

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES ASSOCIATED WITH SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY – A PILOT STUDY IN LICENSED RETAIL OPERATIONS

UDC 640.4:65.012.4
Preliminary communication

Elizabeth M. Ineson
Graham J. Stone

Received 29 August 2010
Revised 8 October 2010
4 November 2010

Abstract

The research sought to identify key qualities associated with successful licensed retail managers, defined as effective, efficient and profitable operators. Through semi-structured in-depth interviews, managers' views on success criteria, and problems associated with this type of employment, were elicited. The greatest assets were considered to be personal stability, mobility, good health and support from relatives/family. Physical and mental stamina, well-developed interpersonal skills, anticipation, vigilance and attention to detail were also cited. Prior academic attainment was not considered to be crucial to success; hard biodata from application forms did not allow successful managers to be identified.. The greatest problems in the job centred on people management. Reasons for choosing the job included variety, challenge, the need to be with, enjoyment from talking to, entertaining, pleasing and developing others and delivering a service. Elements of emotional intelligence, including commitment and hardiness, were identified as primary success indicators.

Keywords Hospitality, Licensed retail, Public house, Management, Success, Problems

INTRODUCTION

This paper outlines the initial stages in determining those attributes associated with successful licensed retail management. The focus is on the licensed retail (pubic) house sector of a major United Kingdom (UK) hospitality and leisure company. The licensed houses under study varied in size and nature, from fairly small inns with restaurants to much larger lodges with up to 40 en-suite bedrooms. The licensed house trade in the UK has suffered greatly in the last decade, with problems being attributed to the smoking ban, spiralling costs, especially of labour and energy, and the erosion of the beer market; furthermore, the economic recession and pressures of the drink-driving legislation, coupled with cheap supermarket deals and high volumes of alcohol being smuggled into the UK for resale, have persuaded potential licensed house customers to drink at home (Lewis 2001; Mintel 2008). As a result, in spite of the attempts of many companies to introduce and promote food and accommodation, the number of licensed houses in the UK continues to fall (British Beer and Pub Association 2010). Given that a successful licensed retail manager is defined in the present paper as a profitable operator, it would appear that astute financial control should be a key attribute (Hull in

Matthews 2002) comments that the financial naivety of the licensed retail manager, who borrows more than s/he can afford to pay back because s/he has underestimated the overheads and the business rates is a major cause of licensees seeking debt advice. Lashley and Rowson (2002a) uncovered financial problems, inexperience and lack of appreciation the realities of licensed house life as frequent causes of business failure whilst Pratten (2004) maintained that public house owners should ensure that the managers they employ have the financial, technical and service skills necessary to run an outlet as well as the ambition. Within the licensed trade, although a “business development manager” is assigned to each tenant or licensee, s/he is not involved in ensuring minimum standards with respect to service, ambience and product range; they may do little more than ensure that the terms of the agreement are met, that is to purchase only from the owner’s supply company and to chase outstanding invoices (Lashley and Rowson 2002b). In support of the present research, Lashley and Rowson (2002a) noted that the licensed house managers whom they interviewed were critical of the way some licensed retail companies recruited managers and failed to support their tenants.

The research sought to identify and clarify existing managers' perceptions of the key qualities associated with successful, (defined as effective, efficient and profitable) licensed retail management. This pilot study was part of an ongoing project to develop and test a system, using a set of valid and quantifiable performance criteria, to be employed for recruiting licensed retail managers. The information gleaned contributed to the development of a system, designed to improve the reliability of recruitment judgements with respect to the identification of applicants who should emerge as "above average" performers within the organisation.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

In 1998, Beaver and Lashley agreed that the managerial competence of the owner manager was an indicator of small business success. However, Pratten (2005) postulated that the role of the licensed house manager had changed substantially in the last 20 years due to the increasing size and diverse nature of the business and activities that the ‘new type’ of managed outlets embraces. He noted that, although profitability is essential for these large volume units, the emphasis is moving to enhanced customer satisfaction to ensure repeat business and he highlights the impact of such changes for selectors, recruiters and trainers if these outlets are to be run in the most efficient way possible. He continues: staff control, meeting targets and satisfying customer, with continuous monitoring of such, are necessary to managerial success, coupled with an ability to make sound judgements regarding products, pricing, sales, staffing and entertainment with a focus on improving trade.

Forty years ago, the majority of UK public houses were owned by six major brewing firms who supplied their own stocks to their outlets (Pratten 2005) and customer loyalty was generated through brewery products (Lashley and Rowson 2002c). During the next 20 years, although mergers took place, brewing and beer sales remained the core activity of each organisation; ‘the brewery-owned outlets were operated either as

managed houses or tenancies and managers were appointed by the owners, who retained strict control of operations', including the products, pricing policy, opening hours, staffing and facilities (Pratten 2005, 332). Tenants selected by the owners paid rent then retained the profits but they were obliged to purchase all retail items from the brewery. Customers' complaints about such houses focused on the tenants whom they regarded being less committed to ensuring quality than managers who had direct stakes in the business (Cambridge & District CAMRA 1998). With the consequent restructuring of the industry, some new pub operators with large units and high volume sales potential decided to operate directly in the market as 'retailers', appointing managers to supervise the operations, whilst smaller and less profitable outlets formed the tenancy and leasehold portfolios (Pratten 2004). In consequence, brewers sold off their managed houses and the owning companies expanded their portfolios, with an overall decline in the number of managed houses as only the most profitable ones were retained. Managers were encouraged to make decisions, manage stock, staff and the business as a whole (Baker et al. 1998) and so meet customer needs; performance incentives were the norm. Success was judged on sales, profit conversion and mystery drinker/diner reports (Pratten 2005).

Traditionally, licensees tended to be 'older' males and bar staff were often female but there was little distinction in the literature between tenants and house managers (Mutch 2002). Hyde (1974) reported that, on recruitment, pub managers and tenants were 'older' males (mean age = 36.6 years) with few academic qualifications, assisted by low paid wives; there were no single female managers (cf. Preece et al. 1999). Key attributes sought in a landlord were technical competence whilst his spouse was expected to be responsible for cleanliness and decorum (Pratten 2005). Lack of company control systems could promote dishonesty in managers, evoking mutual mistrust (Baker et al. 1998). The changes in the public house product had implications for recruitment and training. Young single people, who were more mobile but lacked experience, were easily trained to meet the needs of their employers, with some individual contracts being offered to couples (Pratten 2005). Mutch (2002) noted that just under two-thirds of his sample were married couples and the remainder were single males and females, a third of whom were under 26 years of age and the majority of whom were under 30 years of age, compared with one-fifth and half of the married managers, respectively. Only two fifths of the married couples had previous experience of the licensed trade compared with three fifths of the young single managers, who were concentrated in the town centre outlets. The married couples tended to be from unrelated occupations with low formal qualifications and broadly from a skilled working class background whilst the single managers had higher academic qualifications often came through the bar staff route, possibly through part-time work whilst studying.

The attributes associated with successful management of a 'new' licensed retail house are now more akin to those linked to successful hotel or restaurant management than to a traditional public house management. Generally, hospitality recruiters have shown little interest in prior academic attainment, other than ensuring applicants have attained the 'minimum requisite standard' (Mutch 2001; Pratten and Curtis 2002). They have concentrated their efforts on a search for evidence of interpersonal skills, personal

qualities and commitment to hospitality management. In the latter context, full-time hospitality work experience is rated very highly, especially if it is managerial or supervisory; self-presentation and social skills, including oral communication skills, are also very important to hospitality management success (Ineson 1993; Peacock 1995; Pratten 2003). An extensive literature search (Phillips 1979; Swanljung 1981; Forte 1982; Keegan 1983; Dorsman 1983; Hotel and Catering Industrial Training Board 1983; Lord, DeVader and Alliger 1986; Stone, 1988; Tas, 1988; Worsfold, 1989; Baum 1990; Tett et al. 1991; Saville and Holdsworth 1992; Robertson and Kinder 1993; Peacock 1995; McCredie and Shackleton 2000; Mutch, 2001; Pratten 2003; 2005; Furnham et al 2007; Bartone et al 2009) identified the following as *key* contributors to successful service sector management: well-developed interpersonal skills; self-motivation and ability to motivate others; job knowledge and experience; numeracy; an ability to present and communicate information effectively both in written reports and orally (Peacock 1995). The Hotel and Catering Industrial Training Board (1983) found that over 96% of a sample of 281 managers rated the following characteristics as *very necessary* or *absolutely essential* in the conduct of their jobs: being reliable and responsible; communicating well with other employees; using their own initiative; being honest. A comparison of graduate management employers' and trainees' perceptions of the relative importance of aspects of performance to managerial success (Kelly and Dorsman 1984) revealed the same top eight criteria but with a difference in the rankings, namely, commitment to the job (1,4); self-motivation (2,3); enthusiasm (3,6); effective communication skills (4,1); problem-solving ability (5,2); ability to work in a team (6,6); effectiveness in meeting deadlines (6,8); good interpersonal skills (8,3). Nevertheless, the licensed house sector has not done nearly *enough to create a proper career path for its staff. Students have never really been presented with a case as to why they should join the licensed trade* instead of other sectors of the Industry (Holosi 1996). It appears that this statement still holds true; recruitment to licensed house management undergraduate courses in the UK is notoriously low relative to hospitality, tourism and events' management. More recently, Ineson et al. (2009) revealed the following key attributes in connection with hotel general management, which it might be argued, has much in common with the role of the 'new' licensed house manager: passion for customer satisfaction, cleanliness and work in general; effective management of working relationships; ability to deal with complaints/problems; ability to listen/take in information; ability to provide clear verbal instructions; keeping people informed; high quality service to clients and customers; ability to train staff; mental alertness/quick understanding of situations; ability to apply theory in practice; diplomacy; rule-consciousness/honesty/ trustworthiness; good observational skills/vigilance; ability to make decisions/decisive; optimistic outlook, even when difficulties arise; confident in dealing with/ability to deal with emergencies; persuasiveness/selling ability; knowing how to push for better performance; and creation of an environment of trust and fairness

Goleman (1996), assessing the contributory factors to managerial success, found emotional intelligence (EI) to be twice as important as cognitive or technical skills for job performance and Caruso and Wolfe (2001), Carmeli (2003), and Langhorn (2004) have found EI to be a common determinant of business success, leadership (Weiand 2002; Langhorn 2004; George 2006; Kerr et al. 2006 Bartone et al. 2009), employee

satisfaction (Lewis 2000) and competitive advantage (Weiland, 2002). Bartone et al. (2009) made a pertinent link in this context between leadership and hardiness. The latter was coined by Kobasa (1979) as a personality style or profile associated with continued good health and performance under stress. These attributes might be linked closely to success in licensed house management. Bartone et al (2009) associate hardiness with commitment, control, openness to challenges in life and an ability to cope with stressful and difficult experiences, which are perceived to be interesting and worthwhile. In the service sector, customer satisfaction has been linked positively to service providers' EI levels (Langhorn 2004; Varca 2004; Kernbach and Schutte 2005). Increasingly, researchers are linking elements of Emotional Intelligence (EI) with successful hospitality management (for example, Ineson 1993; Wilson 1998; Ineson et al. 2009). EI dimensions associated with service sector managerial success and uncovered by the previous researchers included: empathy; interpersonal relationships; problem solving; adaptability; optimism; social responsibility; independence; self-regard; stress tolerance and self control. There is clearly a degree of commonality amongst the EI dimensions and those mentioned above in the context of managing the 'new' licensed houses.

Following the decision to standardise the managerial selection and recruitment process across a number of divisions of the restructured Company under examination, a preliminary meeting with the divisional personnel managers gave rise to the following comments: *I am quickly coming to the conclusion that the process used seems to be dependent on the individual conducting it. The recruitment process seems to vary drastically from Manager to Manager. Our selection criteria seem to be mainly subjective; there is nothing on paper.* It quickly became clear that a new system was necessary to ensure staff and job mobility, interchange; enhancement of career opportunities across the merged company and savings in terms of cost and time. It was considered important that procedures and instruments were tailored specifically to meet the needs of the new Company as opposed to adapting an 'off-the-shelf' system, development by, and to the specifications of, an 'in-house' team to promote trust in the system.

The recruitment of 'quality' personnel who are enthusiastic, prepared to work for long hours and have a fair degree of physical stamina, and who are most likely to stay with the Company and to be successful managers, was considered to be of paramount importance. *Companies who are able to ensure a match between job requirements and people's characteristics will obtain a competitive advantage. Good selection procedures should reduce the worry and pressure on employees in jobs where they are out of their depth* (Smith and Robertson 1991). They continue: selection is necessary because people differ in their characteristics such as ability, prior work experiences, personality and interests. Also, jobs differ in the demands they make on workers. Essentially, selection involves matching people to jobs. Smith and Robertson (1991) maintained that the aim of any selection process is twofold: (i) to identify those persons who are most suited to the job requirements and who are therefore, in the opinion of the recruiters, the most likely to succeed, be happy in the job and contribute positively to company performance; and (ii) to avoid accepting those individuals who appear to constitute "high risk" employees. There was a need to establish a system in which both

the recruiters and the applicants had confidence. The purpose of the present research was to identify key attributes possessed by the successful licensed retail managers, defined as effective, efficient and profitable operators. To achieve this aim, a mutually acceptable, fair and objective set of criteria for screening is required (cf. Reilly and Chao 1982). As far as possible factual information, i.e. hard biodata (Shaffer et al. 1986) should be utilised at the initial screening stage to standardise the process, reduce costs and produce a reliable shortlist. It was hoped that such standardisation would release time and funding for the ensuing stages of the selection process, which in turn should ensure a more successful person/job fit within the organisation.

2. METHODOLOGY

The present paper considers the first stage in developing the selection system, that is the conduct of a series of semi-structured in-depth interviews (McDaniel et al, 1994) with a small sample of licensed house managers (N=13 from 7 units). The sample was identified by the Company's Human Resources Manager as representing examples of both "well above average", "just above average" and "below average" performers (Boyatzis 1982) to provide some qualitative information for consideration alongside their views on the relative merits of the items on the prepared list. Of the seven UK houses selected by the area managers, four were in the North West, one was in the South West and two were in the East Midlands. Between 33 and 45 staff were employed in each of the units. Decisions regarding the full-time/part-time mix, and the appointment of assistant or trainee managers, were usually the responsibility of the unit manager(s). Both hard and soft biodata were collected.

The framework for each interview hinged on questions exploring the interviewees' demographic profiles and their opinions regarding licensed house management success criteria, and problem areas, with respect to: career choice and expectations from the job; work experience; essential or desirable prerequisite professional and/or academic qualifications, or training, or specific knowledge of subject areas/working practices; involvement in hobbies and/or interests; personality types; personal qualities and personal details. Simultaneous separate interviews were conducted with each member of the couple if a house was managed jointly and, in every instance, by a researcher of the opposite gender. Probably, because they had been chosen by their area managers *to assist with the development of a new selection system*, the interviewees did not feel that they were under threat. Consequently, they were all very forthcoming and were prepared to offer information, and to discuss both work and personal issues quite freely. The in-depth interviews lasted for up to two hours and were conducted confidentially, without interruption, in a 'quiet corner of the workplace. The differentiating findings reported here evolved from the qualitative data collection. The hard biodata were used to compare the profiles of each of these performance subgroups. The success features and opinions elicited (soft biodata) centre on those of the more successful (N=7 from 4 units) managers.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the primary data, an overview of the 'ideal' profile on recruitment of a hospitality manager specialising in licensed retail operations is summarised in Table 1. The information has been extracted from the interview findings, which are discussed in detail and evaluated below.

Table 1: The 'ideal' profile of a licensed retail house manager on recruitment

Demographic profile	Aged between 29 and 39 years inclusive
Work experience	At least 12 months' service sector work experience, preferably in the hospitality industry prior to appointment
	Enjoyment of job; need to be with, to communicate with, to entertain and to please people; pleasure in delivery of a service; desire to develop people in workplace
Qualifications and academic competencies	Numerate (i.e. understanding of percentages and accounting, ability to do arithmetic or use a calculator and to cope with computer spreadsheets)
	Preferably a food hygiene qualification and, ideally, a training qualification
Career	Never considered an alternative career choice; long term ambition to be a hospitality manager
Personal and interpersonal skills and competencies	Good interpersonal skills; friendly and approachable; able to deal with the public
	Competitive, especially in business environment
	Ability to manage people
	Seeking challenge in the job
	Good time management
	Independent, particularly with respect to management, control and decision-making in personal life
	Anticipation, vigilance and attention to detail
Health	Physical and mental stamina
	Good general health
Personal circumstances	If a management partnership is proposed, there should be a controlling partner who makes the key decisions
	Stable relationship/home life,
	Mobile, i.e. willingness to change units
	Support from relatives/family
	Preferably a car owner with clean driving licence

The above average managers (AAMs; n=4 units) were aged from 29-39 years (mean = 34.5) and had worked for an average of 12 (minimum 4; maximum 18) years for the Company. The majority agreed on the need for at least 12 months' work experience, preferably in the hospitality industry (cf. Ineson 1993; Peacock 1995; Pratten 2003),

and experience of dealing directly with the public, prior to taking on the role of a licensed house manager.

One AAM was a single male, who was assisted by another male; the remainder of the interviewees were couples (cf. Preece et al. 1999; Mutch 2002). The spouses of those with young children (n=2), mentioned that, without careful management, the children could pose problems because of the pressure and demands of the job. It was agreed that successful managers had to be extremely independent, particularly with respect to management, control and decision-making in their personal lives. The comment was made: *in a partnership, there should be a controlling partner who makes the key decisions*. Not surprisingly, everyone was not in favour of this model! It was agreed that it is very difficult for licensed house managers to accommodate 'external' family commitments or obligations.

On joining the Company, the AAMs academic qualifications ranged from school examinations passed at 16 plus to Institute of Hospitality professional qualifications. All of the BAMs had followed a 'craft route' and CGLI 706/2 was the highest level attained. The interviewees did not think that prior academic attainment was crucial to successful management (cf. Mutch 2001; Mutch 2002; Pratten and Curtis 2002) but it was considered that *basic numeracy* (such as an understanding of percentages and accounting), the ability to *do arithmetic* or *use a calculator*, to *use a keyboard* and to cope with *computer spreadsheets* were contributory factors (in line with Pratten 2004). Similarly, a *food hygiene qualification* and an *ability to deal with the public* were mentioned as assets but not prerequisites. However, the belief prevailed that initial in-house training (as recommended by Pratten 2005) could cover all of these areas given that the applicant was of *reasonable intelligence*. As staff training is part of the manager's job, training qualifications were seen to be of value on entry. However, this feature did not differentiate the AAMs from the BAMs.

On application, the greatest assets were seen to be a *stable relationship/home life, mobility*, i.e. willingness to change units, *good general health* and *support from relatives/family*. Holding a *clean driving licence* and *owning a car* were also referred to as plus factors. Also, the ideal licensed house manager should be *prepared to work hard for long hours* possibly under pressure, hence *physical and mental stamina* are required. *Good interpersonal skills*, exhibited in a friendly and approachable person who could deal with the public and not only wanted but needed to be a manager, were also cited as key qualities together with *anticipation, vigilance* and *attention to detail*. In contrast, hard biodata available on application concerning hobbies, interests, charity work, positions of responsibility outside the work environment appeared to be of no value in differentiating between the performance subgroups. The view was expressed that gaps in education or periods of unemployment could be for a valid reason, might add to experience and that evidence of this nature should be explored rather than used for immediate rejection.

All of the *males* cited *hospitality industry management* as a long-term ambition (cf. Pratten 2004), i.e. his first choice of career - *you need to want to be a manager* and to *enjoy working with lots of people* (cf. Ineson et al. 2009), - and, in contrast with the less

successful managers (BAMs: n=3 units) who had begun work at the craft level and then sought promotion, none of the AAMs had ever considered an alternative career choice - although one AAM would have *loved to be on the stage* and another would have *really liked to be a musician*. It became clear that the bar was a surrogate stage for these would-be thespians. All of the AAM females had been able to bring certain complementary features (predominantly competent people handling/caring experience, usually combined with office practice skills) from their prior work experience to their current roles. Without exception, the AAMs had prolonged managerial, and more varied (food/bar/accommodation), experience in employment by the Company than most of their counterparts. The AAM subgroup's reasons for joining the Company included: headhunted (N=3) and seeking a promotional move/challenge (n=4). In contrast with *all* of the BAMs, none of the *male* AAMs had any reservations about their career choices. The AAMs' most important reasons for doing the job centred on enjoyment, variety, the need to be with, enjoy talking to, to entertain and to please others, to deliver a service, to want to develop people and to have a challenge in the job, that is exhibiting key elements of EI (Langhorn 2004; Varca 2004; Kernbach and Schutte 2005): *I like to make people laugh; the job is a way of life; I knew about the long hours and hard work; the job has more than met my expectations; I need both the variety and the challenge*. Staff follow and *bounce off* the manager - this motivates them. It was suggested that money, i.e. the cost of drinks, means 'nothing': *you can charge any price - if they want it, people will pay for the atmosphere*. This statement concurred with the views of Holosi (1996), Pratten (2003) and Peacock (1995): *What customers really care about is the atmosphere in a pub*. This is created and maintained by continual *detailed attention to customers' whims and fancies*.

It was agreed unanimously that gender made no difference to success (cf. Mutch 2002; Pratten 2005) but that people over 50 years of age might have problems in coping with the demands of the job, especially in a lodge/busy unit unless they had the experience, stamina and fitness. Neither local nor ethnic origin nor skin colour was perceived to be a barrier to selection; these features could be used very positively to match managers to specific types of unit or location. Everyone said that, in line with Mutch, (2002), sole managers could be as successful as couples provided that an individual responsible for a large unit with accommodation employed adequate cover, i.e. assistant managers. Nevertheless, the majority supposed that living with spouse/partner was an asset, as was an absence of children under 16, though teenage children could be a bonus if they were prepared to work in the business. Most couples do want children and their need to be time-managed was said to be crucial in this context. It was felt that, for one partner, usually the female, child care should take priority. The overwhelming view was that applicants with three or more children under 14 should be rejected unless the recruiter was absolutely sure (based on previous experience/references) that they could cope. Food handling problems of any type were seen to be a major disadvantage as was a record of regular absences from work or general health problems. With the exception of hearing difficulties or speech impediments, which could be problematic in an emergency, physical disabilities apparent at the time of recruitment were not thought to be a problem provided that the individual could demonstrate that s/he was able to do the job.

Without exception, the managers perceived the greatest problems in the job to involve people management (cf. Baker et al. 1998). It was recommended that prospective licensed house managers should begin by talking to existing manager(s) and the staff about the nature of job, possibly taking on part-time employment in addition to their current jobs so that they could experience the level of commitment (time and effort) required and that new recruits should test their ability to manage successfully in a small unit by setting for themselves, and achieving, goals and targets to prove that they could do the job. Furthermore, lack of time management, reflected in deliveries arriving too late (lack of anticipation) and an inability to take days off, even holidays, was linked to BAM. Strategies for removing undesirable/troublesome elements included barring single males and parties of males in excess of three, removing a juke box, dart board and pool table, increasing prices and offering no facilities for children except in the garden. In contrast, certain market segments were encouraged through targeted staff selection, for example by age, gender or social class, organising quiz nights, pouring drinks into glasses so that customers would not drink directly from bottles and the licensee buying drinks for regular customers (1 in 3).

The AAMs were in favour of training (cf. Pratten 2005; Ineson et al. 2009) and a supportive empowerment of staff to handle customers and to deal with complaints, even offering to waive charges in the case of genuine problems and referring issues to management only if they felt unable to deal with them. In contrast, two BAMs took a relatively authoritarian approach - *stamp your personality* on the establishment. However, in all instances the managers thought that they (or their wives *as inebriated men are less likely to hit a female than a male!*), not the staff, should deal with severe customer aggression. Furthermore, an initial empathetic approach (cf. Ineson 1993; Wilson 1998; Ineson et al. 2009) was recommended for employees' who were not working to standard to confirm whether their own personal problems were having an adverse effect on job performance.

Given its intrusion on the personal life and 'home' of the management, why does anyone ever choose licensed house management as a career? *The financial reward has to be big then it is one of the key incentives* (Meudell and Rodham 1998). If one adds up the 'perks' and compares them with those from other 'outside' jobs, it is *not difficult for successful managers to persuade themselves to stay in the job* in spite of the downside. *The money becomes a challenge because the management has ultimate control over the job and its rewards.* These statements were backed up by the award of annual substantial 'top of the league' rewards for success offered by the Company. Finally, it was also noted that, however experienced the management team, and however successful they have been in the past, they cannot, and should not, be expected to achieve immediate success on moving to a new unit.

CONCLUSION

From the above evidence a series of key characteristics associated with successful licensed retail house management emerged:

- Prepared to work hard for long hours; physical fitness, with stamina and commitment (cf. hardiness, Kobasa, 1979; Bartone et al. 2009).
- *Work is a stage*; gift for making people happy - this is part of the service element; charisma, friendliness, approachability, pleasantness, talkativeness and *enjoyment in sharing life with people* (cf. Pratten 2003).
- A caring employer and a listener; *staff are part of the family*; *work is your baby*.
- Ready for and needing a challenge. Needing variety in the job (Langhorn 2004; Varca 2004; Kernbach and Schutte 2005).
- Ability to manage time and people; adaptability/flexibility, good anticipator, vigilant and attentive to detail (cf. Peacock 1995).
- Sense of humour; ability to take criticism for others and to learn from mistakes; not too proud to ask for help; open-minded and patient with an even temperament.
- *Not bottle things up*; not secretive; tries to resolve problems rather than ignore them and ability to get on with the job regardless/in spite of personal problems.

Pressures of time and cost meant that this preliminary analysis was less rigorous than the researchers might have hoped for and it is acknowledged that the qualitative findings from the present study have been drawn for a very small sample. However, as a pilot study, it did provide a list of potential success criteria as a basis for further examination and their close affiliation with the criteria associated with successful licensed retail house management, according to key findings from the literature pertaining to managerial success, further validates the profile. In order to determine its predictive validity, a questionnaire was developed, the objective of which was to acquire both hard and soft biodata from all the current divisional licensed house managers. Finally, a set of criteria which appeared to be associated with "above" and "below average" managerial performance in the Company was identified but the data still require verification. A preliminary attempt has been made to define the nature of these potential selection criteria and the ways in which they might be measured objectively and reliably for incorporation into the management selection and decision-making process. As far as possible, a standardised approach has been taken in measuring those elements which do not lend themselves to objective assessment. As the selection process is under development specifically for the Company, it is designed so that company personnel could conduct all of the sessions. Clearly, there needs to be further validation of the criterion measures against performance criteria to confirm the best predictors of success in this division of the Company.

REFERENCES

- Badger, J. & Lashley, C. (2000). Musical chairs at the old dog and duck. *Hospitality Review*, 2 (4), 56–59.
- Beaver, G. & Lashley, C. (1998). Barriers to management development in small hospitality firms. *Strategic Change*, 7, 223-35.
- Baker, M., Wild, M. & Sussmann, S. (1998). Introducing EPOS in Bass Taverns: a report of the case and an exploration of some of the issues. *The International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10 (1), 16–23.
- Bartone, P.T., Eid, J., Johnsen, B.H., Laberg, J.C., & Snook S.A.(2009). Big five personality factors, hardness and social judgement as predictors of legal performance. *Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 30(6), 498-521.
- Baum, T. (1990). Competencies for Hotel Management: Industry Expectations of Education. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 2(4), 13-16.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1982). *The competent manager: A model for effective performance*. New York: Wiley.
- British Beer and Pub Association (2010). Pubs still closing but at slower rate
04.02.2010 at http://www.beerandpub.com/newsList_detail.aspx?newsId=317
- Carmeli, A. (2003). The relationship between emotional intelligence and work, attitudes, behavior and outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(8), 788-813.
- Caruso, D.R. & Wolfe, C.J. (2001). Emotional intelligence in the workplace. In J. Ciarrochi, J. Forgas and J. D. Mayer (Eds.) *Emotional Intelligence in Everyday Life*, (pp.150-68) Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Dorsman, M. A. (1983). *Question of Degree*, (Interim Report) Centre for Educational Development and Training, Manchester Polytechnic, Manchester.
- Finegan, J.E. (2000). The impact of person and organisational values on organisational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 73(2), 149-169.
- Forte, R. (1982). How I see the personnel function. *Personnel Management*, August, 32-35.
- Furnham, A., Crump, J. & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2007) Managerial level, personality and intelligence. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 22(8), 805-818.
- George, M. (2006). How intelligent are you ... really? From IQ to EQ to SQ, with a little intuition along the way. *Training and Management Development Methods*, 20(4), 425-36.
- Goleman, D. (1996). *Emotional intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Harvey-Cook, J.E. & Taffler, R.J. (2000). Biodata in professional entry-level selection: Statistical scoring of common format applications. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 73, 103-118.
- Holosi, S. (1996). A firm where talent shows. *The Publican*, April 22.
- Hospitality Training Foundation (1996). *Training: Who Needs It?* London, Hospitality Training Foundation.
- Hospitality Training Foundation (1999). *Look Whose Training Now?* London: Hospitality Training Foundation.
- Hotel and Catering Industrial Training Board (1983). *Hotel and Catering Skills – now and in the future* A report prepared for the Education, Training and Advisory Council, Hotel and Catering Industrial Training Board on behalf of ETAC, Wembley, Middlesex.
- Hotel Employers' Group (1992). *Profile for a Graduate with a Degree in Hotel Management*, unpublished document, Hotel Employers' Group, UK.
- Hyde, P. (1974). *The occupational role of the publican*. M.Phil., University of Kent.
- Ineson, E.M. (1993). "The predictive validity of criteria used in the selection of students for undergraduate courses and graduate training in hotel and catering management" doctoral thesis, London: The British Library.
- Ineson, E.M., Rhoden, S. and Alexieva, I. (2009). *The Bulgarian experience: key contributors to success in hotel management*, "From services to experiences in tourism and the hospitality industry and education", EuroCHRIE, Helsinki, October.
- Keegan, B.M. (1983). Leadership in the hospitality Industry. In E. Cassé & R. Reuland (Eds.), *The Management of Hospitality*, Oxford: Pergamon press.
- Kelly, M. & Dorsman, M. (1984). *An investigation of the employment market for 1982 graduates from universities and polytechnics in the United Kingdom: policies and practice of employers*, Manchester: Manchester Polytechnic.

- Kernbach, S. & Schutte, N.S. (2005). The impact of service provider emotional intelligence on customer satisfaction. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19 (7), 438-44.
- Kerr, R., Garvin, J., Heaton, N. & Boyle, E. (2006). Emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 27(4), 265-79.
- Kobasa, S.C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: an inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1-11.
- Langhorn, S. (2004). How emotional intelligence can improve management performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16 (4), 220-30.
- Lashley, C. (2000). *Hospitality Retail Management: A Unit Manager's Guide*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Lashley, C. & Rowson, W. (2002a). Big firms waiting to grow? Franchisees in the pub sector. *Strategic Change*, 11, 411-24.
- Lashley, C. & Rowson, W. (2002b). A franchise by any other name? Tenancy arrangements in the pub sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 21 (4), 353-69.
- Lashley, C. & Rowson, W. (2002c). When is a franchise not a franchise? When it's a pub. *Strategic Change*, 11, 291-305.
- Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: How followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 221-234.
- Lord, R.G., DeVader, C.L., & Alliger, G.M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalisation procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 402-410.
- Matthews, R. (2002). Rising number of hosts seeking debt advice. *Morning Advertiser*, 26 September, p. 5.
- McCredie, H. & Shackleton, V. (2000). The unit general manager: a competency profile. *Personnel Review*, 29(1), 106-114.
- McDaniel, M.A., Whetzel, D.L., Schmidt, F.L. & Maurer, S. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: a comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 599-614.
- Meudell, K. & Rodham, K. (1998). Money isn't everything...or is it? A preliminary research study into money as a motivator in the licensed house sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality*, 10(4), 128-132.
- Mintel (2008). *Pub Catering - UK - July 2008*, London: Mintel.
- Mutch, A. (2001). Where do public house managers come from? Some survey evidence. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(2), 86-92.
- Peacock, M. (1995). A job well done? Hospitality managers and success. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 7(2/3), 48-51.
- Phillips, J.J. (1979). Industry-Trained Graduates - Yes or No? *Personnel Administrator*, March/April, 74-78.
- Pratten, J.D. & Curtis, S. (2002). Attitudes towards training in UK licensed retail: an exploratory case study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 21(4), 393-403.
- Pratten, J.D. (2003) What is the ideal public house licensee? *British Food Journal*, 105(10), 732-741.
- Pratten, J.D. (2004). Examining the possible causes of business failure in British public houses. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16 (4), 246-252.
- Pratten, J.D. (2005). A new landlord? A study in the changing demands on the public house manager. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 24, 331-343.
- Preece, D., Steven, G. & Steven, V. (1999). *Work, Change and Competition, Managing for Bass*. London: Routledge,
- Reilly, R.R. & Chao, G.T. (1982). Validity and Fairness of Some Alternative Employee Selection Procedures. *Personnel Psychology*, 35(1), 1-62.
- Robertson, I.T., Baron, H., Gibbons, P., MacIver, R. & Nyfield, G. (2000). Conscientiousness and Managerial Performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 73(2), 171-180.
- Robertson, I.T. & Kinder, A. (1993). Personality and job competences: The criterion-related validity of some personality variables. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, 225-244.
- Saville, P. & Holdsworth, R. (1992). Personality measures are valid predictors of job performance – it's official!, *SHL Newslines*, March 11th, Esher: Saville & Holdsworth Ltd.
- Shaffer, G.S., Saunders, V. & Owens, W.A. (1986). Additional evidence for the accuracy of biographical data: long term retest and observer ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 39(4), 791-809.

- Smith, M. & Robertson I. (1991). *The theory and practice of systematic staff selection*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Academic and Professionals Ltd.
- Stone, G.J. (1988). *Personality and effective hospitality management*, unpublished MSc Dissertation, Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Swanlung, M. (1981). How hotel executives made the climb to the top. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, May, 30-34.
- Tas, R. (1998). Teaching Future Managers. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 29(2), 41-43.
- Tett, R.P., Jackson, D.N. & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality Measures as Predictors of Job Performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703-742.
- Vacra, P.E. (2004). Service skills for service workers: emotional intelligence and beyond. *Managing Service Quality*, 14 (6), 457-67.
- Weiland, P. (2002). Drucker's challenge: Communication and the emotional glass ceiling. *Ivey Business Journal*, 66(5), 37.
- Wilson, M.E. (1998). Gendered career paths. *Personnel Review*, 27 (5), 396-411.
- Worsfold, P.M. (1989). Leadership and Management Effectiveness in the Hospitality Industry, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 8 (1), 9-13.
- Worsfold, P.M. (1989). A Personality Profile of the Hotel Manager, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 8 (1), 51-62.

Elizabeth M. Ineson, PhD, Senior Lecturer
Prof. Graham J. Stone
Manchester Metropolitan University
Old Hall Lane, Manchester M14 6HR
e-mail: e.ineson@mmu.ac.uk