance evaluations should focus on a manager’s ability to oversee several employees while maintaining procedural fairness and unbiased treatment (Martin et al., 2016). As described in LMX theory, there exists both an ingroup and an outgroup among employees in respect to their manager. Despite such delineation, managers should treat all employees with fairness and respect; thus, performance evaluations can be used to ensure managers are developing high quality relationships while also maintaining equity in the workplace. Finally, it is important to note that establishing high quality

relationships takes time, so performance evaluations should be conducted on a regular cadence to view the progression of such relationships (Martin et al., 2016). Taken at a single point in time, feedback may not be a true representation of a manager's competency. Additionally, the dimensions of trust, loyalty, affect, and professional respect differ in the time it takes to develop each between the leader and employee. For example, the affective dimension may develop early in the relationship, as most people have a basic tolerance for others. In contrast, loyalty may not be apparent for a considerable amount of time since it is developed through multiple, varied exchanges throughout the course of a relationship (Liden et al., 1997).

Manager Profile

The research objective is to propose a manager profile that can be applied in the hospitality industry based on the theoretical foundations of the LMX theory. Hospitality organizations can use the proposed manager profile as a standard to which all managers are held accountable for their actions and performance. This profile is composed of certain leadership traits that contribute to positive employee outcomes. Such traits also influence whether employees are inclined to form a high quality relationship with their leader, as it is unlikely they will exchange resources with a leader whom they believe is ineffective or not trustworthy (Liden et al., 1997). A summary of leader behaviors and traits for each profile is provided in Table 1. Here, the moderating and mediating factors of leader-member exchange and employee outcomes are addressed.

Moderating factors of LMX

Moderating factors describe variances in the relationship between variables. For example, in the context of survey administration, type of rater is a possible moderating factor in determining whether high quality LMX relationships have an effect on employee performance.

Based on their viewpoints, leaders and employees may have different opinions of their relationship. Indeed, LMX associations tend to be stronger when taken from a leader's perspective (Gerstner & Day, 1997). Thus, it is prudent to test whether there are differences between leader and employee responses in any research that uses data collected from a survey to examine LMX. By way of example, Martin et al. (2016) analyzed over 100 journal articles, dissertations, book chapters, and conference proceedings to understand the relationship between LMX relationship quality and employee performance. As shown by the results of their meta-analysis, the effects of LMX on employee performance tend to be weaker when the follower rates LMX as opposed to the leader.

Mediating factors of LMX

Mediating factors describe causality, or why one variable has an effect on another. For example, high quality LMX relationships may lead to greater employee satisfaction due to the high levels of affect and liking exchanged between leaders and members of the ingroup. Moreover, employees who are part of the ingroup translate trust from their leader into satisfaction and commitment to both their leader and the organization (Martin et al., 2016). Looking again at the meta-analysis conducted by Martin et al. (2016), trust, job satisfaction, motivation, and empowerment have been shown to mediate the effects between LMX and task performance.

Employee Outcomes

Leaders play an integral role in creating a positive work environment. Moreover, leaders who are engaged and invested in their employees have a significant, positive effect on employee performance. High quality LMX relationships can produce a range of employee outcomes, including job satisfaction, engagement, and job-embeddedness. Hospitality organizations need

managers who understand the importance of creating high quality LMX relationships, as exchange of resources can make employees feel equipped and motivated to do their jobs (Harris et al., 2011). Further, an engaged and satisfied workforce reduces expenses for the organization related to turnover, hiring, and training and also translates into improved guest service.

Job Satisfaction

There are two ways to define job satisfaction: overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with each particular component of a job. Overall satisfaction is typically the sum of the individual component measures (Wanous & Lawler, 1972). To feel satisfied, employees first must have their basic needs met. For example, they must be given adequate resources to perform the tasks required of their position. The role of managers in creating employee job satisfaction enters into the equation once employees' basic needs are met. Employees look to their managers for support, guidance, and respect, all of which are apparent in high quality LMX relationships (Loi et al., 2013). In contrast, managers and employees exchange minimal communication and resources with one another in low quality LMX relationships. Without support and congeniality from their manager, it is unlikely that employees will find satisfaction with their job; rather, they will be disconnected with the goals of the organization (Loi et al., 2013).

Satisfaction can be associated with commitment. This association is explained through Rusbult's (1980) investment model, which was initially developed to examine romantic relationships. It can be applied within the LMX framework to predict one's degree of commitment to and satisfaction with a relationship. Essentially, a relationship is considered more valuable as more resources are exchanged. If they are satisfied, both the leader and the employee will commit to their relationship and continue the ongoing exchange of resources (Rusbult,

1980). Further, leaders and employees may demonstrate greater commitment towards one another if they are satisfied with the type and frequency of resources exchanged (Rusbult, 1980).

Engagement

Nearly 30 years ago, Kahn presented engagement as a psychological state of being, explaining that individuals choose when and how much of themselves they invest in their work. More specifically, Kahn (1990) termed personal engagement as the harnessing of oneself in their work role and personal disengagement as the “uncoupling of selves from work roles” (p.694). Since Kahn’s initial research, engagement has been further defined, measured, and explained through a variety of theoretical frameworks. For example, Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) proposed that engagement is the “positive antithesis” (p.416) of burnout. Further, Maslach et al. (2001) presented a model of engagement by way of comparison to burnout as measured across three dimensions: exhaustion, cynicism, and ineffectiveness. Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, and Bakker (2002) tested the model by administering a survey based on the Maslach-Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS). The results of their study among university students and employees indicated a negative relationship between burnout and engagement and, more importantly, provided empirical evidence to the Maslach et al. (2001) burnout model. Additional research on the MBI-GS led to the development of the widely-used Utrecht Work Engagement Scale by Schaufeli et al. (2002). This “Utrecht Group” (named so for their affiliation with Utrecht University in The Netherlands) defined engagement as a positive state of mind, one in which individuals choose to devote their full energies towards work activities (Schaufeli et al., 2002). This definition of engagement is relevant to hospitality and other service organizations, since employee performance is closely linked to their emotional states.

Shifting perspectives, engagement has also been defined as a management practice in contrast to the aforementioned “state of mind” definitions (Truss, Shantz, Soane, Alfes & Delbridge, 2013). In this definition, the emphasis is placed on managers, who play an active role in generating enthusiasm for work and providing key resources to employees. The type of relationship employees have with their manager has a significant impact on their level of engagement and the enactment of other performance outcomes (Alfes, Shantz, Truss, & Soane, 2013). Managers have frequent tangible work and communication exchange with employees in high quality LMX relationships (Sheer, 2015). This interaction keeps employees engaged in their respective roles and makes them feel connected to what is going on within the organization as a whole. Additionally, employees engage in more positive behaviors when they complete tasks assigned exclusively to them by their leader. This exclusivity implies trust, which is prevalent in high quality relationships. Leaders trust their ingroup and afford these employees greater leeway in completing certain tasks, as compared to the outgroup. Furthermore, tasks assigned to the ingroup may extend beyond what is specified in the employment contract. This definition of engagement aligns with the job demands-resources (JD-R) framework, such that employees who receive high levels of resources are more likely to be engaged at work (Bailey, Madden, Alfes, & Fletcher, 2017).

Job-Embeddedness

The general premise of job-embeddedness is that an employee who is embedded within an organization is more likely to stay in their role, as opposed to those with few ties to their employer, role, and/or coworkers (Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, & Erez, 2001). The main components of job-embeddedness are links, fit, and sacrifices. Links are the formal and informal connections that develop between a person and other people or activities (Mitchell et al., 2001).

The higher the number of links one has in their “web”, the more they are tied to their employer. Fit relates to how compatible one’s job is with the other aspects in their life. The better the fit from a personal and professional standpoint, the more likely one is to feel connected to their employer. Finally, sacrifice represents what one must give up if they are to leave their job, or the links that would be broken in their “web” (Mitchell et al., 2001). These sacrifices include both material goods (e.g., salary) and psychological benefits (e.g., friendships with coworkers).

The frequent exchange of resources and communication in high quality LMX relationships can promote job embeddedness by increasing linkages and strengthening employees’ “webs”. On the other hand, low quality LMX relationships lack exchange of meaningful resources that can embed employees within the organization (Harris et al., 2011). Further, satisfied employees who are engaged at work are more likely to stay embedded within an organization. Research has shown that employees who receive support from their manager experience lower amounts of stress and burnout, both of which contribute to turnover intentions (Breevaart et al., 2013).

In addition to the exchange of resources, another factor that influences employee job-embeddedness is uncertainty. Employees may seek alternative employment if they believe their jobs are at risk. In these circumstances, an employee’s web begins to unravel. To an extent, managers can alleviate concern and establish links through frequent exchange of information. As a result, employees interpret this exchange as verification of their role within the organization (Loi et al., 2013).

Conclusion

The LMX theory measures specific dimensions of relationship quality between managers and employees, including trust, loyalty, affect, and professional respect. These dimensions are

apparent in high quality LMX relationships, which are characterized by frequent exchange of resources and communication. Furthermore, high quality LMX relationships can lead to performance outcomes such as employee satisfaction, engagement, and job-embeddedness. Hospitality organizations can benefit from understanding what attributes of managers contribute to high quality LMX relationships with employees. Part Three now proposes manager profiles applicable to hiring, training, and conducting performance appraisals.

PART THREE

Introduction

In Part Two, the existing literature on LMX theory was reviewed and the theory's theoretical foundations were used to propose a manager profile for hospitality organizations. Part Three builds upon the literature review and presents a manager profile in three sections: hiring, training, and conducting performance evaluations. Each section also addresses the dimensions of relationship quality identified in the literature review, as well as the impact to employee performance outcomes.

Hiring

Behaviors can be identified during the hiring process to determine whether or not individuals are more likely to develop high quality relationships with their employees. Such behaviors include fairness, empathy, integrity, and trustworthiness (Wang & Hsieh, 2013). Psychometric assessments can be used to identify behaviors and attributes of leaders that generate positive effects among their employees, such as loyalty and trust. These attributes can then be further examined during interviews. For example, integrity and transparency are qualities of a leader that cultivate trust by using highly-structured interview questions that are behaviorally anchored. These qualities and others can be measured through aptitude tests, personality tests, and skill tests.

Personality assessments measure traits that influence a leader's behavioral style towards others and their decision-making preferences, among other things. Aptitude and skills tests measure one's critical thinking and problem-solving skills in relation to the required job functions. Once an initial candidate pool is determined, psychometric assessments can be administered by organizations to identify candidates who possess qualities that are apparent in

high-quality LMX relationships. Following the assessment stage of the hiring process, organizations can then conduct interviews. Questions asked during interviews should address specific behaviors and answers should be evaluated using a pre-determined anchored rating scale. Ratings should correlate to the candidate's ability to provide specific examples of their leadership style and previous experiences with employees. For example, on a 5-item scale, a score of "1" would equate to a less-than-acceptable response, meaning the candidate failed to demonstrate application of the particular behavior in question. In contrast, a score of "5" would equate to a highly acceptable response, meaning the candidate provided a response that significantly demonstrated their application of the behavior.

Training

In addition to the hiring process, characteristics of leaders can be identified and assessed through training. Curriculum that incorporates both scenario- and problem-based exercises can be added to an organization's current leadership training or as an alternative to these methods (Gerstner & Day, 1997). By assessing leaders' behaviors and answers during training, organizations can then address problematic behaviors early and introduce beneficial practices for leaders to use in their exchanges with employees (Harris et al., 2011).

For example, training can identify a leader's personal biases. Addressing biases is important, as they can impede the development of loyalty between subordinates and leaders. Moreover, employees who perceive bias as inequity or unfair treatment by their leader may engage in counterproductive behaviors that are detrimental to the organization (Martin et al., 2016). Organizations can incorporate tests into training to identify personal biases. The Implicit Association Test (IAT) was first reported by Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz in 1998 and is used to identify trait associations that trigger attitudes and stereotypes. The IAT measures bias in

a variety of contexts, from age to gender. Regardless of what bias is tested, training can address the impacts on relationship development and employee performance outcomes.

Training can also focus on task assignment and delegation of authority. Employees who have a high-quality relationship with their leader are often provided with more responsibility and discretion in completing tasks, as they are seen as more competent and trustworthy (Yukl & Fu, 1999). Training programs can illustrate the benefits of establishing trust with employees. For example, delegation can reduce a leader's workload while simultaneously empowering employees to complete tasks with a sense of ownership.

Performance Evaluations

When conducting performance evaluations, leadership personnel are typically assessed on both hard and soft metrics. Hard metrics focus on what a manager does to meet business objectives, such as increasing productivity and lower costs. On the other hand, soft metrics focus on how managers interact with and are perceived by their employees. Both metrics can be used to evaluate a leader's performance in terms of relationship quality. To illustrate, the relationship dimension of loyalty can be evaluated through an examination of voluntary turnover. High levels of voluntary turnover may indicate a lack of affect and professional respect among employees and their leader, which should be addressed during performance evaluations.

Additional components of performance evaluations include succession planning and 360° feedback. In succession planning, managers identify new leaders who can replace them in their current role when they advance in their own careers. Succession plans should be monitored to identify, address, and correct potential biases of leaders towards certain employees and demographics. In 360° feedback, multiple perspectives are obtained in regards to a leader's performance. More specifically, anonymous feedback is provided by employees, coworkers, and

direct supervisors (Brett & Atwater, 2001). The justification for 360° feedback is that it provides a more holistic assessment of an individual's behavior and performance, as compared to self-evaluations or those provided only by direct supervisors. Obtaining multiple perspectives can also identify gaps and congruencies in performance. However, it should be noted that negative feedback obtained through 360° reviews may be interpreted as inaccurate and lead to negative reactions from the individual who is evaluated (Brett & Atwater, 2001). As with any performance evaluation, organizations must provide leaders with actionable takeaways to further develop positive behaviors and minimize negative behaviors.

Conclusions

A practical interpretation of LMX theory was provided and manager profiles proposed for hospitality organizations to use when hiring, training, and evaluating leaders. A summary of leader behaviors and traits for each profile is provided in Table 1. In all of these activities, organization should focus on identifying, reinforcing, and evaluating behaviors that are apparent in high-quality LMX relationships. Ideally, organization can use the proposed manager profiles to find leaders who understand the effects of leader-member exchanges on employee and business outcomes.

Loyalty, trust, affect, and professional respect are dimensions of relationship quality as identified in the literature. These “currencies of exchange” are what leaders and employees bring to the relationship and which produce positive employee outcomes such as job satisfaction, engagement, and embeddedness (Dienesch & Liden, 1986, p.625). An engaged and effective workforce provides several advantages to hospitality organizations, as employee satisfaction has a direct correlation to guest satisfaction. Furthermore, LMX theory can be incorporated into human resources management practices. By doing so, theory is translated into practical terms for

organizations to use when hiring, training, and conducting performance evaluations of leadership personnel.

Table 1
Leader Behaviors and Traits by Manager Profile

Profile	Behaviors	Traits
Hiring	Frequently exchanges resources and information Develops meaningful, positive relationships	Respectful, Transparent, Honest, Dependable
Training	Makes unbiased decisions Acts with integrity	Supportive, Non-judgmental, Empathetic
Performance Evaluations	Delegates authority Acts as a mentor	Influential, Fair, Inspirational Trustworthy

Recommendations for Future Research

Additional research on the mediating and moderating factors of LMX relationships is recommended to expand upon the preliminary profile recommendations presented here. Moreover, conducting empirical studies focused on leader-member exchanges within hospitality organizations will add support and justification to the practical implications provided. Studies should be designed to examine each process (hiring, training, and performance evaluations) over a long period of time to accurately capture the dimensions and effects of LMX relationships.

References

- Alfes, K., Shantz, A. D., Truss, C., & Soane, E. C. (2013). The link between perceived human resource management practices, engagement and employee behavior: A moderated mediation model. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(2), 330-351. doi:10.1080/09585192.2012.679950
- Anand, S., Hu, J., Liden, R. C., & Vidyarathi, P. R. (2011). Leader-member exchange: Recent research findings and prospects for the future. In *The sage handbook of leadership* (pp. 311-325). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., & Fletcher, L. (2017). The meaning, antecedents and outcomes of employee engagement: A narrative synthesis. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 19, 31-53. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12077
- Bernerth, J.B., Armenakis, A.A., Feild, H.S., Giles, W.F., & Walker, H.J. (2007). Leader-member social exchange (LMSX): Development and validation of a scale. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 28(8), 979-1003.
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2013). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 138-157. doi:10.1111/joop.12041
- Brett, J. F., & Atwater, L. E. (2001). 360° feedback: Accuracy, reactions, and perceptions of usefulness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 930-942. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.930
- Campion, M. A., Pursell, E. D., & Brown, B. K. (1988). Structured interviewing: Raising the psychometric properties of the employment interview. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 25-42. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00630.x

- Dansereau, F., Graen, G.B., & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership in formal organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 618-634.
doi:10.5465/amr.1986.4306242
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 827-844.
doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.827
- Graen, G.B., & Cashman, J. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach, In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership Frontiers* (pp. 143-166). Kent, OH: Kent State University Press.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5
- Greenwald, A. G., Mcghee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464-1480. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464
- Harris, K. J., Wheeler, A. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (2011). The mediating role of organizational job embeddedness in the LMX-outcomes relationships. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(2), 271-281. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.003
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. doi:10.2307/256287

- Liden, R.C. & Maslyn, J.M. (1998). Multidimensionality of leader-member exchange: An empirical assessment through scale development. *Journal of Management*, 24, 43–72.
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 15, 47-119.
- Loi, R., Chan, K. W., & Lam, L. W. (2013). Leader-member exchange, organizational identification, and job satisfaction: A social identity perspective. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(1), 42-61. doi:10.1111/joop.12028
- Martin, R., Guillaume, Y. R., Thomas, G., Lee, A., & Epitropaki, O. (2016). Leader-member exchange (LMX) and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 69(1), 67-121. doi:10.1111/peps.12100
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1102-1121. doi:10.2307/3069391
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16(2), 172-186. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(80)90007-4
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326

- Sheer, V. C. (2015). "Exchange lost" in leader–member exchange theory and research: A critique and a reconceptualization. *Leadership, 11*(2), 213-229.
doi:10.1177/1742715014530935
- Truss, C., Shantz, A., Soane, E., Alfes, K., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Employee engagement, organisational performance and individual well-being: Exploring the evidence, developing the theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 24*(14), 2657-2669. doi:10.1080/09585192.2013.798921
- Wang, D., & Hsieh, C. (2013). The effect of authentic leadership on employee trust and employee engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality, 41*(4), 613-624.
doi:10.2224/sbp.2013.41.4.613
- Wanous, J. P., & Lawler, E. E. (1972). The measurement and meaning of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 56*(2), 95-105. doi:10.1037/h0032664
- Yukl, G., & Fu, P. P. (1999). Determinants of delegation and consultation by managers. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*(2), 219-232. doi:10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(199903)20:2<219::aid-job922>3.0.co;2-8