

FACE TIME IN THE HOTEL INDUSTRY: AN EXPLORATION OF WHAT IT IS AND WHY IT HAPPENS

John W. O'Neill

The Pennsylvania State University

Many hotel companies, and the hotel industry in general, have been cited as having a culture of face time, that is, a culture inducing its managers to spend considerable amounts of nonproductive time at work. This subject exploratory study seeks to provide greater understanding regarding this apparently common practice but understudied academic topic. This empirical study analyzes how and to what extent the culture of the hotel industry, and of specific lodging companies, relate to levels of face time. It also analyzes how differences in hotel location and size and differences in manager age and tenure affect the extent to which hotel managers report putting in nonproductive face time at work.

KEYWORDS: *hotel management; lodging operations; organizational culture*

The employment environment in the hotel industry has a number of defining characteristics including a “culture of face time” (Munck, 2001, p. 125). Although the concept of face time is apparently one that is widely used in the hotel industry, there is limited academic research regarding this specific topic. When asked to define this concept, hotel employees have indicated that the purpose of face time is to “see and be seen,” and the prevailing ideology has been that “the more hours you put in the better” (Munck, 2001, p. 125). Face time requirements go above and beyond productive work hours required to complete one’s job—it is simply an employee’s “presence at work” (Perlow, 1997) or “hanging around when you didn’t really need to be there” (Munck, 2001, p. 127) that distinguish

Author’s Note: This research project was supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and conducted as part of the Work, Family and Health Network (www.WorkFamilyHealthNetwork.org), which is funded by a cooperative agreement through the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (Grant Nos. U01HD051217, U01HD051218, U01HD051256, U01HD051276), National Institute on Aging (Grant No. U01AG027669), Office of Behavioral and Science Sciences Research, and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (Grant No. U010H008788). The contents of this article are solely the responsibility of the author and do not necessarily represent the official views of these institutes and offices. Special acknowledgement goes to Kathy Christensen, Nan Crouter, Jan Cleveland, Anna Mattila, Amy Snead, Kelly Davis, Michelle Hammond, Qu Xiao, David Almeida, Susan McHale, Lydia Hanks, and Ellen Kim.

Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, Vol. 36, No. 4, November 2012, 478–494

DOI: 10.1177/1096348011407489

© 2012 International Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education

the concept of face time. Similarly, previous academic literature has noted that it is important for a multitude of organizational and individual reasons for hotel employees to balance their work life with their life outside work (Cleveland et al., 2007).

Although there has been limited academic research regarding face time, Cooper (1998, p. 314) identifies a similar phenomenon as "presenteeism," which he describes as "an overwhelming need to put in more hours or, at the very least, appear to be working very long hours." Face time and presenteeism are considered an expression of commitment to the job or to the company (Bailyn, 1993; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999) or as a way for employees to distinguish themselves from peers and signal to management that they are valuable employees. Face time is seen as a way to "pay your dues" (Eder & Lundberg, 1990, p. 363), earn your pay, or gain an advantage over peers in terms of advancement or promotion (Munck, 2001). Face time, then, can be defined as time spent at work, above and beyond what is needed to complete the job, for the purpose of expressing to peers and superiors one's commitment to the job or the organization. Face time occupies a place of great significance in the hotel employment culture, particularly as it relates to work-life balance (Cleveland et al., 2007). Along with irregular schedules and intense guest contact, the need for face time can exert a negative effect on a number of outcome variables, including employee stress, work-family conflict, and employee turnover (Cleveland et al., 2007; Mulvaney, O'Neill, Cleveland, & Crouter, 2007; Munck, 2001). Despite recognition in the hotel industry that a culture of face time can have negative outcomes for both employees and the organization (Munck, 2001), putting in face time continues to be a standardized norm across the hospitality industry, particularly among hotel management employees (Mulvaney et al., 2007). To provide understanding why the norm of face time persists in spite of evidence to suggest that it negatively affects employees and organizations, this exploratory study investigates theories of organizational culture, and the macroculture of the hotel industry, in particular. Such theories help explain how standardized norms become institutionalized in organizations.

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND MACROCULTURE

Organizational Culture

Although there is no overall consensus regarding an exact definition of organizational culture, previous literature has described it variously in terms of shared rituals, heroes, symbols, practices, myths, assumptions, beliefs, and values (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, & Sanders, 1990; O'Neill, 1997; Schein, 1985; Thompson et al., 1999). It is generally agreed that the construct of organizational culture is holistic, historically determined, related to anthropological concepts, constructed in a social context, and resistant to change (Hofstede et al., 1990). Organizational culture can be a dynamic process (Schein, 1985) that develops regardless of intent on the part of management.

The model of organizational culture popularized by Hofstede et al. (1990) posits concentric circles composed of symbols, heroes, rituals, and values.

Symbols of the organization can be tangible or intangible, and they hold meaning for the members of the organization, which may be above and beyond their objective meaning. Heroes are people who serve as role models for members of the organization. They can be leaders, employees, alive, dead, real, or imaginary, but their primary function is to model and reinforce behavior that is prized in the organization. Rituals are activities carried out by the members of the organization that do not have any value to the organization in and of themselves but are carried out as a reinforcement of the culture. Hofstede et al. (1990) suggest that these aspects of culture are supported by practices that are visible to observers. The core of organizational culture, values, is in contrast, intangible and cannot be identified through observing practices. Organization values are similar to the more traditional understanding of personal values, in that they are unconscious, somewhat indefinable, and not necessarily based in rational thinking. Face time in hotels could be a valued practice displayed by organizational heroes.

According to Sims and Lorenzi (1992), organizational culture is a schema agreed on by the organizational members, suggesting that members have learned to process and understand information the same way and have agreed to do so. Organizational culture can be seen as an explanatory factor, illuminating the causes behind various outcomes observed in the organization (Ajiferuke & Boddewyn, 1970). Organizational culture may be an explanatory factor that can help us understand face time as an organizational outcome. Some previous literature hypothesizes that organizations are not a product of culture but in fact produce culture (Louis, 1980; Siehl & Martin, 1981), such as face time behavior. In this model, organizations are seen as producing culture as a byproduct of producing goods and services, including cultural artifacts such as rituals, legends, and ceremonies (Smircich, 1983), including face time. There could be a bidirectional path between organizational culture and face time whereby the culture shapes organizational practices such as face time, and as face time becomes institutionalized, it continues to shape the organizational culture. Thus, each organization produces its own unique culture, including attitudes and behaviors regarding face time, although organizations producing the same goods and services may have similar culture, and thus, organizations in the hotel industry may possess similarities regarding face time practices. Organizational culture is not strictly beneficial to organizations. It has been previously hypothesized that organizational culture could have retarding effects on organizations, as well (Schein, 1985).

Macroculture

The majority of literature regarding organizational culture focuses on the culture of individual organizations (Everett, Stenning, & Longton, 1982). Pfeffer (1981), for example, suggests that organizational culture results in a socially constructed reality, shared by the members of an organization. However, it is conceivable that such socially constructed reality could be shared by members across organizations within an industry. The presence of this socially constructed reality, coupled with shared beliefs and values, creates a macroculture in the

hotel industry (O'Neill, 1997). According to Abrahamson and Fombrun (1994), macroculture consists of consistent strategies, processes, and operations across organizations that operate in the same industry. O'Neill, Beauvais, and Scholl (2004) expand on this definition by including nonoperational elements; they define macroculture as "organizational culture manifested in behavior patterns shared among organizational participants in an industry resulting from shared beliefs, needs, and/or circumstances, and resulting in similar mental models" (pp. 4-5). Abrahamson and Fombrun (1994) note that macroculture indicates a level of agreement or homogeneity among top managers across organizations in an industry. A macroculture can be vertical, as when the culture includes suppliers, distributors, and retailers in the same industry. A macroculture can also be horizontal, with competing organizations across the industry included (Abrahamson & Fombrun, 1994). It is important to note that although a norm or standard may be nonfunctional for a single organization of the system, this norm can persist across the macroculture (O'Neill et al., 2004).

One of the defining characteristics of the hotel industry, macroculture may be an emphasis on face time. Despite potential negative outcomes to individual organizations in the industry, putting in face time is a value that may be shared across multiple segments of the hotel industry. Mulvaney et al. (2007) note that long, irregular hours are commonplace in the hospitality industry and that particularly at the management level, face time is a pervasive expectation. Hotel management employees are expected to be on property as much as possible, regardless of whether or not their presence is actually needed (Munck, 2001). McLaughlin and Cullen (2003) found that a presenteeism management style, in which managers put in long hours at the property, is widespread in the industry. Cullen and McLaughlin (2006) argue that this emphasis on face time arises not out of necessity or mandate but out of the culture of the hotel industry itself. As one employee put it, "It's not demanded of people, but the culture dictates that it happens that way" (Cullen & McLaughlin, 2006, p. 512). Cullen and McLaughlin (2006) suggest that this value of putting in face time and being present becomes internalized in hotel managers at an early stage through enculturation at work.

This study conceptualizes face time as a component of culture specifically related to work and family balance. In doing so, this study applies Thompson et al.'s (1999) measure of work-family culture, which identifies three dimensions of employee-level perceptions of supportive work-family culture—namely, managerial support for work-family balance, perceived negative consequences regarding work-family benefit usage, and organizational time expectations that require employees to sacrifice their family lives. Higher levels of managerial support and lower levels of the second and third dimensions are associated with higher levels of a supportive work-family culture. Work-family culture will be described in greater detail in the Measurement section of this article. This study posits that greater overall levels of such work-family culture may be associated with lower levels of face time, specifically:

Hypothesis 1: Higher levels of work–family culture will result in significantly lower levels of face time of hotel managers at work.

Although previous research suggests that face time may be influenced by the hotel industry’s macroculture, there also may be variations in face time in different hotel companies or in different hotel locations. The hotel industry has several specific cultural norms or expectations regarding behavior or attitude that are particularly relevant to employees’ work–family interface, including expectations regarding face time (Eder & Lundberg, 1990; Munck, 2001), especially among hotel managers. Although these characteristics are common in the hotel industry as a whole, they may not necessarily be present to the same degree across different companies (Mulvaney et al., 2007). Previous academic research has concluded that human resource practices in hotels can and do vary from property to property, with some being more progressive than others (Head & Lucas, 2004). Therefore, the present study applies categories commonly used by *Smith Travel Research* to compare hotel locations. Specifically, *Smith Travel Research* categorizes hotel locations as city, suburban, airport, highway, and resort. This study also examines differences by hotel companies. In summary, the following hypotheses are tested:

Hypothesis 2: Face time will vary significantly based on different hotel location types.

Hypothesis 3: Face time will vary significantly based on different hotel companies.

Organizational culture can affect both the behavior of hotel managers and hotel manager work–family balance (O’Neill et al., 2009). Previous research has found that organizational culture may be affected by and operationalized in terms of a number of organizational factors, including organization size and structure (Watts, 2010). It is conceivable that in larger hotels, for example, it is more challenging for hotel managers to obtain visibility with the hotel leaders. Thus, larger hotel properties, in terms of the number of managers employed, may be associated with higher levels of face time. Therefore, the following hypothesis is made:

Hypothesis 4: Managers employed in hotels with a greater number of managers will report significantly higher levels of face time.

AGE AND TENURE

As previously discussed, the specific construct of face time has not been widely discussed in the hospitality academic literature. However, face time shares components with other constructs that have been more extensively studied in the literature, such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and employee commitment. OCB includes individual contributions in the workplace that go beyond role requirements and contractually rewarded job achievements and include behavior such as spending more than normal hours at work.

Although there is no evidence that previous research has evaluated the effects of variables such as age and job tenure on the specific construct of face time, previous research has evaluated the effects of age and tenure on OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995). In an extensive review of extant literature regarding the antecedents, components, and correlates of OCB, it was found that generally speaking, demographic variables such as age and tenure are correlated with OCB or are antecedents to OCB, at least to some extent (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). An extensive meta-analysis conducted by Organ and Ryan (1995) reported mixed results regarding whether age and tenure are correlated with OCB, with some studies reporting tenure to be positively correlated with OCB but other studies showing no significant relationship between age and OCB (Organ & Ryan, 1995). A study by Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) found a significant positive correlation between organizational tenure and loyalty, and in a factor analysis, loyalty was found to be the most significant component of OCB.

Age and tenure appear to be somewhat more highly correlated with organizational commitment, a construct closely related to both face time and OCB. Using data from a military supply organization, Becker and Billings (1993) examined several correlates and antecedents to commitment. Results demonstrated that tenure on the job and age of respondent were generally positively correlated with commitment. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) conducted a meta-analysis examining the relationship between organizational commitment and a number of variables. Results suggested that age and tenure were positively related to commitment.

Although there have been disparate findings regarding the relationships between age/tenure and OCB/organizational commitment, there has been limited academic study regarding the construct of face time, particularly related to the hospitality industry. Thus, previous research related to OCB and organizational commitment may have limited applicability to the present study related to the hospitality industry. It is plausible that in the hospitality industry, older managers with greater tenure may have less need to display face time than younger managers with less tenure in order to exhibit their citizenship and commitment to the organization. Therefore, the final hypothesis is presented:

Hypothesis 5: Older hotel managers and hotel managers with greater industry tenure will report significantly lower levels of face time.

METHOD

Sample

This study was funded by grants from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. The project's primary aim was to explore work-family issues in the U.S. hotel industry through interviews with hotel managers. Participants for this study were recruited from full-service hotels located across the United States and identified through initial contact with the

President of the American Hotel & Lodging Association and representatives with municipal hotel associations in New York, Washington DC, Atlanta, Orlando, Chicago, Saint Louis, Kansas City, Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. From these referrals, 121 hotel general managers were contacted by telephone, of whom 65 (53.7%) agreed to participate. The other 56 general managers did not wish to participate or did not respond to multiple telephone calls. Hotel general managers were first interviewed in person and then their support was obtained to contact and survey via telephone the other managers employed in their hotels, that is, departmental managers in areas such as rooms, food and beverage, sales and marketing, engineering, accounting, and human resources.

Over the course of multiple weeks, 869 randomly selected departmental managers were contacted by telephone. A total of 588 (67.7%) participants completed the survey. There were 126 departmental managers (14.5%) who could not be reached or did not call back, 81 (9.3%) who were reached but refused to participate, 45 (5.2%) who had left the hotel or were no longer a manager, 13 (1.5%) who were not reachable (no answer, no answering machine), 12 (1.4%) who were unable to be reached because a wrong telephone number had been provided and the correct number could not be found, 2 (0.2%) who did not speak English, and 2 (0.2%) who partially completed the interview but who were unable to be reached to complete the interview. Partial interviews were not included in the analyses.

Full-service hotels were the subject of this study because the study focused on hotel properties where numerous departmental managers were employed. Departmental managers surveyed ranged from hotel executive committee members (such as food and beverage directors) to hourly supervisors (such as front desk supervisors).

Measurement

Face time. In a pilot study of the subject project, 30 hotel managers who were employed in urban or suburban hotels in several metropolitan areas in the northeastern United States were interviewed in person, and several themes emerged regarding the culture of the hotel industry. The concept of face time (as well as that specific term) was not only frequently cited but also frequently discussed in a negative, problematic light. Particularly, when being asked about hotel culture, numerous participants indicated that the hotel industry was known for its pressure on managers to exhibit “face time.” Previous research has defined face time as being seen at work both during and outside of normal business hours (Elsbach, Cable, & Sherman, 2010). Although that definition addresses the important concepts of face time involving not working at home when possible or appropriate, but being seen at work above and beyond normal working hours, it is not entirely applicable to the hotel industry because the industry’s 24/7 nature is not reflective of anything that could be considered to be “normal business hours.” Based on the pilot study, review

of literature regarding face time, presenteeism and related issues, and in-depth, in-person discussions with hotel industry executives (including hotel company presidents, vice presidents, and other senior executives, typically conducted at those executives' offices), the investigators of the subject project developed a four-item face time scale to assess perceptions that managers need to be visible in the hotel and put in long hours to display commitment: (a) senior management in this hotel pays close attention to when people are not working enough hours, (b) senior management in this hotel really notices if people leave early, (c) sometimes managers in this hotel feel they have to come to work early or leave late just so senior management thinks they work hard, and (d) you are considered a more valuable employee in this hotel if senior management sees you working long hours. In the survey, the participants were requested to answer each question with a five-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*). For this scale, Cronbach's coefficient α was .77, indicating an acceptable level of reliability (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991).

Work-family culture. Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999, p. 394) define work-family culture as "the shared assumptions, beliefs and values regarding the extent to which an organization supports and values the integration of employee's work and family lives." Work and family culture was measured with 20 items by adapting Thompson et al.'s (1999) scale, using only items that were pertinent to the hotel industry. Factor analysis was conducted and three dimensions of work and family culture were identified, each with eigenvalues greater than 1.0: managerial support for work-family balance, career consequences associated with utilizing work-family benefits, and organizational time expectations that may interfere with family responsibilities. Five items were deleted through the process due to cross-loadings and low factor loadings. *Managerial support* (7 items) for work-family balance is concerned with how much the hotel management cares regarding department managers' (DMs') personal or family matters and supports DMs to balance their work and family lives. *Career consequences* (6 items) associated with using work-family benefits is concerned with the organization's consideration of family-related issues and the company's effort to disconnect use of work-family benefits from DMs' career progress. Last, *organizational time expectations* (6 items) that may interfere with family responsibilities represents organization culture that discourages DMs to take work home at night and/or on weekends. Cronbach's coefficient α was .85 for managerial support, .70 for career consequences, and .81 for organizational time expectations.

Age and industry tenure were measured in chronological years, and hotel location was based on the standard *Smith Travel Research* location-type categorizations.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Managerial support	3.65	3.73	0.73	1.00	5.00
Career consequences	3.58	3.60	0.78	1.00	5.00
Organizational time expectations	3.11	3.00	1.08	1.00	5.00
Managers in hotel	64.28	65.00	45.11	6.00	200.00
Industry tenure	12.83	11.33	7.89	0.08	36.00
Age	37.82	36.00	9.20	21.00	64.00
Face time	3.02	3.00	0.92	1.00	5.00

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 summarizes descriptive statistics regarding the respondents. The departmental managers came from various departments, including food and beverage (27.9%), rooms, (19.2%), sales and marketing (17.9%), general management (17.3%), accounting (7.4%), human resources (3.4%), recreation (2.5%), engineering (1.5%), and others (2.9%). The sample represents all U.S. regions and several different hotel location types, including city (47.7%), suburb (15.2%), airport (15.2%), and resort (21.9%). Most major hotel companies, including Marriott, Hilton, Hyatt, InterContinental, Starwood, Kimpton, Fairmont, and independent hotels, were included in this study. A total of 300 (51.0%) participants were male and 288 (49.0%) were female.

No significant differences were found in responses based on the department in which each manager was employed, the manager's position/level within each hotel organization, or gender. However, as might be expected, relatively older employees and employees with greater industry tenure were more likely to be married or in a union with a significant other and also were more likely to be parents.

Correlation Analysis

Correlations between the relevant variables are provided in Table 2. Although correlations were found among some variables, diagnostics did not reveal evidence of any significant violations of multicollinearity because, as shown in later tables, the highest variance inflation factor was less than 5, which is well below the widely accepted cut-off value of 10 (Neter, Kutner, Nachtsheim, & Wasserman, 1996; Ott & Longnecker, 2001).

The effects of work and family culture on face time. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the effects of the three work and family culture

Table 2
Correlation Matrix

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
a. Managerial support	1						
b. Career consequences	.525**	1					
c. Organizational time expectations	.715**	.565**	1				
d. Managers in hotel	-.079	-.092	-.118**	1			
e. Industry tenure	.095*	.061	.101*	.106*	1		
f. Age	.086*	.116**	.109**	.114*	.682**	1	
g. Face time	-.526**	-.465**	-.577**	-.014	-.194**	-.161**	1

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

Table 3
Regression Results (Dependent Variable: Face Time)

Independent Variable	Beta	Variance Inflation Factor
Managerial support	-.216*	2.176
Career consequences	-.172*	1.533
Organizational time expectations	-.321*	2.314

* $p < .001$.

factors on DM face time. As shown in Table 3, the model of face time was overall significant, $F(3, 495) = 101.64$, $p < .001$. A total of 38.1% of the variance in face time was explained by the three work and family culture factors. Variance inflation factor values were less than 5.0, indicating that multicollinearity was not an issue. The results indicate that all three dimensions—managerial support, career consequences, and organizational time expectations—had significantly minimizing effects on DM's face time, and the beta coefficients for all three dimensions were in the hypothesized direction (career consequences and organizational time expectations were reverse coded). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

The effects of hotel classification on face time. An ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of hotel classification on DM face time. The results show that DM face time level was independent of hotel classification, $F(3, 522) = .436$, n.s. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

The effects of hotel organization on face time. An ANOVA was conducted to examine the effects of the hotel organization on face time. Table 4 shows the hotel organizations. Brands have been coded to protect their identity. The results indicate that the hotel organization is a significant predictor of DM's face time, $F(7, 518) = 1.73$, $p = .10$. In other words, DM face time significantly differed between hotel brands.

Table 4
Mean Scores of Face Time

Hotel Organization	Mean	Standard Deviation
Brand A	3.041 _{ab}	0.124
Brand B	3.254 _a	0.121
Brand C	2.981 _{ab}	0.114
Brand D	2.844 _b	0.062
Brand E	3.053 _{ab}	0.120
Brand F	3.000 _{ab}	0.303
Brand G	2.972 _{ab}	0.161
Independent	3.158 _a	0.139

Note: Means with different subscripts differ at $p < .05$. In other words, the subscripts a, b, c, and d are used to indicate which hotel companies are significantly different from others. For example, for the face time variable, hotels with "a" are not significantly different from each other. Brand A has "a" and "b," so it is not significantly different from hotels with "a" and "b," hotels with only "a," and hotels with only "b." However, Brand B only has "a," so it is significantly different from Brand D, but not significantly different from other hotels that have "a" or both "a" and "b."

The results indicate that, in terms of face time, Brand B and independent hotels showed significantly higher DM face time levels than Brand D. The results indicate that DMs working for Brand D have relatively low face time levels, and DMs working for independent hotels have relatively high face time levels. As previously discussed, the organizational culture within each hotel company may lead to such results. For example, senior executives at Brand D may pay more attention to quality of work rather than the working hours of DMs, encouraging DMs to be productive rather than inducing them to work longer hours. On the other hand, the Brand B and independent hotel cultures may encourage DMs to work relatively longer hours. The results further indicate that because Brands A, B, C, D, and E have relatively low standard deviations for face time, they may have stronger company-wide cultures than Brands F and G (and independent hotels). In summary, Hypothesis 3 was supported.

The effects of hotel size, DM tenure, and DM age on face time. Multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the effects of hotel size (number of managers) and DM tenure/age (i.e., DM industry tenure and age in years) on face time. The model of face time was overall significant, $F(3, 440) = 3.453$, $p < .01$, explaining a total of 5.3% of the variance in face time. The results indicate that number of managers (hotel size) is positively related to DM face time, and industry tenure and DM age are negatively related to DM face time.

The findings indicate that number of managers is positively related to DM's face time. The more managers there are within a hotel, the more competition there may be between the DMs working in the hotel, leading DMs to perhaps feel pressured to display face time to impress their senior executives.

The number of years that DMs have worked in the hospitality industry, that is, industry tenure, is negatively related to face time. It appears that the longer DMs have worked in the hospitality industry, the better they may understand

Table 5
Regression Results (Dependent Variable: Face Time)

Independent Variable	Beta	Variance Inflation Factor
Number of managers	.179**	3.060
Industry tenure	-.126*	2.402
Department managers' age	-.140*	2.395

** $p < .05$. * $p < .01$.

how to be efficient with their time. DMs with longer industry tenure may focus more on the quality of work than on how many hours they work. Also, these more tenured managers may have, over time, developed credibility and status and feel less pressured to display face time.

The findings also indicate that DM age is negatively related to face time. The older the DMs are, the more experience they have gained, and the better they may understand how to manage their time. Since all beta coefficients were in the hypothesized direction, Hypotheses 4 and 5 were supported (see Table 5).

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Face time is a relatively new academic concept evolving from the same, ubiquitous term commonly used in the hospitality industry. The scale developed for face time both displayed acceptable reliability and was positively correlated with organizational time expectations.

This study found the face time of American hotel managers may be a function of work–family culture in the hotel industry, in general, and face time varies by the actual hotel organization, as well. Specifically, relatively high levels of managerial support and relatively low levels of organizational time expectations and career consequences associated with using work–family benefits are linked with reduced face time, that is, a beneficial, pragmatic, and functional culture. These results extend the earlier research conducted by Thompson, Beauvais, and Lyness (1999).

Although this study found that hotel location had no significant effect on face time, the hotel company had a significant effect. In short, different hotel companies have different levels of face time, and those variances may have deleterious as well as positive effects on their employees. Potential detrimental effects may be of particular concern not only in certain hotel companies but in larger hotels as well, based on the results of this study. Previous research suggests that organizational culture is visible in organizational practices (Hofstede et al., 1990), such as face time. Since this study found there to be significant differences in face time by organization, this study also suggests there to be significant differences in the organizational culture of different hotel companies as well.

This study also found that older and more tenured hotel managers reported engaging in significantly less face time than younger and less tenured managers. Manager tenure and age may indicate more experience, and not only industry

experience but life experience as well. Thus, older managers may believe that the quality of work is more important than the hours they spend at work, feeling less pressure to impress the senior executives by displaying face time, perhaps because older and more tenured managers have established certain credibility to a greater extent than relatively younger and less experienced managers. Also, when managers get older, they may tend to settle down and have a family; thus, they might spend more time with their family members and handling family-related responsibilities than unproductive time at work. A potential task for future research would be to analyze whether more tenured managers may be able to have the effect of shaping the organizational culture of their hotels in a positive, pragmatic fashion.

Future academic research should explore the relationships between face time and other individual and organizational dependent variables of interest. For example, future research could investigate whether there appear to be specific work-related benefits to individuals who engage in relatively greater levels of face time, such as relatively higher salaries, bonuses, and number of promotions. Previous research in nonhospitality workplaces has suggested that when employees display face time, observers of those employees tend to perceive them to be relatively dependable or committed to the organization (Elsbach, Cable, & Sherman, 2010).

In addition, future research could investigate the relationships between face time at work and quality of life at home for the employee's spouse and children as well as the employee's own quality of life. The strength of spousal bonds and the quality of upbringing of children and their overall health could be potential sociological effects of face time that would be worthy of study. Future research could also look outside the United States. It would be informative to investigate the relative effects of country culture, macroculture of the hotel industry, and culture of the individual hotel company on levels of face time.

Clearly, the hotel industry is well renown as a 24/7 business, and its tendency to capture a great deal of managers' time is well known. On the other hand, the industry's 24/7 characteristics could serve as an ideal excuse for managers who do not wish to balance their lives with time spent elsewhere, such as with family. Organizational culture that endorses such face time may create deleterious personal and sociological effects. Practitioners should take note, particularly during challenging economic times like the recent ones, employees (particularly managerial employees) are likely to feel induced to be present and visible for the sake of job security, but such face time has negative and costly implications for both individuals and organizations, such as symptoms of emotional exhaustion such as depersonalization and detachment. Furthermore, since emotional exhaustion and turnover have been previously correlated in the academic literature, practitioners should be concerned that employees who feel manipulated into face time, but do not display emotional exhaustion in the workplace, are still susceptible to leaving the organization as soon as the economy improves and alternative opportunities present themselves—and these employees may be exactly the ones hospitality industry executives do not want to lose.

As O'Neill et al. (2004) pointed out, norms in a macroculture can persist despite the fact that they may not function well for individual organizational units. Such may be the situation with face time. A requirement of excessive face time can have a number of adverse consequences for employees. For example, Munck (2001) found that hotel employees felt that the amount of face time required at work had a negative impact on family life. The expectation that an employee should spend excessive hours at the hotel property has been shown to be correlated with high levels of work–life conflict and low levels of facilitation (Mulvaney et al., 2007). O'Neill and Xiao (2010) found that expectations of excessive face time lead to burnout among hotel managers, and Adams, King, and King (1996) noted that excessive work hours leads to increased levels of life dissatisfaction.

A culture of excessive face time has negative effects at the organizational level, as well, in that it leads to lowered levels of effectiveness and productivity (Cooper, 1998; Lowe, 2002). As Munck (2001) found, face time requirements can also lead to higher than desired levels of managerial turnover, as managers are forced to make decisions between family and work responsibilities.

CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

As with any research, the results of this study should be interpreted with limitations. First, this study only includes employee self-reports regarding face time. Direct observation was not feasible, and furthermore, direct observation is prone to researcher bias. In addition, to recruit a sufficient number of employees from each hotel, employees of limited-service hotels were not included in this study. As limited-service hotels may have different demands, pressures, and climate than full-service hotels, the results of this study may not be generalizable to the limited service segment. Also, with the participation rate of 67.7% of managers who were contacted, 32.3% of the employees were unwilling or unable to participate, or were unreachable. Since it was not possible to collect demographic information from nonparticipants, it is not possible to conclude that this sample is representative of each hotel chain studied, or of the entire U.S. hotel industry. Reasonable attempts were made to balance these uncontrollable factors by controllable factors such as visiting multiple areas of the United States, representing each major region.

Though in theory employees may be free to choose to reduce their levels of face time in the workplace, previous research has shown that hotel workers often feel powerless to make such changes, particularly when those employees are not represented by a labor union (Macaulay & Wood, 1992; Welch & Leighton, 1996), as is the case with managerial employees, employees who are not necessarily highly paid either. Similarly, previous research conducted outside the hospitality industry suggested that employees may exhibit face time because observers of those employees probably attribute to such workers other positive characteristics that are beneficial to the organization, as well (Elsbach, Cable, & Sherman, 2010). Thus, hotel managers who perceive themselves to be upwardly mobile, or who wish to receive

organizational rewards, may display face time in hopes of career success even though such behavior may be detrimental to the hotel and to themselves in the long term. Ultimately, high-level organizational support is a prerequisite for true organizational changes to occur in human resource dimensions such as reductions in unproductive face time, and there is a limited though promising precedent of hotel organizations taking such action for the benefit of both the organization and the employee (Munck, 2001). Future research and practice should recognize these potential benefits as well as the existence of the practice of face time in the hotel industry to begin with. From there, researchers and practitioners could experiment with reducing unproductive face time and track the effects these reductions have on organizational variables such as employee engagement, intent to stay, and productivity, as well as individual variables such as stress levels, use of drugs and alcohol, and health care costs.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, E., & Fombrun, C. J. (1994). Macrocultures: Determinants and consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, *19*, 728-755.
- Adams, G. A., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1996). Relationship of job and family to involvement, family social support and work-family conflict with job and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*, 411-420.
- Ajiferuke, M., & Boddewyn, J. (1970). "Culture" and other explanatory variables in comparative management studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, *13*, 153-163.
- Bailyn, L. (1993). *Breaking the mold: Women, men and time in the new corporate world*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *14*, 177-190.
- Cleveland, J., O'Neill, J., Himelright, J., Harrison, M., Crouter, A., & Drago, R. (2007). Work and family issues in the hospitality industry: Perspectives of entrants, managers, and spouses. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *31*, 275-298.
- Cooper, C. L. (1998). The changing nature of work. *Community, Work, & Family*, *1*, 313-317.
- Cullen, J., & McLaughlin, A. (2006). What drives the persistence of presenteeism as a managerial value in hotels? Observations noted during an Irish work-life balance research project. *Hospitality Management*, *25*, 510-516.
- Eder, R., & Lundberg, C. (1990). "Paying your dues" in the hospitality industry: How functional is the belief? *Hospitality Research Journal*, *14*, 363-369.
- Elsbach, K. D., Cable, D. M., & Sherman, J. W. (2010). How passive "face time" affects perceptions of employees: Evidence of spontaneous trait inference. *Human Relations*, *63*, 735-760.
- Everett, J., Stenning, B., & Longton, P. (1982). Some evidence for an international managerial culture. *Journal of Management Studies*, *19*, 153-162.
- Head, J., & Lucas, R. (2004). Employee relations in the non-union hotel industry: A case of "determined opportunism"? *Personnel Review*, *33*, 693-710.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *35*, 286-316.

- Louis, M. (1980). *A cultural perspective on organizations: The need for and consequences of viewing organizations as culture-bearing milieux*. Paper presented at the National Academy of Management meetings, Detroit, MI.
- Lowe, G. (2002). Here in body, absent in productivity. *Canadian HR Reporter*, 15(21), 5-6.
- Macaulay, I., & Wood, R. C. (1992). Hotel and catering industry employees' attitudes towards trade unions. *Employee Relations*, 14(3), 20-29.
- Mathieu, J., & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- McLaughlin, A., & Cullen, J. (2003). *Managers and work-life balance: The case of the Irish hospitality industry*. Dublin, Ireland: Irish Management Institute.
- Mulvaney, R., O'Neill, J., Cleveland, J., & Crouter, A. (2007). A model of work-family dynamics of hotel managers. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34, 66-86.
- Munck, B. (2001). Changing a culture of face time. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(10), 125-131.
- Neter, J., Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Wasserman, W. (1996). *Applied linear statistical models*. Chicago, IL: Irwin.
- O'Neill, J. W. (1997). An interorganizational macroculture: The case of all-suite hotels. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 21, 98-110.
- O'Neill, J. W., Beauvais, L., & Scholl, R. (2004). Strategic issues and determinant factors of an interorganizational macroculture in the lodging industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 28, 483-506.
- O'Neill, J. W., Harrison, M. M., Cleveland, J., Almeida, D., Stawski, R., & Crouter, A. C. (2009). Work-family climate, organizational commitment, and turnover: Multilevel contagion effects of leaders. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 18-29.
- O'Neill, J. W., & Xiao, Q. (2010). Effects of organizational/occupational characteristics and personality traits on hotel manager emotional exhaustion. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29, 652-658.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775-802.
- Ott, R. L., & Longnecker, M. (2001). *Statistical methods and data analysis* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury Press.
- Perlow, L. A. (1997). *Finding time: How corporations, individuals, and families can benefit from new work practices*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of organizational paradigms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 3, 1-52.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26, 513-563.
- Rosenthal, R., & Rosnow, R. L. (1991). *Essentials of behavioral research: Methods and data analysis*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Siehl, C., & Martin, J. (1981). *Learning organizational culture*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Sims, H. P., & Lorenzi, P. (1992). *The new leadership paradigm: Social learning and cognition in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 339-358.

- Thompson, C., Beauvais, L., & Lyness, K. (1999). When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 392-415.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 765-802.
- Watts, S. (2010). Identification and the cultural organization: How the concept of identification can impact the constituencies who work within cultural organizations. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 40*, 200-216.
- Welch, R., & Leighton, P. (1996). Individualizing employee relations: The myth of the personal contract. *Personnel Review, 25*(5), 37.

Submitted February 11, 2010

Accepted January 25, 2011

Refereed Anonymously

John W. O'Neill, MAI, CHE, PhD (e-mail: jwo3@psu.edu), is an associate professor at the School of Hospitality Management, The Pennsylvania State University in University Park, Pennsylvania.