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ABSTRACT

Leadership is a complex and diverse field of knowledge (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004). In multifaceted, fast-paced and ever-changing organisational environments, leadership is crucial for growth and organisational success (Abson, 2017). Events are a reflection of such business environments and the rapid growth and expansion within the events industry is reflected in available literature (Getz & Page, 2016). Leaders can directly impact organisational outcomes through their values and management style (Appelbaum, Degbe, MacDonald, & Nguyen-Quang, 2015). Importantly, leadership has a direct impact on the success of events (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013). However, research addressing leadership in the context of events is lacking to date, thus, it is paramount to explore managers’ leadership styles within an events context in order to bridge the gap between the fields of leadership and event management.

Further, volunteers are said to be one of the main distinctive features of events (Dudovskiy, 2012). Event volunteers are distinct from permanent employees as their commitment is typically short-term and episodic, as opposed to developing a relationship with an organisation over a longer period of time (Cuskelley, Hoye, & Auld, 2006). Traditionally, episodic volunteers were only trained on the job, learning as they went (Edwards, 2012). However, volunteers are often crucial to events, providing intangible frontline service, where high-quality training is advocated to ensure a successful event (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). As a result, event management has become an identifiable and unique profession requiring managers to lead diverse, paid and volunteer workforces in short-term, volatile environments (Bowdin, Allen, O’Toole, Harris, & McDonnell, 2011). This suggests a different, more nuanced
management style is required for successful event management compared with traditional organisational contexts.

The present study explored leadership styles of event managers in Australia and their attitudes towards training event volunteers. A pragmatic methodological approach, guided by the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT, Avolio & Bass, 1991), was taken using mixed methods to facilitate exploration of event managers from events across the eastern seaboard of Australia. Participants were purposively selected and completed an online questionnaire comprising demographic questions and Bass and Avolio’s (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), followed by semi-structured interviews via face-to-face or phone. Traditionally, leadership has been explored through quantitative methods (Bryman, 2011). However, according to social science research people are seen as social beings, unpredictable and with continually changing competencies, interactions and dependencies (Ambrose, 2009). Therefore, a qualitative approach was adopted to examine event managers’ styles of leadership in-depth, allowing the voice of participants to augment and enrich the quantitative MLQ data.

Nineteen event managers were purposively selected to partake in the research. Findings revealed that the majority of participants predominantly displayed transformational leadership styles according to the MLQ. These results were further reinforced by participants’ qualitative narratives. Transactional styles were uncommon among the sample, evident only among some male participants, suggesting this traditional form of leadership may have less of a presence within an events context. Although no definitive style of leadership can be advocated as a result of this research, data suggested that an exclusively transformational or transactional approach may not be appropriate within event management contexts for a number of reasons.
Alternatively, a more flexible approach to leadership within events is suggested, aligning with Parent and Smith-Swan’s (2013) research advocating event managers must be flexible and adaptable. Event managers may enact behavioural traits from beyond their preferred leadership style to meet organisational objectives when circumstances dictate. Other extraneous factors imposed upon event managers necessitates them to adapt their natural leadership style to dynamic and emergent circumstances. Factors affecting event managers decision to implement volunteer training included budget restrictions, time and other resource constraints, event managers’ perceptions of their peers’ attitudes towards volunteer training, the complexity of volunteer roles, current skill/knowledge of volunteers, differences between paid staff and volunteers, and non-standardised training.

Although leadership is not a new concept, it is becoming an increasingly popular topic “given the importance of leadership in today’s world” (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009, p. 3). Leadership is an ageless topic and has a considerable amount of research devoted to it. There appears, however, to be a gap in the literature pertaining to leadership in an event context. Abson (2017) also recently pointed out this shortcoming within the event management literature, noting that few studies have focused specifically on leadership in events and only a small number of studies have explored competencies required for the event manager’s role. This study makes a significant contribution to existing literature regarding leadership and event management by exploring the leadership styles of event managers according to the FRLT and assessing if their attitude towards training volunteers varies according to leadership styles.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The study of leadership is complex and multi-faceted, dating back to ancient times (Daft, 2005; Yukl, 1989). Scientific studies began in the twentieth century, with leadership continuing to be an important and central part of the management and organisational behaviour literature (Daft, 2005; Yukl, 1989). Considered an evolving yet, “ageless topic”, leadership produces movement as individuals who have created change are viewed as leaders (Kotter, 1990, p. 3). As most people devote more than half of their waking hours to work settings, it is crucial that research examine all aspects of organisational life, including leadership, in order to continually improve this function within organisational environments (Ambrose, 2009).

Although leadership is not a new concept, it is becoming an increasingly popular topic for research “given the importance of leadership in today’s world” (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009, p. 3). French, Rayner, Rees and Rumbles (2011) believe that for organisations to prosper, strong leadership skills are required throughout the organisational hierarchy. This is expanded upon by DuBrin (2013), who argues that profitability, productivity and efficient customer service all rely on effective leadership at all organisational levels. According to Avolio, Walumbwa and Weber (2009), there has never been a more opportune time to research the field of leadership. While it may be arbitrary to examine leadership instead of management, Fairholm and Fairholm (2009) advocate that “leadership subscribes to a different reality than management” (p. 14). The need for constant change in organisations underpins a constant need for ongoing research into leadership (Kotter, 2001), and in today’s continually changing
business environments the need for strong leadership, in addition to management, has been advocated. Moreover, a recent shift towards studying leadership in context (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Fairhurst, 2009) paves the way for more contextualised research, however, finding a niche is important to contributing significantly to the literature.

The era of special events appears to be upon us, as tremendous growth has occurred within the tourism sector, with events continually expanding and growing rapidly (Hede & Kellett, 2011; Monga, 2006; Tonge, 2010). The increasing growth of events coincides with an abundance of literature exploring the roles and impacts of planned events (Getz, 2008). However, little research has been conducted examining leadership within the context of events. Increasingly important are the human resources associated with the frontline service delivered at events, typically volunteers, who are recognised as one of the most crucial stakeholders in achieving event success (Bang, 2009). Baum and Lockstone (2007) further highlight the vital role volunteers play in the delivery of events, suggesting most events depend on volunteer workforces to some degree.

Event volunteers are distinct from permanent employees, as their commitment is typically short-term, rather than developing a relationship with an organisation over a longer period of time (Cuskelley, Hoye, & Auld, 2006). Kemp (2002) found that event volunteers are typically experiential learners; that is, they learn by doing. In addition, she identifies the varied skills learned at events are relevant to future jobs in many industry sectors (Kemp, 2002). Training volunteers, however, presents challenges as they essentially donate their time, not receiving financial compensation for their labour (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). This challenge is further exacerbated with event/episodic volunteers as there are logistical difficulties with organising training sessions at
mutually convenient times (Leigh, Lamont, & Cairncross, 2013), and volunteers often
do not have time to spend attending lengthy training sessions (Macduff, 1995).
Therefore, unlike paid employees, volunteers must be managed with a nuanced
approach.

Managing special events and event volunteers presents a unique set of
challenges due to the temporary or infrequent nature of events, and the short-term
commitment of volunteers (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000). Thus, event management is
fundamentally different to managing traditional business’s as the very nature of events
and their workforces are generally episodic, ‘pulsating’, complex, and ever-changing
volunteers as the lifeblood of many events, while Nassar and Talaat (2009) infer that
events would even cease to exist without volunteers. Therefore, as the viability of
events depends on high quality service delivered by a volunteer workforce, training
should be considered an opportunity to build upon current skill sets and enforce a sense
of community to enhance volunteer satisfaction and commitment (Costa et al., 2006).

While there appears to be a hurdle in volunteer management, it should be noted
that training of any kind is typically viewed with approval by volunteers (McCurley &
Lynch, 2009). Traditionally, episodic volunteers were only trained on the job, learning
as they went (Edwards, 2012); however, due to the aforementioned challenges, training
for contemporary event volunteers now requires closer examination or possibly to be
reconsidered. Training is advocated as essential for all event volunteers and should
begin with an orientation or induction to the event itself and the event organisation
(Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). Additionally, the results of an empirical study by
Downward and Ralston (2006) suggest that in order to capitalise on event volunteering,
the promotion and harnessing of volunteers’ personal development is essential. While it
is noted that training volunteers requires some finance, it is a valuable investment, not only reducing volunteer turnover but strengthening volunteer loyalty and commitment (Chen, Chen, & Chen, 2010).

Pittaway, Carmouche and Chell (1998) have called for leadership research applicable to the hospitality industry, while research is also advocated for event managers within the events industry in order to equip them with proactive strategic planning tools for not only the short-term but long-term as well (Dudovskiy, 2012). Specifically addressing the Chief Executive Officer/event manager holds particular importance for future research, as these senior actors are said to have the ability to change or reinforce existing actions within organisations (Boal & Hooijberg, 2000). As Dudovskiy (2012) argues, leadership styles of event managers have an influence on the overall outcome of an event where motivation and performance of staff contribute either positively or negatively. Hence, exploring the leadership styles of event managers holds promise for contributing knowledge to the existing literature in the event management and leadership fields.

1.2 Study Context

As the study of leadership continues to evolve (Daft, 2005), there is a need for further research, especially in the context of emerging organisational contexts such as events. Events perform a powerful role in modern society and have since ancient times (Bowdin et al., 2011); consequently, events are both diverse and ubiquitous (Mair, 2009). Events are major contributors to host community economies and, as argued by Oakley (2011, p. 2), “festivals are big business”. However, Parent and Smith-Swan (2013) argue that effective leadership can make or break an event. It is not surprising then that research conducted into event management is growing and becoming increasingly diverse.
Consequently, an overarching aim of this thesis is to explore the intertwined concepts of leadership, volunteer management, and volunteer training within event management organisations.

Although leadership research within event management contexts is scarce to date, previous studies have typically assessed leaders in overseas and other cultural contexts. Abson (2017) explored the leadership practices of business event managers based within the UK, identifying six key leadership practices which are essential in order to develop successful event managers. Smith and Wang (1997) analysed the ways in which Chinese leaders managed work events and discovered likely incentives such as training to be a source of guidance for event management. The present study therefore makes an original contribution to the fields of event management and leadership within a Western cultural perspective in Australia.

The Sydney 2000 Olympic Games were a significant catalyst for increasing inbound tourism growth within Australia (Woodward, 2000), and arguably concurrently sparked a penchant for event management educational programs in Australia. In regional areas of Australia, events and festivals are today key contributors to community development, economic growth, and catalysts for future social and economic development (Derrett, 2000). Derrett (2000) highlights the significant growth in regional events and festivals, noting attention is being given to event management practices as events have the potential to boost regional tourism. Studies such as these highlight the important role events play within contemporary Australian society culture, notably within smaller, regional areas.

Almost two decades have passed since Getz (2000) labelled the events industry as an immature topic of academic research. Since then the events industry has grown exponentially (Lockstone-Binney, Robertson, & Junek, 2013). With the proliferation of
mega-events, such as the Olympics, and high-profile events within Australia, such as
the Melbourne Cup and Splendour in the Grass, awareness of this events sector is
becoming more well-known proving events are more central to Australian culture today
(Bowdin et al., 2011; Harris, 2004). In addition, the event management profession is
growing, and is today an established field of academic research (Damm, 2011;
Goldblatt, 2000). Increasing professionalisation of the event management sector is
evident through the provision of training courses, emergence of education providers,
and within expanding academic research (Harris, 2004). Bowdin et al. (2011) state
limited research has explored the skills, attributes and qualities of event managers
within context. Further, Schmader and Jackson (1997) note that successful events rely
on strong leadership. Thus, exploring leadership within the context of events holds
promise of contributing to a clear gap in the leadership and events management
literature.

The case study event managers purposively selected for the present study were
based on: the event’s geographical location to the researcher, namely between the
Northern Rivers in New South Wales (NSW) and the Gold Coast in Queensland (Qld),
Australia; the number of volunteers the event requires; and the structured training
provided. However, the sample was extended to allow event managers from as far as
Victoria to participate, as snowballing resulted from current participants’ suggestions
for future participants. Subsequently, event managers from a variety of different events
that were diverse in size, number of volunteers, level of training provided and individual
requirements of participants to be in the role of event manager made up the nineteen
case studies. Individual event managers holding the most senior management position
were each associated with a single event which they led. The events led by the event
managers ranged from small, local events in regional areas to larger events, termed ‘hallmark’ in nature, and all were annual recurring events.

Smaller events are equally as important as larger events, typically generating local economies and enhancing local communities at minimal cost, as they rely heavily on existing infrastructure (Gursoy, Kim, & Uysal, 2004). Hallmark events are characterised by the large numbers of participants and volunteers they attract, and that they take place repeatedly in the same destination, for example Oktoberfest in Munich (Mair, 2009). Major events, in contrast, may actually involve more people than a hallmark event, however, and have significant economic pulling power, the Australian Open tennis in Melbourne for example (Mair, 2009). Additional to the event size, the type of event was also considered, including sporting, music, arts and cultural. Around ten events were chosen as an initial sample, however, the actual events are not named for anonymity purposes. Such events fall into both the smaller, local events and hallmark/major event categories, with all relying on large numbers of volunteers to fulfil many organisational roles, and thus are required to undertake some form of prior training. The Gold Coast and surrounding areas have a rich and diverse history of well-attended annual events related to sports, arts and music (GCCEC, 2013), thus making it a suitable region to explore a variety of different events in context.

1.3 Research Aim and Objectives

The overarching aim of this thesis is to identify and explore the leadership styles of event managers, and to examine if and how event managers’ attitudes towards training for event volunteers varies according to leadership style.

The specific objectives of the research are to:
1. Identify and categorise leadership styles of event managers according to an established leadership theory;

2. Explore event managers’ perceptions of their leadership style and how leadership styles manifest in event management contexts;

3. Examine if and how attitudes towards training for event volunteers varies across event managers’ leadership styles; and,

4. Identify and explore factors shaping event managers’ decisions regarding the allocation of training resources for event volunteers.

1.4 Significance of the Study

There are a number of core themes to be explored within this study, being events, leadership, volunteers, and volunteer training. Each examined separately warrants investigation; however, combining these themes taps into organisational and managerial contexts that are continually changing, giving rise to numerous scholarly issues that are yet to be thoroughly explored within the event management literature. Events are an important and growing sector within the field of tourism (e.g. Hede & Kellett, 2011; Monga, 2006; Tonge, 2010), and within regional areas in Australia (Derrett, 2000). In accordance with such growth within events more research concerning event leadership is needed to facilitate sustainability of events long-term.

This study is significant as it links the management of volunteers with leadership in the context of event management, an issue that has attracted scarce scholarly attention to date. Volunteer workforces are one of the main distinctive features of events (Dudovskiy, 2012), and the performance of volunteers is often a direct result of the training they receive (Maynard, 2007). Facteau, Dobbins, Russell, Ladd and Kudisch (1995) ascertain that the importance of training for contemporary organisations will
continue to increase in the future as improving service quality is emphasised. While the success of events is often dependent upon effective leadership (Goldblatt, 2005; Tassiopoulos, 2005), the fusion of these concepts together creates a niche for future research. This study contributes knowledge regarding event managers’ attitudes towards volunteer training, which broadens current training literature providing insights into more effective training programs for both volunteers and event managers.

In today’s increasingly volatile and ambiguous business environment, leadership is advocated as imperative for organisational success (Gleeson, 2017). Additionally, the events industry is rapidly developing, and with such growth there is a clear gap in knowledge linking event management leadership with leadership theory (Getz & Page, 2016). More and more people are required to step up and lead in order for organisations to survive in this rapidly changing environment (Kim, 2007; McKee, Kemp, & Spence, 2013); moreover, effective leadership can underpin competitive advantage (Robbins, Judge, Millett, & Waters-Marsh, 2008). Bass and Bass (2008) advocate that “leadership makes the difference” (p. 3); thus, to be more effective, continual growth must be made within this area. With this increase in demand for leadership within organisations it is vital that researchers ascertain the effects of differing leadership styles on the deployment of human resource development (HRD) processes within continually changing environments. Such changing environments are often associated with event organisations. Further, the growth within the events field has been advocated. Additionally, a gap in the literature lies in determining why some leaders engage in charismatic or transformational leadership (Avolio et al., 2009). Boal and Hooijberg (2000) note the lack of leadership research in organisational or environmental contexts, particularly focusing on new or emergent leadership theories.
The challenge for leaders and thus leadership research is the “pace of change and the complexity of the challenges faced” (Petrie, 2014, p.7). In today’s rapidly changing, diverse business environment—even more so in the fast-paced environment of events—leaders face such complex challenges and are required to adapt. Leadership has been extensively examined in a wide variety of organisational settings (Yammarino, 2012), however, very little is understood of this complex phenomenon in relation to event management. Increased attention in leadership research is bound to bring about further understanding of the topic and contribute to the future of research in this area (Rost, 1993). Further, the increasingly competitive environment of events, coupled with more discerning consumers, suggests that effective leadership is required to achieve successful events (Yeoman, Robertson, Ali-Knight, Drummond, & McMahon-Beattie, 2004). Little research explores leadership in the context of event management utilising established leadership theories. This research adds to the literature already addressing leadership within an event context (Abson, 2017; Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). However, this study adds rigour to the literature addressing leadership in events by applying established leadership theory to explore leadership styles of event managers.

Limited research has been conducted within the capacity of events that examines skills, qualities or attributes of successful managers (Bowdin et al., 2011). While this research does not specifically examine these qualities, it examines the behaviours of event managers by way of the MLQ, which aims to ascertain the distinctive styles event managers used in everyday events. As growth within the events sector is increasing, concerns of sustainable leadership are more evident (Pernecky, 2015). Research aimed at exploring leadership within the events context is thus prudent. Therefore, this study is significant because it aims to measure event managers’ preferred leadership style using
Bass and Avolio’s (1995) MLQ, and further explore any variance in participants’
determined leadership style concerning their attitude towards volunteer training.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

Although this research aimed to contribute empirically rich data in this field there were
a number of delimitations imposed to strike a balance between addressing a gap in the
literature and designing a manageable project. This study was limited to a Western
context as only events along the East Coast of Australia were included. Further, mega-
events, like the Olympics, were excluded due to the anticipated problems accessing the
appropriate senior event managers and the extended format of participation. Due to
resource and time limitations imposed by the thesis timeframe, the study’s cultural
context was unable to be diversified from the geographical location, excluding overseas
events. The sample was purposively selected to include participants who partook in the
online questionnaire and follow-up semi-structured interviews. A total of 19 participants
completed this questionnaire and participated in an interview via face-to-face or
telephone methods. These methods were also limiting on the research. Thus, the
findings should be considered within the limited context of this study.

Further delimitations were the population of potential participants included, as
only the most senior event manager was invited to participate. Thus, only the MLQ 5X
self form was used, purposely excluding the volunteer populations at each of the 19 case
study events, rendering the rater form not applicable in this study. This limited feedback
and scoring to event managers who completed the self form. The relatively small
number of participants made for a more manageable study as the researcher conducted
all aspects of the research herself, from participant recruitment to data collection and
analysis. While the generalisability of findings is limited to the present study, this was not an objective of the research design.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

In order to effectively address the research objectives of this study a theoretical framework is required to underpin the research. Although numerous leadership theories exist, none are presumed authoritative within the field (Antonakis, Schriesheim, Donovan, Gopalakrishna-Pillai, Pellegrini, & Rossomme, 2004). Therefore, it is prudent that researchers adopt methods, theories and models where validity has been established (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). The theoretical framework chosen to guide this research is the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT) framework (Avolio & Bass, 1991), of which Bass and Avolio’s (1995) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) constitutes the instrument designed to operationalise and measure the various leadership styles embedded within the FRLT.

Transforming leadership was originally introduced by Burns (1978), who described this broad leadership style as an approach producing significant change within organisations and people. Bass (1985) further developed Burns’ (1978) work, coining the term ‘transformational’ leadership and developing an instrument to measure leadership styles and how they impact follower performance and motivation. However, Avolio and Bass (1991) later introduced the FRLT distinguishing three leadership styles: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. Antonakis and House (2002) argue that the FRLT is leading the way as a ‘new leadership’ approach with the potential of explaining the phenomenon of leadership. The aim of the FRLT is to profile how frequently a given leader displays a full range of leadership styles encompassing transformational leadership (Idealised Influence Attributed, Idealised Influence...
Behavioural, Individualised Consideration, Intellectual Stimulation, and Inspirational Motivation); transactional leadership (Contingent Reward, Management-By-Exception Active, Management-By-Exception Passive); and Laissez-Faire leadership (Bass, 2000).

While attempts have been made to develop an integrative theory of leadership, to date no theory is universally accepted as adequately encapsulating and explaining all synergies associated with leadership (Antonakis & House, 2002). Older, classical leadership theories including the trait approach, the behavioural/style approach, and situational leadership have been criticised for their unidirectional and narrow perspectives (Winkler, 2010). In contrast, the FRLT is argued to have higher utility than prior approaches as it builds on current theories; has been developed in an integrative manner; and a growing body of empirical evidence has led to this theoretical framework gaining widespread acceptance within leadership and management literature (Antonakis & House, 2013). Additionally, the MLQ, developed to measure the FRLT, is a widely accepted instrument and underpins quantitative approaches to leadership research as required to address Research Objective One.

While leadership has typically been assessed using quantitative approaches, qualitative studies are suggested to complement such an approach and bring a more rich, nuanced understanding of such a complex phenomenon (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). The FRLT is advocated as more comprehensive than prior leadership theories as it has been developed in an integrative way, supported by empirical findings, and has received widespread acceptance within leadership and management literature (Antonakis & House, 2013). Building upon the support the FRLT has already received ensures that this underpinning theory is valid and reliable and will break new ground within the confines of this research. A qualitatively-driven mixed-methods approach was thus used to combat quantitative-focused leadership research. The quantitative
aspect, the MLQ, was used to derive the leadership styles of participants and this was qualitatively followed up with semi-structured interviews to attain participants’ perceptions not found with a solely quantitative method.

Literature connecting volunteer management and leadership in contexts aside from event management does not exist, however, conceptual writing dominates this field of study. Empirical studies are noted by Rowold and Rohmann (2009) to be rare. Leadership is advocated as an important aspect of volunteer management and essential to the success of volunteer programs (Holmes & Smith, 2009), with volunteers often requiring a more nuanced management approach than that of paid staff (Hager & Brudney, 2004). Waikayi et al. (2012) found that leadership skills were crucial in establishing a positive rapport with volunteers. Further, Rowold and Rohmann’s (2009) empirical study on German choirs contributed to knowledge concerning leadership styles and emotions elicited from followers. They employed the FRLT, a widely-used theoretical framework for the study of leadership across a wide variety of contexts, to studying volunteers, and by association, the MLQ 5X instrument which revealed negative emotions were more strongly linked to transactional leadership styles. Freeborough and Patterson (2015) also employed the FRLT to examine the relationship between leadership and non-profit employee engagement. Utilising the MLQ within the aforementioned studies were based on the MLQ’s strong construct validity and reliability, with results indicating positive correlations with transformational leadership. Indeed, it is this distinction between the broad approaches of transformational and transactional leadership that was of most interest in this study, and given that the FRLT has been previously employed in varying situational contexts and has proven instructive for studying volunteer management contexts per the studies above, the FRLT was
deemed to be appropriate for empirically examining the nexus between leadership and leading and managing event volunteers.

1.7 Overview of the Methodology

To date, a well acknowledged definition and school of leadership is as elusive as it was 40 years ago. As a result, an outstanding authority on reviewing leadership does not exist (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). Therefore, as noted above, deciding upon an approach to studying leadership should be based upon models and methods where validity has been established (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). Typically, leadership research has been examined via quantitative methods; however, many authors advocate a qualitative approach to leadership research as this allows new theory to generate (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004; Bryman, 2004; Conger, 1998). Bryman (1999) insists that a qualitative approach to leadership research has great potential for the field, allowing different questions and issues not readily accessible by a quantitative approach to be addressed. Additionally, qualitative approaches, as yet, do not have a unifying theoretical framework, but rather are exploratory and inductive in nature (Abson, 2017).

A ‘qualitatively-driven’ mixed-methods approach, as advocated by Mason (2006), was employed underlined by a pragmatic research paradigm. The limitations of single-method studies are acknowledged and, as advocated by Yukl (1989), it is “imperative to use multiple methods in research on leadership” (p. 278). Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) note that central to pragmatism is valuing both subjective and objective knowledge. This allowed for a hybrid research design integrating a quantitative online questionnaire and qualitative semi-structured interviews, therefore allowing the strengths of both approaches to be harnessed. The two different approaches
were employed to achieve complementarity and completeness of the overall research design (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008), and its potential to uncover unanticipated findings (Bryman, 2006). Firstly, event managers were invited to participate in an online questionnaire consisting of closed-ended questions to determine their leadership style according to the FRLT. This instrument was administered via an online survey platform containing demographic questions and the MLQ 5X short self form. This was followed by a second phase of data collection, where qualitative semi-structured interviews were carried out to augment this initial quantitative inquiry. Interviews were conducted face-to-face where possible and via telephone when face-to-face was not possible.

The sample was deliberately selected based on a number of purposive selection criteria, including: initial response to the study request via completion of the MLQ and consent to participate in a follow-up interview; events that had a significant volunteer workforce; events in which training for volunteers was a prerequisite; and events based along the East Coast of Australia. A total of 19 event managers participated in the study. MLQ results were analysed as per Bass and Avolio’s (1995) MLQ Scoring Key 5X short for each participant in order to determine their preferred leadership style. Qualitative data collected through semi-structured interviews were then thematically analysed to flesh out perceptions of participants’ personal leadership styles and to triangulate the quantitative data.

1.8 Definition of Terms

The following list defines key terms and acronyms used throughout this thesis.

**Attitude:** “A mindset or a tendency to act in a particular way due to both an individual’s experience and temperament” Attitudes are explored as a determinant of a person’s behaviour (Pickens, 2005, p. 44).
**Episodic volunteering:** A volunteer who gives service that is short in duration or temporary (Macduff, 1995).

**Event volunteers:** They are different to permanent, paid employees as they are bound by a psychological contract which excludes the reward of pay (Nichols & Ojala, 2009). Typically considered experiential learners who learn by doing, their commitment is short-term and they often take on a variety of specialist roles within an event (Cuskelley, Hoye, & Auld, 2006; Kemp, 2002).

**Full Range of Leadership Model** (FRLM): As the name suggests, this model attempts to depict the whole range of leadership styles. It articulates the full range of leadership styles according to the FRLT in a four-quadrant diagram, with passive and active on opposing ends of a horizontal continuum and effective and ineffective at opposite ends of a vertical line (Robbins et al., 2010).

**Full Range of Leadership Theory** (FRLT): The FRLT proposed by Avolio and Bass (1991) is one of the new theories of leadership, with its constructs comprising three typologies of leadership behaviour—transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership—represented by nine distinct factors:

1. **Idealised Influence (Attributed)** (IIA): This factor refers to the socialised charisma of the leader, including whether the leader is perceived by followers as confident or powerful, and whether they focus on higher-order ideals and ethics (Antonakis et al., 2003).

2. **Idealised Influence (Behavioural)** (IIB): This factor refers to the charismatic actions of the leader centred around values, beliefs and a sense of mission (Antonakis et al., 2003).

3. **Individualised Consideration** (IC): This factor refers to leader behaviour which contributes to follower satisfaction by supporting individual needs and
providing individualised coaching/mentoring, allowing self-actualisation and
development (Antonakis et al., 2003).

(4) **Inspirational Motivation** (IM): This factor refers to the ways in which
leaders motivate their followers by setting achievable goals, communicating
an idealised vision and encouraging followers (Antonakis et al., 2003).

(5) **Intellectual Stimulation** (IS): This factor refers to leader actions that appeal
to followers’ logistical and analytical side, where they are challenged to
think creatively and brainstorm solutions to problems (Antonakis et al.,
2003).

(6) **Contingent Reward** (CR): This factor refers to leader behaviours which
focus on role and task clarification, followers are then offered rewards
contingent on fulfilling contractual obligations (Antonakis et al., 2003).

(7) **Management-by-Exception Active** (MBEA): This factor refers to the
active supervision of the leader, whose aim is to ensure standards are met by
taking corrective measures when issues occur (Antonakis et al., 2003).

(8) **Management-by-Exception Passive** (MBEP): This factor refers to passive
leader interventions occurring once mistakes have already happened
(Antonakis et al., 2003).

(9) **Laissez-Faire** (LF): This factor refers to leaders who avoid making
decisions, often abdicating responsibility and where an absence of leadership
power is visible (Antonakis et al., 2003).

**Human resource development** (HRD): HRD is the study and practice of increasing the
learning capacity of individuals, teams and organisations through ongoing development
and training activities for the purpose of growing individual performance and
optimising organisational effectiveness (Chalofsky, 1992).
Leadership: “A process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (Northouse, 2013, p. 5).

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ): The most current version of the MLQ 5X (revised) containing 45 items that identify and measure key leadership and effectiveness behaviours developed through research and shown to link strongly with individual and organisational success (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

On-the-job training (OJT): An active method of organisational training, denoting ‘real work’ in ‘real time’, which is attractive for event organisations as learning tasks and enacting role requirements are simultaneous, requiring no transfer between training and practice (Stone, 2010).

Training: “A planned and systematic effort to modify or develop knowledge/skill/attitude through learning experience, to achieve effective performance in an activity or range of activities. Its purpose, in the work situation, is to enable an individual to acquire abilities in order that he or she can perform adequately a given task or job and realise their potential” (Buckley & Caple, 2009, p. 9).

Transactional leadership: Lewis-Anthony (2013, p. 43) defines transactional leadership as occurring “when a leader exchanges something of value with his followers.”

Transformational leadership: Emphasis is on extrinsic motivation and the positive development of followers, and followers seek inspiration, guidance, empowerment and challenging work (Bass & Riggio, 2008).

Volunteerism: A complex and multi-faceted phenomenon characterised as both a leisure activity and unpaid work, whereby an individual’s time, skills and knowledge are given freely to benefit another person, group or organisation (Cuskelly, Hoye, &
Auld, 2006; Holmes & Smith, 2009; Lockstone & Baum, 2009; Lynch & Smith, 2010; McCabe, White, & Obst, 2007).

1.9 Outline of the Thesis

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter Two presents a discussion of relevant literature pertaining to the research objectives. In order to address all of the study’s research objectives, literature covering a broad range of topics is examined in depth. Firstly, leadership is broadly discussed as a field of research, and theoretical concepts and instruments for measuring leadership are reviewed. HRD, and training as a core HRD process, are then discussed, as it is a focused approach on human capital investment. Attention is then turned to volunteerism and volunteer management as a key topics within this research. Lastly, event management is reviewed, and a summary of the chapter provided.

Chapter Three describes and justifies the methods used to collect and analyse data for this study. The overall research design and overarching paradigm are initially outlined. The methodological approach is next described, justifying the methods employed to collect data. Data analysis techniques are detailed, and methodological limitations are acknowledged. Ethical considerations pertaining to this research are then discussed, noting the ethics approval obtained for this study.

Chapter Four is the first of three results chapters. Addressed herein are the results of participants’ online questionnaires. The training offered by event managers, the FRLT and an in-depth discussion of event managers are discussed, addressing Research Objective One. Following this, Chapter Five explores participants’ perceptions of their personal leadership style as addressed via Research Objective Two. This chapter aims to interpret and analyse the meanings embedded within the data
pertaining to Research Objectives One and Two. Thus, a comparison of data collected in phase one and two is presented. Finally, Chapter Six concludes the results chapters of this thesis. Research Objectives Three and Four are addressed within the chapter, exploring event managers’ attitudes towards training volunteers and situational variables which shape their decision to resource and implement volunteer training.

Chapter Seven presents the discussion of findings as they relate to relevant literature. Here prominent themes are described as they emerged during data analysis. The final chapter, Chapter Eight, concludes this thesis by presenting a summary of the key findings and contributions. Implications as they pertain to theory and practice are then described. Research limitations are noted as well as recommended areas for future research.

1.10 Chapter Summary

Chapter One has outlined the background of the study and described the context of the thesis. The study’s research aim and objectives were outlined, and the significance of the research was advocated. A gap within current event management literature regarding leadership styles was highlighted. The study’s theoretical framework is then stated, depicting the FRLT as the overarching framework underlying the study. Delimitations of the study and an overview of the methodology were discussed. A definition of commonly used terms and an outline of the overall thesis concluded the chapter. The following chapter, Chapter Two, reviews the existing literature pertinent to this study.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Chapter Two examines the literature pertinent to the research aim and objectives of this thesis. This section begins by examining leadership, a core concept within this thesis and the overarching field of research requiring review in order to fulfil the study’s research objectives. Research Objectives One and Two require particular attention to the leadership literature. To address the third and fourth research objectives literature addressing human resource development (HRD), event management, training and volunteers, is also reviewed.

Leadership is the starting point for this literature review. Research Objectives One, Two and Three all encompass concepts of leadership, particularly leadership styles. As a result, a thorough examination of the literature pertaining to leadership is undertaken. Leadership is firstly reviewed as a broad field of research to gain an understanding of the phenomenon under study. The review then defines leadership, and a comparative analysis of leadership versus management ensues. The theoretical approaches to the study of leadership are then reviewed, from traditional to contemporary. Instruments to measure leadership are identified, as well as literature addressing leadership within events, subsequently pinpointing a gap within the literature. A description and analysis of HRD and training as a process of HRD follow. Volunteerism is next reviewed, including where it has been used in previous studies exploring events. The event management literature, incorporating event workforces, is lastly examined.
2.2 Leadership

Bowerman and Van Wart (2011) argue that people in leadership positions have an influence on others on a daily basis and, in turn, can be influenced themselves. Combining this normative act of influence with achieving organisational goals is a formula for leadership (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011). Thus, there is a lot of conjecture within the leadership body of literature as it concerns an activity necessary in all walks of life. According to Yammarino (2012), “leadership is one of the most highly discussed and researched topics in all of human behaviour” (p. 517). Although this connotation is backed by other researchers (e.g. Daft & Marcic, 2006), it has also been noted that there is a discerning level of disagreement surrounding exactly what leadership is, and the ‘born vs made’ leadership debate suggesting it is a speculative body of literature and not well understood (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004).

Leadership has quite literally been an emerging and interesting source of learning since ancient times (Daft, 2005; Lussier & Achua, 2010), explored within varying contexts, it can be traced back to ancient Egyptian and Chinese origins (Hunt & Dodge, 2000). However, in today’s dynamic and ever-changing business environment, leadership effectiveness can be an important determining factor in the success and viability of an organisation (Daft & Marcic, 2006; Mann, 2013). The study of leadership is ongoing because how leaders relate and respond to historical influences varies according to the times and complexities they are dealing with. Accordingly, Avolio et al. (2009) state that the twenty-first century is the ideal time to examine leadership, as the emergence of new leadership figures within popular culture has sparked a resurgence in leadership research.
2.2.1 Defining Leadership

Leadership is a complex concept (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004; DuBrin, Dalgish, & Miller, 2006), and is considered an ever-evolving topic within literature (Bass & Bass, 2008; Daft, 2005), making the term leadership a continual ‘work in progress’. Bass and Bass (2008) identified that there will be no respite from new leadership typologies emerging in the foreseeable future. Accordingly, it is widely acknowledged that no universally accepted definition of leadership exists (Gill, 2011). This lack of a collective definition is partly attributable to inconsistent measures used in research conducted within this domain and the ability to identify leadership within context, as ultimately leadership lies in the eye of the beholder (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004; Bass & Avolio, 2018). Or, put simply, “seeing after all … is believing” (Wexler, 2005, p. 1), so it is necessary to view leadership in order to identify it. By this view, Mann (2013) argues that “we all seem to sense what is meant by the use of the term” (p. 16). Yukl (2002) suggests that defining leadership is subjective and arbitrary. This can be attributed to the variety of different ways in which leadership is studied, requiring different definitions (Lussier & Achua, 2010; Mann, 2013). Antonakis, Cianciolo and Sternberg (2004) note that although leadership is quite easy to identify in situ, it is more difficult to define precisely. Similarly, Bennis (2009) equates defining leadership to defining beauty, stating: “leadership is like beauty: it’s hard to define, but you know it when you see it” (p. xxx).

Definitions of leadership adopt different perspectives and vary according to traits, relationship, skill(s), process, competency and a construct (Gill, 2011; Gregoire & Arendt, 2004). Kort (2008), on the other hand, argues that definitions of leadership only differ in the particulars of situational roles in practical settings. However, leadership is commonly defined as an influence relationship between the leader and their follower(s)
The social process of influence occurs on a daily basis and, when combined with achieving a collective goal, the elements of leadership transpire (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011; DeRue, 2011). Put simply, leadership is a reciprocal activity occurring among people (Daft & Marcic, 2006). Although the influential aspect of leadership is a common identifier, existing literature presents a more one-directional approach, as opposed to influence in a social interaction process (DeRue, 2011). Within this thesis, leadership is considered as an activity of social interaction and influencing process.

In this absence of a universal definition, a characterisation is nevertheless still necessary to guide this study. The literature identifies leadership, most broadly and commonly, as an influencing process (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004; Helms, 2006; Van der Wagen, 2007). Defining leadership as an influencing process does not distinguish leadership solely as a trait or behaviour residing within the leader, but rather an interactive relationship occurring between leader and follower (Northouse, 2009). This broad definition applies most appropriately to this study, as leaders will be asked to participate based on the preconception of an influence relationship with volunteers in event organisations. In fact, Lussier and Achua (2006) state that influence is so significant in the leadership process that it is called the “essence of leadership” (p. 109). Northouse (2013) identifies four concepts which are central to leadership: (1) leadership involves influence, (2) it is a process, (3) it occurs in groups, and (4) it involves common goals. Based on these four components, Northouse (2013) defines leadership as “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 5).

Leadership is similarly defined by Daft and Marcic (2006) as “the ability to influence people toward the attainment of goals” (p. 412); although it is not as
thoroughly defined as Northouse’s (2013) definition, which includes three out of the
four central leadership components proposed by Northouse (2013). Differing definitions
of leadership were considered, however, Northouse’s (2013) all-encompassing
definition is adopted here as the definition of leadership for this study. While a
definition has been identified here, it is acknowledged that “leadership will continue to
have different meanings for different people” (Northouse, 2013, p. 4). As organisations
evolve, leaders are more susceptible to change, and factors such as generational
differences and growing global influences will continue to define leaders, in turn
affecting people’s perceptions of leadership (Northouse, 2013). An important aspect of
leadership in addition to the factors just covered is power, and how and why it is used
by leaders (Northouse, 2013). The next sub-section considers the literature pertaining to
this important issue.

2.2.2 Power as a Defining Concept of Leadership

Although leadership is not defined by power for the purposes of this thesis, power is
significant to all leaders. Heim, Chapman and Lashutka (2004) state that while all
leaders have power, it is the manner in which they use power that influences their
effectiveness. Power is the “capacity or potential to influence” (Northouse, 2013, p. 9).
In this manner, Bennis and Nanus (2003) state that power is a leader’s currency. It is
this power that a leader uses to exert influence over others to ultimately achieve
organisational objectives (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). By this definition, it is clear that
power, although not explicitly recognised in this study’s definition of leadership, is a
necessary constituent concept of leadership. Also noted by Lussier and Achua (2006),
power is about achieving influence over others. Northouse (2013) determines that
“people have power when they have the ability to affect other’s beliefs, attitudes, and
courses of action” (p. 9). Defining leadership by power was ruled against for the
purposes of this thesis, as goal compatibility is not a precursor for power. However, taking Northouse’s (2013) four central components of leadership (described above) into account, leadership in this study requires that leadership involves common goals.

Early theories of leadership were typically reliant on power as the key defining concept (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011), and it would be negligent to not discuss power as a leader cannot lead without some form of power (Bennis & Nanus, 2003). Power determines how people are able to influence each other (Yukl, 2002). However, the concept of power in the hands of leaders entails human risks, often ethically challenging when used to define leadership (Zaleznik, 1989). Additionally, according to Hogan, Curphy and Hogan (1994), leadership only occurs when others willingly follow—not when leaders wield their power or domination. Definitions incorporating the term ‘power’ are justifiably ruled against due to the pertinent issues surrounding this concept and, as such, are beyond the scope of this thesis. Effectively, while power is excluded from the definition used in this study, it is acknowledged that power is a prerequisite for influence, the significant aspect of the leadership definition adopted for this thesis.

According to Hamlin (2004), modern theorists often erroneously refer to leadership as management, with the two terms often used interchangeably. The next section discusses the differences between leadership and management, and implicitly leaders versus managers, and the debate surrounding the distinction between the terms is discussed.

### 2.2.3 Leadership vs. Management

Debate as to whether leadership and management are distinct concepts began in the 1970s (Gregoire & Arendt, 2004), and is an issue still debated today (Northouse, 2013). The two terms are often confused and sometimes used synonymously (Robbins, Judge, Millett, & Waters-Marsh, 2008). Likewise, in organisations today, the term ‘leader’ is
often substituted for a manager’s role; however, both management and leadership skills are necessary in contemporary organisations (Rabey, 2005). As noted by van Knippenberg (2011), it is typical to think of organisations as just having managers; however, it is difficult to imagine them without some form of leadership structure. However, “leadership cannot replace management; it should be in addition to management” (Daft, 2008, p. 15). This connotation that leadership should be differentiated from management is supported by numerous other researchers (e.g. Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011; Helms, 2006; Kotter, 2001).

While there is distinction between the two concepts, they can overlap (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011). This being said, the difference between leadership and management is explicated by DuBrin (2013): “Effective leaders also manage, and effective managers also lead” (p. 6). Rather than viewing one without the other, they should be addressed relative to each other. Kotter (2001) also suggests that leadership should not be considered superior to management, nor a replacement, but as a complementary system of action. As event managers are the key participants within this study, and it is their leadership styles that are under investigation, it is prudent to address both concepts individually for the purpose of critical evaluation. Consequently, although leadership is recognised as a distinct concept from management, leaders also have to perform management functions and for the purposes of this thesis will be addressed in relation to management.

Bennis and Nanus (2003) have contributed substantially to debates around leadership versus management. They argue that while leadership should be considered a subset of management, differentiating between the two concepts comes down to the roles they usually undertake in any given organisation. Scholars often argue management is about ‘taking the short view’, using coercion to encourage compliance,
while leadership should take a long-term perspective and be persuasive rather than coercive (Allio, 2013). Birkinshaw (2010) articulates that management is about operationalising work, while leadership is about creating a vision and inspiring others to pursue it. However, Daft and Marcic (2006) distinguished each with three identifying tasks—management promoting stability, order and problem-solving—and, on the other hand, leadership promoting vision, creativity and change. In organisational terms, management addresses its efficiency, while leadership addresses effectiveness (Mann, 2013). Leadership is most commonly associated with successfully managing change (Kotter, 2001). Mann (2013), who called on Bennis and Nanus’s (2003) work, identifies that an organisation in an unstable and challenging environment requires more than just management; leadership is necessary in this circumstance to adapt. Thus, while management is important, and leaders do require management skills, it is only part of the bigger picture. In contemporary business environments, leadership is therefore required to successfully manage change and for organisational success in an ever-changing environment (Mann, 2013).

Just as management and leadership are two independent terms, manager and leader are two concepts often used interchangeably; however, they are also not synonymous or interchangeable, reflecting two different functions (Armandi, Oppedisano, & Sherman, 2003; Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009). While reviewing such concepts may appear repetitive, distinguishing management/leadership as core skills and manager/leader as status roles suggests the need to examine them as differing concepts. The key point of differentiation between these two concepts is the idea that followers willingly do what a leader asks and not just because it is required of them, as is the case with a manager (Armandi et al., 2003). Like Daft and Marcic (2006), Yukl (2002) differentiates leaders and managers with three identifying values. Yukl states
that leaders value flexibility, innovation and adaptation, while managers value stability, order and efficiency. Managers are often associated with the terms ‘control’ (Storey, 2004a) or ‘authority’ (Rabey, 2005), while a leader, in comparison, is seen as someone who guides people on a journey, thus having an influential effect rather than a controlling one (McKee et al., 2013). Storey (2004a) takes another approach, arguing managers are transactional while leaders are transformative. He suggests leadership is often made to stand for all the desirable qualities wanted in top-level managers, such as flexibility, innovation, commitment, a performance focus and a clear vision (Storey, 2004a). Interestingly, eminent management theorist Henry Mintzberg characterises a leader as only one function out of ten managerial roles (Lussier & Achua, 2010). By this definition, all managers are described as having a leadership role, which includes tasks such as hiring, training, motivating and disciplining employees (Robbins et al., 2008).

Although managers and leaders differ in their abilities and skills, the two are not inherently different types of people (Daft, 2008). Leaders are often already managers, and many managers already possess the qualities necessary to be an effective leader (Daft, 2008). DuBrin (2013) describes leaders as visionary, creative, passionate, inspiring, warm and radiant, while managers are identified as analytical, authoritative, business-like, cool and reserved. Across the literature it is evident leaders are generally associated with being uplifting and positive, while managers tend to be viewed with more negative connotations. It is generally agreed that, while managers and leaders are often mistaken for one another, not all managers are leaders, nor are all leaders managers (Robbins et al., 2008). While it is clear that management and leadership can be differentiated by the tasks and values of leaders and managers, it should be noted that the degree of overlap is variable and not without controversy (Yukl, 2002).
While different, leadership is similar to management in a number of ways. A key feature of leadership—influence—is also essential in management, while both require a relationship process as they entail working with people, and accomplishing goals is a task concern for both managers and leaders (Northouse, 2013). While this study predominantly examines leadership, it does take into account that event managers are the core participants of this research, thus examining leadership in the context of managers as leaders. Consequently, while this thesis does not focus on managers per se, the importance of strong management as reviewed within the existing literature is not discounted, nor is leadership deemed a superior concept.

Having defined leadership as a theoretical concept, and differentiated between the terms management and leadership, and managers and leaders, it is necessary to distinguish who leaders are in organisational settings. In relation to Research Objective One, leaders will need to be identified within the event organisation, hence knowing how to identify a leader is important for the purposes of this study and is addressed in the following sub-section.

### 2.2.4 Identifying Leaders

Determining what and who a leader is largely depends on the leader’s skills, knowledge and attitude, and their position either within an organisation or relationship with their followers. Fairholm and Fairholm (2009) argue the title of ‘leader’ does not necessarily denote true leadership, nor does the absence of the title in an organisational context suggest someone is not a leader. However, the evidence is quite strong in that people have a relatively uniform perception of what characterises a leader, citing attributes such as being smart, verbally adept and personable (Robbins et al., 2008). Jackson and Parry (2011) note that “leadership is probably easier to find than a leader” (p. 18). They are typically the people getting the credit for successes; however, also taking the blame
for failures at the same time (Robbins et al., 2008). Thus, in some circumstances it may prove difficult to identify a leader as there is no universal behaviours common to all leaders, meaning not all leaders act the same way (Shane, 2010). A leader may be formal or informal; there may be a sole leader or multiple leaders; the leader might be appointed to the role or may emerge as an unrecognised organisational leader; however, leaders are required at all levels of organisations (Mann, 2013). In spite of any differences, leaders are common to all organisations, whether large or small (Daft, 2008). Some leaders are charismatic, while others are functional, some command when others build consensus (Shane, 2010). While leaders’ skills vary, Storey (2004b) contends a range of leadership competencies are necessary for all leaders. As a consequence, people typically follow the lead of a person who uses their actions and personal influence to bring about change (DuBrin et al., 2006). In many cases a leader is identified as the prime holder of responsibility, ‘the boss’ in most organisations (Mann, 2013).

Bass and Bass (2008) state that the informal–formal leadership continuum continues to thrive. A formal leader possesses organisational authority and has been appointed or elected to that position, while an informal leader emerges and is not appointed (Murugan, 2004). On the other hand, Daft (2008) argues management is based on position within organisational hierarchies and formal authority, whereas leadership is a personal influence relationship. Although this sentiment resonates as true (Robbins, Judge, Millett, & Jones, 2010), a leader is still often noted to be formally appointed to such a position (Armandi et al., 2003). Mann (2013) states that, in large, formal organisations, leadership rarely resides within a single person, and is more likely assigned to dominant individuals at different hierarchical levels. Whether those persons occupying formal leadership positions will be leaders depends on their actions and
ultimately how they perform (Mann, 2013). In contrast, Montgomery (2012) argues leadership is a choice and leadership skills can be learned by anyone. This statement reflects that while leaders may be appointed within organisations, individuals must still consciously choose to take on this role in order to effectively fulfil it.

2.2.5 Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Leadership

Although leadership has been a highly researched topic, the science of leadership is a relatively new arena, not emerging until the twentieth century (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011). Much of the existing leadership research focuses on transformational and charismatic leaders and their effects on followers’ performance and motivation (Antonakis et al., 2003). However, despite extensive literature addressing leadership, no ‘grand unifying theory’ exists (Allio, 2013). However, an established leadership theory is necessary for this research project in order to provide a robust theoretical foundation for identifying and exploring event managers’ leadership styles (Porter, Smith, & Fagg, 2000). Thus, in order to effectively measure leadership as a core concept within this study theoretical approaches common within the contemporary leadership literature are now reviewed.

There are numerous theories and associated models pertaining to leadership. Indeed, Hunt and Dodge (2000) argue there are “more than in any other area of the behavioural sciences” (p. 436)—counting over a dozen within their research. However, there are six primary approaches to leadership comprised of individual sub-theories accounting for the numerous broader-scale leadership theories that have been developed over time (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2005). These include the trait school, the behavioural school, the contingency school, the visionary school, the emotional intelligence school and the competency school. Other researchers argue leadership theory has evolved throughout three eras: the trait, behaviour and contingency eras (Helms, 2006; Tirmizi,
2002). Alternatively, others conclude leadership can be classified as one of eight major
types (Cherry, 2013). Rather than debating the number of possible theories, the
prominent theories are discussed here in terms of traditional/old and contemporary/new
and are described in order to gain an understanding of the history of leadership theory.
As the exact number of theories is contentious, it is acknowledged the scope of this
thesis is unlikely to take account of all existing leadership theories. However, to gain a
more rounded understanding of leadership requires an examination of the key schools of
thought on this topic.

2.2.5.1 Traditional Theories of Leadership
As no two people or situations are exactly the same, no two individuals will lead in
exactly the same manner (Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013). Theories are developed in an
attempt to explain the nature of leadership (Bass & Bass, 2008), and as new theories
emerge a better understanding of how leadership works is gained. Traditional leadership
theories provide a framework for newer theories which have been developed over time
(Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011). A leadership theory is an explanation of some aspect
of leadership (Lussier & Achua, 2010). Early theories focused on personal
characteristics of leaders (Brownell, 2010). In fact, leadership research is dominated by
an interest in leaders, namely who the leader is (trait/identity) and what the leader does
(behaviour) (Jackson & Parry, 2011). Theories are often referred to as approaches and
styles (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). As a result, all of these alternatives may be used
within this thesis. Leadership theories are used to better understand, predict and control
effective leadership, which highlights the practical value such theories possess (Lussier
& Achua, 2010).
2.2.5.2 Great Man Theory

The earliest studies of leaders began in the late 1800s, with one of the seminal leadership theories being Great Man theory (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011; Daft, 2005). Skills of leaders were once thought a matter of birth. This theory argues that leaders were born not made (Bennis & Nanus, 2003). Accordingly, the Great Man theory assumes that “people are born to leadership” (Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013, p. 1).

According to Northouse (2013), Great Man Theory advocates leaders can be identified by their physical characteristics, personality features and their traits. Leaders, who were always thought of as men, were born with special heroic traits that provided them with a natural ability to lead (Daft, 2005). Bennis and Nanus (2003) argue only those with the right breeding and inheritance could lead: “either you had it or you didn’t” (p. 5). The Great Man perspective is consistent across the literature in that it typifies leaders as men, being born not made, breeding and inheritance were compulsory, and power was the key identifying trait. While it is usually a stand-alone theory, the Great Man theory is often integrated with the trait theory of leadership (Tirmizi, 2002).

2.2.5.3 Trait Theory

In the early twentieth century, the Great Man theory evolved into trait theory of leadership (Mann, 2013; Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013). Similar to the previous theory, the trait perspective assumes that leaders possess special qualities, or traits, and it is these characteristics that differentiate them from non-leaders (Northouse, 2013). Some of the identified traits include confidence, charisma and decisiveness (Van der Wagen, 2007). The purpose of this theory is to identify the traits required to place people in successful leadership positions (Armandi et al., 2003). Trait theory is evidenced throughout history as strong leaders, such as Mahatma Ghandi, Winston Churchill and, in more recent times, Barack Obama, have been described in terms of the leadership
traits they possess (Robbins et al., 2008). Unlike the Great Man perspective, trait theory makes no assumptions as to whether leadership skills were a birth right or acquired through experience, as such leaders do not have to be born with leadership traits (Mann, 2013; Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013).

Trait theory has its limitations, however (Armstrong, 2012). Firstly, it fails to ascertain a set of key characteristics that would identify great leaders (Marturano & Gosling, 2008) and, secondly, it does not determine which traits are suitable for different situations (DuBrin et al., 2006). In saying this, there are certain universal traits assumed important for all leaders in all situations, such as flexibility, adaptability, internal locus of control, a passion for the people and work, and courage (DuBrin et al., 2006). The trait theory was popular until the late 1940s when it was deemed outdated, and new theories began to be introduced that took into account personal styles of the leader (Bass & Bass, 2008).

2.2.5.4 Behavioural Theories

Behavioural theories stemmed from criticisms of the trait approach, discussed above, and aimed to expand the literature on leadership by examining behaviours rather than only traits in strong leaders (Robbins et al., 2010). Emerging during the 1950s, behavioural theories, in line with their name, aimed to study the behaviour as demonstrated by leaders (Lussier & Achua, 2010; Marturano & Gosling, 2008). In more recent research, this theory is also known as the leadership-style approach (Lussier & Achua, 2010). A significant difference is that while trait theories assume leaders are born, behavioural theories argue leaders can learn the requisite skills required, thus they can be made, thereby rejecting the Great Man perspective’s assertion that leaders are born not made (Robbins et al., 2008). This is noteworthy as it is a turning point where researchers began to see leadership as a discipline that could be learned (Yaverbaum &
The purpose of behavioural theories are to understand leadership behaviours that could be applied in training people to be leaders (Armandi et al., 2003). Three major contributing studies that evaluated the behaviour of people thought to be successful leaders are the Ohio State University studies (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011; Daft, 2005), the University of Michigan studies (Daft, 2005), and Blake and Mouton’s Managerial Grid (Daft, 2005; DuBrin et al., 2006). Research was conducted between the mid-1940s to mid-1950s at the Ohio State and Michigan universities independently, yet simultaneously (Lussier & Achua, 2010; Robbins et al., 2010). Ohio State researchers conducted surveys using the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). This study identified initiation of structure and consideration as key leadership behaviours (Northouse, 2013). The Michigan University studies, in contrast, also identified two core dimensions of leadership, which they called employee-oriented and production-oriented (Robbins et al., 2010). Meanwhile, the Managerial Grid produces a framework for leaders dominate personality traits that results in two styles: concern for people and concern for production (Robbins et al., 2008). All three studies contributed significantly to the emergence of the behavioural theory (Northouse, 2013), although the Managerial Grid was conducted after the other two and did not add any new information (Robbins et al., 2008).

2.2.5.5 Leadership Styles
The behavioural differences in a leader’s actions refer to the different leadership styles taken to lead their followers (Shane, 2010). Not to be confused with leadership roles, which are typically considered as functions of management (DuBrin et al., 2006), at this point it is also instructive to note the range of leadership styles. Firstly, leadership roles can include figurehead, coach, negotiator and spokesperson, while similar leadership styles are reflected in behaviour and attitude (DuBrin et al., 2006; Kippenberger, 2002).
Leadership style can be defined as “the relatively consistent pattern of behaviour that characterises a leader” (DuBrin et al., 2006, p. 74) and is concerned with how a leader interacts with their followers (Kippenberger, 2002) as well as describing the emphasised actions taken by a leader in their role (Marturano & Gosling, 2008). Consequently, leadership styles are reflective of one’s behaviour which, depending on the situation, may result in both positive and negative variations (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011). The exact number and type of leadership styles varies among researchers, with Bowerman and Van Wart (2011) noting seven leader styles, while Daft (2005) focuses on two styles, and DuBrin et al. (2006) explain three leadership styles. Acknowledging this inconsistency within the literature, the more prominent leadership styles are discussed within this review.

2.2.5.6 Situational Theories

Following on from behavioural theories, situational theories emerged where the focus shifted from what leaders are, to what leaders do (Tirmizi, 2002). These theories were a direct development of the behavioural theories (Lewis-Anthony, 2013), as no single pattern of leadership behaviour emerged to characterise all leaders (Hamlin, 2004). Attention in this theory is on “where leadership takes place” (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009, p. 11). Situational theory, also known as contingency theory, was developed due to a lack of cohesive results obtained from prior studies on leadership, and a failure to consider situational variables (Robbins et al., 2008). It assumes that no leader traits, styles or behaviours automatically constitute leadership (Tirmizi, 2002). The word contingency implies that ‘it depends’. So, in order for a leader to be effective, their behaviour and style depend largely on their followers and the situation (Lussier & Achua, 2010). Situational theories consider the contextual and situational variables that influence what behaviours of leaders are effective (Daft, 2005). Yaervbaum and
Sherman (2013) presuppose that nothing in the business world is rigid and unchanging, thus, it goes without saying that no one leadership style works in all situations. The situational approach suggests leading depends on three concepts: the goal, the people and the relationship the leader develops with the people in their team (Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013).

The two most commonly cited versions of situational theories are path–goal theory and contingency theory (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009). Yet, Helms (2006) cites the Vroom-Yetton-Jago decision-making model and the situational leadership theory as additional theories, thus making a top four. Fiedler developed the first comprehensive contingency model in 1967, proposing effective group performance requires a match between the leader’s style and their control over the group (Armandi et al., 2003; Brownell, 2010; Robbins et al., 2010). The Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale is a model which assesses the importance of relationship, power and task structure (Brownell, 2010). Path–goal theory, on the other hand, is derived from the Ohio State leadership research, advocating effective leaders clarify the path for their followers to help them achieve their goals (Robbins et al., 2008).

2.2.5.7 Traditional Theories of Leadership Summarised

While it has been noted that within the traditional theories of leadership framework numerous theories have evolved, discussed here were the broadest and most commonly reviewed theories. These theories of leadership focus on profiles of people considered leaders who exhibit special qualities (Natale, Sora, & Kavalipurapu, 2004). Traditional theories started from humble beginnings in the 1800s, examining only male leaders according to the Great Man theory (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011), moving forward to trait theory and behavioural theories which aimed to measure leaders on their traits and behaviours respectively, and culminating in situational/contingency theories in the late
1970s (Robbins et al., 2010). Such theories mark the most common leadership theories arising in the twentieth century. Newer theories which emerged in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century will now be reviewed.

2.2.5.8 Contemporary Theories of Leadership

In the continuing quest to discover better ways to enhance our understanding of leadership, new theories are emerging and expanding the current knowledge on leadership. The world is full of problems, from world poverty to global warming, and such contemporary issues call for forward-thinking leadership (Jackson & Parry, 2011), thereby resulting in a newer take on past leadership and its theories. As the concept of leadership and leadership theories evolve, a better understanding of what a leader is and their traits is emerging (Johnson, 2011). While trait, behavioural and contingency theories have each contributed to leadership knowledge, none of these approaches satisfactorily explain leadership effectiveness (Helms, 2006). Such theories are limited because they do not recognise the leader as an emotive or inspirational figure who evokes something in followers in any situation (Fairholm & Fairholm, 2009). Since the 1970s, alternative approaches have been developed in order to advance existing knowledge of leadership (Helms, 2006). While categorised here as contemporary theories, such theories can also be classified as ‘new leadership theories’ (Bryman, 1999). The leadership field has bounced between fads, often in the rush to discern new theories; however, the development of leadership theories has occurred at an alarmingly slow pace (Yukl, 2002). As a result, theories classified as contemporary have been around since the early 1970s, including transformational leadership (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Northouse, 2013).

With this in mind, Lewis-Anthony (2013) reminds researchers that every timeline and chronological description of leadership theories is different. Classical
theories of leadership emphasise characteristics and behaviours of the leader, while the
majority of modern leadership approaches suggest leadership is a complex process of
interaction (Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013). Contemporary theories also take into
account “the ability of the leader to inspire others to act beyond their immediate self-
interests” (Robbins et al., 2010, p. 226). This accounts for the leader as a communicator
who shapes meaning, a typically ignored factor in traditional theories. The continued
interest in leadership can be attributed to the resurgence in transformational and
charismatic leadership research (Hunt, 1999). Another contributing factor to this new
approach to studying leadership stems from an assumption that traditional theories
ignore the leader as a communicator (Robbins et al., 2010).

2.2.5.9 Transformational Leadership

In the search for creative, dynamic, emotional and symbolic aspects of leadership,
transformational leadership emerged in the 1980s (Lewis-Anthony, 2013; Yukl, 2002).
Researchers became interested not only in the individual, but in how leaders influence
their followers and make self-sacrifices above their own materialistic self-interests
(Yukl, 2002). The transformational approach to leadership remains popular in current
studies (Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013), and holds a central place in leadership research
(Northouse, 2013). Dulewicz and Higgs (2005) have identified the transformational/
transactional leadership model as the dominant approach to studying leadership.
Transformational theories are framed as ‘universal’ as they can apply to all leaders in all
situations (Chemers, 2000).

Robbins et al. (2010) define transformational leaders as those who “inspire
followers to transcend their own self-interests for the good of the organisation and are
capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on their followers” (p. 230). The
needs of others are crucial to the transformational leader, as this theory focuses on the
followers’ motivation and commitment (Porter et al., 2000). It identifies leadership as a process occurring between leader and followers that contributes to the greater common good (Northouse, 2013). A seminal leadership theorist, Bass (1985) identifies four aspects of effective leadership in his transformational leadership theory, being charisma, inspiration, consideration and intellectual stimulation (Helms, 2006).

Brownell (2010) argues transformational leadership is the most relevant leadership style used by hospitality leaders in today’s business environment. Their effectiveness is often based on their charismatic nature and the strong relationships they form with their workers. There are said to be four components of transformational leadership, but more often five (as used within this thesis), with Idealised Influence split into attributed and behavioural: (1) IIA represents the highest level of transformational leadership, where followers trust and emulate their leaders and leaders are said to be authentic and have a high degree of credibility; (2) IIB leaders exhibit behaviours which encourage, unify and allow followers to identify and develop trust with them; (3) IM leaders encourage followers to pursue challenges, display enthusiasm, demonstrate commitment and clearly communicate their expectations; (4) IS is used to encourage creativity and followers are stimulated to try new approaches; (5) IC leaders typically act as a mentor, providing special attention individually so that followers can reach a higher level of potential (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Bass & Riggio, 2008; Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008).

2.2.5.10 Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership is a theory distinguishable from transformational leadership; however, it is common practice to treat these two theories as equivalencies (Northouse, 2013; Yukl, 1999). The differences between the two are often labelled ‘modest’ and ‘minor’ (Robbins et al., 2008). Yet the founding researcher of transformational
leadership, Bernard Bass, considers charisma only a part of transformational leadership, therefore arguing charisma alone is insufficient (Bass & Bass, 2008). Thus, these two theories are distinct, although there are some overlapping processes (Yukl, 1999). The word charisma suggests that the possessor has a special gift allowing them the capacity to achieve extraordinary things (Northouse, 2013). Charismatic leaders have been defined by French et al. (2011) as those, “who by force of their personal characteristics, are capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on followers” (p. 449).

2.2.5.11 Transactional Leadership
In comparison to its counterparts, charismatic and transformational leadership, transactional leadership can quite easily encapsulate the bulk of leadership models as they are typically underpinned by an exchange relationship; however, it is a stand-alone theoretical concept (Northouse, 2013). Transactional leadership is characterised by a mutually beneficial exchange relationship, making it a very common approach, while proving it tends to be transitory as the relationship is typically over once the exchange occurs (DuBrin et al., 2006). Transactional leaders are known to take charge and lead through social change (Bass & Riggio, 2008). Lewis-Anthony (2013) defines transactional leadership as occurring “when a leader exchanges something of value with his followers” (p. 43). The leader offers rewards in return for compliance from their subordinates (Jackson & Parry, 2011). Transactional leadership runs a fine line between a social and business transaction (Yaverbaum & Sherman, 2013), where leaders can offer contingent rewards or praise in return for a high-performance output. Such exchange relationships revolve around a bargaining process, and for this reason is often considered closely related to management on the leadership versus management spectrum (Marturano & Gosling, 2008). Transactional leadership can be limiting if
utilised exclusively; however, most leaders employ this behaviour to some degree (Marturano & Gosling, 2008).

Transformational leadership is in some ways built upon and is an expansion of transactional leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2008). Transformational and transactional leadership can complement each other; however, they are far from opposing approaches to stimulating action among followers as some researchers have argued (Robbins et al., 2008). A key difference between transactional leadership and transformational leadership is that the leader does not individualise the needs or further development of their followers (Northouse, 2013). Palmer, Walls, Burgess and Stough (2001) differentiate the two based on emotion, stating transformational leaders evoke heightened emotional levels, while transactional leaders are also linked with position power and transformational leaders are linked with changing the organisational culture (Strang, 2005). The superiority of the transformational approach, however, is noted throughout the literature (Robbins et al., 2010). The transformational approach dominates transactional leadership as it builds on this approach, producing levels of follower effort and performance that go beyond what a transactional leader can produce (Robbins et al., 2008).

2.2.5.12 Full Range of Leadership Theory

Proposed by Avolio and Bass (1991), the Full Range of Leadership Theory (FRLT) identifies nine distinct leadership styles, denoting three typologies of leadership behaviour: transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership (Antonakis et al., 2003; Robbins et al., 2010). The FRLT was created based on arguments concerning existing theories of leadership which primarily focused on basic exchanges with followers, typical of transactional leadership (Antonakis et al., 2003). The FRLT represents nine single-order factors, comprised of five transformational, three
transactional and one laissez-faire leadership factor. The first five styles are all components of transformational leadership: IIA, IIB, IM, IS and IC. Each style results in increased effort and productivity from subordinates, while leading to higher morale and satisfaction, in turn lowering absenteeism and turnover (Robbins et al., 2010). Figure 2.1 presents the FRLM and the nine styles which every leader is said to exhibit.


---

Idealised Influence is a style emphasising a leader’s charisma, where they are admired, respected and trusted (Bass & Riggio, 2008; Johnson, Vernon, McCarthy, Molson, Harris, & Jang, 1998). This style depicts leaders as role models who encourage their followers to share in and work towards a common goal (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Idealised Influence is further broken down into two factors: IIA, referring to the socialised charisma of the leader, focusing on perceptions of followers and ethics; and,
IIB, which refers to charismatic actions of the leader centring on the organisation’s values, beliefs and mission (Antonakis et al., 2003). IM refers to the way in which leaders energise their followers through optimism, setting an idealised vision and reinforcing communication in order to achieve goals (Antonakis et al., 2003). This leader arouses team spirit, and when combined with Idealised Influence can form a single factor of charismatic-inspirational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2008). IS manifests when a leader acts to increase productivity and innovation (Brown & Arendt, 2011), while IC refers to leaders who give special attention to individuals, often acting as a coach or mentor so needs are achieved and there is opportunity for growth (Bass & Riggio, 2008).

The following three styles are transactional styles of leadership: Contingent Reward (CR), Management-By-Exception Active (MBEA) and Management-By-Exception Passive (MBEP). CR is known as the classic transactional style, where rewards are exchanged for compliance of behaviour (Kirkbride, 2006). Considered the most effective transactional factor based on constructive transactions, CR refers to leader behaviours focusing on clarifying role and task requirements and offering material and psychological rewards in return for efficient performance (Antonakis et al., 2003; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). There are two forms of Management-by-Exception, active and passive, both involving a laissez-faire approach until the situation commands due attention (Johnson et al., 1998). Regardless of whether the leadership approach is active or passive, it is too often considered ineffective leadership (Robbins et al., 2010). MBEP leaders are corrective in nature as mistakes have usually already occurred, while MBEA leaders are vigilant in ensuring standards are continually met (Antonakis et al., 2003).
Lastly, LF leadership, often regarded as non-leadership or an absence or avoidance of leadership, refers to leaders who avoid decision-making, are often absent when needed and who hesitate to take action (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Kirkbride, 2006). Conjecture surrounds this factor, as some researchers suggest it is an absence of leadership or essentially non-leadership (Kirkbride, 2006; Stafford, 2009), while others argue a LF approach is in fact not an absence of style at all (Bowerman & Van Wart, 2011). This type of manager withdraws from the leadership role and offers little direction or support to followers (Kirkbride, 2006). While negatively associated with leadership, some argue it has a place in contemporary leadership as followers often perform optimally with little or no intervention from leaders except in extreme circumstances (Stafford, 2009).

Advocated as having the potential to explain the leadership phenomenon (Antonakis & House, 2002), the FRLT is the theoretical framework underlying this thesis. Achieving unprecedented acceptance within the leadership and management literature (Antonakis & House, 2002), “the ability to use the full range of leadership behaviours is what separates ineffective from effective leaders” (Barbuto & Cummins-Brown, 2007). Transformational leadership, on average, is more effective than transactional leadership at generating higher levels of performance, extra effort, satisfaction and commitment from followers (Wilde, 2011). The FRLT, in conjunction with the MLQ (discussed in detail in Section 2.2.6)—the instrument designed to operationalise the FRLT and used to measure where a leader sits within the FRLT according to their particular leadership traits—represents an effort to capture a broader range of leadership behaviours (Bass & Avolio, 1997). The diverse challenges facing many contemporary organisations suggest that an over-reliance on transactional
leadership styles may not yield the competitive results that transformational styles are inclined to (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

2.2.5.13 Contemporary Theories of Leadership Summarised

Contemporary theories have broadened understandings of leadership, and have overcome limitations of earlier theories (Winkler, 2010). However, traditional leadership theories remain the building blocks for the evolution of contemporary theories and still provide a sound basis for examining leadership. Thousands of empirical studies have been conducted using the abovementioned theories, but many of the results are inconsistent and inconclusive (Yukl, 2002). As yet, no single theory has succeeded in encapsulating all aspects of leadership (Johnson, 2011). While theories form the basis for measuring leadership, it is necessary to explore some of the key instruments for measuring leadership characteristics.

2.2.6 Leadership Measurement Instruments

Research Objective One aims to establish event managers’ leadership styles according to an established leadership measurement instrument. Hence, it is prudent to review the literature surrounding such instruments. According to Johnson (2011), researchers have used numerous methods to test and measure leadership theories, including questionnaires, observation of leadership behaviour (past and present), elections, and nominations or rankings. The primary instrument used has been the questionnaire; however, research has focused more on the individual leader, often discounting the situation in relation to the individual (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003). Measuring leadership is complex due to issues such as managing a culturally diverse workforce, shared leadership in network-oriented organisations, having four distinct generations to manage in diverse workplaces, and the effects of technology on working relationships.
(Avolio et al., 2003). Leadership instruments measure different facets of leadership (e.g. traits, behaviours, styles, interactions, charisma and other dimensions accordingly), thus an understanding of exactly what requires measuring aids the selection of the appropriate instrument (Johnson, 2011), although no single leadership model is effective for every situation.

Although a variety of instruments have been developed to assess different dimensions of leaders, in the absence of a universal definition of leadership there is also no universal leadership measurement instrument (Johnson, 2011). Surveys including the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the least preferred co-worker scale (LPC), and models such as the Leadership Grid and the Full Range of Leadership Model (FRLM), are all used to examine leadership in some form. Although beyond the scope of this study, Northouse (2013) notes that very few models or instruments have been designed to measure ethical aspects of leadership.

According to Northouse (2013), the two most commonly used measures have been the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), advocated by Stogdill (1963), and the Managerial Grid, developed by Blake and Mouton which they published in 1964 (Lussier & Achua, 2010). The LBDQ originated from the Ohio State University studies in an attempt to measure leadership styles (Lussier & Achua, 2010). The Leadership Grid, while based largely on the behavioural approach combining concern for people and concern for production, presents five alternative leadership styles (Helms, 2006).

It is beyond the scope of this study to review in detail each existing leadership instrument. However, for the purposes of this chapter, this review will consider the leadership measurement instruments most pertinent to this study. These include the LBDQ; the Supervisory Behaviour Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) which, while
term under leadership behaviours, will be reviewed as, according to Lussier and Achua (2010), they “are actually more commonly called leadership styles today” (p. 71); the University of Michigan Leadership Model; the Leadership Grid; the MLQ; the LPC scale; and the FRLM.

The Ohio State studies, grounded in the behavioural approach, led to the LBDQ (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). This instrument has since been deployed to examine leadership behaviours within military, manufacturing, and college settings (Helms, 2006; Lussier & Achua, 2010). The original questionnaire was constructed from more than 1800 items tapping different aspects of leader behaviour (Northouse, 2013). From this list, 150 items were distilled to create the first LBDQ of definitive leader behaviours (Daft, 2008; Northouse, 2013). The significantly shorter, current 15-item questionnaire centres around statements asking subordinates to describe their leader’s behaviour in terms of their relationship, communicative patterns and ways in which they accomplish tasks (Bass & Bass, 2008). It was found that two distinct aspects of leadership, consideration and initiating structure, described how a leader carries out their role (Helms, 2006). This model is two-dimensional in that each aspect is independent of the other, resulting in four leadership styles: low structure and high consideration, high structure and high consideration, low structure and low consideration, and high structure and low consideration (Lussier & Achua, 2010). An industrial version was also developed from this model, the Supervisory Behaviour Description Questionnaire (SBDQ), measuring 20-items (Bass & Bass, 2008). This model is highly popularised due to its reliability and validity, as the LBDQ has been widely researched and noted as stable and consistent between situational applications (Bass & Bass, 2008).
Similar to the LBDQ, the University of Michigan Leadership Model was created around the same time as the Ohio State model, categorising dominant leadership styles (Northouse, 2013). Two types of leader behaviours were identified, known as task- or relationship-oriented (Lussier & Achua, 2010), or employee- and production-orientation (Northouse, 2013). Unlike the Ohio State studies’ two-dimensional model, this leadership instrument conceptualises each orientation on separate ends of the same continuum, making it unidimensional (Lussier & Achua, 2010). What is relevant is that the LBDQ and the University of Michigan Leadership Model contain variables that relatively correspond to one another whether they be consideration or initiating structure, task- or relationship-oriented, employee- or job-centred or a concern for people versus a concern for production (Daft, 2008). The similarities are thus evident; however, concerns have been raised as to whether these are the two most important behaviours of leaders, whether both orientations can manifest within the one leader or how a leader could perform both behaviours, and whether people can conform themselves to a certain leader behaviour (Daft, 2008).

The Leadership Grid is a framework for classifying types of leadership through dimensions that typify leaders as concern for people and concern for production (DuBrin et al., 2006). The grid was initially called the Managerial Grid, and is still known by this title (Robbins et al., 2008). It is a nine-by-nine matrix outlining 81 different leadership styles, where results are dependent on the dominant factors in a leader’s thinking (Robbins et al., 2008). This grid suggests that the best leader is one who exhibits both dimensions, with a resultant score of 9.9 representing a team management style (Robbins et al., 2008; Van der Wagen, 2007). The goal of the three aforementioned models (the LBDQ, the Michigan State Leadership Model and Blake and Moutons Leadership Grid) was to find a universal set of leadership behaviours.
The LPC scale is a one-dimensional model developed by Fiedler to measure leadership styles (Northouse, 2013) and was the first comprehensive contingency model (Robbins et al., 2010). It is arguably one of the best-known exemplars of contingency thinking (Bryman, 1999) and assumes a leader’s style is fixed within the leader (Johnson, 2011). This fixed style refers to the leader having one set style which cannot be changed. The LPC scale aims to measure the effectiveness of group performance by matching a leader’s style to the degree to which a situation gives control to that leader (Robbins et al., 2010). What makes this instrument unique is that it measures a leader’s style by having them describe a co-worker with whom they have had difficulty with in completing a task (Northouse, 2013). Stated differently, their least preferred co-worker, as the name of the scale suggests. The scale categorises leaders as being task- or relationship-oriented (Lussier & Achua, 2010) or task- or people-oriented, further classified according to the favourability of the situation following three dimensions: leader–member relations, task structure and position power (Avolio et al., 2003). The LPC scale comprises 18 eight-point bipolar adjective scales which are summed (Johnson, 2011). This scale has been the subject of much controversy, with many researchers unconvinced by the link between the leader’s LPC score and their leadership approach (Bryman, 1999). However, Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009) advocate this scale as appropriate for measuring leadership style in the constantly changing nature of the event environment as it favours the context-specific situation.

Developed by Bass in 1985, the MLQ contains scales of transformational and transactional leadership (Avolio et al., 2003). This instrument has gained both support and criticism since its inception and has ultimately undergone several revisions (Avolio
et al., 2003). However, it continues to be the most widely used method of measuring transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2008; Northouse, 2013). It is also advocated as the most widely used instrument to assess the nine factors of the FRLT (Antonakis et al., 2003). Research has shown that leaders rating highly in the transformational categories perform better on the job as leaders (Kirkbride, 2006).

There are two forms of the MLQ: (1) the self form or leader form requiring leaders to rate the frequency of their own leadership behaviour; and (2) the rater form, which asks associates of leaders to rate their leader’s transactional and transformational behaviour (Bass & Riggio, 2008). The rater form is the more popular model as research has shown that leaders are prone to bias, typical of self-rating necessary in the self form (Bass & Riggio, 2008). Commonly, the instrument contains 20 statements related to transformational leadership behaviours which participants are asked to rate from 0 = ‘not at all’ to 4 = ‘frequently, if not always’ (Bass & Riggio, 2008; Brown & Arendt, 2011). The dimensions of the MLQ questionnaire are somewhat contested, with Palmer et al. (2001) advocating a 45 item instrument, while Eagly et al. (2003) advocate a 36-item instrument. However, Johnson (2011) argues that no matter what revisions, they all comprise subscales and use a five-point Likert scale. The most recent version, the MLQ (5x-short), is advocated as successful in adequately capturing the constructs of transformational leaders (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). This instrument has attracted criticism over its factorial validity (Palmer et al., 2001), conceptual framework (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008) and for potentially overlooking behaviours associated with transformational leadership (Yukl, 1999). While it has been argued that this model is not without limitations, Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008) believe the MLQ will be “heavily used for the foreseeable future” (p. 512). It is noted as not only applicable to a broad range of situations, but can also be applied at all organisational levels where there
is responsibility to influence others (Johnson, 2011). The MLQ was chosen to measure leadership styles of event managers as it is the instrument purported by the FRLT.

The FRLM is the research-supported theoretical model for the MLQ, based on transactional and transformational leadership (Robbins et al., 2010). As the name suggests, this model attempts to measure the whole range of leadership styles, from non-leadership to more transformational styles (Kirkbride, 2006). The model is divided into four quadrants, with passive and active on opposing ends of the horizontal continuum and effective and ineffective at opposite ends of the vertical line. Five transformational styles (IIA, IIB, IM, IS and IC), three transactional styles (CR, MBEA and MBEA), and LF leadership run perpendicular within the quadrants. The aim of this model is to determine a leader’s transactional or transformational style. The LF approach is the most passive, and as such the least effective style, whereas leaders are considered effective when they regularly use each of the four transformational styles within the FRLM (Robbins et al., 2008). Alternatively, effective leaders are said to exhibit transformational styles more consistently than transactional styles or non-leadership (Kirkbride, 2006). According to Bass and Riggio (2008), there is a growing body of evidence supporting transformational leadership over transactional leadership in this model.

Lastly, some leadership models are prescriptive while others are descriptive. Prescriptive models are often preferable as they provide guidance on style(s) appropriate to a given situation, while descriptive models identify the variables and styles as identified by empirical research in real-world settings, yet do not specify which style to use (Lussier & Achua, 2010). For example, the LPC model is prescriptive, while path–goal models are descriptive. Managers typically employ prescriptive models as a clear outcome is determined, allowing training to be suited. In contrast, researchers
prefer descriptive models for their solid theoretical backgrounds. Thus, the choice of model should be used in relation to the situation and the results to be gained (Lussier & Achua, 2010). There are many alternatives to measuring leadership styles; however, what is known is that the measure of a leader cannot be determined by the successes or failures of the ventures they have led (Mann, 2013). Additionally, Johnson (2011) suggests instruments employed more consistently and replicated are to be preferred over ones that do not have such a reputation. However, the use of any instrument must be determined based on the appropriateness to the intended application (Johnson, 2011).

### 2.2.7 Leadership in Events

Although leadership has been extensively researched, leadership in the context of event management has received considerably less attention. According to Greenwell, Danzey-Bussell, and Shonk (2014), a successful event relies heavily on strong leadership. Goldblatt’s (2005) event management text addresses event leadership, stating that for competitive advantage and long-term success of event organisations: “leadership is the secret to success” (p. 28). With leadership noted for its ability to give events competitive advantage, it begs the question of why event researchers have not examined leadership in a greater capacity within event studies.

To date there is minimal research regarding leadership within event management studies; much of this literature is speculative and lacks empirical studies. Abson’s (2017) study examining how event managers lead is the most recent, and one of the few, empirical studies of leadership within event contexts, however, she acknowledges the paucity of research focusing specifically on leadership in events. Abson (2017, p. 405) stated that, “no studies were identified that focus specifically on leadership in events” and few were noted to focus on the competencies required for the role of event managers. Key findings of Abson’s study suggest that managing resources rated highly
among event managers’ leadership priorities, and encouragement and training for their team was considered part of their leadership role (Abson, 2017). Also, Parent, Olver and Séguin’s (2009) paper reviewed leadership within a major sporting event case study. They discuss theoretical frameworks behind leadership and justifiably explore the most appropriate leadership styles to employ in a sporting event. This thesis contributes to the event management/leadership literature, alongside Abson’s (2017) work, by providing empirical insights into the nexus between event leadership and volunteer human resource development.

The leading textbooks in the field of event management suggest leadership is a core competency of event managers (Getz, 2007; Goldblatt, 2005; Van der Wagen, 2007). While these are generally not based on primary research and are largely speculative, they contribute to establishing the context and theoretical approach on which this thesis was built. For example, Getz (2007) advocates that leadership is the key role of managers and highlights setting a vision, developing goals and strategies, and inspiring a team to work towards those goals as essential objectives. He notes that “events typically require both artistic and management leadership” (Getz, 2007, p. 314), which fittingly appear to align with some categories of the FRLT, argued to be the platform from which to potentially explain the leadership phenomenon (Antonakis & House, 2002). In contrast, Van der Wagen (2007, p. 215) suggests that “not every manager is a leader … and that every leader is not a manager”. She highlights that most leadership research is concerned with the long-life organisation, which is quite different to the short-life used to describe special event contexts. Challenges and non-routine are stressed for leaders within the event environment, as is creating a vision (Van der Wagen, 2007).
Furthermore, Van der Wagen (2007) stresses the importance of leadership in the challenging environment of events. She states that, as events themselves are diverse, unique in concept and execution, the leadership required must also be flexible and adapted to the individual nature of the event. Leadership for events requires a clear vision, the development of goals and strategies to meet that vision, and essentially inspiring the workforce through an influence to band together and work towards those goals (Getz, 2007). Therefore, looking at what researchers have culminated as the most appropriate leadership styles is an important point to address within this literature review. Goldblatt (2005) discusses three prominent leadership styles in the context of event managers: democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire. He notes that the democratic style is typically used during the early stages of the event process, while the autocratic style should be used sparingly (Goldblatt, 2005). Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009) state that transformational leadership in a sporting event may prove challenging, while a transactional approach may be more appropriate. Giving due attention to individuals working at an event is argued as difficult and, as there is no monetary reward for volunteers, a transactional leader will often reward with other incentives (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). Six leadership characteristics are also common to event leaders: integrity, confidence and persistence, collaboration, vision, communication skills, and problem-solving (Goldblatt, 2005).

Leadership studies often reflect what is going on in the world, and have been examined from an array of aspects, including science, ethics, politics, technology, strategic and executive, and international relations (Bass & Bass, 2008). Notably, leadership studies examining events are indeed limited, with the exceptions aforementioned listed, thus opening the door to more extensive research within this field. Avolio et al. (2009) note that there is a lack of research examining why some
leaders engage in charismatic or transformational leadership behaviour, while Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009) suggest that using “theories which focus on the organisation’s upper-management level leader (e.g. charismatic) … may be more appropriate” (p. 171). Further research has been identified as being needed to determine effective leadership in different event settings (Getz, 2007). Given that the majority of these authors provide only a theoretical basis for future research, there is broad scope to build upon this literature with more exploratory, empirically-informed work. Consequently, there is a significant gap within event management literature to empirically explore leaders within the context of events utilising an established leadership theory, the FRLT in the case of this study (Avolio & Bass, 1991).

2.2.8 Summary: Leadership

Given more and more people are required to step up into leadership positions in order for organisations to survive in evolving business environments (Kim, 2007; McKee et al., 2013), the study of leadership becomes a highly germane topic for examination. Today, organisations require many managers to be leaders and vice versa (McKee et al., 2013). However, as Bass and Bass (2008) note, “leadership makes the difference” (p. 3). Thus, while the management of events is receiving increasing scholarly attention, to truly contribute to the event management literature it is pertinent to explore leadership within this context. With this increase in demand for leadership within organisations, it is paramount researchers ascertain the effects of differing leadership styles on the deployment of HRD processes within event organisations. Consequently, the following section reviews HRD processes in order to understand this topic and discuss the implications for use within this thesis.
2.3 Managing Event Workforces

The events sector is a continually growing field as there will continue to be cause for celebration in most peoples’ lives for years to come. Accordingly, as the events sector grows, their management comes under the spotlight, and Hede (2007) highlights further advancements in the event management field are thus necessary. As the management of volunteers typically falls within the scope of event management, event management as a concept is briefly discussed here. Event management is a growing profession (Goldblatt, 2000) and presents unique challenges because events involve the commitment of a number of people—most of whom are volunteers (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000). Event managers must take a different approach as events are unique, differing from everyday organisations. Event business settings can differ from conventional organisational settings (Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010), hence their management must be adjusted accordingly. However, the challenges of managing volunteers are superseded by the extra qualities they bring to the event, such as enthusiasm, empathy, local knowledge, pride and, the most obvious, that they are cheaper than paid staff (Nichols & Ojala, 2009).

Event management as a field encompasses the design, production and management of events (Getz, 2007). Recruitment, training, supervision and evaluation of volunteers are core roles of event managers (Farrell et al., 1998). Also, justifiably reviewing HRD processes can be attributed to the context of HRM within the role of event management, where it is concerned mostly with the demand and supply of volunteer labour (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000). Managing volunteers is an essential task of event managers, as is the delivery of a suitable volunteer training plan where expectations of volunteers are set (Nassar & Talaat, 2009). Managers must also deal with the pressures of the event itself, as unlike regular attractions events differ in their
size, scope and timeline (Van der Wagen, 2007). Managing an event workforce is a significant priority and differs from that of other organisations, as the motivations of workers, job roles and duration of the role are all largely heterogeneous (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010).

While being noted as a significant priority, the management of human resources must be an integral function of the overall management of an event (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000). In the context of events, this largely refers to volunteers (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000). While there has been extensive research into the motivations of event volunteers, it is essential for event managers to have a substantial understanding behind the motivations of their workforce in order to better place volunteers into roles (Anderson & Cairncross, 2005). Event volunteers are typically episodic, thus requiring a more intensive management approach, which is different to traditional, long-term volunteering (Bryen, 2007; Cuskelly, Hoye, & Auld, 2006). Effective management of a volunteer workforce is not only critical to a volunteer’s motivation, level of enthusiasm and retention as noted, but also contributes to perceived satisfaction with their personal experience and with the event itself (Ralston et al., 2004). Volunteer management involves guiding volunteers to support an organisation’s overall mission (Nassar & Talaat, 2009).

Considering growing dependence on volunteers within the events industry, it is surprising that there are relatively few empirical studies exploring event volunteer training. Of the studies available, most prominent is Costa, Chalip, Green, and Simes (2006), which evaluated the role of training in event volunteers’ satisfaction from volunteers’ perspective. It was found that there was no correlation between training evaluation and job satisfaction, however, it was determined that conceiving training as a potential opportunity to enhance commitment rather than a perfunctory exercise in
information dissemination may nurture the volunteer experience and strengthen the volunteer/organisational relationship. Moreover, although the issue of event volunteer training is addressed within some event management textbooks, many such writings are speculative in nature and are not grounded within empirical research; for example, Heitmann and Roberts (2010) devote a chapter of their text to successful staffing of events describing the benefits and challenges of event volunteer training, however, they do not present any evidence to support the efficacy of their recommendations. Alternatively, if studies examining event volunteer motivations are taken into account, more can be found highlighting the importance of training to event volunteers. Arguments within this body of literature are typically made for the development of specific training programmes for event volunteers (e.g. Barron & Rihova, 2011; Monga, 2006; Nassar & Talaat, 2009), discussed in detail in the following section.

2.3.1 Training Event Volunteers

Events and their workforces are quite different to traditional organisations and can be pulsating, complex, often volatile, and episodic, making training difficult, yet, crucial to facilitate effective service quality (Hanlon & Cuskelly, 2002; Yeoman et al., 2004). Solnet and Hood (2008) highlight the importance of a properly trained workforce, as engaged and committed workers are more likely to produce a high level of quality service, in turn creating a strong competitive advantage as it is difficult for competitors to emulate. Therefore, the difficult task of managing this workforce, particularly the training component, is important to gain a competitive advantage in today’s event market. The imperative to maintain and upgrade volunteers’ skills, knowledge and abilities is an essential goal for many organisations (Smith, 2006); however, an event organisation requires skills to be learnt on a more immediate basis. These proficiencies need to be updated regularly in order to establish competitive advantage. Lead-in
training periods should be used as ways to inspire volunteers with positive expectations regarding their experience during the event (Ralston et al., 2004). Cairncross and Buultjens (2007) note that a perceived lack of training ultimately results in higher staff turnover rates. In order to effectively manage event volunteers it is therefore necessary for event managers to periodically evaluate existing training practices in order to effectively accommodate for new, and possibly younger, volunteers within this sector. Training is the key for organisations looking to attract a prominently younger volunteer base (Cairncross & Buultjens, 2007).

With particular reference to event volunteers, Cuskelly and Auld (2000) have created a module for the effective management of volunteers in events. They highlight the importance of a performance evaluation for individual volunteers, not only as a reward for volunteer performance but to aid the design of effective training plans in the future. It is good practice to evaluate the volunteer program in the weeks post-event in order to assess the HRD processes used and improve the program for future events (Delahaye, 2010). Evaluating the volunteer program and gaining feedback from the volunteers themselves provides an ideal source of information to help develop and refine HRD processes used in the program, in order to create an overall successful training plan. Cuskelly and Auld (2000) also note that this stage is often overlooked by event organisers, however crucial, and can be as simple as administering a brief volunteer survey or conducting a limited number of volunteer interviews after the event. It is argued that the satisfaction of future volunteers depends on this phase, as satisfied volunteers are more likely to produce higher levels of performance and production. This in turn ultimately affects the day-to-day operations of the event, suggesting the importance of this stage within the training plan which is something proactive leaders should be aware of.
2.3.2 Human Resource Development in Event Management

To efficiently stage and deliver successful events, effective HRD strategies are required (Van der Wagen, 2007). As the contemporary events sector is constantly changing, HRD itself must be adaptable and successfully manage change (Simmonds & Pedersen, 2006). In order to keep up, HRD practices within event organisations must be examined and continuously evaluated for their effectiveness. It may be argued that, as events are periodic, requiring staffing for limited periods of time, then only basic HRD requirements are needed. This would entail increasing workforce competence by developing the skills, knowledge and attitudes of its workers, as well as motivating and committing them to the event organisation (Beaver & Hutchings, 2005). More complex HRD involves lifelong learning and adapting to change and is thus viewed as superfluous in an event life cycle. To further research within the HRD context, evaluating leaders’ choices behind HRD processes goes a way to determining the best strategies for training and developing event volunteers.

2.3.3 Summary

The high level of contact involved between workers and customers in an event context makes the management of an event workforce a crucial aspect of event management (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). Not only is the management of events different from traditional organisations, but also their workforce places additional challenges on event managers. However, regardless of the costs associated with managing and training a volunteer workforce, Holmes (2009) argues that such costs can be justified through volunteers’ contributions to the organisation. The temporary nature of events and their workforce suggests implications at a broad level for managers. However, the training and development of volunteers is typically a top concern to ensure the overall success of
the event (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). Although event managers often have the
difficult task of managing an unpaid workforce, underlying challenges often exist in
implementing effective HRD processes to get this workforce ready for the event as
quickly as possible. Training, however, is crucial to developing an effective workforce
(Hayes & Ninemeier, 2009).

In the context of rapidly changing organisational environments, leadership is
said to make the difference by providing a strong competitive advantage (Bass & Bass,
2008; Kim, 2007; McKee et al., 2013). With this increase for effective leadership, it is
paramount that human resources are also effectively led. In order to stage and deliver
successful events, effective HRD strategies are needed (Van der Wagen, 2007).
Training constitutes an important component of HRD, and the training event managers
choose to deliver to frontline event workforces suggests the quality of customer service
delivered would be affected (Simmonds & Pedersen, 2006; Werner & DeSimone,
2012). Sims (2006) notes that organisational leaders often overlook the impact of HRD
processes on learning, performance and change, suggesting a closer look at concepts
within this field is necessary.

Due to the pivotal role volunteers play in events, the lack of substantial literature
on this topic is concerning given the growing nature of the events sector globally
(Anderson & Cairncross, 2005). Volunteers are essentially the frontline of events and it
is their performance and commitment which is evaluated by event patrons and
ultimately crucial to the operation and success of an event (Nassar & Talaat, 2009).
Volunteering is noted to benefit individuals, organisations, not-for-profit businesses,
communities, societies and economies in general (Nassar & Talaat, 2009).

It is estimated that formal volunteering in general, involving 6.1 million people,
(excluding travel costs) was conservatively worth $25.4 billion to the Australian
economy (O’Dwyer, 2015). O’Dwyer (2015) also argued that, “because the value of volunteering is attached to a multiplicity of outcomes, one hour of a volunteer’s time should be valued not just once, but several times (to account for other entities that benefit from the volunteer’s time). Based on this reasoning, she estimated an adjusted total value of volunteering in 2010 at around $200 billion (using a multiplier of 25% of the average hourly rate multiplied by four entities)” (p. 8)

Further, more research has been documented concerning volunteers in more stable and long-term working environments (Baum & Lockstone, 2007); thus, a closer examination of episodic volunteers may enhance this area of literature. The significance of this study lies in examining a typology of volunteers being episodic in nature. The focus is narrowed further to limit the phenomenon to an event of limited duration, with supplementary concepts of leadership and HRD processes to be explored.

### 2.4 Human Resource Development

HRD is a field of study that is often labelled ‘evolving’, ‘emerging’, ‘dynamic’ and ‘equivocal’ (Garavan, Morley, Gunnigle, & McGuire, 2002; Hamlin & Stewart, 2011; Pedersen, 2000). HRD encompasses processes to train and develop human resources in order to provide quality customer service that is essential in gaining business success (Jago & Deery, 2002). It was established in the early 1980s based on the belief that organisations are human-made entities that rely on the skills and knowledge of human resources to achieve their goals (Hassan, 2007; Pedersen, 2000). However, it is acknowledged that human resources are potentially a competitive advantage for diverse organisations today (Price, 2011).

The question of why reviewing HRD as opposed to human resource management (HRM) literature is worth briefly considering at this point. Although HRD
is usually associated with the broader discipline of HRM (Pedersen, 2000), the two encompass different processes. It is widely accepted that training, developing and educating people stem from a historical background in people management; however, HRD is a concept representing the latest evolutionary stage in this long tradition (Wilson, 2005). While HRM is a philosophy on people management, it is an all-embracing term covering a number of approaches to managing human resources (Price, 2011). HRD, contrastingly, is a more focused approach, essentially “a strategic approach to investing in human capital” (Price, 2011, p. 455), where learning and performance are at its core. Where learning is concerned, HRD is part of adult education, where it is considered to be an element of HRM it links with performance (Wilson, 2005).

Although HRD is a key function within HRM (Price, 2011), the focus of HRM is on managing people within the employer–employee relationship (Stone, 2010). It is concerned with the productive use of people in achieving an organisation’s strategic objectives while simultaneously satisfying employees’ needs (Stone, 2008). Although beyond the scope of this literature review to extensively examine the HRM literature, this concept is acknowledged because its purpose, within the context of events, is to ensure volunteer personnel are appropriately equipped with the correct skills to better perform for the event and are productive in achieving the organisation’s objectives while satisfying individual needs (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000; Stone, 2008). HRM is relevant to this study because HRD cannot thrive without the development, reward, motivation and maintenance of human resources, which essentially fall under the umbrella of HRM (Stone, 2008).

Broadly, HRD is a development tool, concerned directly with the processes of developing an organisation’s human resources (Werner & DeSimone, 2012). While
training and development constitute a major part, other activities including coaching, mentoring, team-building, career/organisation development and leadership development are also aspects of HRD (Simmonds & Pedersen, 2006; Werner & DeSimone, 2012)—all of which are subject to change, thus suggesting that HRD is itself a changing process (Simmonds & Pedersen, 2006; Wilson, 2005). According to Pedersen (2000), change is the central theme associated with HRD. As the contemporary business environment exists in a constant state of change, HRD processes must be flexible and proactive in order to effectively manage human resources (Pedersen, 2000). Garavan, Costine and Heraty (1995) note that HRD is a link between human resources and organisational strategy. Consequently, while HRM is a broader field concerned with managing people, HRD is concerned with developing strategies to provide those people with further knowledge, skills and attitudes. Therefore, in accordance with this study’s research objectives it is only necessary to review HRD, as this concept specifically encapsulates training at its core. In a constantly moving marketplace, an organisation’s human resources depend on effective HRD in order to successfully impart services to the wider community. Such a diverse and sophisticated workforce is a valuable asset in this continually changing environment (Delahaye, 2005). Consequently, HRD is an essential point of review for the literature of this study.

2.4.1 Defining Human Resource Development

To date HRD continues to be an equivocal and challenged field, as a universally accepted definition remains absent, largely attributable to the multidisciplinary nature of HRD itself. A primary or universal definition is difficult to isolate, as the terms ‘human resources’ and ‘development’ hold different meanings, usages and understandings within the literature (Hamlin & Stewart, 2011). This is by no means a downfall of HRD, as Sims (2006) implies multiple perspectives are healthy and should be viewed as a
strength of the HRD field. However, to understand what HRD encompasses, definitions generally recognise the capacity of the organisation and the individual to learn. HRD also includes supplementary learning concepts, such as training and development, the purpose of which is to optimise human and organisational growth and effectiveness (Chalofsky, 1992; Garavan et al., 1995; Hassan, 2007; McLagan & Suhadolnik, 1989; Simmonds & Pedersen, 2006). Although there is no universal definition (Hamlin & Stewart, 2011), HRD refers to the learning of individuals, groups and organisations to enhance human resource productivity, and achieve the organisation’s strategic objectives (Wilson, 2005).

HRD is recognised as a potentially undefinable term; however, for the purposes of this study, HRD is defined as: “… any process or activity that helps or enables individuals, groups, organisations, or host systems to learn, develop and change behaviour for the purpose of improving or enhancing their competence, effectiveness, performance, and growth” (Hamlin & Stewart, 2011, p. 213). Werner and DeSimone (2012) propose a similar definition and suggest that HRD is “a set of systematic and planned activities designed by an organisation to provide its members with the opportunities to learn necessary skills to meet current and future job demands” (p. 4), while Sims (2006) presents HRD as “strategically-driven (i.e. systematic and planned) activities designed to improve current and future organisational learning, performance and change” (p. 1). Although HRD is argued to be undefinable, such definitions portray relatively similar meanings. Hamlin and Stewart’s (2011) definition, however, refers to the concept of ‘growth’ and supports the notion that HRD itself is a continually growing concept. Although HRD may be problematic to define, similarities among definitions and research studies reveal that HRD typically follows the same lines. Thus, the aim of HRD is to effectively train and develop employees, through the strategic
implementation of an organisation’s core values and goals in their training methods (Hassan, 2007).

While HRD and training are two terms often used synonymously, training should be regarded as a distinct process, although an important part of HRD as the broader concept (Price, 2011). Blanchard and Thacker (2010) note that HRD needs to be a part of any training activities. Established throughout the literature is the connotation that, while HRD and training are sometimes used to mean the same, HRD is the framework and training is an integral aspect of this (Price, 2011). Training is reviewed in more detail in Section 2.4

2.4.2 Summary: Human Resources Development

Human resources are often an intangible organisational resource and are likely to provide a strong source of competitive advantage, therefore HRD should be seen as an essential tool for the training and development of an organisation’s workforce. HRD is necessary for organisations to implement skills, attitudes and knowledge to develop their advantage (Hitt, Bierman, Shimizu, & Kochhar, 2001). Stone (2010) argues that HRD is an important activity, and consequently the driving force of any training and further development employees receive. In order for HRD to be effective it must: adapt to change (Simmonds & Pedersen, 2006), improve the productivity of an organisation’s workforce to acquire competitive advantage (Stone, 2010), and realise the value of this human capital in order for human resources to be an asset to the organisation (Hassan, 2007). Growth within this field is contingent on a continuing supply of multiple perspectives and frameworks (Sims, 2006). Accordingly, this study aims to address HRD from the perspective of event leaders to expand the knowledge within this field. Attention is now turned to the literature addressing training as a process of HRD.
2.5 Training as a Human Resource Development Process

Higher expectations are placed on employees in terms of performance and effectiveness than ever before due to the competitive and dynamic nature of contemporary business environments (Palmer, 2005). This enhanced focus on individual contributions means identifying training needs and implementing training programs effectively has become a critical element of HRD and is essential for organisational success (Wilson, 2005). Stone (2010) argues that “a well-trained, multi-skilled workforce is essential to economic survival” (p. 338). On this note, Meighan (1995) argues the success of any organisation depends heavily on training as an integral HRD process. Thus, training is often the most recognised development tool and the overriding method used to develop workers. Training is essentially an investment in people, and Naik (2007) highlights that “investing in your people makes good business sense” (p. 74). Accordingly, training is a key concept within the present study and a review of the existing literature on this topic is necessary. Training methods, the design of a training plan, the importance of an effective trainer and the benefits of training are all discussed as essential concepts for this study.

Training is an integral part of HRD, whereby an individual’s skills are enhanced and broadened, helping them to grow within an organisation and enabling them to make better use of their skills and abilities (Wilson, 2005). The progressive nature of training has ensured it is a dynamic field (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). As a consequence, research can only improve and benefit individuals and organisations by updating training material and content. Thus, it is crucial for successful organisations to have effective training practices in place (Meighan, 1995). Training is essential to fashioning a skilled and knowledgeable workforce; however, contemporary organisations are
always looking to cut costs, and training has typically been number among the first
areas to have funding cut (Anon., 1997).

While costs are inevitable both directly and indirectly (Naik, 2007), the amount
and quality of training can be directly linked to employee turnover (Kalargyrou &
Woods, 2011). Business organisations, and to a greater degree the labour-intensive
hospitality industry, rely on their workforce as their most crucial asset (Hayes &
Ninemeier, 2009). Indeed, potential employees base a considerable amount of their
choice of job based on the training and development on offer (Robbins et al., 2008).
Thus, instead of cutting training from organisational budgets, to increase organisational
competitive advantage and recruit the right people, a logical decision is to contribute as
many resources to enhance this asset in order for workers to make maximum
contributions to the organisation’s success (Hayes & Ninemeier, 2009). While the
literature indicates training can be costly, it is a necessary process to give organisations
a competitive advantage to stay ahead of their competition while also attaining better
employee retention rates (Read & Kleiner, 1996). Training is the key to creating a
skilled and knowledgeable workforce and should be given due attention in order to use
the workforce most effectively (Blanchard & Thacker, 2010).

2.5.1 Defining Training

The very nature of training begins with a basic problem: “the notion that learning
something you don’t already know requires another person (a trainer), or a medium (a
book, a computer) to provide it” (Silberman & Auerbach, 2006, p. 1). Numerous
definitions of training exist; however, they are not universally agreed upon. In the
broadest terms, training can be defined as “an activity that alters people’s behaviour”
(Ghosh, Joshi, Satyawadi, Mukherjee, & Ranjan, 2011, p. 248). This definition was
built upon by Werner and DeSimone (2012), who suggest training typically involves
equipping employees with the knowledge and skills to do a particular task or job, whereby attitude is also often changed or improved. Pepper (1984) defined training as “that organised process concerned with the acquisition of capability or the maintenance of capability” (p. 9). While all three definitions adequately encapsulate what training is, Pepper’s (1984) definition takes into account the reciprocal nature of training to the organisation. The definition adopted for this study is that of Buckley and Caple (2009), as these authors take into account both the individual and the organisation, also addressing ‘what’ training is and ‘why’ it is necessary:

A planned and systematic effort to modify or develop knowledge/skill/attitude through learning experience, to achieve effective performance in an activity or range of activities. Its purpose, in the work situation, is to enable an individual to acquire abilities in order that he or she can perform adequately a given task or job and realise their potential. (Buckley & Caple, 2009, p. 9)

Similar to training, employee development can be defined as a process “… where the objective is to acquire a set of capabilities which will equip a person to do a job sometime in the predictable future, which is not within his [sic] present ability” (Pepper, 1984, p. 9). Although training and development often go hand in hand and can be thought of interchangeably (Palmer, 2005; Wilson, 2005), for the purposes of this study, only training is examined. While some researchers tend to use these concepts interchangeably, the major differentiating factor is time; training deals with current situations and is short-term, covering specific skills, contrastingly development is long-term, focusing on future needs (Buckley & Caple, 2009; Stone, 2010). Similarly, Naik (2007) identifies training as having a narrow focus on skills acquisition, while development has a broader perspective of the integrated development of individuals. Thus, in accordance with the objectives of this study, it was only necessary to examine
the concept of training. Events explored within this study provided an array of informal and formal training including, induction, OJT, and role-specific training, however, further staff development was not examined.

2.5.2 Implementing Effective Training

Considered a necessity for any successful organisation, training is costly, yet, a strategic component implemented in order to gain competitive advantage (Buckley & Caple, 2009; Wilson, 2005). The intention of training is to increase the skills/knowledge, expertise, and often attitudes of trainees (Werner & DeSimone, 2012). In order for training to be successful, it must be designed and delivered effectively. As a result, it must be effectively designed from the beginning in the early planning stages. The systematic approach to training typically includes four stages: identifying needs, planning, delivery, and evaluation (Santos & Stuart, 2003). The features of a training plan all contribute to maximising learning (Naik, 2007).

Silberman and Auerbach (2006) note that the key to effective training starts with the ‘design’, which is an ongoing process feeding from identifying learners’ needs and a constant evaluation system. The design of a training program involves translating an organisation’s objectives and strategies into a balance of learning and instruction (Buckley & Caple, 2009). In order for a training program to be effectively delivered and meet these objectives, training methods must be considered first to determine the best approaches for this purpose. While there is a wide variety of training methods, materials and resources to choose from when designing and delivering a training program (Blanchard & Thacker, 2010; Sims, 2006), there are three factors common to all training plans that when combined create an instructional approach: (1) instructional strategies (e.g. task analysis), (2) methods (e.g. simulation), and (3) content (i.e. required competencies) (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).
Training methods are most readily identified as formal (structured) or informal (unstructured), and on-the-job or off-the-job (Robbins et al., 2008). Methods are the delivery systems used to train people and some examples include: lectures, demonstrations, games and simulations, OJT, coaching and mentoring (Blanchard & Thacker, 2010). Other factors important to developing an effective training program include the trainer, the training environment and relevant informative material.

Historically, training was thought of as formal, indicating a classroom setting with a trainer who gave a lecture on the subject at hand (Robbins et al., 2008). Nowadays, the majority of training can be classified as informal and on-the-job (Robbins et al., 2008).

OJT is an active method of training as it denotes ‘real work’ in ‘real time’, requiring no need for transfer of training (Stone, 2010). The literature suggests that OJT is the most common form of training used today (Blanchard & Thacker, 2010; Werner & DeSimone, 2012). This is likely to be because the trainee is more attentive and more motivated as they can directly connect theory with practice (Blanchard & Thacker, 2010). The speed at which learning occurs is accelerated (Rothwell & Kazanas, 2004) and costs are usually minimal, making OJT ideal for budget-conscious organisations (Beaver & Hutchings, 2005). While it is popular, there are some drawbacks to this method, as it is typically conducted without structure, planning or careful thought (Werner & DeSimone, 2012). Disadvantages of conducting training on the job include disruptions to the normal workplace, noise or physical constraints that may inhibit a trainees’ learning, a temporary reduction in the quality of customer service and irreversible mistakes in an actual work environment (Robbins et al., 2008; Werner & DeSimone, 2012). Sims (2006) also notes that the extent of long-term benefits may be limited from OJT as employees are not typically in a job long enough to learn very
Because training is necessary though costly, “training must be as effective as possible” (Read & Kleiner, 1996, p. 25). In order to achieve such effectiveness, the training plan needs to seek to maximise the return on this investment (Read & Kleiner, 1996). While no single training method is argued as superior to all others (Sims, 2006), the method will likely depend on the training situation and needs of the learners. Buckley and Caple (2009) stress the importance of the delivery stage in order to effectively get across all necessary information; however, they concede that even the most effective design and delivery is no guarantee of success. Meanwhile, Pont (2003) cites flexibility across training plans—a general rule is to strive for a variety of training methods and media/resources.

As “training faces increasing demands to demonstrate results in terms of return on investment” (Blanchard & Thacker, 2010, p. 23), there is a need for better identification of training requirements (Canning, 1996). Ideally, training programs must grow and change to meet the developing needs of future learners (Anon., 1997). An assessment of training practices is recommended so that improvements can be made for future events (Peacy, 2006).

### 2.5.3 Benefits of Training

The benefits of training affect not only the individual but also the organisation. It is often noted that the direct purpose of training is to prepare an individual to perform a specific task more effectively (Buckley & Caple, 2009). But it can be forgotten that training has a resounding impact on the organisation, where it can contribute to an organisation achieving its strategic objectives (Buckley & Caple, 2009). Santos and Stuart (2003) revealed training has many benefits in that it increases confidence and
self-efficacy, improves competencies and skills, reassures employees they are being
invested in, and motivates staff to further their own abilities, thus improving
organisational performance. In contrast, training is equally as non-beneficial if it is
delivered ineffectively, especially if it leaves employees unable to function
productively, and leads to dissatisfied staff and high turnover rates (Sanders & Kleiner,
2002).

2.5.4 Summary: Training
Salas and Cannon-Bowers (2001) argue that training has “… progressed and matured—
it is now truly an exciting and dynamic field” (p. 473). While training has received
considerable attention from scholars, a gap exists when it is combined with other
concepts that have received considerably less attention. So far, examining training in
combination with leadership provides substance to furthering research in this unique
field. Sprogoe and Elkjaer (2010) identify that training has been well documented, with
a focus on individual and organisational performance; however, more research is
needed (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Indeed, this study may identify training
processes favoured by certain leadership styles—an area which seems to be missing
from the leadership and training literature. The following section addresses the literature
exploring volunteerism as it constitutes a central context of this study, that being
volunteer workforces at events.

2.6 Volunteerism
While volunteerism is not a new phenomenon, considerable attention has been paid to
volunteer activity in recent years (Lockstone-Binney, Holmes, Smith, & Baum, 2010).
Today, organisational efficiency is linked to the performance of workforces, hence
volunteers can play a vital role in achieving strategic goals (Peacy, 2006). Thus, this
research is timely and warranted because volunteers are increasingly significant as a major source of labour for events, where they are also considered a basis of the event organisation’s competitive advantage. Opportunities for volunteering exist across all sectors and organisations (Lynch & Smith, 2010) and sustain communities and organisations at many levels (Cuskelly, Hoye, & Auld, 2006). It is dependent on culture and social settings and incorporates a wide range of activities that make volunteer management a human resources topic open to further development (Lockstone, Smith, & Baum, 2007). Definitions of volunteerism vary within the literature (Cuskelly, Hoye, & Auld, 2006). However, there is some consensus in the available literature that volunteerism is a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon (Cuskelly, Hoye, & Auld, 2006; Holmes & Smith, 2009).

Volunteerism may be framed as a leisure activity, as a volunteer chooses to participate and has the ability to opt out at any point (Nichols & Ralston, 2011). However, volunteerism is predominantly characterised as unpaid work, whereby an individual’s time, skills and knowledge are given freely to benefit another person, group or organisation (Lockstone & Baum, 2009; Lynch & Smith, 2010; McCabe, White, & Obst, 2007). A broad definition of a volunteer is someone who works for no monetary gain (Shin & Kleiner, 2003; Waikayi, Fearon, Morris, & McLaughlin, 2012). Volunteering research seems hindered by a lack of an accepted definition (Lockstone et al., 2007). The term is complex as it must consider elements of motives, activities and setting to appropriately define volunteering correctly (Baum & Lockstone, 2007).

The value of volunteering has typically been examined from three perspectives, including its economic value, and more recently, the social benefits to volunteers and to the wider community (Holmes, 2009). Cuskelly, Taylor, Hoye and Darcy (2006) note that the volunteer literature has predominantly been explored through motivation and
satisfaction issues. This also applies to the event volunteering literature, where volunteers’ motivations have provided a large focus of research (Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010). The present study differs from previous studies as it focuses on the training provided to volunteers at 19 case study events and the influence of event managers’ leadership styles on the efficacy of these HRD processes, potentially adding to research already conducted in this field. According to Cuskelcy, Taylor et al. (2006), effective management of volunteer resources is in need of further study, highlighting the significant gap within this literature. The next section addresses volunteers’ motivations. While motivations will not play a major role within the present study, event managers must understand the motivations of their volunteers in order to implement effective management strategies (Anderson & Cairncross, 2005).

2.6.1 Motivations of Volunteers

Although this study does not seek to understand the motivations of volunteers, it is a fundamental principle of which managers of volunteers must be aware of in order to fully satisfy the volunteers’ volunteering experience (Anderson & Cairncross, 2005). Motivation itself has long fascinated researchers, and considerable attention has been paid to the motivations of volunteers (Anderson & Cairncross, 2005). An understanding of a volunteer’s motivations is central to their satisfaction of their volunteering experience (Farrell, Johnston, & Twynam, 1998; Monga, 2006). Ralston, Lumsdon and Downward (2005) argue that volunteer satisfaction is established through motivations, expectations and actual volunteering experience, while Monga (2006) notes that an organisation’s success in recruiting and maintaining their volunteer workforce is largely due to understanding their motives.

Ralston, Downward and Lumsdon (2004) suggest the reasons why people volunteer have been well documented, and ultimately form a mixture of altruistic,
social-affiliative and instrumental reasons. People ultimately volunteer to fulfil a need, but over time the factors influencing this motivation may change (Osborn, 2008). Accordingly, volunteer motivations are complex, dual and may be adaptable to the situation (Ralston et al., 2005). A key motivation identified by Ralston et al. (2004) is the opportunity to better one’s skills and improve one’s qualifications. This can be tied to the present study, whereby the examination of training volunteers receive is directly relevant to an individual’s skill enhancement via training. Although this study specifically aims to investigate training of event volunteers, it is essential to acknowledge that motivations of volunteers are a crucial consideration for managers in order to better understand their volunteers (Jarvis, 2007; Nassar & Talaat, 2009).

Considerably less is known about the motivations of volunteers within events; however, event research shows that within this context volunteering at sporting events dominates prior research (Barron & Rihova, 2011). This may be due to implications of events in that they are short-term, one-off or annual occasions, characterised by their uniqueness, atmosphere, social and cultural experiences, and hospitality (Monga, 2006). Consequently, motivations of event volunteers becomes a different strategic concept for event managers. Thus, the exploration of event volunteers’ motivations proves more elusive. While typical motivations of volunteers are not discounted, event volunteers have other motivating factors unique to their status. Farrell et al. (1998) note the motivations of event volunteers are typically different to those of other volunteers. This is also backed by Johnston, Twynam and Farrell (1999), who argue that the motivations of event volunteers are linked to dimensions unique to the event itself. Conclusive evidence from Farrell et al.’s study suggests the highest-ranking motivation to volunteer at a special event was “they wanted to help make the event a success” (p. 215).
Event volunteers’ experiences are typically comprised of two key elements: (1) training and (2) task execution (Costa, Chalip, Green, & Simes, 2006). Thus, it is often argued that motivation to volunteer is largely dependent on the training volunteers are likely to receive. Ultimately, it is the event manager’s responsibility to facilitate the satisfaction of volunteers, which accordingly relies on a clear understanding of their motivations. Consequently, a highly satisfied volunteer is more likely to volunteer for future events and influence others to also participate (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000). It can also be noted that a greater understanding of event volunteers’ motivations has the potential to improve the planning and management of this workforce, ultimately building a stronger, more effective volunteer workforce (Farrell et al., 1998). However, according to Ralston et al. (2004), a dissatisfied volunteer may not result in immediate turnover, mostly due to the limited duration of an event, although there are implications for the volunteer’s effectiveness and productivity. Thus, an essential point to take away is that the key to maintaining an event workforce is to keep volunteers satisfied.

As with previous studies (e.g. Anderson, 2004; Monga, 2006), this study has the potential to improve the quality of service delivered at events relying on volunteers, and also to improve volunteer retention through effective HRD training processes. While this does not directly address event volunteer motivation, as noted the training event volunteers receive is a major contributing factor for their motivation to volunteer. Subsequently, the suggestion training may possibly be a determining factor of volunteer choice can contribute to the literature pertaining to event volunteers’ motivation and satisfaction on a minor level. The following section addresses the management of events and the significance of this discipline within a growing area of tourism.
2.6.2 Volunteer Workforces at Events

Due to their temporary, short-term or infrequent nature, event managers face a different set of challenges compared with conventional organisations, including the management of volunteer workforces (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000). Today’s hectic lifestyle limits the time available that many potential volunteers can contribute to volunteering (Peacy, 2006). Ideally, the short-term, flexible nature of events provides an alternative to traditional, organisational volunteering. Consequently, a large proportion of those who work in events do so on a voluntary basis (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). As events are essentially service-oriented organisations, their human resources, particularly volunteers, are a source of potential competitive advantage (Solnet & Hood, 2008). Consequently, event organisations rely heavily on a volunteer workforce in order to achieve continuity and success (Anderson, 2004; Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). Unlike the literature on volunteerism, event volunteering represents a relatively new aspect within the wider literature (Barron & Rihova, 2011). Nichols and Ralston (2011) note that “volunteering provides a link to events that transcend the individual” (p. 911). While the choice to volunteer is typically determined by an individual based on personal motivations, evidence of event volunteering has shown that a volunteer’s identity is additionally expressed as part of the event organisation (Nichols & Ralston, 2011). Thus, volunteering at events is often characterised as being of altruistic motivation, as there is a desire to help others above oneself. Without volunteers, many events, programs and organisations that are run at little to no cost to patrons would cease to exist (Nassar & Talaat, 2009). Indeed, volunteers have been called the ‘lifeblood’ of events (Getz, 2008).

Volunteering at events typifies ‘episodic’ volunteering, as they are often involved on a short-term or occasional basis (Holmes & Smith, 2009). While
complexities surround the term ‘episodic’, what is apparent is that it is very different to long-term, traditional volunteering (Bryen, 2007). This connotation is also inferred by Holmes and Smith (2009), as they argue a volunteer’s involvement with an event is quite distinct when compared to regular, more permanent attractions. Consequently, the difference between conventional organisational volunteers and episodic volunteers lies in their commitment (Cuskelley & Auld, 2000). Thus, the very nature of episodic volunteering suggests a short-term stint of service, usually under a predetermined time period where the focus is specific and limited in duration (Edwards, 2012). Evidence suggests that this form of volunteering is becoming more popular (Barron & Rihova, 2011), particularly amongst the younger generations as it appeals to their flexible lifestyles (Lockstone, Holmes, Deery, & Jago, 2009).

Event volunteers differ from paid employees, as their commitment is typically short-term, rather than developing a relationship with an organisation over a longer period of time (Cuskelley, Hoye, & Auld, 2006). Kemp (2002) identified that event volunteers are typically experiential learners; that is, they learn by doing. In addition, she identifies the varied skills learned at events are relevant in future jobs in many industry sectors (Kemp, 2002). Training volunteers, however, presents challenges as volunteers are essentially donating their time, not receiving compensation for their labour (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). This is further exacerbated with event/episodic volunteers as they often do not have time to spend attending lengthy training sessions (Macduff, 1995). Therefore, unlike paid employees, volunteers must be managed with a nuanced approach.

While there are challenges associated with event volunteer management, it should be noted that training of any kind is typically viewed positively by volunteers (McCurley & Lynch, 2009). Traditionally, episodic volunteers were only trained on the
job, learning as they went (Edwards, 2012); however, the training component for contemporary event volunteers now requires closer examination. Training is advocated as essential for all event volunteers and should begin with an orientation or induction to the event itself and the event organisation (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). Additionally, the results of an empirical study by Downward and Ralston (2006) suggest that, in order to capitalise on event volunteering, the promotion and harnessing of volunteers’ personal development is essential. While it is noted that training volunteers requires some finance, it is a valuable investment—not only reducing volunteer turnover but strengthening volunteer loyalty and commitment (Chen et al., 2010).

2.7 Chapter Summary

The literature reviewed herein focused on key concepts, leadership and event management, an essential starting point for this study. Events are advocated as a growth sector (Derrett, 2000; Hede & Kellett, 2001), and accordingly their management comes under the microscope as events rely heavily on strong leadership for their success (Greenwell, Danzey-Bussell, & Shonk, 2014). Current literature, while strongly advocating effective leadership as a driver for event success, is significantly lacking empirical research. Relatively few studies have addressed this niche topic, providing little critique of empirical studies; however, theoretical texts have paved the way and provided a basis to conduct further research. However, such texts are mostly speculative, and it is difficult to verify their claims. This thesis aims to contribute to available literature, although varying claims are made as to which style best suits leaders within the events sector. Conflictingly, Parent, Olver, and Seguin (2009) suggest that while a purely transformational approach is ideal, implementing this style of leadership can be challenging. Additionally, Parent et al. (2009) advocate that
transactional styles are appropriate in certain situations. Bass and Avolio (1997) have shown that women tend to score predominately higher in the transformational categories and lower in transactional leadership than their male colleagues. Meanwhile, Bass and Avolio (1996, 2002) deduced that transformational leadership is in fact beneficial for followers and their organisation, regardless of the situation. These findings highlight the diverse views regarding effective leadership styles for particular contexts evident within the existing literature, highlighting a need for more exploratory, empirical research as is undertaken within this thesis.

Subsequent topics for exploration, HRD, training, and volunteerism, within the comprehensive role event managers undertake, highlight a paucity of research and suggest the exploratory nature of this study may contribute to a gap in the literature. The following chapter addresses the overarching research paradigm and methods employed to explore leadership styles within the present study.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter examined the available literature pertinent to the key concepts associated with this thesis. The purpose of this chapter is to describe and justify the methods used to collect and analyse data for this study. This chapter begins by outlining the guiding paradigm. The overarching design of the research project is then addressed in Section 3.3. Section 3.4 discusses a mixed-methods approach, and as case studies were used to structure the study they are described in Section 3.5. Section 3.6 continues with the data collection methods, which are justified as appropriate to this research. As leadership is the dominant concept to be examined, a measurement instrument is discussed and justified in Section 3.7. The data analysis methods are outlined in Section 3.8, followed by the methodological limitations in Section 3.9. The ethical considerations of the study are discussed in Section 3.10. Finally, Section 3.11 summarises and concludes the chapter.

3.2 Research Paradigm

A research paradigm is a worldview—essentially the planning framework for the research process (Neuman, 2006)—defined by ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions (Blanche, Durrheim, & Painter, 2006). One of the researcher’s first tasks is to position their study paradigmatically (Cameron, 2011) by carefully considering epistemological, ontological and methodological assumptions as they pertain to the intended research. Atkinson (2012) adequately surmises these branches of philosophy: (1) epistemology as the production of knowledge, for example
it aims to better understand potential answers to a question of exploration; (2) ontology concerns “central metaphysical questions about the world” (p. 148), in other words ontology is a researcher’s position which shapes their reality; and, (3) methodological assumptions are those made by the researcher regarding the methods used in designing the research.

To facilitate a rigorous examination of leadership in the context of event management, and to design the study, an in-depth exploration of the literature pertinent to these fields was necessary. Gathering indirect empirical knowledge revealed a gap within the literature to explore the leadership styles of event managers and, additionally, variance in their attitudes toward training volunteers. Constructing a background within this knowledge better places the researcher to decipher multiple realities, assuming a relativist ontology, and positing that reality cannot be separate from one’s knowledge of it, a subjectivist epistemology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Thus, in order for the research to produce valid empirical knowledge, event managers’ subjective experiences are taken as reality, and the researcher’s subjective interactions with the event managers allows sense to be made of their experiences (Blanche et al., 2006).

In order to address the research objectives of this study an objective means of classifying the event managers according to leadership style was originally sought, which called for a partly positivistic approach using a quantitative questionnaire. Understanding that leadership is highly individual and often shaped by context (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009), an exclusively positivistic study would not have allowed an exploration of the nuanced nature of leadership in events. Consequently, from an ontological perspective, elements of this study required a more flexible approach to accommodate multiple explanations of event leadership, using interviews as an interpretive approach (Cohen & Crabtree, 2006). Thus, an exploratory investigation
allowed the researcher to employ an open, inductive design to better suit the needs of the overall study. As the study called for strengths of both positivist and constructivist approaches, the adoption of the pragmatic paradigm and the deployment of mixed methods was chosen to better explore the leadership styles of event managers.

### 3.2.1 Pragmatism

A research paradigm provides guidelines for the researcher to follow (Ticehurst & Veal, 2000). Traditionally, positivism has dominated social science research, with quantitative surveys and experimentation setting the standard for being methods of choice (Blanche et al., 2006). Meanwhile the qualitative approach, favoured by researchers working within the interpretive/constructivist paradigm, has been less dominant until recently (Blanche et al., 2006). However, through the emergence of mixed methods, the mixing of qualitative and quantitative methods, an alternative framework accommodating these diverse research methods was devised as the third methodological movement. In designing the methodological approach, the methods most complementary to answering the research objectives of this study were chosen to be a questionnaire, in-depth interviews and a multiple case study approach, advocating a mixed-methods research design. Additionally, the qualitative data were analysed using an interpretive, inductive approach.

The paradigm most commonly regarded as the philosophical partner for mixed-methods research is pragmatism (Cameron, 2011; Denscombe, 2008; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). While this approach is not the only paradigm associated with mixed methods—there are others, such as transformative, postpositivism, and constructivism—pragmatism focuses on the research problem and consequences of such research (Feilzer, 2010; Hall, 2012). Johnson, Onwuegbuzie and Turner (2007) support pragmatism as a well-developed and attractive paradigm for researchers seeking to
integrate approaches and methods. Pragmatism is most simply defined as “a practical approach to a problem” (Cameron, 2011, p. 101), while Maxcy (2003) defines pragmatism as a “practical and applied research philosophy” (p. 85). Pragmatism is advocated as a research paradigm where singularly neither qualitative nor quantitative approaches alone would suffice. The central idea behind pragmatism is that it values both subjective and objective knowledge (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The use of multiple methods suggests practicality of a research design, where a ‘what works’ approach is applied rather than constraints of solely numerical or narrative data (Denzin, 2012).

According to Denzin (2012), mixed-methods research is characterised by paradigm pluralism. Hence, although pragmatism will act as the overarching paradigm guiding this research, individual paradigms will support the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the methodology. As questionnaires reside within a quantitative approach, and interviews are typically qualitative in nature, employing them within the same research design requires a more flexible approach. Rich, qualitative data obtained through interviews with event managers are key to valid research from an interpretive perspective, in addition a positivist perspective traditionally underlies controlled research designs typical of questionnaires (Blanche et al., 2006). Blanche et al. (2006) argue that it is possible for a researcher to draw on more than one paradigm when undertaking such a mixed-method study. Support for combining quantitative and qualitative methods is increasing, with pragmatism advocated as both a practical and applied research philosophy to mixed-/multiple-methods research (Denzin, 2012).

Far from being considered an ‘easy way out’, a pragmatic design is intellectually demanding on the researcher, thus requiring difficult decisions to be made (Blanche et al., 2006). The researcher continually reflects on the research process, and through
refinement and development valid conclusions are sought (Blanche et al., 2006). For example, transcribed interviews were analysed thoroughly to better understand how event managers led their teams and their attitude towards volunteer training. Although time-consuming such insights allowed for valid contributions to the research. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) advocate pragmatism as a ‘best worldview’ for mixed-methods researchers. Additionally, Feilzer (2010) advocates pragmatism as the rationale for mixed-methods research where the focus is on whether the research has helped or advanced current research.

The justification for employing an overarching pragmatic research paradigm is on the basis of pragmatism’s ontological, epistemological and methodological bases. According to this paradigm, reality is equivocal, and knowledge is derived from experience, and methods are diverse, ranging from interviews to questionnaires (Klenke, 2008). Pragmatism is also heralded as a common approach to mixed-methods research, taking quantitative and qualitative stances under its umbrella design (Blanche et al., 2006). Alone, neither a positivist nor interpretivist approach would have adequately addressed the research objectives of this thesis, however, pragmatism was deemed a suitable approach to guide a comprehensive exploration of leadership within an events context (Klenke, 2008). A discussion surrounding the research design employed in the present study ensues.

3.3 Research Design

It is the complex nature of leadership that makes it a current field of interest, although it is this very nature that also makes it a challenge to understand and research (Stentz, Plano Clark, & Matkin, 2012). Contemporary leadership literature reveals that there is a wider methodological diversity than in the relatively recent past (Bryman, 2004; Parry,
Mumford, Bower, & Watts, 2014). However, leadership has tended to be measured via quantitative methods. A review of methods utilised within previous studies shows leadership, events and volunteering being researched from a largely quantitative perspective. Literature centring on the value of volunteering is described by Holmes (2009) as largely quantitative, and as a result the voice of the volunteer has often been lost. Moreover, the voice of the event manager in understanding the level of training implemented within events has not often been accounted for. Further, event volunteering research is hindered by a lack of qualitative studies (Holmes & Smith, 2009).

The field of leadership research has been examined from a variety of different angles, often rushing from one fad to the next (Yukl, 2002). Along with no universal definition for leadership, there is also no leading authority or unifying theoretical construct through which leadership is said to be better understood (Allio, 2013; Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). Although challenging, the research and measurement of leaders working in today’s culturally diverse workforce suggests that a new approach may be needed and should be theory-inducing (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). A qualitative approach, complementing quantitative methods, is advocated in order to build upon and generate new approaches to theory (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). Transformational leadership is noted by Bass and Riggio (2008) as the leading approach to leadership research. They ascertain that this appeal stems from transformational leaders providing a better fit in today’s complex organisational environment, where followers seek inspiration, challenges and empowerment (Bass & Riggio, 2008).

Leadership research has largely been quantitatively examined, measured primarily by survey methods (Avolio et al., 2003; Bryman, 2011); however, there are
growing suggestions that a qualitative approach matches more appropriately to the complex nature of leadership (Conger, 1998). This shift in interest has been acknowledged by Bryman, Stephens, and Campo (1996) back in the late 1990s, and more recently by Parry et al. (2014). Stentz et al. (2012) take this further by suggesting that leadership research may be best addressed through a multiple method/theory approach, rather than through the primarily singlular, quantitative approach that currently dominates. Advocates for quantitative approaches within leadership research remain, as they have been widely used and are often known for their psychometric qualities (Bryman, 2011). Taking such suggestions into account, this study aims to examine event managers’ leadership styles and potential variance in their attitudes towards volunteer training through a mixed-methods approach.

An interpretive social sciences methodology seeking to explore “the perspectives of those being studied offers the greatest promise of making a difference in people’s lives” (Merriam, 2009, p. 1). To gain a better understanding of event managers’ perceptions, a mixed-method, qualitatively-driven methodology was employed. To demonstrate the utility of quantitative methods to leadership, a valid and reliable leadership measurement instrument, the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1995), was selected in order to categorise event managers into a leadership style as per the FRLT. Extensive research provides both support and criticism for the MLQ; however, it is considered the benchmark measure of transformational leadership (Avolio et al., 2003; Bass & Avolio, 2018). Follow-up semi-structured interviews were chosen as they aim to explore in-depth experiences of participants (Adams, 2010). Due to the semi-structured nature of interviews conducted, participants could be probed to incite further perceptions regarding their personal leadership style and attitude towards volunteer training. Narratives are typical of qualitative methodologies (Hyde, 2000). A mixed-method
approach using multiple case studies underpins the research design and is explicated in
the ensuing sub-sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 respectively.

3.3.1 Mixed-Methods Research

Traditionally, researchers were defined by either their quantitative or qualitative
stances, with neither straying far from their preferred research methodologies.
Quantitative research has been labelled the dominant methodological orientation,
typically associated with the positivist/postpositivist paradigm (Tashakkori & Teddlie,
2009), while qualitative research is less well-known, often labelled intensive and
complex, residing within the interpretivist/constructivist paradigm (Conger, 1998). As
Boonyachai (2011) notes, both approaches are dependent on the nature of a study’s
research questions. Separately, quantitative and qualitative approaches reside within
different paradigms and have their individual limitations, thus a middle ground
approach—mixed methods—offers the chance to offset the weaknesses of one approach
with the other and leverage the strengths of each (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).
Research involving both quantitative and qualitative methods, however, has become
increasingly common in recent years (Bryman, 2006). Such research goes beyond
merely using quantitative or qualitative methods alone and has emerged as the third
paradigm or research approach, known as mixed-methods research (Burke, Johnson, &
Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Denscombe, 2008).

Mixed methods, also variously labelled the third methodological
movement/moment (Denzin, 2012; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003), multi-methods, multi-
strategy (Bryman, 2004) or mixed methodology (Hibberts & Johnson, 2012; Tashakkori
& Teddlie), is the third distinct approach to research, alongside quantitative and
qualitative approaches (Bryman, 2006). However, it is important to note that the mixed-
methods approach is actually not the same as a multiple-method approach. As Morse
and Cheek (2014) note, mixed methods consists of one complete project that incorporates an additional strategy using a different analytical technique. Since the 1900s, advocates of this approach have increasingly gained momentum, which is championed by researchers including Abbas Tashakkori, Charles Teddlie, John Creswell, Burke Johnson and Anthony Onwuegbuzie (Denscombe, 2008). In a review by Johnson et al. (2007), mixed-methods research is most commonly defined as the mix of qualitative and quantitative methods. Other defining characteristics of this research approach include the sequencing and integration of the qualitative and quantitative elements, and pragmatism as the philosophical underpinning for the research (Denscombe, 2008).

Praise for mixing methods is becoming increasingly common and, as Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) note, it is both practical and intuitive as it offers multiple ways to view everyday problems. Mason (2006) goes so far as to suggest that mixing methods is simply a “good thing to do” (p. 9). While Axinn and Pearce (2006) advocate using every reasonable method to build a comprehensive dataset suitable to the research question at hand. Hence, mixed-methods supporters portray a convincing ideal of employing the right data collection methods, no matter the structure, nature or underlying paradigm.

While a mixed-methods approach has been deployed across an array of fields and disciplines, Stentz et al. (2012) point out that it is yet to be specifically addressed in the field of leadership. Although leadership researchers have employed a wide range of research methods, Bryman (2011) highlights that this is relatively recent, acknowledging this field has typically relied upon single research methods. Despite the lack of application within the field, numerous authors advocate the application of a mixed-methods approach in the leadership field (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004;
Stentz et al., 2012). Yukl (2002) surmises this need, inferring that it is desirable in leadership research to employ a mixed-method approach whenever feasible. With the continual introduction of new leadership theories, researchers are required to explore the leadership phenomena through broader, unrestricted means (Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden, & Hu, 2014).

Even though mixed methods are gaining support, issues surround disagreements over definitions, paradigm debates and just what is a mixed-methods study and what value is added by applying this research design (Denzin, 2012). Not discounting the ever-increasing applicability of mixed-methods research, it remains, however, a contested field with numerous limitations. Johnson et al. (2007) believes that mixing methods is a very intensive and difficult task, even when the study is well designed and conducted. Upfront, the mixed-methods researcher must be innovative and versatile, with a repertoire of skills larger than those of a mono-method researcher (Cameron, 2011). Also, integration of each dataset—quantitative and qualitative—is often noted to be an area of concern (Bryman, 2007). Researchers are too often writing up their quantitative and qualitative findings for different audiences, emphasising one set of findings, or treating them as separate domains, with the result being a lack of data integration, possibly missing valuable contrasts and findings (Bryman, 2007). Arguably, the most common disagreement concerning mixed methods is that qualitative and quantitative research lie within different, and often opposing, paradigms and cannot be easily combined (Denzin, 2012).

Acknowledging the limitations and concerns associated with mixing methods, the present study adopts mixed-methods by combining a quantitative questionnaire and qualitative semi-structured interviews with event managers. According to Tashakkori and Teddlie (2008), the purpose of employing mixed methods is to achieve two specific
objectives for the overall study: (1) complementarity and (2) completeness. Unlike single-method approaches, mixed methods aims to support arguments from both sides, providing complementary views about the same phenomenon, in turn amounting to a complete picture of the phenomenon (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008). The combined elements of quantitative and qualitative strategies signify breadth of understanding and corroboration (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Further, Bryman (2006) advocates mixed-methods research for its multiplied potential to uncover unanticipated findings, while Mason (2006) claims that the multi-dimensionality of lived experiences requires methods that open up our perspectives; in other words, to think ‘outside the box’. With a note of finality, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) state that “the time has come for mixed methods research” (p. 24). Reviewing the literature pertaining to methods chosen to examine leadership research, it is clear that, mixed-methods research is an appropriate approach for this study.

3.3.2 Research Methods in Leadership

Previous research employing a mixed-methods design within the field of leadership was reviewed in order to gain a better understanding on the methodology in context. While an overall quantitative approach was employed, the GLOBE researchers applied a mixed-methods approach within their multi-phase project to capture cultural influences on leadership (House, Javidan, & Dorfman, 2001). Through this approach, new understandings rich in cultural context regarding cross-cultural interactions were identified (Stentz et al., 2012). Developing such contextualised findings was suggested to benefit many other leadership topics. Boonyachai (2011) used the MLQ within a mixed-methods design to determine the dominant leadership style of Thai hotel middle managers. Here, no overarching paradigm defined the study, instead both positivist and interpretivist/constructivist paradigms underlay the quantitative and qualitative
components of the research (Boonyachai, 2011). A mixed-methods study was conducted by Aarons, Ehrhart, Farahnak, and Hurlburt (2015) to test a leadership and organisational strategy in order to promote effective leadership for implementing evidence-based practice. Surveys and a focus group were employed in their study, which allowed comparative analysis of data, resulting in a more complex and detailed array of findings (Aarons et al., 2015).

Further, in a more recent study by Abson (2017), she highlighted the lack of research into the leadership practices of event managers which has resulted in assumptions regarding the nature of event leadership, unsupported by primary research. Similar to Abson’s (2017) methodological approach, a core facet of the research design was in the study of the detail, being the perceptions event managers held of their own leadership style, key to a qualitative design. As noted by Abson (2017, p. 407), “this qualitative approach has often been missed from leadership research.” While studies focusing on the competencies required of event managers is scarce, it would also suggest that research within this domain follows no set methodological regulations. As such, an insurgence of qualitative, exploratory methodologies, as is employed with this study, could contribute invaluable empirical findings within this field.

While the researcher acknowledges employing a mixed-methods approach, the present study adopts Mason’s (2006) stance in which mixing methods is ‘qualitatively-driven’. In doing so, the complexities and contexts of social experience are explored in new ways, generating a wider understanding, generalisability and explanation for such a phenomenon (Mason, 2006). Congruently, Morse and Cheek (2014) report that a qualitatively-driven approach seeks a richer, deeper understanding of important facets of our social world. Thus, a qualitatively-driven mixed-method design can be characterised by: (1) related methods addressing the same research aim; and (2) results...
from different methods are integrated, with the qualitative component forming the basis of the narrative supplemented by the additional method (Morse & Cheek, 2014). This suggests ‘qualitative thinking’ as a starting point for mixing methods; however, it transcends these boundaries in order to understand the complexities of social research (Mason, 2006). Johnson et al. (2007) support mixed-methods approaches as they typically “… provide superior research findings and outcomes” (p. 129). Creswell (2014) advises selecting a research approach based on the research aim and objectives of the study, the researcher’s personal experiences and the intended audience(s). Encouraged by this advice, a mixed-methods approach was chosen to generate findings with greater depth and rigour than a mono-method study’s findings.

3.3.3 Case Study Approach

Case study research can be defined as a detailed investigation, where a researcher collects data within context typically over a period of time (Hartley, 2004). Continuing to be popular, the case study method has grown from single cases, gradually incorporating multiple cases (Bryman, 2004), as is the case with this project. Case study research is typically approached from a qualitative perspective; however, Woodside (2010) notes that, to achieve a deeper understanding of the research phenomenon, multiple methods should be employed. Yin (2011) reinforces this notion by suggesting case studies benefit from multiple sources of evidence. Further, understanding complex issues, as is the case with leadership, is a strength of case study research (Soy, 1997). Other advantages include the case study’s applicability to real-life situations, observing contemporary organisation’s and people, and cross-examination through a multiple case study approach (Noor, 2008; Soy, 1997).

Case studies dominate tourism volunteering research (Smith & Holmes, 2009) and, in general, are also common in volunteering research (e.g. Anderson, 2004;
Lamont, Kennelly, & Weiler, 2018; Waikayi et al., 2012). However, case studies have not been as widely employed in leadership research. Bryman (2004) ascertains that single case studies were popular among the earliest examples of qualitative leadership research, which in the past have been few and far between. An example is Shamir, Arthur and House’s (1994) research, which examined the motivation theory of charismatic leadership via a case study approach. The use of multiple case studies is indeed gaining momentum in leadership research (Bryman, 2004). The present study examines the leadership styles of event managers from 19 different events across the East Coast of Australia, contributing to research within a multi-method context.

3.4 Sampling

According to Bouma and Ling (2004) an important feature of all research is sampling. The number and size of samples within mixed-methods research depend on the research question and design; however, there are usually multiple samples (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). Hibberts and Johnson (2012) suggest that mixed-methods sampling is designed according to two dimensions: (1) time orientation of the methods; and (2) the relationship between the qualitative and quantitative samples. Subsequently, mixed-methods sampling techniques can be classified according to one of four types: identical, parallel, nested or multilevel (Hibberts & Johnson, 2012). This study employed an identical study sample, as the same event managers took part in both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the research (Hibberts & Johnson, 2012).

As a mixed-methods study involves some portion of both quantitative and qualitative data collection, sampling based on Hibberts and Johnson’s (2012) classification was imposed. An identical sample was necessary, as the research objectives sought to analyse the leadership styles of event managers, where participants
were purposively selected. Purposive sampling constitutes sampling with a purpose (Ritchie, 2003). Purposive sampling “is the deliberate choice of an informant due to the qualities the informant possesses” (Dolores & Tongco, 2007, p. 147). Bryman (2012) notes that most qualitative research entails some form of purposive sampling. Accordingly, there are two strategies implicit to purposive sampling: (1) the sample has to be tied to the research objectives; and (2) following on from the first, noting there is no one best sampling strategy as it is also dependent on the context (Palys, 2008). This statement alone justifies employing a purposive sample, as participants were chosen according to their ability to give insights which would facilitate satisfying the research objectives. Although purposive sampling was deployed to assemble a diverse sample of event managers, it is acknowledged that this kind of sample can only facilitate research outcomes with limited generalisability (Bouma & Ling, 2004).

A number of event managers were contacted based on their suitability to the research and the geographical location of the researcher, so that as many semi-structured interviews as possible could be carried out face-to-face. Purposive sampling involves deliberate choices of informants based on the specific information they possess (Dolores & Tongco, 2007). A purposive sample was chosen of case study event managers, based on the purposive selection criteria of this study, namely events along the east coast of Australia that had an event manager, volunteer population and defined volunteer training processes in place. Event managers from the selected events were deliberately chosen based on their seniority status as event managers/Chief Executive Officers and their direct involvement with volunteers and their training to undertake the online questionnaire and participate in a follow-up semi-structured interview. These selected event managers made up the case study participants.
Snowball sampling is often used to augment purposive sampling, particularly for
difficult to access populations (Atkinson & Flint, 2001). The majority of the sample was
sourced via purposive sampling with 12 event managers recruited directly. Due to this
original smaller sample, a further 7 event managers were contacted and recruited for
participation as a result of recommendations from current participants. A total of 19
event managers were involved in the study, who completed both phases of the data
collection. Although every effort was made to purposively select participants, event
managers were able to recommend useful potential candidates for the research, as a
consequence snowballing did occur (Marshall, 1996). Snowball sampling resulted, as
participants recommended potential participants (in other words their peers) within the
event industry, allowing the researcher to take advantage of the social networks
predisposed to the interviewees (Atkinson & Flint, 2001). Usually considered a useful
tool for accessing the vulnerable or deviant, snowball sampling is also known to assist
in accessing ‘hard-to-reach’ elites or professionals within urban contexts (Atkinson &
Flint, 2001).

Data saturation was unlikely reached as emergent findings continued to occur in
subsequent interviews. Data saturation is a widely utilised indicator assisting
researchers determine adequate sample size in qualitative research. Data saturation is
said to have occurred when no new information emerges, so that the phenomenon under
investigation is adequately represented (Byrne, 2001). Event managers were contacted
after initial follow-up interviews to provide additional information and to gain a more
thorough understanding of their analysed data. Although attempts were made to reach
saturation point by undertaking this method they proved unsuccessful, with most
participants declining further questioning. Providing participants with the opportunity to
offer more information to further cement findings was time consuming, yet essential to
validate data collected, however, as the majority of the event managers declined any further participation, any findings could not be clarified in more detail. The following section details the data collection procedures employed in this study.

3.5 Data Collection

This study employed both a self-administered questionnaire and semi-structured interviews deployed across multiple case studies of event managers in order to effectively engage a mixed-methods design. The advantage of employing a structured quantitative questionnaire and a less-structured qualitative interview in a single data collection method allows the researcher to build on the data collected from structured methods by gaining new insights from more unstructured methods (Axinn & Pearce, 2006). Combining popular research methods utilised within leadership research with less common data collection methods in this field supports existing numerical and narrative data, all the while expanding knowledge within this field.

For the purposes of this study, a quantitative closed-ended questionnaire was employed to determine participants’ leadership styles, followed up in a second phase with qualitative semi-structured interviews to collect a more detailed view to aid initial quantitative inquiry. Thus, instrument data were intended to be augmented by in-depth semi-structured interviews. As the research is concerned with perceptions and attitudes of event managers, relying on an exploratory, inductive approach allowed participants’ voices to be heard. While mixed methods in design, this study is qualitatively driven, giving weight to the semi-structured interview phase in order to explore the research objectives in-depth. The ensuing sub-sections explicate the sampling protocols utilised in this study as well as detailing the quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures.
3.5.1 Quantitative Method: Self-Administered Questionnaire

According to Bryman (2011), the self-administered questionnaire has been the dominant research method of choice for leadership researchers. Additionally, the self-administered questionnaire has been the instrument which has “more or less defined the field of leadership research” (Bryman, 2011, p. 17). This argument is supported by other researchers including Conger (1998), who notes quantitatively-based surveys have been the research method of choice for leadership studies. Avolio, Bass and Jung (1999) suggest that leadership researchers continue to use survey and questionnaire instruments to measure leadership, also employing additional methodologies, such as interviews or focus groups, to examine leadership.

As this study aimed to explore the leadership styles of event managers, choosing an instrument to best measure this factor was of the utmost importance to the researcher. Transactional and transformational leadership are said to be most effectively measured by the MLQ (Bass, 1999). Thus, the chosen self-administered questionnaire for this study is the MLQ, one of the most intensively used and well-known scales for measuring transformational and transactional leadership (Bryman, 2011). The MLQ was developed to expand the dimensions of leadership previously measured by other leadership surveys as they have generally ignored key factors including IM, which is often associated with successful leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1997). The overriding aim of questionnaires is to achieve maximum clarity from respondents’ answers (Layder, 2013).
3.5.2 Choosing a Leadership Measurement Instrument

Understanding that leadership can be viewed in terms of a person’s characteristics and behaviour enables researchers to view leadership as a quantifiable and measurable property differing within individuals (Jago, 1982). In order to measure leadership, an instrument is needed which effectively fits the situation. Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al. (2004) note that, unlike other fields of research, leadership has no governing authority to turn to, to determine the legitimacy or validity of a product for use (e.g. the Food and Drug Administration determining the safety of a product for consumption). Leadership theories and measurement instruments thus come under scrutiny, making the validity of established models and methods more valuable to leadership researchers (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004).

Classifying managers by their leadership style according to transactional versus transformational forms is supported by Burns (1978). While there are strong distinctions between the two, a manager may indeed possess each style simultaneously and singularly (Lowe et al., 1996). Diaz-Saenz (2011) notes that ideal leaders exhibit both transactional and transformational styles. While transformational leadership measures are diverse, the MLQ was chosen as it measures a full range of leadership styles according to the FRLT. Backed by widespread use and sufficient feedback, the MLQ is advocated to be broadly applicable to a diverse range of organisational and leadership situations (Diaz-Saenz, 2011; Johnson, 2011).

3.5.3 The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire in Context

Developed by Bass and introduced in 1985 (Antonakis & House, 2013), the MLQ is a theoretically derived survey instrument which is “one of the most widely used instruments to measure transformational leadership” (Diaz-Saenz, 2011, p. 300). The
instrument has gone through several refinements and adaptations, and consequently has become increasingly reliable (Diaz-Saenz, 2011). The instrument is used to measure leadership behaviour and the relationship between leadership styles and effectiveness and satisfaction within the work unit (Lowe et al., 1996). Leaders are evaluated according to three broad categories of leadership styles: transformational leadership, transactional leadership or laissez-faire (passive avoidant) leadership. The five I’s of transformational leadership include: IIA, IIB, IM, IS and IC. IIA refers to the attribution of charisma to a leader. This leader’s perceived positive attributes, such as power and moral values, are likely to build trust and confidence in followers. IIB refers to the positive behaviours a leader exhibits where a collective sense of mission and values are emphasised. IM refers to the vision and attitude expressed by a leader. Articulating a compelling vision for the future compels follower motivation. IS includes challenging the assumptions of followers’ beliefs and generating forward thinking and initiative. Lastly, IC refers to leaders who consider the individual needs of their followers and develop their strengths through coaching.

Transactional leadership is encapsulated within CR and MBEA. CR is based on an exchange process, whereby effective performance is rewarded. MBEA leaders actively monitor for mistakes and deviations from standards, in contrast MBEP and LF are considered passive/avoidant styles of leadership. In contrast to MBEA leaders, MBEP leaders take corrective action only after mistakes have occurred. LF is defined as non-leadership, or the absence of leadership, and is used to contrast against more active forms of leadership. A visual model of the FRLM can be found in Section 2.2.5.12. The three outcome criteria which are included in the MLQ are: followers’ Extra Effort (EE), the Effectiveness (EFF) of the leader’s behaviour, and followers’ Satisfaction (SAT) with their leader. These outcome criteria are related to the success of the group. Success
is measured by how often followers perceive their leader to be motivating, how effective followers rate their leader at different organisational levels, and how satisfied followers are with their leader’s methods of working with others. A more in-depth description of each style precedes each resultant category.

The questionnaire was employed as a self-assessment tool to measure a leader’s self-perceived behaviour; however, it does include both self and rater forms (Bass & Avolio, 2018). One aspect that has been adapted is charisma, which was an original assessment of transformational leadership but has now been transformed into inspirational influence (Díaz-Saenz, 2011). The MLQ was used within the current study to measure leadership styles of event managers according to the FRLT. Table 3.1 defines all nine categories of leadership styles as per the FRLT.
Table 3.1 The Full Range of Leadership Styles Defined (Source: Boonyachai, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Idealised Influence Attributed (IIA)</td>
<td>Instil pride in others for being associated with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idealised Influence Behavioural (IIB)</td>
<td>Display a sense of power and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirational Motivation (IM)</td>
<td>Talk about their most important values and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation (IS)</td>
<td>Specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Consideration (IC)</td>
<td>Talk optimistically about the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contingent Reward (CR)</td>
<td>Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Active)</td>
<td>Seek differing perspectives when solving problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management-by-Exception (Passive)</td>
<td>Spend time teaching and coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Help others to develop their strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus attention on irregularities,</td>
<td>Provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mistakes from the standard</td>
<td>Express satisfaction when others meet expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct attention toward failures to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meet standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to interfere until problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>become serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wait for things to go wrong before</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taking action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.5.4 Administering the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The MLQ was purchased for use by the researcher on 13 July 2014 and downloaded from [https://www.mindgarden.com/16-multifactor-leadership-questionnaire](https://www.mindgarden.com/16-multifactor-leadership-questionnaire). The researcher had permission to reproduce 50 copies of the MLQ within one year of the purchase date. As the licence had an expiry date of 13 July 2015, data collection was limited to this timeframe. All rights and responsibilities of the researcher to maintain this agreement were upheld. For a copy of the licence and example MLQ statements see Appendix D.

Online survey software Qualtrics was used to reproduce and administer the MLQ. Additional demographic information, such as age group, gender, position status, level of education, length in current role, number of volunteers under their direct management, and details pertaining to volunteer training, were also collected to ascertain the background of potential participants and better inform results. This information was also collected to gain an insight into the candidate’s suitability for further data collection. Initial contact with potential participants was made via phone and email (see Appendix A). Contact information was obtained from peers at Southern Cross University, Lismore, and through an online search of events. Those agreeing to participate were sent an email containing a link to the online questionnaire: [https://scuau.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_0VZoNSgGbRJHjb](https://scuau.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_0VZoNSgGbRJHjb). The online
questionnaire contained demographic information and the MLQ (Appendix D). Event managers were asked to respond to 45 descriptive statements that described their leadership style as they perceived them according to a five-point Likert scale (0 = ‘Not at all’, to 4 = ‘Frequently, if not always’). A few examples of item statements in the MLQ 5X short leader form included: “I talk optimistically about the future”, “I avoid making decisions”, and “I act in ways that build others’ respect for me.”

Consent to participate was obtained either at the time of the initial phone call or when the completed questionnaire was submitted to the researcher. All questionnaires received were completely filled in, thus categorisation of participants’ leadership styles was accurate as a self-rating. Event managers were informed of any possible risks associated with participating in this study and they were also informed of the benefits of participation, this being an insight into their personal leadership style. Event managers who submitted a completed questionnaire were then invited to participate in a follow-up interview at a time of their convenience. In order to complete the second phase of data collection, event managers were emailed a leadership profiling report describing their dominant leadership style (Appendix B). This afforded event managers an insight into their preferred style of leadership, as determined by the MLQ, further allowing them to consider whether this style was reflective of how they led prior to their scheduled interview.

Completion of the MLQ required participants to respond to 45 items on the MLQ 5X short leader form using a five-point behaviourual scale (0 = ‘Not at all’ to 4 = ‘Frequently, if not always’). The instrument measures each of the nine leadership styles in the full range of leadership and three outcome scales: extra effort (EE), effectiveness (EFF) and satisfaction (SAT). Each style is measured according to four statements highlighting important aspects of individual styles. The self form states that “this
questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it” (Avolio & Bass, 1995). The target leader completed the MLQ self form, evaluating how frequently or to what degree they believe they engage in leadership behaviours (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This allowed individuals to measure their perceived leadership behaviour with the purpose of reaching a value predetermined by a well-established instrument.

3.5.5 Justification for employing the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The study’s research objectives aim to address the leadership styles of event managers and their attitudes towards training event volunteers. Employing one of the ‘new leadership’ theories, the FRLT allows participants to be categorised according to a full range of leadership styles (Antonakis et al., 2003). The most common measure of transformational and transactional leaders is the MLQ, originally developed by Bass in 1985, and further adapted by Bass and Avolio (1991) (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). Den Hartog et al. (1997) acknowledge that a better understanding of transformational leadership can be gained by contrasting and comparing it to transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio (2018) argue that the MLQ is the benchmark instrument for measuring transformational leadership.

The questionnaire used in this research (the MLQ) is a known instrument, and therefore conveys a number of advantages. In fact, it “is arguably the most researched leadership instrument in the world” (MLQ International, 2008, p. 12). Popular in the field of leadership, the MLQ has been extensively researched, with Antonakis and House (2013) describing it as the “best validated instrument to represent the FRLT” (p. 18). Employing a reliable and tested method to research transformational and transactional leadership strengthens the study’s research design. Combining mixed methods fosters the use of the most innovative methods to answer the study’s research
objectives. Much of the empirical knowledge concerning transformational and transactional leadership to date has been derived from research involving the MLQ (Bass, 1999). Thus, allowing participants to voice their perceptions of their leadership style through semi-structured interviews will broaden the literature in this field.

Mixed methods were employed to enhance trustworthiness of the study. It was an essential forethought of the researcher to undertake the study in an ethical manner and contribute knowledge to the field of leadership and event management that is believable and trustworthy (Merriam, 2009). To further enhance trustworthiness of this study, the researcher attempted to follow up the findings gathered from the MLQ and interview data to flesh out more of the emergent themes identified. Attempts to extract further information from participants proved difficult, as event managers were short on time and unwilling to devote more time to interviews. Despite efforts made by the researcher to verify emergent themes, saturation point of the data was not reached, thus limiting the generalisability of findings. The data analysis techniques used in the present study are described in the next section.

**3.5.6 Qualitative Method: Semi-Structured Interviews**

Over-reliance on self-administered questionnaires has long been acknowledged by leadership researchers, and leadership studies are now being duly compensated with new and different ways of exploring such an elusive and complex phenomenon (Bryman, 2011). Klenke (2008) is one researcher arguing for this change and concludes that the interview as a primary research method is very appealing for leadership researchers; however, the use of interviews within current leadership studies has been relatively limited. Boonyachai (2011) states that interviews are the most commonly used technique for gathering qualitative data. Data that are rich, complex and detailed are not often arrived at by statistical methods (Digance & Wilson, 2001).
The interview is one of the most important techniques for gathering qualitative data (Adams, 2010). The aim of interviewing during research is to discover meaningful patterns of descriptive data by interpreting participants’ opinions verbatim (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Semi-structured interviews are conducted with a fairly open framework, allowing for conversation-like communication, and are less intrusive than other types of interviews (Hermanns, 2004). However, an interview—as opposed to a conversation—follows a clearly set theme of discussion (Hermanns, 2004). Although adhering to a standard question-and-answer structure, structured interviews were not employed as they restrict further exploration of participants’ answers (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008). Similarly, unstructured interviews were also not employed in this study as there is a high propensity to veer off topic, resulting in a lack of control on the researcher’s behalf (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008). Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they seek new insights, allow for question modification according to the flow of conversation, identify descriptive patterns and answers can be further probed to prompt exploration (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008). To explore event managers’ personal perspectives of their leadership style and perceptions of volunteer training, semi-structured interviews were considered the most effective method to build on the data obtained via the MLQ. As noted by Hersey and Blanchard (1974) a person’s self-perception of their leadership style may be different to their actual style of leadership. Such depth of information is crucial to meeting the study’s research objectives and is well-suited to exploring event managers’ perceptions and attitudes (Barriball & While, 1994).

Event managers were interviewed in the second phase of data collection after their MLQ data had been analysed and a leadership profile report was emailed back to them prior to their scheduled interview. Interviews were pre-scheduled, taking place at a
time and location convenient to event managers. The majority of semi-structured interviews took place face-to-face with participants, usually at their place of business or at a mutually convenient location. Some interviews, however, were necessary to be conducted via telephone as the participants worked and resided too far from the researcher’s hometown. After making every effort to conduct interviews via face-to-face means, financial constraints and the restricted timeframe of this research limited some interstate interviews, meaning conducting face-to-face interviews in these circumstances was not possible.

A list of interview questions guided the semi-structured interviews (refer Appendix C). Interview questions were divided into two parts to include those relating to the event managers’ leadership style and questions concerning training for volunteers. Example questions included: What does leadership mean to you? What attributes do you possess which you consider to be leadership? Could you give an example of a leadership technique you use to motivate staff? Do you believe training is necessary for this event? Are you directly involved in training? What methods do you use for training? Do you consider training a worthwhile investment? Is training necessary for all volunteers involved in this event? Questions were also asked about their industry colleagues’ attitudes toward volunteer training in order to perceive social pressure to engage in training. Such questions allowed an insight into participants’ perceptions of their personal leadership style characteristics and attitudes towards training for event volunteers.

Although guided by this list of questions, interviews took a more relaxed format, allowing participants’ answers to be furthered explored where necessary. A total of 19 semi-structured interviews were conducted, ranging from around 1 hour, to 1 hour 45 minutes. In order to more accurately ascertain event managers’ perceptions of their
leadership style and attitudes toward volunteer training during interviews, each participant was emailed a leadership profile feedback report for their individualised style of leadership according to their MLQ result prior to their arranged interview. Unforeseen challenges were faced, however, as event managers were typically difficult to intercept and arrange a meeting time with. This resulted in many potential participants who completed the first phase (the online questionnaire) but were unwilling or unable to schedule time for a semi-structured interview. The event managers’ busy schedules proved a significant limitation to this research, as participants were often running on a restricted schedule, limiting available interview time, and interviews frequently disrupted due to the participants’ need to take phone calls or address colleagues during this time.

On account of the exploratory nature of this study, open-ended questions were asked to allow participants the freedom to answer in their own words at length. This further allowed emerging issues to be explored, not as a direct result of questions pertaining to the study’s research objectives (Braun & Clarke, 2006). An online questionnaire containing demographic information and the MLQ as well as follow-up semi-structured interviews were conducted with event managers to gain the best perspective of their leadership style through a combined methodology. For interviews to be effective, the researcher had to gain participants’ trust and express empathy and knowledge of the subject throughout the interview. Unlike the constraints of the questionnaire, interviews allowed participants to express their opinions and experiences of leadership (Harrell & Bradley, 2009). Approaching interviews with this in mind allowed participants to give answers freely and without bias, minimising the challenges interviewing can sometimes face. Social desirability bias was, however, a concern throughout the data collection and is discussed below.
3.5.7 Social Desirability Bias

Ideally, participants’ perspectives and beliefs expressed during an interview or through the questionnaire would align with their actions. However, although this is the ideal, it is not always the case. There can be significant differences between a participant’s self-perception of their leadership style and their actual leadership style (Hersey & Blanchard, 1974). Social desirability bias has been identified as one of the most common sources of bias affecting the validity of research data (Nederhof, 1985). Social desirability bias implies that research participants tend to omit points that may reflect poorly on themselves and tend to say things that place them in a favourable light (Nederhof, 1985), and constituted a highly feasible potential limitation of this research.

The researcher was concerned about the potential influence of social desirability bias in the present study, as participants were asked to complete the MLQ and rate each leadership statement on a Likert scale, while also speculating on their personal competencies as a leader through their event manager role during interviews, along with their attitudes towards training volunteers. While potentially problematic, in order to minimise this bias quantitative data obtained from the MLQ were further triangulated through in-depth interviews. This allowed a more accurate insight to be gained into participants’ actual leadership style and how this can manifest in event management contexts. Additionally, deploying the MLQ, which has been empirically tested, and has been shown to be a valid and reliable instrument, contributes to limiting this social desirability bias occurring (Lowe, Kroek, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Lievens, Van Geit and Coetsier (1997) note that social desirability bias does not appear to be a strong biasing factor associated with the MLQ; however, they concede transformational scales as more socially desirable. Thus, there is a reliance on participant honesty, which is mitigated through a valid research instrument and data triangulation. Social desirability
bias is noted as a potential bias in this research, however, measures were taken to ensure a deeper investigation into participant data.

### 3.6 Data Analysis

As the growth in mixed-methods research intensifies, the requirements on analysing mixed-method data are of concern (Cameron, 2011). Analysis of mixed methods involves employing quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques within a single study (Onwuegbuzie & Combs, 2011). Mixed analysis—the term for analysing mixed-methods data—requires specific skills to integrate the multiple data sources gathered (Bazeley, 2009; Onwuegbuzie & Combs, 2011). As both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in this study, quantitative and qualitative analyses must also be involved. The advantages of employing mixed methods is to offer convergence in results of different data methods, complementary data to better enrich findings and validation of separate methods (Bazeley, 2009). Thus, the aim of mixed analysis is to illuminate the results of both quantitative and qualitative components of the research, cementing the advantages of employing mixed methods (Bazeley, 2009).

While Axinn and Pearce (2006) note that today researchers are too often secondary analysts of information that some other investigator has collected, this study’s data were collected and analysed by the sole researcher. This afforded her an insight into the limitations of collecting the data and to use introspection to her advantage. A qualitatively-driven study requires the researcher to pay special attention to understanding the world as the participants see it, measuring products of human thought (Babbie, 2013). Bazeley (2009) suggests that mixed-method researchers often believe that qualitative and quantitative data should be analysed separately first. As the quantitative component of the research was the predecessor to the qualitative
component, and interview questions were structured around participants’ responses to the questionnaire, it was necessary for analysis to take a sequential approach. A sequential mixed analysis was conducted whereby the quantitative analysis was first conducted, which then informed the subsequent qualitative analysis (Onwuegbuzie & Combs, 2011).

To follow a sequential mixed analysis, an essential first step was to analyse the quantitative data obtained from the questionnaire. As participation in the study required event managers to complete two data collection phases—an online questionnaire (1) followed by semi-structured interviews (2)—it was necessary to analyse the quantitative data to inform the qualitative interviews. As participation required completion of both phases, event managers were unable to complete the questionnaire anonymously. Anonymity was applied after all data had been collected and analysed from both sources. Participants’ responses to the MLQ were first scored by the researcher according to Bass and Avolio’s (1995) MLQ Scoring Key 5X short (for an example see Appendix D). This scoring key was purchased as part of the licence to administer the MLQ from Mind Garden. Each event managers completed MLQ responses were analysed and scored as an average score for the items on the scale. The score was derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale. This was completed for each of the nine leadership styles, within each category were four items, EE has three items, EFF has four items, and SAT has two items. The results from initial scoring can be found in Chapter 4 (Section 0) as these directly relate to the findings of Research Objective One. As a result of initial scoring, participants could be further categorised into their dominant/highest scoring style of leadership, as per the FRLT. In doing so, the researcher was able to profile each participant’s resulting preferred leadership style against researched benchmarks of the optimal frequency of
each style (provided in detail in Section 0). For analytical purposes it was necessary to
categorise participants into a ‘best fit’ style of leadership in order to achieve the thesis’
research objectives. Although this is not a primary focus of the MLQ, narrowing
participants’ results to one leadership style allowed comparisons to be made. Bass and
Avolio’s (2004) descriptive statistics for the MLQ 5X normative sample were used for
comparison here to highlight contrasts of both comparable international and Oceania
norms. Participants were then emailed a feedback report profiling their personal
dominant leadership style prior to their scheduled interview time.

The second phase of data collection involved conducting semi-structured
interviews with those event managers who completed the questionnaire. Interviews
were conducted at a time and place convenient to the participant, after presenting them
with their leadership profile feedback report (for an example see Appendix B). This was
to allow the participant to have a better understanding of their MLQ result and to
consider if this style of leadership indeed reflected their actual leadership style. The
report was generally emailed up to three days prior to participants’ scheduled interview
time to allow sufficient time to deliberate on their result, although not too far in advance
that they may forget before this time. Event managers could then suitably prepare
themselves for likely questions to come during interviews. Interviews were recorded
(with permission) so that the researcher could accurately transcribe data verbatim.

Transcription of interviews was a lengthy process; however, it allowed the researcher to
familiarise herself with the data before analysis. Qualitative data were analysed via a
thematic analysis, which aims to identify, analyse and interpret patterned meanings in
qualitative data (Braun, Clarke, & Terry, 2015). This analysis tool can potentially
provide a complex account of the data in a rich and comprehensive way (Braun &
Clarke, 2006). Braun et al. (2015) note that qualitative methods are underpinned by the
‘Big Q’, characterised by theoretical flexibility and natural coding processes where themes come to the fore. Taking such an approach to qualitative data analysis allowed the researcher to be flexible, and allowed her to dissect interview data quite systematically.

To further ensure trustworthiness of the data analysis it is imperative that researchers be clear on exactly how they analysed their data (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017). It is important to acknowledge the ‘active’ role of the researcher in deciphering data and identifying patterns/themes relevant to the study’s research topic (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This active role was evident in this study as the researcher collected and manually analysed all data, essentially immersing herself in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This involved having transcribed interview transcripts printed out and the researcher highlighting as many important concepts as possible and making notes to identify different potential themes. Interview data were initially coded in this manner as potential issues of interest to the researcher surfaced and patterned important concepts came to the fore. Themes were determined based on recurring patterns inductively derived from the data themselves (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Although there was no rigidity to the number or proportion of statements that determined themes, there were highlighted components of the data which the researcher found to link directly with the study’s objectives. The data were then reanalysed. This was done to highlight any missed themes and prominent concepts. Themes here were identified at an interpretive level, looking beyond the surface level of what the participant has said in an attempt to theorise with broader meanings and implications (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As with the very purpose of thematic analysis, themes were highlighted across the dataset so that repeated patterns were identified and further refined.
The next phase of analysis involved comparing the scored data obtained from quantitative questionnaires with individual qualitative interview transcripts. The preferred leadership styles of participants that resulted from their MLQ data were then searched for within their qualitative data. This was done using the same manual process as the initial qualitative analysis of highlighting prominent concepts. This search prompted findings of other leadership style characteristics within participants’ qualitative data. This analysis prompted comparison of each participants’ MLQ data and interview data, highlighting several contradictions within some participants’ qualitative narratives. Results of this analysis linked directly with Research Objective Two, which aimed to explore participants’ perceptions of their own leadership style compared to their categorised MLQ leadership style.

Data in this study were coded separately according to individual quantitative and qualitative analysis methods. Quantitative data were coded using Bass and Avolio’s (1995) MLQ Scoring Key 5X short, analysed by the researcher with permission. A thematic approach was followed for qualitative interview data analysis, which allows core themes to be inductively derived (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A mixed analysis allowed quantitative and qualitative data to complement and ‘add to’ one another (Layder, 2013). This process lets findings pertinent to the research objectives come to the fore as well as emergent findings to be explored. The verified and reliable foundation of the MLQ questionnaire established a foundation for further exploring the event managers’ leadership styles utilising in-depth semi-structured interviews. The limitations of the methods employed and other methodological limitations are discussed in Section 3.9.
3.7 Methodological Limitations

The epistemological orientation for this study sits within the field of pragmatism. The research is concerned with perceptions/attitudes of event managers and their individual styles of leadership, which generally lend themselves to components of both qualitative and quantitative research. Thus, a mixed-methods design was employed to effectively address the study’s research objectives. Additionally, purposive sampling selected event managers to participate within the study. This involved quite deliberate choices of research participants. While limiting the participant population, it was used as it required clear objectivity and allowed the researcher to permeate a difficult-to-access group of people (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). Further, as purposive sampling is indeed deliberate in approach, this is in fact a strength in the intentional bias (Dolores & Tongco, 2007).

The mixed methods employed were chosen as they provide different perspectives and the combination of collected data results in a more complete understanding of the research problem than either one method can obtain by itself (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Each method has its limitations; however, the limitations of one method can be offset by the strengths of the other (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Firstly, case studies were chosen as they are concerned with everyday experiences, and thus are applicable to real-life situations while offering manageable and flexible data collection (Veal, 2005). The events selected were mainly smaller, locally-run events from across the East Coast of Australia. There were a few larger national events; however, the selection criteria ensured that participants managed events similar in size and with a similar number of volunteers. Accessing the event management population proved difficult, hence data saturation was not reached;
findings are therefore not generalisable to the wider event management or leadership literature (Diefenbach, 2009).

Next, questionnaires rarely permit exploration of the phenomenon being studied. Participants are limited to choosing from a fixed set of alternatives, with analysis based on predetermined categories (Layder, 2013). The advantage of conducting follow-up semi-structured interviews was to build on the findings of the questionnaire data. While this is a strength of the research, limitations apply to interviews just like any other research method. Although regarded as best practice, interviewing is typically a time-consuming method where data are recorded and transcribed verbatim, usually by the researcher (Rowley, 2012). Demands are more highly placed on the researcher when using interviews (Rowley, 2012); however, the depth gained from allowing participants the space to talk can reveal new insights—crucial to the exploratory nature of this study (Adams, 2010).

The MLQ itself was only used in the self form due to the time restrictions placed on the researcher and data collection. The research objectives focused on the leadership styles of event managers and their personal perceptions of their leadership style, thus it was only necessary to collect self-ratings. Employing the rater form would have broadened the data for this study and offered additional insights from followers, it was, however, beyond the scope of this study. Future research could potentially obtain completed MLQ data from both leaders and followers in the same scenario to offer a different perspective of event managers’ leadership styles.

Researcher subjectivity and bias are ingrained with qualitative research (Delahaye, 2005). Despite the limitations of qualitative research, this method aims to increase understanding of a phenomenon, as opposed to generalising findings (Byrne, 2001). Bias also stems from the case study design and sampling procedures employed.
Further limitations include the limited resources of the researcher, such as time and money. The deadline imposed by the PhD thesis requirements placed additional limitations on the sequential phase of data collection, and accessing event managers and securing an interview time with them was difficult as the very nature of event management is busy, running to scheduled timeframes.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

According to Mertens and Ginsberg (2009), there are two fundamental ethical issues of concern to social scientists. The first involves the proper way to collect, analyse and report research data, while the second—receiving considerably more scholarly attention—concerns the behaviour of the researcher with respect to their research subjects (Mertens & Ginsberg, 2009). Essentially, the researcher aimed to carry out the study in an overall ethical manner and contribute believable and trustworthy knowledge to the field (Merriam, 2009). A mixed-methods approach was justifiably chosen based on the study’s research objectives, where it was necessary to determine leadership styles of event managers using a quantitative questionnaire and qualitative semi-structured interviews. Veal (2005) recognises the mixed-methods approach as an inherent strength of the research design, while Axinn and Pearce (2006) argue that there are three distinct advantages to varying the approach to data collection: (1) to provide new/alternative information from different method, (2) to reduce non-sampling error by providing redundant information from different sources, and (3) potential bias can be eliminated in different methods. The highly structured nature of the MLQ instrument, supplemented with less-structured interviews, combined to add researcher involvement and to provide numerical and narrative data useful for understanding participants’ perceptions (Axinn & Pearce, 2006).
Before taking part in the questionnaire, participants were contacted via email/phone to discuss requirements and consent to participating in the study. They were then informed that all information collected would be kept anonymously and confidentially and they were free to withdraw from the study at any point if they did not feel comfortable. For the event managers, individual informed consent was obtained from initial contact and on completion of the MLQ, and also verbally prior to conducting the semi-structured interview. Bass and Avolio (1995) advocate the no-login method of administration to anonymise data; however, this was not used in the present study as it was necessary to link participants’ MLQ data with their interview data.

Guidance from the researcher’s ordinary moral sense dictated the research, where what she has learned from a previous research study (Honours) and her lifetime experiences, together with a moral character, predisposed her to act in morally appropriate ways (Mertens & Ginsberg, 2009). In fact, this can be considered more important than a set of ethical rules or principles (Mertens & Ginsberg, 2009). To act ethically, the researcher abided by specific codes of practice as noted by Mertens and Ginsberg (2009), including nonmaleficence, beneficence, respect for persons, fidelity and justice. Additionally, ethics approval (ECN-14-181) for the study was obtained from Southern Cross University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC).

3.9 Chapter Summary

Chapter Three described the methodology and the methods undertaken by the researcher for the purposes of examining the leadership styles of event managers and the variance in their attitudes towards volunteer training. This study is underlined by a pragmatic research design in order to employ a mixed-method approach to effectively address all four research objectives. A quantitative online questionnaire containing demographic
questions and the validated and reliable MLQ was emailed to potential participants.

Follow-up qualitative semi-structured interviews were then conducted with those respondents willing to make time to discuss their leadership style with the researcher. Such methods were found to be advantageous to this study, as interviews elicited rich, experiential data that build upon the results obtained from the questionnaire. Chapter Four now turns attention to presenting the findings of Research Objective One in depth.
CHAPTER 4: EVENT MANAGERS’ LEADERSHIP STYLES

4.1 Introduction

With the methods used to address the research objectives in the previous chapter having been outlined, this chapter is the first of three results chapters which present the findings of this study. Chapter Four aims to present the findings pertaining to Research Objective One: Identify and categorise leadership styles of event managers according to an established theory. The chapter will take the following structure. Firstly, a description of the sample is described. This is followed by a demographic profiling of each participant and their leadership style categorisation according to their MLQ result. Lastly, a summary of the results relating to Research Objective One is described.

4.2 Description of the Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 19 event managers who held senior leadership positions within events based along the eastern seaboard of Australia, geographically spanning from Bright, Vic, to the Gold Coast, Qld. They managed sporting, cultural, music and arts events, all of which included a wide array of different individual themes. As discussed in Chapter Three, the sample was chosen based on an event manager’s suitability to the study, specifically the number of volunteers they managed and the degree to which they provided training for these volunteers. Participants were further selected based on their role within the event organisation. Thus, they were purposively chosen based on their level of management, being the most senior manager and their role in the training of event volunteers.
Further, the sample of participants was selected based on their ability to provide information germane to the research objectives and the interviewees’ accessibility and willingness to participate. Accessibility of event managers and their willingness to participate became a significant logistical issue in conducting this study and invoked certain limitations on the research as discussed in Section 3.8. As an attempt to overcome accessibility issues, snowball sampling resulted from this limitation as a complementary strategy to obtain more comprehensive data (Atkinson & Flint, 2001).

To protect the anonymity of the participants, they were each given a pseudonym that will serve the purpose of identifying their individual responses from the online questionnaire and follow-up semi-structured interviews. Additionally, no events will be identified within this thesis to further preserve participants’ anonymity. Table 4.1, however, outlines participants’ demographics and their highest scoring leadership style according to the MLQ, along with the type of event they represent.
Table 4.1 MLQ Categorisation and Demographic Characteristics of Event Managers Interviewed in this Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>MLQ Leadership Style</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age¹</th>
<th>Type of Event</th>
<th>Work Status²</th>
<th>Approximate Weekly Hours Worked</th>
<th>Highest level of Education³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addisyn</td>
<td>IIB &amp; IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25 or under</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>IIB &amp; IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25 or under</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Cultural/Music/Food</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>Music/Cultural/Art</td>
<td>Volunteer (part-time)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>High School or Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>IS &amp; IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Volunteer (part-time)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>High School or Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>IIA &amp; IIB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>IIB &amp; IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25 or under</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>IS &amp; IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexi</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsay</td>
<td>IS &amp; IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41–55</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>MLQ Leadership Style</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age¹</td>
<td>Type of Event</td>
<td>Work Status²</td>
<td>Approximate Weekly Hours Worked</td>
<td>Highest level of Education³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Cultural/Music</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26–40</td>
<td>Cultural/Music</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Age was determined based on participants choosing one of four options: 25 or under, 26–40, 41–55, or 56 or older.

²Work status suggests this is their main form of work and was determined based on participants choosing one of five options: Employed Full-Time (More than 35 hours/week), Employed Part-Time, Casual, Volunteer (Full-Time) or Volunteer (Part-Time).

³Highest level of education was determined based on participants choosing one of four options: High school or equivalent, TAFE, Undergraduate Degree or Postgraduate Degree.
Table 4.1 shows that the majority of participants were female, equating to just over two-thirds of the participants involved in this study. Most participants were in the 26–40 age group, closely followed by the 56 or older age category, and the majority worked full-time (more than 35 hours/week). Only one participant was categorised in the 41–55 age group and three were aged 25 or under. All but two participants had completed some form of post-secondary education, ranging from TAFE to postgraduate degrees. It can be noted that those two participants who work as volunteers came from a high school or equivalent background and both scored highest in the MBEA leadership category. The two participants with postgraduate degrees were in the 56 or older age category and, interestingly, both resulted in an IC high score.

4.3 Training Offered at the Case Study Events

As training is a core concept and basis for analysis in this study it was part of this study’s purposive selection criteria case study events must provide training to some degree. Table 4.2 summarises participants’ initial responses to the online questionnaire item: ‘Does this event organisation have a formal training program in place for event volunteers?’ and their answers when questioned about training during interviews. Initial responses varied significantly, with only eight participants (less than half) answering “yes” to a formal training program. This was, however, clarified during the semi-structured interviews, as all 19 participants acknowledged that they do indeed deliver volunteer training to some degree. While the formality of training was diverse, all participants ultimately agreed that training was certainly delivered at their event. For some of the smaller local events training could be delivered the morning of the event, informally, and based purely on the skill set required to undertake the role. However, some of the larger events required more sophisticated training in the days prior to the
event, which was of a more formal nature. Although the level of training was not
standard across the case study events, all event managers recognised that no volunteer
would undertake their role without direction, supervision and training.

Table 4.2 Training Provided and Approximate Number of Volunteers for Each Event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Online Questionnaire: Any form of volunteer training?</th>
<th>Interview: Any form of volunteer training?</th>
<th>Average number of volunteers working for the event</th>
<th>Average number of volunteers directly managed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addisyn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>500+</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsay</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>300+</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were also asked via the online questionnaire “How many volunteers
work in this event organisation?” and “How many volunteers are under your direct
management?” These questions were implemented to facilitate a comparison of event
sizes in relation to their volunteer numbers. This permitted insight into the estimated
number of volunteers working at each event and an estimate of how many of those volunteers each participant personally managed. Table 4.2 reflects the varying numbers of volunteers across events, ranging from around 20 volunteers to as many as 1100 volunteers. Each event manager was responsible for the direct management of a number of volunteers starting from as few as five.

4.4 Event Managers’ MLQ Leadership Styles

Research Objective One relies on the use of the MLQ to identify and categorise event managers according to their leadership style. Measuring leadership styles using the MLQ adds rigour to the study by utilising a quantitative, and therefore objective, approach to measuring leadership (Avolio et al., 2003). This questionnaire was chosen based on extensive and validated prior research (Bass & Avolio, 2018) and because it is relatively easy for participants to follow (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This section is devoted to the results obtained from completed participants’ online questionnaires.

In order to accurately present a benchmark for leadership styles, comparison norms were obtained to compare study results. According to Bass and Avolio’s (1997) manual for the MLQ, effective leaders are rated in accordance with the Likert scale of the MLQ. Effective leaders display transformational leadership behaviours, including: all five I’s at least fairly often (3.0), CR at least sometimes (2.0), MBEA can be between sometimes (2.0) and once in a while (1.0), and MBEA and LF leadership should be between once in a while (1.0) and not at all (0.0). Bass and Avolio’s (2004) descriptive statistics for the MLQ 5X normative sample, obtained from Mind Garden Inc. “www.mindgarden.com”, are used in this study for comparison. Noting both international and Oceania (covering Australia, New Zealand and Pacific Islands) norms
allows for greater comparability. Additionally, group norms are also displayed to show comparison amongst study participants.

Table 4.3 presents the results of the online questionnaire administered to participants. Participants’ results were calculated and are denoted as the mean of their scores. Each participant was categorised into a leadership style(s) based on the highest scores of their completed MLQ. Individual participants’ high scores are relative to the results of their completed MLQ only. For example, Karen’s IC high score of 3.5 was calculated as the mean of her total IC statement ratings. High scores for each participant are highlighted in the full range of leadership styles and outcomes of leadership measured by the MLQ. All nine full range of leadership style factors are shown and are represented as follows: IIA, IIB, IM, IS, IC, CR, MBEA, MBEP and LF. Outcomes of leadership are represented as follows: EE, EFF and SAT. Additionally, the mean scores for this group have been calculated to show the overall ratings for the study. In order to have a benchmark comparison, two norms are shown: universal and Oceania.
Table 4.3 Categorisation of Participant Results using Bass and Avolio’s (1995) MLQ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MBEA</th>
<th>MBEP</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>EE</th>
<th>EFF</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addisyn</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>CR</td>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>EFF</td>
<td>SAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexi</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsay</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Average</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Norms*</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania Norms*</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Universal norms have been taken from Bass and Avolio’s (2006) MLQ feedback report prepared for sample MLQ report (pp. 18–20).

* Oceania norms have been taken from Bass and Avolio’s (2004) MLQ International Normative Samples (p. 3) retrieved from [www.mindgarden.com/documents/MLQInternationalNorms.pdf](http://www.mindgarden.com/documents/MLQInternationalNorms.pdf)

* Highlighted sections denote high scores for both leadership style and outcomes of leadership.
From Table 4.3 it can be seen that participants’ highest scores differed across the sample, resulting in a diversity of results in seven out of nine leadership styles. As noted, high scores are highlighted in grey for individual participants for both their leadership styles and outcomes of leadership. Highlighting participants’ high scores allows comparison and contrast within the study. CR leadership exhibited the highest group average and SAT averaged highest for leadership outcomes among these event managers. For comparison, Avolio and Bass (1995) state that an optimal and balanced MLQ profile implies 3.0 or higher on the transformational components, 2.0 or lower on transactional components, and 1.0 or lower on LF components. Two norms are given, universal and Oceania, to compare against benchmark standards. Participants in this study scored on average higher in five out of the nine benchmark styles for both universal and Oceania norms, with only minimal below-average results compared to Oceania norms in IS, IC and MBEP leadership styles, and only MBEA and LF resulting in lower than universal norms against the group average. EFF and SAT outcomes of leadership cleared their benchmark norms, with only EE falling slightly below the Oceania norm by 0.01. A closer examination of event managers’ MLQ high score results ensues.

### 4.5 Transformational Leaders

Transformational leadership is an influencing process whereby leaders change their followers’ awareness of what is important and afford them a new way of looking at challenges of their environment (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Transformational leadership styles alone are not the answer; however, they are said to augment the more traditional/transactional leadership behaviours (Bass & Avolio, 1997). The MLQ assesses transformational leadership across five categories: IIA, IIB, IM, IS and IC. A
full review of transformational leadership and its five sub-scales are discussed in detail in Chapter Two. The following results are those of event managers who resulted in a transformational style of leadership.

According to the MLQ analysis 15 of the 19 event managers, almost 80%, exhibited in a transformational leadership style category. This is a significant finding and reveals that the majority of participants scored highest in transformational categories. Only one participant scored highly in the IIA category. The IC category gained the highest scores overall, with nine of the 15 scoring highest here. Some participants scored highly in a single category, while a number scored equally highly in two categories, both falling into the transformational sector. No participant scored highly in two different categories across both transformational and transactional leadership styles.

Table 4.4 represents the participants who scored highly in transformational categories. The shaded boxes are the styles each participant scored highest in, with some participants scoring highly in two categories, denoted by an asterisk. Seven of the 15 participants scored equally highly in two leadership categories, while eight participants exhibited a single-category high score. Each individual participant’s high scores will now be discussed according to their transformational or transactional result.
Table 4.4 Participants’ Categorised Transformational Leadership Style Result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addisyn*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsay*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes participants with equal high scores in more than one leadership style.

Highlighted areas denote participants’ high scores as a result of the completed MLQ.

Participants with a transformational leadership style result will now be discussed individually to critically analyse the qualitative data and thereby assess the veracity of their MLQ result in comparison to their perception of their personal leadership style.

4.5.1 Addisyn - IIB and IC Leader

Managing an art event on the Gold Coast, Qld, Addisyn was female and aged 25 or under. She held an undergraduate degree and was working approximately 37.5 hours per week full-time. The results of the MLQ revealed Addisyn to be a combined Factor 2 – IIB and a Factor 5 – IC leader. A combined high score in these two categories suggests that Addisyn leads in an ethically moral way and tends to provide socio-
emotional support to her team. As previously discussed, an IIB leader behaves charismatically, reflecting their values and beliefs and conveying a sense of purpose, while an IC leader spends time coaching and mentoring in order to meet the needs of individuals. Alloting no points to LF questionnaire items generated a 0 overall score for that leadership style. Addisyn rated the following statement “I emphasise the importance of having a collective sense of mission” a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). Alternately, she rated “I delay responding to urgent questions” as 0 (‘not at all’). A high score of 3.5 in both IIB and IC categories is above the average benchmark norms. Addisyn also scored highly in two outcomes of leadership, with a score of 3 in both EFF and SAT, perceiving herself to work satisfactorily with others and effectively meet organisational requirements.

4.5.2 Aimee - IIB and IC Leader

Aimee was a female aged 25 or under. She worked full-time as an event manager approximately 37.5 hours per week and had achieved an undergraduate degree as her highest level of education. Aimee managed a sporting event on the Gold Coast, Qld. According to the MLQ, Aimee scored highly as a combination of two leadership categories, Factor 2 – IIB and Factor 5 – IC, with her lowest score in the Factor 9 – LF category. Her high scores are both forms of transformational leadership, where the leader is admired for having a collective mission and actively building trust and confidence in their team. For example, Aimee rated the statement “I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group” as a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’) on the behavioural scale. Whereas the statement “I avoid getting involved when important issues arise” was nominated as 0 (‘not at all’). The contrast in ratings here is evident. Universal norms for IIB and IC are rated 2.6. Aimee’s results indicated a 3.5 for both categories, displaying an above-average score in these categories. Aimee rated
herself highest in the SAT outcome of leadership, perceiving that her methods of leading and working with others are satisfactory.

4.5.3 Amanda – IIB Leader
Amanda managed a cultural/music/food event in Ballina, NSW, and was a female aged 26–40 years old. She held an undergraduate degree and worked full-time as an event manager, approximately 38 hours each week. Amanda’s MLQ result categorised her solely as a Factor 2 – IIB leader. A high score in this category reflects a leader’s desire to act as a role model for their followers and embody the values which they believe in by leading by example. Scoring a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’) for the statement “I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decision” highlights the moral responsibilities of an IIB leader. Her lowest score was in the Factor 9 – LF category, essentially a form of non-leadership and an inactive leadership style. This is reflected in the fact that Amanda rated the statement “I avoid making decisions” as 0 (‘not at all’) on the Likert scale. A high score of 3.5 in the IIB category was above the group average. Universal norms for IIB are 2.6 and Oceania norms are 3.05, so a score of 3.5 is above-average in relation to the norms as well. She also scored above group-average scores in six out of the other eight leadership styles. A high score of 3.5 in SAT for leadership outcomes suggests she believes her followers view her leadership style as satisfactory.

4.5.4 Claire – IS and IC Leader
Claire was a 26–40 year old female who managed an art event. She held an undergraduate degree and was working full-time approximately 40 hours per week. Claire was another participant resulting in a combination leadership style, exhibiting equally high scores in both Factor 4 – IS and Factor 5 – IC. IS refers to how leaders
question the status quo. Leaders appeal to followers’ intellect and invite new ways of problem-solving. While IC refers to leaders who tend to spend time coaching and counselling followers. Claire scored lowest in the Factor 9 – LF category. For example, Claire rated the statement “I get others to look at problems from many different angles” a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). Similarly, she also rated the statement “I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group” a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). These represent two differing behaviours of IS and IC leadership styles respectively. Universal norms are represented by a score of 2.5 for IS and 2.6 for IC. Claire scored an equal high of 3.5 in both categories, displaying an above-average score here. Claire also scored equally highly in two outcomes of leadership: EFF and SAT.

4.5.5 Connor – IM Leader

Connor was a 26–40 year old male managing a sporting event in Lismore, NSW. He had achieved an undergraduate degree and was working around 50 hours full-time each week. Connor scored highly in the Factor 3 – IM category. This form of transformational leadership is where the leader prominently aims to inspire and motivate followers to reach ambitious goals. An equal low score resulted for both the Factor 9 – LF and Factor 8 – MBEP categories. For example, scoring high with a four (‘frequently, if not always’), Connor resonated strongly with the statement “I articulate a compelling vision of the future.” The statement “I fail to interfere until problems become serious”, on the other hand, was rated as 0 (‘not at all’). Universal norms for IM leaders are rated 2.6 and Oceania norms are 3.07. With a high score of 3.75 Connor scored well above benchmark averages in this category. Like many other participants, Connor scored himself highly in the SAT outcome of leadership. This suggests Connor
considers his followers perceive him to be satisfactory in the way he leads and works with them.

### 4.5.6 Jenny – IIA and IIB Leader

Managing a music event, Jenny was a 56 or older female. She had a TAFE education and worked full-time, approximately 40 hours each week. Jenny was another event manager with equal high scores in two different leadership categories. The results of the MLQ determined she scored highest in the Factor 1 – IIA and Factor 2 – IIB categories. Both are transformational leadership styles with a focus on emotional and behavioural qualities of the leader as perceived by the leader. IIA refers to the socialised charisma of the leader, while IIB refers to the charismatic actions of the leader. She also had equal low scores in both Factor 8 – MBEP and Factor 9 – LF. Jenny scored the following statements a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’), “I talk about my most important values and beliefs” and “I instil pride in others for being associated with me”. Universal norms for IIA are rated 2.5 and 2.6 for IIB. Her high and low score results fall at opposing ends of the FRLM spectrum, displaying a vast difference in behaviours. Jenny had an equal high score in two outcomes of leadership, —EFF and SAT, —perceiving her followers to consider her an effective leader at all levels of the organisation and rating her methods of leadership as satisfactory.

### 4.5.7 Karen – IIB and IC Leader

Managing a cultural event in southern New South Wales (NSW), Karen was female and in the 25 or under age category. She had achieved an undergraduate degree as her highest education level and worked part-time approximately 10.5 hours per week. Karen scored equally highly in two categories as a Factor 2 – IIB leader and a Factor 5 – IC leader. Her lowest score was as a Factor 7 – MBEA leader, with a second lowest score
An IC leader shows a high degree of interest in others’ wellbeing, assigns projects individually and treats followers based on their individual needs. An IIB leader, on the other hand, is considered someone who ‘walks the talk’ and key strengths are namely building trust and confidence within followers. A combination of these two leadership styles displays a focus on hands-on and coaching styles of leadership. Analysing her MLQ responses, Karen rated the statement “I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others” as a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). As well as rating the statement “I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose” also as a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). This reflects her result of a combined high score in multiple categories as an IIB and IC leader, while she rated the statement “I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action” as 0 (‘not at all’). Universal norms for IIB and IC are rated 2.6, while Karen scored a high 3.5 in both of these categories. Karen’s highest outcome of leadership was in the SAT category, reflecting her belief that she satisfactorily leads and works well with her team.

4.5.8 Lesley – IS and IC Leader

Lesley managed a cultural event in Brisbane, Qld. She had achieved an undergraduate degree as her highest level of education and was categorised in the 26–40 age group. Working approximately 37.5 hours per week she was considered a full-time manager. As per the results of the MLQ, Lesley was analysed as being a multiple-category leader, with high scores in both Factor 4 – IS and Factor 5 – IC leadership styles. These are both forms of transformational leadership with an emphasis on intelligence and attention to others. IS leaders challenge followers to be innovative and creative, while the IC leader provides socio-emotional support to followers. This combination leader appeals to their team’s intellect, while developing and empowering them. This is
reflected with Lesley rating the statements “I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments” and “I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others” a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). Although scoring lowest in the MBEP and LF categories, these were above group-average scores. Interestingly, Lesley had lower than group-average scores across the board for all transformational and transactional leadership styles. She tended to favour ‘once in a while’ and ‘sometimes’ ratings, according to MLQ results. For example, she rated the statement “I spend time teaching and coaching” a 2 (‘sometimes’), despite resulting in a high score in the IC category to which this item belongs.

4.5.9 Lexi – IC Leader
Managing a cultural event in southern NSW, Lexi was a 56 or older female. Lexi held a postgraduate degree and worked full-time approximately 44 hours each week. Lexi scored most highly in the Factor 5 – IC category, with her lowest score in the Factor 7 – MBEA category. IC refers to behaviour that results in follower satisfaction. Here the leader displays behaviours such as support, advising and paying attention to individuals’ needs, allowing them to develop and self-actualise. Lexi gave a high score of 4 (‘frequently, if not always’) for the statement, “I spend time teaching and coaching”, revealing her supportive nature as an IC leader. Contrastingly, she rated the MBEA statement “I wait for things to go wrong before taking action” a 0 (‘not at all’). Universal norms for an IC leader are rated 2.6; however, Lexi scored a 4 in this category. A high score in the SAT leadership outcome for Lexi reveals her belief that her followers see her methods of leadership as satisfactory.
4.5.10  Lyndsay – IS and IC Leader

Lyndsay was a female who managed an art-based event. She was categorised in the 56 or older age group and worked full-time, approximately 50 hours per week. Lyndsay was one of only two participants who had achieved a postgraduate degree as her highest level of education. Lyndsay scored highly in quite a large number of categories, displaying high scores in all transformational styles. She scored equally highly in Factor 4 – IS and Factor 5 – IC. Again, these are both forms of transformational leadership. The IS leader challenges followers to be innovative and creative, while the IC leader provides socio-emotional support to followers. She scored lowest in the Factor 9 – LF category. However, with only one statement scoring 0 (‘not at all’), “I avoid getting involved when important issues arise”, scores were higher than usual for this participant. Universal norms for an IS leader are rated 2.5, while again an IC leader is rated 2.6. Lyndsay scored equally high in both categories, with a 4 for both IS and IC styles of leadership. This meant she scored a 4 for every statement of IS and IC leadership, suggesting a high regard for those facets of her leadership style. Interestingly, Lyndsay scored above average on the universal norms in all leadership styles except MBEA. Lyndsay also rated EE most highly in her outcomes of leadership, being the only participant to score most highly in this category. This outcome focuses strongly on how motivating the leader is perceived to be, suggesting the leader pushes their followers to achieve more than they expect and increases their desire to succeed.

4.5.11  Matt – IM Leader

Matt was a 26–40 year old male with TAFE as his highest level of education. He managed a sporting event in Lismore, NSW, and worked full-time approximately 40 hours each week. According to his MLQ results, Matt scored highest as a Factor 4 – IM leader. This form of transformational leadership refers to leaders who inspire and
motivate their followers to achieve more than they thought they could accomplish. Matt rated the statement “I talk optimistically about the future” a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’), demonstrating this link with IM tendencies. Scoring lowest in the Factor 9 – LF category, he rated the statement “I delay responding to urgent questions” as 0 (‘not at all’). Universal norms for an IM leader are 2.6, however, Matt scored highly in this category with a score of 3.75. With a score of 3.5 in the SAT category for outcomes of leadership, this indicates Matt perceives his style of leadership is adequate to his followers. This is an above-average score, with universal norms at 2.5 and Oceania norms at 3.12 for this category.

4.5.12 Michelle – IC Leader

Michelle managed an art event and was a female in the 26–40 age group. Her highest level of education was TAFE and she worked full-time. She noted that her weekly hours were approximately 60, which is the highest nominated weekly hours worked in this study. Michelle was found to score highest in the Factor 5 – IC category for her leadership style. This form of transformational leadership refers to leaders who consider the individual wants and needs of their followers and develop their individual strengths through mentoring. An equal low score was achieved in two categories, a Factor 8 – MBEP and Factor 9 – LF. These leadership styles are at the opposite end of the FRLM. An IC leader typically relates strongly with the statement, “I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group”. Michelle rated this statement a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’), showing she indeed resonates strongly with this category of leader. Universal norms for an IC leader are rated 2.6, while Michelle scored an above-average score of 3.5. Michelle rated equal high scores for both EFF and SAT leadership outcomes. This finding suggests her perceived belief that followers would rate her as
effective and satisfactory in the way she meets organisational requirements and works with others respectively.

4.5.13 Sally – IC Leader

Sally was another female participant in the 26–40 age category. She managed a cultural/music event and had a TAFE educational background. She approximated working around 40 hours per week, classifying herself as a full-time manager. According to the MLQ, Sally scored highest in the Factor 5 – IC category. A form of transformational leadership, an IC leader provides socio-emotional support to followers while developing and empowering them. Sally scored lowest in the Factor 9 – LF category. This is evidenced in her scoring the statement “I am absent when needed” as 0 (‘not at all’). Although scoring highest in the IC category, Sally scored only one IC statement a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). This MLQ item was “I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others”, which stands out as the prominent ideal for this leader. The universal norm for an IC leader is rated 2.6; Sally scored a 3.25 in this category. Like Jenny, Sally scored equally highly in both the EFF and SAT outcomes of leadership. This suggests Sally perceived her followers would highly rate her ability to lead effectively at different levels of the organisation and her leadership methods as satisfactory.

4.5.14 Sophie – IIB Leader

Sophie was a 26–40 year old female who managed a cultural/music event in Lismore, NSW. She had achieved an undergraduate degree as her highest level of education and worked around 30 hours per week, considered part-time work. The results of the MLQ found Sophie to score highly in the Factor 2 – IIB category. This type of transformational leader behaves in ways that result in them being admired, respected
and trusted, such that their followers wish to emulate them. Interestingly, Sophie gave no 0 ratings for any items of the MLQ. An example of a high-scoring statement, “I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose”, is identified in the IIB category with a rating of 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). This resulted in her scores being more even across all categories. Her lowest score was, however, in the Factor 9 – LF category. IIB leadership and LF leadership are at opposing ends of the FRLM spectrum. Universal norms for an IIB leader are scored at 2.6, while Sophie was above this benchmark, scoring a 3.5. Sophie interestingly scored highest in the EFF outcome of leadership category. She was the only participant to score highest in this outcome as her solo result. This suggests her belief that followers believe she can effectively meet their job-related needs and that she led an effective team.

4.5.15 Steph – IM Leader

Steph managed a cultural event on the Gold Coast, Qld, working full-time approximately 40 hours each week. She was a female in the 56 or older age group and held a TAFE educational qualification. Steph scored highest in the IM category on the MLQ. This form of transformational leadership refers to leaders who communicate a level of confidence that followers can indeed achieve ambitious objectives and strongly motivate their teams to reach seemingly unreachable goals. She scored lowest in the MBEP category, suggesting a low regard for inactive and ineffective leadership. Steph rated the statement “I express confidence that goals will be achieved” a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’). In contrast, the statement “I wait for things to go wrong before taking action” was scored a 0 (‘not at all’). This displays a comparison of the behaviours Steph considered important to those that she used to a lesser degree. Steph scored a high of 3.25 for IM leadership, above the group average of 3.18. Her results in the other eight leadership styles were fairly mid-range and below the group average in all other styles.
Steph scored a high 3.5 in the SAT outcomes of leadership category, meaning she perceived her followers to see her leadership style as satisfactory to them.

### 4.5.16 Summary: Transformational Leaders

This section presented the results of event managers in this study who were categorised as transformational leaders. Data showed that 15 participants reflected a transformational leadership style, with some exhibiting multiple leadership styles. Initial analysis of participants’ MLQ results revealed that all five transformational leadership styles were represented within the sample of event managers. IIA was the least represented style, with a group average of 2.89 and only a single categorisation. Contrastingly, IC recorded the largest number of high scores with nine participants, with IIB leadership close behind with six participants. Both of these styles, however, averaged group scores of 3.16, coming in behind IM leadership with a group average of 3.18. This is interesting to note, as only three participants scored highest in this category; however, overall participant scores averaged higher. The following section explores the results of participants scoring highest in transactional styles.

### 4.6 Transactional Leaders

Transactional leadership is characterised by a mutually beneficial exchange relationship, where rewards are often exchanged for compliance or performance. Transactional leadership styles when used solely can be limiting; however, they are said to be employed to some degree by all leaders (Marturano & Gosling, 2008). Far from opposing approaches, transactional and transformational leadership can complement each other (Robbins et al., 2008) and, when used in conjunction, a leader can effectively caputlate all styles of leadership. According to Antonakis and House (2002),
transactional leadership comprises three factors: CR, MBEA and MBEP. However, participants dominantly scored highly in only CR and MBEA styles.

It has been determined that four out of the 19 participants displayed transactional leadership styles. High scores from these four participants resulted in above-average scores overall against the benchmark universal and Oceania norms and group-average scores. The group-average score for CR leadership was 3.25. The universal norm for this category was 2.5 and the Oceania norms was 2.9. This resulted in a higher study average than the aforementioned norms and, subsequently, the Factor 6 – CR leadership style scored highest overall in group averages. Similarly, MBEA had a group-average score of 2.11, which exceeded the universal norm of 1.7 and Oceania norm of 1.08. Interestingly, while some leaders scoring highest in transformational leadership styles scored equally highly in two categories, those scoring highest in transactional styles only scored highly in a single category.

Table 4.5 shows the participants who scored highest in transactional leadership styles in this study. The shaded boxes highlight the style each participant scored highest in. The event managers who exhibited a transactional high score, scored highly in only a single category, unlike many of the transformational participants. Interestingly, of the four participants with transactional leadership style results, all were male. Elijah and Chris resulted in an MBEA high score and were both in the 56 or older age group, with their highest education level being high school or equivalent. Both of these participants were the only event managers who worked as volunteers on a full-time basis, averaging around 20 hours per week. Daniel and Mark, both CR leaders, held a TAFE qualification as their highest education level. All four transactional event managers had a significantly lower than group-average educational background, and as half were volunteers they also exhibited a lower than group-average hours worked per week. The
participants resulting in transactional styles of leadership are now discussed in further
detail.

Table 4.5 Participants Categorised as having Transactional Leadership Styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Contingent Reward</th>
<th>Management-by-Exception Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 Chris – MBEA Leader

Chris was male aged 56 or older who managed a music/cultural/art event. His highest
level of education was high school or equivalent. He worked approximately 20 hours
per week as a full-time volunteer event manager. His MLQ responses revealed that
Chris scored highest in the Factor 7 – MBEA style of leadership. The MBEA leader
actively monitors deviations from norms and provides corrective action based on
mistakes and errors. This form of transactional leadership can be considered a negative
transaction due to the attentive monitoring of performance based highly on corrective
action. Rating the statement “I keep track of all mistakes” a 4 (‘frequently, if not
always’) revealed Chris’s tendency to favour MBEA traits. Chris’ scores for all
transformational styles were below group and benchmark norms. However, his scores
for MBEA, MBEP and LF were all above the groups averages for those styles.
Universal norms for MBEA are 1.7, whereas Chris scored a well above-average rating
of 3.5 for this category. For the outcomes of leadership, he scored highest in the SAT
category, revealing he perceives that his leadership style is regarded as satisfactory by
his team.
4.6.2 Daniel – CR Leader

Daniel managed a cultural event in southern NSW. He was a male aged 26–40 and held a TAFE qualification as his highest level of education. He worked full-time, approximately 38.5 hours each week as an event manager. The results of the MLQ found Daniel to score highest in the Factor 6 – CR category. Daniel was one of two participants to receive a result of CR as their dominant leadership style. This is a form of transactional leadership based predominantly around economic and emotional exchanges, where role requirements are clarified and desired outcomes are praised and rewarded. Like most of the other respondents, Daniel’s lowest score was in the Factor 9 – LF category. The statement “I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts” was rated a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’), displaying Daniel’s predisposition to CR-style leadership, while the LF statement “I avoid making decisions” was rated 0 (‘not at all’). Universal norms for the CR category are rated 2.5. Daniel scored an above-average score of 3.75 in this category. Daniel also scored most highly in the SAT leadership outcome. This result reflects a belief that his followers would consider his methods of working with others highly satisfactory.

4.6.3 Elijah – MBEA Leader

Elijah was a male event manager aged 56 or older and managed a sporting event in Bright, Victoria. He had a high school or equivalent background. He was one of only two participants to work as a volunteer on a full-time basis, working approximately 20 hours per week. Elijah scored most highly as a Factor 7 – MBEA leader according to the MLQ. Similar to many other participants, his lowest score was in the Factor 9 – LF category. His high score is a form of transactional leadership, specifically an active form of corrective leadership, where corrective action is taken before issues arise. For example, Elijah rated the statement “I concentrate my full attention on dealing with
mistakes, complaints and failures” as a 4 (‘frequently, if not always’) on the Likert scale. In contrast the statement “I avoid making decisions” was rated a 1 (‘once in a while’). Universal norms for MBEA are rated 1.7, whereas Elijah’s result was a rating of 3.5. This is an above-average score for MBEA leadership. Elijah also rated himself highly in the SAT outcome, believing his methods of leadership and interaction with followers are satisfactory.

4.6.4 Mark – CR Leader

Mark was a full-time sporting event manager working approximately 40 hours per week. He was a male aged 41–55 years and held a TAFE qualification as his highest education level. Answering frequently, if not always, for all CR items on the MLQ, resulted in Mark being categorised as Factor 6 – CR leader. A CR leader’s behaviour focuses on clarifying role and task requirements and providing psychological or material rewards in exchange for this performance. This form of transactional leadership is viewed as a constructive transaction. Some MLQ items which Mark resonated strongly with include, “I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts” and “I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.” Mark scored lowest in the LF category; however, he scored second lowest in the IC category, revealing a tendency to shy away from coaching and mentoring leadership traits, focusing more intently on reaching the goals of the event by increasing performance standards. Universal norms for CR leadership are 2.5, whereas Mark had a high score of 4, placing him well above average for this style. Mark also scored equally high in both EFF and SAT outcomes of leadership, believing he leads an effective team satisfactorily.
4.6.5 Summary: Transactional Leaders

This section presented the MLQ results of the event managers in this sample who were categorised as transactional leaders. Four participants exhibited transactional styles, with all four displaying a single MLQ leadership category. Participants were categorised into both transactional leadership factors and all participants in this section were male. Although only two participants resulted in CR high scores, CR leadership scored the highest group-average score overall, with a 3.25 mean score. Following is a chapter summary highlighting the key findings pertinent to Research Objective One.

4.7 Chapter Summary

The findings of the identified categories as proposed by the MLQ and the individual perceptions of the participants were described above and divided into transformational and transactional leadership styles. Fifteen of the 19 event managers exhibited a transformational style of leadership, with the remaining four resulting in a transactional style of leadership. Findings revealed nine of the 19 participants overall scored most highly in the Factor 5 – IC category. However, the Factor 6 – CR category resulted in the highest group-average score, although only two participants were categorised as CR leaders. None of the event managers scored highest in the Factor 8 – MBEP category or the Factor 9 – LF category.

Additionally, some females scored highly in multiple categories, whereas males scored highly in a single style of leadership. Overall, the majority of transformational leaders were female, categorised in all five transformational categories. Males, on the other hand, were categorised into both transformational and transactional categories, consisting of IM, CR and MBEA leadership styles. This concludes the findings for Chapter Four. The following chapter addresses the results pertaining to Research
Objective Two of this study which is concerned with analysing participants’ qualitative narratives in light of their MLQ result.
CHAPTER 5: A QUALITATIVE EXPLORATION OF EVENT MANAGERS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR LEADERSHIP STYLE

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter presented findings relating to the first objective of this study. The purpose of Chapter Five is to present and analyse data pertaining to Research Objective Two: Explore event managers’ perceptions of their leadership style and how leadership styles manifest in event management contexts. This chapter follows on from the findings presented in Chapter Four, whereby the quantitative results of the MLQ are triangulated in relation to the event managers’ qualitative perceptions of their own leadership style. This chapter strives to firstly determine participants’ personal perceptions of their own leadership style and then discuss these in accordance with the findings of the previous chapter. Although discussed separately, Research Objectives One and Two are interrelated, as the second objective builds upon the findings resulting from Research Objective One. This chapter takes the following structure. Firstly, event managers are categorised into a single leadership style based on their original MLQ results combined with qualitative data analysis. An analysis of individual participants’ overall leadership styles ensues, where an in-depth analysis of their qualitative narratives according to Research Objectives Two is explored. Lastly, an overview of the findings pertaining to Research Objectives One and Two is summarised.
5.2 Participants’ Qualitative Perceptions of their Leadership Style

Chapter Four categorised participants into transformational or transactional leadership styles according to quantitative data collected through the MLQ. As this chapter now explores Research Objective Two, a closer look at the perceptions of these event managers utilising qualitative data pertaining to their style of leadership is instructive. Each section begins by giving an overview of individual leadership styles (for in-depth review of the leadership styles, refer to Chapter Two). Table 5.1 indicates the event managers’ MLQ results, which revealed multiple styles in some cases, with darker shaded boxes indicating their revised, most prominent leadership style based upon the qualitative analysis that will be presented in this chapter. In this chapter, those event managers who exhibited overlap between multiple leadership styles in their MLQ categorisation are now be categorised into a single style of leadership by drawing upon the event managers’ interview data to more accurately identify a single preferred leadership category. The resultant categorisation of those participants with multiple styles is based on the researcher’s critical analysis of the event managers’ qualitative interview responses. This section now picks up where the previous chapter left off, critically analysing each participant according to transcribed interview data compared to their MLQ result.
Table 5.1 Critical Analysis Categorisation of Participants’ Leadership Style Result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addisyn*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aimee*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsay*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes participants with equal high scores in more than one leadership style.

¹Darker shaded boxes denote the leadership style that those with multiple-style results have been placed into according to their interview data.

5.3 Transformational Leaders

5.3.1 Idealised Influence Behavioural Leaders

The IIB leader is often seen as a role model for followers to emulate (Wilde, 2011). Occurring in the top-right quadrant of the FRLM, it is seen as the most effective of the four Is (MLQ International, 2008). The Idealised Influence leader is typically the driving force in moving a team, organisation or project forward, and uses insight to assess what is necessary at present and in the future (Wilde, 2011). IIA refers to the socialised charisma of the leader, taking into account the perceptions that a leader is strong and powerful, whereas IIB refers to charismatic actions of the leader centred
around values, beliefs and a sense of mission (Antonakis et al., 2003). A sample item from the MLQ is: “I emphasise the importance of having a collective sense of mission.”

Analysis of the interview data revealed that five participants resonated with their MLQ results as IIB leaders. While this category initially resulted in six participants scoring highly in IIB leadership, some of these were multiple results and were further narrowed to reach a single category result for each participant. Of these five, only two scored singularly highly as IIB leaders as result of the MLQ. The other three were categorised utilising qualitative responses to augment the quantitative MLQ data. All participants were female: Aimee, Jenny, Sophie, Addisyn and Amanda. Four of the five held undergraduate degrees as their highest level of education and were aged 40 years or under. The participant aged in the 56 or older age group achieved TAFE as their highest level of education. Three of the five participants scored equally highly in more than one leadership style and have been categorised as an IIB leader on the basis of their interview responses. The following sub-sections further explore the leadership styles of these Idealised Influence event managers by infusing qualitative insights into their quantitative MLQ responses. The purpose here was to categorise these event managers into a single leadership style.

5.3.1.1 Addisyn – IIB Leader

During the semi-structured interview, Addisyn spoke of the event’s vision and of how she strives to challenge her team by setting clearly defined goals, akin to an IIB leader’s expected characteristics. As Addisyn scored equally highly in IIB and IC categories, for the purposes of this study she has been placed predominantly as an IIB leader after analysing her qualitative responses. Although she was categorised as an IIB leader from her MLQ results, her interview responses suggest more in common with a transactional style of leadership. Addisyn agreed with the results of the MLQ when questioned;
However, she quite often spoke of meeting performance with rewards, suggesting she may be more akin to a transactional leadership style such as a CR leader. For example, when asked to describe how she leads her team, Addisyn said:

> Whether you’re a volunteer or a paid worker you must respect your work and that is reflected in your performance. I’m all about giving verbal praise for a job well done and working towards targets during the event … I believe it drives them to do a better job.

Although Addisyn’s sole focus was not on reward, her emphasis on this aspect of her role was highlighted through other statements, such as: “People like to be recognised, especially volunteers, for their work. A little bit of praise or compliments or even in-kind gifts like a free drink or meal never go astray.” Such comments reflect a strong CR style of leadership. Addisyn did resonate with her recorded IIB style, stating:

> I want people to be able to look up to me and how I do things and absolutely believe in me. I don’t consider myself an icon, but in a way I like to think I’d be a decent role model to my team.

Analysing Addisyn’s transcript it became evident that, while displaying many IIB and IC traits, she could also be likened to a CR leader.

### 5.3.1.2 Aimee – IIB Leader

As Aimee resulted in equally high scores in two categories, for the purposes of this thesis it was necessary to place her into a single high-scoring category. Aimee’s semi-structured interview responses tended to reflect the IIB category. This is evident with an overwhelming degree of Aimee’s responses relating to IIB characteristics, such as her core beliefs and behavioural leadership examples. For example, Aimee stated that the way she leads is quite “hands on”, suggesting that her leader behaviours reflect her core
beliefs and she displays this by being direct and using her knowledge and skills firsthand. She explained, “I encourage our volunteers to represent our organisation to the utmost of their ability. Promoting our core organisational values is really important so our volunteers understand and can be engaged in their role.” Adding weight to her IIB high score, Aimee spoke of her values and the organisation’s and how these affect leading her frontline. She stated:

I know what I’m talking about within the organisation and my role and what I’m asking of people; I align with the mission and vision of what we’re doing.

It makes it easier to be a leader and for people to have that respect.

Through Aimee’s focus on the organisation’s values, her ethical orientation and her confidence in her own leader behaviour were befitting of an IIB style. These types of interview responses indicated that Aimee tended towards an IIB style of leadership, even though her MLQ responses were equally high in both IIB and IC styles of leadership.

Aimee was questioned about her own perceptions of her leadership style. She indeed agreed with her equal high-score MLQ results, stating: “I do believe this is quite close to describing how I would act as a leader within the organisation.” She further noted her inclination to behavioural tendencies that reflected her beliefs, saying: “I’d say the way I lead is by example. With the volunteers I like to give them a really clear definition of where they’re going and then give them some autonomy… I don’t take on micro-managing.” Aimee was also asked whether, after looking at the different leadership categories, she agreed with the MLQ results or thought she might have been better placed as a different leader. Aimee explained that:
Reading the characteristics of the categories I was placed into I do feel like they are closer to being me. Some of the others have similarities in there so I feel like there could be a little room for swing. However, I’m all about the end goal and interacting with people so those styles nailed me on the head.

Aimee was quite adamant in her answers, displaying a clear reflection with both IIB and IC styles of leadership, with a fraction more congruence to IIB leadership. Consequently, Aimee’s perceptions of her own leadership style were a strong reflection of those depicted by the MLQ. Indeed, her qualitative data suggest a coherence between Aimee’s MLQ result and her own perceptions of her leadership style.

5.3.1.3 Amanda – IIB Leader

Amanda’s singular leadership style result suggested a more dominant display of IIB characteristics, which was also reflected in her analysed interview data. However, after the data had been analysed, it was discovered that she indeed reflected the characteristics of an IIB leader. Firstly, she agreed with her MLQ result by stating:

Yeah, I do believe that’s the type of leader I am or the one I hope I’d be. I try to lead by example and want my volunteers to see me as the kind of person they’d want to follow and look up to.

Further into the interview, Amanda expressed a passion for instilling a sense of trust and confidence in her volunteers in order to foster teamwork. Amanda noted: “Our volunteers represent us. Our event. They need to embody the spirit and passion we value … it’s up to me to engage them with that vision and foster harmonious teamwork.” A strong vision and commitment to encouraging her volunteers shone through in Amanda’s responses. She spoke of the need for a compelling vision for the event and achieving the strategic goals set prior to the event: “I believe in what this
event is striving to achieve, and if I believe it then my volunteers will too. It’s important that volunteers put some meaning to their work so they feel valued”.

Additionally, Amanda spoke of creating a strong, effective team. She noted, “In order for our team to function optimally we must work towards meeting our goals and embodying the values of our event. By creating an environment of trust I can show the volunteers the right way to do things.” She further added, “I’d never ask a volunteer to do something that I myself wouldn’t do. It’s a relationship of mutual respect.” These statements highlighted Amanda’s strong moral values and her motivation to work towards organisational goals—traits consistent with an IIB style of leadership. Many of Amanda’s responses resonated directly with the characteristics of IIB leadership. There did not appear to be any other leadership styles congruent with her responses. Therefore, it can be concluded that Amanda’s qualitative perceptions regarding her own style of leadership confirmed her MLQ result.

5.3.1.4 Jenny – IIB Leader

Jenny’s original two high scores in IIA and IIB leadership were deduced to a single category, IIB, according to her analysed interview data. Analysis of her qualitative responses suggested that Jenny was more congruent with IIB leadership behaviours. Her responses resonated more closely with charismatic behaviours, such as a focus on values and beliefs and a sense of mission or purpose, rather than her attributed charisma, which refers to follower attributions as to how they perceive their leader’s power, confidence and transcendent ideals. While IIA has a strong follower focus, follower perceptions were not accounted for in this study. Thus, due to this limitation, categorising Jenny as an IIB leader was founded more on her narrative of a strong behavioural focus. As Jenny explained, “I would hope that I would lead by example, by setting a good example … The aim of our event is to provide a fun, culturally aware
event for the community.” This type of statement suggests Jenny’s close link to her leadership behaviours, where she is inclined to set a good example, and a reflection of her purpose and beliefs. She also noted, “I believe every volunteer has something special and unique to give, but it’s definitely a reflection of the mission and purpose we impose on them that allows their true potential to shine.” Jenny’s statements in her interview were more reflective of an IIB style of leadership; however, they tended to also align with an IC leadership style. Jenny agreed with the outcome of the MLQ, simply stating, “Yes, I do agree.” In her own words, she described her leadership style as:

I like to consider different people and personalities and the way in which they learn. You’ve really got to look at that to be able to work with people. I’d say I’m considerate yet still firm. Overall I would call myself a fair leader.

While this is fitting with Jenny’s result as a combined IIA and IIB leader, elements of her narratives leant towards an IC style of leadership where the needs of the follower are considered. She goes on to say she considers herself an empathetic person and likes to consider other people’s opinions. Jenny noted that her team would “… see me as someone easy to approach and talk to … I would call most of my volunteers friends and have good rapport with them.” Such statements more reflect an IC style of leadership. Thus it can be concluded that although Jenny’s MLQ result somewhat conflicted with her qualitative responses, her qualitative narratives suggested she resonated more highly as an IC leader. Although Jenny agreed with her MLQ result, her perceptions of her own leadership style could be more aligned to IC leadership.

Speaking of empowering, befriending and supporting her volunteers were integral in Jenny’s responses and as such are more reflective of IC leadership behaviours. The findings here revealed that Jenny’s MLQ result did not entirely triangulate with her
semi-structured interview responses, thus she may be more aptly positioned as an IC leader.

5.3.1.5 Sophie – IIB Leader

Unlike the event managers discussed above, Sophie scored highly in a single leadership category, thus allowing analysis of her semi-structured interview data to be solely related to her MLQ outcome of IIB leadership. Sophie agreed that her dominant behavioural traits were IIB in nature. She stated, “Yes, I really would. I mean I laugh at the idea of having people emulate me, but the feedback I’ve received in this role from people would be in line with that. I’d definitely mostly agree.” Describing her own leadership style, Sophie said, “To be honest I’ve never really thought about it. I suppose that I’m not dictatorial. I would try and lead by example. I ask as much as I can rather than tell.” While this is congruent with IIB leadership, Sophie was carefree in her responses, displaying more passion when she spoke of her volunteers, which relates more to an IC style of leadership. This is evident in her response, “It’s hard to see myself as a leader sometimes. You do what you do on a daily basis and maybe that’s leading, but maybe not.”

Sophie’s narratives reflected a great deal of concern in the way her followers viewed her as a leader. This can be reflected in many statements where she says, “I find it easier to please the group rather than being a dictator”, “I work as much as I can in a team. I ask for everybody’s input” and “I generally feel like I’m pretty safe for people because I’m spongey, because I’m nice about things rather than hard.” Although not in contrast to IIB leadership, which emphasise a leader’s behaviours, these kinds of statements also resonate with an IC style of leadership where the focus is on the individual and gaining team appeal is important. Giving plenty of examples during her interview, Sophie talked of getting involved and helping her team, acting as a mentor.
and supporting her volunteers’ ideas and suggestions, opposing the idea of a leader giving orders and sitting on the sideline. Additionally, Sophie demonstrated her eagerness to mentor, revealing many IC characteristics. She noted:

I generally try and do as much one-on-one as I can. They’re all volunteers and they want to feel important and like their opinion matters. Like their contribution is important and valued. I find one-on-one contact is the best way to do that.

Consequently, these qualitative findings suggest that Sophie’s perceptions, although in agreement with her IIB MLQ results, can also be partly likened to those of an IC leader. For the purposes of this study Sophie, is analysed according to her dominant IIB style.

### 5.3.2 Inspirational Motivation

IM reflects the degree to which a leader provides a vision, uses appropriate symbols and imagery to help others focus on their work, and tries to make others feel their work is significant (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This leader is focused on emotional stimulation by using strong and evocative language, expressing confidence, articulating compelling visions/goals and encouraging followers to achieve goals, and aligning individual and organisational goals. IM leaders aim to express the importance of desired goals in simple ways, where communication is key to high levels of performance and reaching expectations through meaningful and challenging work. Inspirationally motivating leaders often succeed in elevating the expectations of followers so that they achieve more than they thought was attainable (Koh, Steers, & Terborg, 1995). A sample item from the MLQ is: “The leader articulates a compelling vision of the future.”

The event managers discussed in sub-sections 5.4.1 through 5.4.3 are those who resulted in an IM high score after completing the MLQ. Three event managers exhibited an IM leadership style, scoring highest in this category alone. With no equal high scores
in neighbouring categories, all three IM leaders were placed into this category based solely off of their MLQ results. Thus their qualitative responses are analysed here to explore how IM leadership style manifested in the context of event management. Two male participants, Connor and Matt, and one female participant, Steph, resulted in an IM leadership style. Of note, aside from transactional leadership styles, is that the IM category is the only transformational style to contain male participants. Both males were grouped in the 26–40 age category and were from a sporting event, while the only female IM event manager was aged 56 years or older and managed a cultural event.

5.3.2.1 Connor – IM Leader

Connor’s MLQ result conformed to a single leadership style, thus his responses can be analysed directly based on those attributes of an IM leader. Connor’s transcribed interview was punctuated by statements portraying a leader who is proud of their event and pushes their volunteers to be the best they can be. Agreeing with his MLQ result, Connor stated: “I’d say yes. That’s how I hope my leadership is. Certainly, we’ve got a large number of staff and volunteers and I want to empower them to do the best they can for themselves and the events we run.” He described his leadership style as follows:

I don’t know if inspirational is the word I’d use, but essentially, I see my form of leadership as one where I like to lead by example and also to empower people to get the best out of them and what they can provide to the event. Also, to allow people to grow and develop, and take a task and run with it and put their own flavour and spin on it.

After his qualitative interview data had been analysed, it was concluded that Connor resonated highly with IM leadership. This was evident as he emphasised a vision for the future of the event and the methods he uses to motivate his team. The
findings here show that Connor’s perspective of his personal style is strongly reflective of his MLQ result.

5.3.2.2 Matt – IM Leader

Matt also scored highly in the IM leadership category alone, which allowed qualitative data to be analysed and directly compared to his quantitative IM categorisation. Matt was found to be an IM leader according to the MLQ and he acknowledged that this type of leadership style accurately represents him. In his interview, he addressed motivation and his need to challenge his team’s way of thinking by training them to come to him with a solution to their problem at hand. For example:

> Basically, how I train my team is, don’t come to me with a complaint. If you have an issue, yes you need to come to me with the problem; however, you need to have a justified course of action for a solution to the problem. If you don’t have a problem with a solution, then you don’t really have a problem, you’re just complaining.

Matt considered himself a democratic or “chaotic” type of leader, suggesting he allows his team a more participative role in the decision-making process. He noted, “When decisions are made at work, essentially it’s my decision, but it’s a team discussion to come to that decision.” Matt could also be closely linked with transactional leadership, as he explained that he often praised his team based on their level of performance:

> I come from an army background and you don’t get rewarded if you don’t get the job done, you keep going until it’s done. I like to think I instil this passion for hard work in my team and push them to do their best. Sometimes a job well done is its own reward.
Matt appeared to use his motivational attributes akin to an IM leader to inspire dedication and hard work from his team, while simultaneously rewarding and praising desired outcomes, which is reflective of a different style, that of CR leadership. Matt’s constant referral to motivating and instilling confidence in his team is congruent with his IM result; however, he revealed a constructive CR side when speaking of using praise for recognition of hard work. Thus, it appears that, although Matt’s MLQ result was an IM leader, he also portrayed elements of CR leadership.

Matt’s interview responses likened him to a CR leader, although it should be noted that this was an adjacent style, with IM characteristics dominating his answers. Matt came across as a strong IM leader, as in almost every one of his responses he discussed his team in terms of motivating, supporting and engaging their actions throughout the event. Matt perceived his leadership style to be motivating first and foremost, explaining that:

I think my efficiency is noted by other people and I think the way that I conduct myself in the workplace is motivating for other people. My strengths are desirable. So they see the way that I work and what I achieve in a day and I think that to other people is motivating. I’m definitely a leader that will lead from the front … and I think the best way to motivate people is for them to come to the self-realisation that what I’m suggesting is the best way to do something, rather than just telling them … I do have a fair bit of experience in this field … a strong work ethic and a passion for this event motivates others to do as I do.

Matt was a very self-assured type of leader, which he himself said was often misconstrued by others to be arrogant or conceited, and his interview responses reflected this assuredness. However, this type of self-assurance is typical of an IM
leader, who requires a degree of self-confidence in their beliefs to effectively motivate their team by asking not telling (Bass, 1999). Matt’s response here is representative of this notion, where he suggests the correct way to do something, or asks, as opposed to telling, his team in an authoritarian way what needs to be done. Matt’s MLQ result therefore seemed congruent with his perceptions of his leadership style, although components of CR leadership were also reflected. However, owing to his strong narratives, which were congruent with IM leadership, he is treated as an IM leader for the purposes of this study.

5.3.2.3 Steph – IM Leader

Steph was another participant whose qualitative responses concerning her IM leadership style ultimately resonated strongly with her MLQ result. From the outset, Steph spoke of a compelling vision for her event and attributed the success of her event on motivating her volunteers to achieve stated organisational goals. Steph intensely agreed with her MLQ result, stating:

I wholeheartedly believe that’s the kind of leader I am. Our event has a strong vision and I encourage all my volunteers to keep that in the back of their minds during the event. I think it helps us achieve the best results for this event.

Further, she went on to share her perceptions of her personal leadership style, where she talked of being a motivator and support role for her team. Steph described her leadership style by saying:

I like to be that cheery, upbeat manager where people look up to me and think, well if she can do it why can’t I? I’m 63 and if they see me pumped up and ready to go, they feel that enthusiasm and then it catches like wild fire.
During the semi-structured interview, the researcher could feel the positive energy and passion in the way Steph spoke of her event and volunteers. Steph displayed a sense of appreciation for her team: “I have a great team working with me on this event. We vibe off each other. It’s a very encouraging and supportive community … we want the same thing at the end of the day, a hugely successful event.”

Upon reflection, another style that stood out in Steph’s interview data was IS. Although not her dominant style, Steph hinted towards innovation and creativity, key characteristics of an IS leader. For example, Steph suggested:

We work as a team and I’m all about getting creative and brainstorming new ideas. Sometimes I ask everyone to bring a new idea for some aspect of the event to me. My way isn’t always the right way and I encourage volunteers to come to me with inventive ways to do even the most tedious of tasks. If there’s a better way to do it, I welcome it.

These kinds of responses show that Steph encourages her volunteers to be innovative and creative, essentially stimulating them to share ideas and tackle old problems in new ways. This was possibly an underlying style of Steph’s, as her core focus appeared to be articulating a vision for the event and motivating her volunteers, which are characteristics of IM leadership. However, it was concluded that, while leadership styles such a IS were evident within Steph’s responses, she was ultimately categorised as an IM leader consistent with her MLQ result.

5.3.3 Intellectual Stimulation

IS reflects the strong degree to which a leader encourages others to be creative in looking at old problems in new ways, creates an environment that is tolerant of seemingly extreme positions, and nurtures people to question their own values and
beliefs and those of the organisation (Bass & Avolio, 1997). These leaders emphasise the value of follower's intellect and rational thoughts. This leader challenges followers’ ideas and values and encourages problem-solving in new ways. While this style is less common in organisations favouring a ‘telling’ approach, it creates a readiness for changes in thinking. Followers feel comfortable in expressing their ideas, which leads to greater autonomy, as there is little risk of punishment. A sample item from the MLQ is: “The leader gets others to look at problems from many different angles.”

Originally, IS leadership resulted dominantly in three event managers’ MLQ results (Claire, Lesley, and Lyndsay), with two of those sharing dominant results in other leadership categories. Of these participants, Lesley and Lyndsay, were analysed as IC leaders as they reflected IC traits more dominantly throughout their qualitative narrative than IS leadership. As a result, only one participant, Claire, was categorised as an IS leader. The female participant, Claire, was aged 26–40 years and had achieved an undergraduate degree as her highest education level. Claire’s MLQ result and perceptions of her own leadership style are now discussed in detail.

5.3.3.1 Claire – IS Leader

As Claire scored equally highly in two leadership style categories, it was necessary to analyse her interview responses to categorise her into a single category. Claire’s qualitative responses tended more towards IS leadership, as Claire spoke of creating a fun event by encouraging her volunteers to be forward thinkers in an artistic environment. Claire responded to a question pertaining to whether she believed the MLQ had depicted her leadership style correctly by saying, “I hope so. I’d like to think I display those qualities.” Although it seemed she was a little unsure of herself and her own leadership traits, she suggested her strengths were: being aware of what is going on around her and with other people, her strong vision for the event and expressing this to
the volunteers, and being a voice of encouragement for others. Claire talked about the event’s artistic nature and emphasised that the event was for creative and innovative minds to express their ideas. Claire described herself as a “creative bird”, noting she leads from behind: “I’m behind my team all the way and I encourage an open mind and bringing their own ideas to the table. I like to inspire my team to get crafty in their roles and use their intuition.” In line with her IS result, Claire spoke of valuing autonomy and allowing creativity as a tactic for motivating her team:

I lead my team to the belief that a happy team, when they feel appreciated, will always do more than what is expected. They need to feel that their effort and time is important. Which it really is. But once someone feels needed they give without restraint.

This kind of thinking is representative of IS behaviours, in that stimulating new ideas and ways of thinking are paramount. Additionally, Claire expressed a tendency to articulate a vision to her team in order to give more meaning to the task at hand. Claire articulated her personal perceptions of how she likes to lead, saying:

I really want to get the volunteers enthusiastic about the event, talk them through the vision and get them to see the bigger picture. I try to keep the morale up by encouraging and motivating them. I like to make sure their input is considered so they feel valuable to [sic] their place within the event.

Further, Claire stated: “If you treat your volunteers with respect and thank them for the participation I believe they will feel more valued and thus give more to their role.” Claire believed in the importance of treating volunteers as individuals and encouraging them to use their initiative and give that little bit extra to the role.

Resonating highly with both an IS and an IC leader, it also incorporates the vision and
motivation of an IM leader. Motivating and encouraging followers while compelling a positive vision for the future are commensurate with the traits of an IM leader, and were reflected in Claire’s transcribed interview. Although not an overarching leadership style, IM was apparent in Claire’s interview data. Claire scored equally highly in two categories, however, she was more prone to an IS style of leadership with underarching IM qualities. Thus, Claire’s perception of her own leadership style seems congruent with that of the MLQ so she was categorised as an IM leader, although IM leadership was also partly evident.

5.3.4 Individualised Consideration

IC leadership reflects the degree to which a leader shows interest in others’ wellbeing, assigns projects individually and pay’s attention to those who seem less involved in the group (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This type of leader treats followers based on their individual needs—equitably on a one-to-one basis—and spends more time teaching and coaching (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Individually considerate leaders are active listeners who encourage two-way communication and promote self-development, listen to follower’s needs and concerns, show genuine compassion, and actively and regularly coach (Bass & Avolio 1997). This leader often feels needed and important, thus facilitating autonomy through enhancing followers’ internal frames of reference. A sample MLQ item is: “I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.”

This is the category with the largest number of high scores. IC proved to be the top-scoring leadership category, with nine event managers initially scoring highest in this category. Aimee, Addisyn, and Claire, who originally shared in IC high scores, were analysed to reflect other styles of leadership more dominantly. Those scoring highest in IC leadership alone, Lexi, Sally, and Michelle, along with those participants
sharing in multiple prominent styles, Karen, Lesley, and Lyndsay, will be discussed below as dominant IC leaders. Their qualitative data is analysed and deciphered according to the FRLT also highlighting other preferred leadership styles. All participants who exhibited IC leadership were female. It was difficult to make any further linkages between participants in this category as it was the largest group of any leadership style. Interestingly, the two event managers who held postgraduate degrees were both categorised as IC leaders and both were aged 56 years or older. All the event managers categorised as IC leaders managed art or cultural events. IC leaders who will be discussed in detail further include: Karen, Lyndsay, Sally, Lexi, Michelle and Lesley.

5.3.4.1 Karen – IC Leader

It was necessary to categorise Karen into a single style of leadership as she scored equally highly in two categories, IIB and IC leadership. Upon reflection, it was concluded that Karen was more akin to an IC leadership style as her key focus appeared to be on mentoring her volunteers to reach their maximum potential. Karen was questioned about her perceptions regarding the outcome of the MLQ and whether it was congruent with how she perceived her own leadership abilities, and her answer was quite unique. Karen stated that she agreed with the results of the MLQ, saying:

Factor 2 is kind of me and me in the past, while Factor 5 is me working on my own approach to leadership. So, I found it really interesting that I scored highly in both these categories and was quite happy it revealed this way.

She reinforced this by revealing:

Old Karen, or transitioning Karen, would most likely lead by example. So, I would typically try and show someone how something’s done because that’s the way I learn … my style is changing and it comes down to being more
comfortable in my role now. I still think I lead by example, but now my example is a bit more polished and I take a firmer hand when delegating tasks to others.

Although Karen agreed with her MLQ result, there was a dominance of qualitative responses consistent with IC leadership. Karen did speak about leading by example, stating: “I lead by example. So, I like to show volunteers how things are done properly in the first place, and then give the volunteers some autonomy and free reign to not feel micro-managed.” She explained that she tries to lead by example by giving practical examples to her volunteers. This is where her IIB style of leadership shone through. However, Karen’s more dominant IC style is highlighted in her statement: “Each one of my volunteers is unique. They have different skills and creative talents and, in order to harness this potential, I talk to each of them individually and we work on what they’re good at.” Karen suggested that this attention to the needs of her volunteers creates a stronger and more willing team. Another response depicting this IC style was her statement that: “Volunteers are our frontline. The service they provide is what our customers are valuing our event on. Ensuring they feel valued is important.” A clear focus on the needs of her volunteers suggests Karen’s perceptions of her own leadership style are indeed consistent with her IC MLQ result. In addition to her dominant IC style, IIB leadership was evident in her responses also. Thus, the qualitative interview data confirmed that Karen’s beliefs about her leadership style corresponded with the MLQ results.

5.3.4.2 Lesley – IC Leader

Scoring highly in two different leadership categories, further analysis was required to categorise Lesley into a single style for this study. Reflecting on her interview responses, it became evident that Lesley was more akin to an IC style of leadership;
however, her responses were also congruent with a transactional CR style of leadership. Firstly, Lesley’s belief her MLQ result was ‘correct’ differed to that of other participants, as some of her interview statements displayed CR characteristics. She stated: “Yeah, I’d agree. But my job is to get what needs doing done. There’s no mucking about. We only have one shot at getting this event right. I need to make sure it’s successful.” Such statements suggest a more transactional approach, whereby the focus is on performance and a leader invokes managerial behaviours to lead their team. This is further illustrated in statements such as: “I set clearly defined goals for my team to reach”; “On the day I supervise different aspects of the event, but it’s my job to ensure it all runs smoothly”; and “I’m all for encouraging a job well done … when something’s not done right I need to pull them into line.”

Despite being categorised according to her dominant MLQ result, Lesley was more attune to the characteristics of a CR leader. This CR nature is reflected in most of her responses and further noted when she said: “At the end of the day it is my responsibility, the buck stops with me. I may be firm but it’s only because I care.” There were, however, some responses tailored more towards IC leadership. This can be found when Lesley said, “I will say I try and take on a coaching mentality when it comes to my volunteers. The best way to enhance their performance is if I am there to see them through every step of the way.” She further reinforced this notion, stating: “The success of the event is my responsibility and volunteers are a huge part of achieving this. I make sure they feel appreciated by checking in on them, giving praise, you know, keeping their needs in mind.”

Ultimately, it was evident that Lesley’s perceptions of her own leadership style supported her MLQ result. However, this was to a lesser degree than her principal CR style that shone through. Lesley appeared to be the only participant whose qualitative
narratives seemed to contradict her MLQ result, with a more dominant leadership style not reflected by her MLQ style of leadership. This was a significant finding, as most of the other participants’ perceptions were indeed commensurate with their MLQ result.

5.3.4.3 Lexi – IC Leader

Lexi scored highly in the IC category solely and, based upon her supporting qualitative narratives, has been categorised to this style in accordance with her MLQ result. Lexi was adamant in her agreeance with the results of the MLQ, stating: “I’d agree. I think that describes me really well.” She viewed herself as the type of leader who has grown over the years, only recently understanding her true potential as a leader. Lexi describes her own leadership style by saying, “I’d say I’m a mentor. I like to empower people that I’m working with. It’s all about confidence, confidence in yourself and empowering people to have that confidence within themselves also … I would guide people every day.” This kind of response is evidence that Lexi’s perception of her leadership style is IC in nature. Lexi talked of mentoring quite often and her need to guide her team, suggesting a mirroring of her responses to the results of the MLQ.

Lexi firmly referred to herself as a leader who shows genuine interest in and compassion for her volunteers, she also demonstrated a likeness to an IM style of leadership in some of her responses, for example:

If a person does demonstrate the skills, I’m all for pushing them to go further.

If someone wants to do better, I’ll empower them to think they can. I’m definitely not a micro-manager. I get a big buzz when people get out of their comfort zones and just go for it.

This echoes the sentiments of an IM leader, where followers are encouraged to reach their highest potential and leave their comfort zones. Although not her dominant
leadership style it was found that IM characteristics shone through, suggesting that motivation and encouragement are parallel traits she used to mentor her volunteers. Findings for this participant revealed that Lexi’s perceptions of her leadership style are indeed akin to the outcome of the MLQ. Additionally, IM characteristics were evident in Lexi’s narratives and further supported IC characteristics as her preferred leadership style.

5.3.4.4 Lyndsay – IC Leader

Lyndsay’s interview was unique in that the researcher was taken on a tour of the event preparation site. The researcher was also introduced to many of Lyndsay’s volunteers and was able to observe a working dynamic as she interacted with them. Like previous participants, Lyndsay scored equally highly in both IS and IC leadership and for the purposes of this study needed to be categorised into a single style. Analysis of her interview data suggested that Lyndsay was more inclined to IC leadership as she had a strong focus on the individual needs of her volunteers. Her interview was overwhelmingly IC-centred, with numerous statements focusing on the connections with her volunteers and her mentoring relationship with them. This is evident when she agreed with her MLQ result, saying: “Absolutely it has. I think that is most definitely me. I’m the mother hen who wants to take care of all her chicks.” She also agreed that scoring lowest in the LF category was spot on, noting: “I’m not a laissez-faire leader particularly.” An IC leader is all about consideration for others and Lyndsay backed this particularly well when she described her own leadership style as:

I think I’m a kind person. I try and work from a heart space … I like to take the time to actually enjoy people and listen to their stories as well. Work isn’t just work to me. It’s just a facet of our life and I like to live mine. So talking to people and helping people, and having friends is a big part of this for me.
During Lyndsay’s interview it became apparent that she was still working, handling issues in person and via telephone concerning her volunteers and event, referring fondly to her volunteers as “vikings”. This rapport and interaction with her team, in addition to her interview responses, reflected the IC nature of Lyndsay’s leadership style. Her concern for the individual needs of her volunteers is again reflected in the statement:

I like to surround myself with beautiful souls who make sharing and creating my dream very fun and I’ll admit that I couldn’t do it alone, so having volunteers helping me to fulfil my mind’s work is really something else. That sounds very egocentric and conceited, but it really isn’t just about me.

Further cementing this, she noted: “I really care about people … you need to make sure people are okay. I think that’s my bottom line.” Picking up on her IS nature she noted:

I have all these creative ideas yet I can’t do everything in my imagination so I get all these other poor buggers to help me create it. I encourage them to create what they want as well. This is an environment of new ideas.

This kind of response lends itself to IS leadership, whereby ideas are encouraged, and innovation and creativity is supported.

Conversely, Lyndsay suggested that she can tend to micro-manage when she becomes over-enthusiastic, evoking a more transactional leadership style in which performance is monitored more closely: “It’s about me finding that balance. While I am enthusiastic and want to get things done, it’s how I go about it. Sometimes that requires a firmer hand and having to buckle down to make sure things get done.” However, she countered this again with her concern for people’s feelings and not wishing them to feel
unsupported. Ultimately, Lyndsay’s perception of her own leadership style was consistent with the results of the MLQ. Through the interview the IC category shone through more so than the IS style of leadership and, although not dominant, Lyndsay herself admits to using transactional qualities in order to get the job done. In conclusion, Lyndsay’s qualitative narratives were overwhelmingly akin to IC leadership characteristics and were thus congruent with her MLQ result.

5.3.4.5 Michelle – IC Leader

Michelle scored highly in a single category, meaning she could be categorised as per her MLQ result of IC leadership. Upon reflection of her transcribed interview, it was found that Michelle truly resonated with the characteristics of an IC leader. She agreed wholeheartedly with her result, stating: “I’m a people person. I couldn’t have been anything else … I’m happy with my result.” Describing her personal leadership style, Michelle stated: “I’m by no means an authoritarian. I believe with the right people and the right attitude anything can be accomplished.” A focus on the individual is evident here as Michelle spoke of building rapport with her volunteers and taking the time to build their confidence in order to achieve optimal performance during the event. For example:

I believe people are key to this event’s success. My volunteers need to feel comfortable and confident in their role to properly satisfy the customer’s needs … this makes it my job to develop their skills through effective training and encourage and support them. Make sure they know I’m here to help them. This creates an environment free from stress, with a focus on getting the job done.

Michelle overwhelmingly spoke of her need to hone the skills of her volunteers by mentoring them, showing concern for their needs and wellbeing. This is attuned to
the characteristics of an IC leader. Michelle was confident in her leadership capabilities, saying she had been in a position of leadership for many years now and she knew what works:

I’m down-to-earth and friendly. I want people working for me to give their best and challenge themselves. I’m happy to be asked questions as I want people to gain experience and knowledge from my experiences. I’d call myself a workplace mother because I want to look after all my kids [workers] and see them achieve their greatest potential. In turn that creates the most successful event. It’s a win-win.

These perceptions are prominently congruent with an IC leader. Upon reflection, there was no evidence of any other dominant styles of leadership in Michelle’s interview data. Constant references to the needs of her volunteers, mentoring and/or coaching and a genuine compassion with concern for her volunteers suggests Michelle’s MLQ result was indeed consistent with her qualitative responses.

5.3.4.6 Sally – IC Leader

The MLQ categorised Sally into a single leadership style. Therefore, it was not necessary to draw upon her interview data to place her into a category. Upon analysis of her data, however, it became apparent that Sally indeed was befitting of her MLQ result. Initially hesitant, she agreed with being an IC leader, stating: “I think that’s me. Some of it definitely, however some of it maybe not so much. In comparison to the other leadership styles, I’d say I’m mostly a Factor 5 leader though. The questionnaire got me right.” Sally maintained that while she did agree with the results, she had read through the outlines of the other eight factors which the researcher offered and certain phrases resonated with the way in which she leads. For example, she spoke of motivating her
team and encouraging initiative, rewarding a job well done, and keeping a positive attitude even when things do not go as planned. However, in accordance with the IC category, Sally suggested she “encourages two-way communication … is an active listener … shows genuine interest and compassion for people. So, I guess for those Factor 5 is me.” In further likeness to an IC leader, she talked passionately about her team and working with new people. She discussed this notion, stating: “I’m a real people person. I like to build rapport and make people feel comfortable. I believe when they feel valued they give more to their role.” Sally also noted:

I am someone who is genuinely interested in other people. I will genuinely like talking to you and hearing your story, and what makes you tick. Events are about people and I have a big heart wanting to get the best from every individual.

Hinting that she may resonate with an IIB leader’s attributes, she also suggested she’s a leader who likes to lead by her actions. She stated: “I’m a leader that likes to jump in there and get things done. I don’t have a problem with rolling up my sleeves and getting my hands dirty. I think I earn a lot of respect that way.” By demonstrating a sense of work ethic and belief in the work she also reflects the core traits of an IIB leader—to a lesser degree than IC leadership though.

Unlike any other participant, Sally spoke freely of labelling herself an LF leader in relation to another event she runs. Sally discussed openly that for a different event she organises she would consider herself an LF leader, stating: “The event I originally had in mind to discuss would have put me as a Factor 9 laissez-faire leader I’d say … The kind of work means I don’t really have to care as there wasn’t much to do.” Sally noted that this alternative event is very different to the one she talked about during the interview, relying less heavily on volunteers and having another event manager to take
up some of the event strain. This was an interesting finding, as typically many other participants did not resonate with LF characteristics, opposing any likeness to an inactive form of leadership. She reasoned that her leadership style does depend on the individual circumstances surrounding an event, noting:

I think it all depends how you work on the event. For that event I don’t have to worry too much, but for this other event I work so closely with the volunteers and I like to really immerse myself in the culture and community of the event. So, my leadership style does vary, but I’m more attuned to being approachable, so saying I’m a laissez-faire leader would only be applicable to that other event.

Sally’s narratives demonstrate that she is aware of her positive and negative leadership traits but applies different characteristics to events as circumstances necessitate. Sally’s qualitative responses were congruent with her MLQ result; however, she had some outstanding IIB characteristics and was the only participant to admit to using an LF leadership style for another event she manages.

5.3.5 Summary: Transformational Leaders

This concludes the analysis of the transformational event managers. This section analysed participants’ perceptions of their personal leadership style compared to their MLQ result. Overall, it was found that, while all participants concurred with their MLQ result, upon further analysis, several participants could be categorised into different categories. Findings here revealed that MLQ results were not consistent with some participants’ qualitative narratives. Seven of the 15 participants’ statements were congruent with their MLQ result. However, further analysis suggested that eight participants’ perceptions evoked other styles of leadership divergent from their MLQ
result. However, interview data suggested that all transformational leaders’ statements did indeed reflect their MLQ result to some degree. It was only with an in-depth analysis of each participant that other leadership styles were brought to the fore.

5.4 Transactional Leaders

5.4.1 Contingent Reward

CR is the classic transactional style where the leader sets clear goals, objectives and targets, and clarifies what rewards can be expected for successful completion (Bass, 1997). Essentially, it is a form of motivation so as to elicit desired performance and is considered an effective way to lead (Bass & Riggio, 2008). CR leaders literally exchange rewards for follower effort and performance, and in contrast, discipline or punishments for tasks unmet (Bass, 1997). The contingent rewarding leader: sets goals together with followers that are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and time-bound; monitors progress toward goals actively and provides supportive feedback; suggests pathways to meet performance expectations; and provides rewards when goals are attained. This leader is highly goal-directed, thereby resulting in high levels of trust from followers when rewards are delivered upon specified expectations. When this style is effectively deployed it tends to produce performance at required levels (Bass, 1997).

A sample item from the MLQ is: “The leader makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.”

While only two event managers exhibited a high score in CR leadership, this category scored the highest overall group average out of the nine styles of leadership assessed in this study. A group average of 3.25 significantly dominates, overshadowing universal norms for this category of 2.5. Two event managers, Daniel and Mark, are discussed in detail in this section.
5.4.1.1 Daniel – CR Leader

A high score in a single category meant Daniel was immediately categorised according to his CR high score. Daniel agreed with this result, responding: “That would be pretty accurate. Yep definitely, yep. I definitely think I set goals that are specific. I’m a very measurable sort of person and I do monitor progress.” He reiterated this notion further by stating:

I really like to set goals. That’s pretty important for any event as they run to a specific deadline … like working to a checklist and ticking things off as they’re completed. I would give volunteers the tasks they need to complete that day and monitor their progress, making sure all the tasks are being completed.

Upon analysing Daniel’s interview data, it was found that a majority of his statements were congruent with this style of leadership. Analysing his own style of leadership, he was concise and clear, stating: “I would say I’m attentive, driven and determined.” Key to a CR leader are qualities such as emphasising goals and operational efficiency, which were reflected in Daniel’s statement: “I believe someone who has a set goal to work towards will be more capable of achieving that goal when pushed to succeed … goals allow progress to be monitored.”

Overwhelmingly, he spoke of achieving organisational goals and monitoring performance to ensure each goal was being met. Conversely, Daniel also expressed that he believed he could also fit into the Factor 3 – IM category. He stated:

I find that I also express confidence and I have the ability to motivate people. I also have a strong vision for the future. I do think I’m more inclined to the Factor 6 leader as it’s [the MLQ] put me, but I would have some ties in with Factor 3 too.
This is evident, as Daniel noted: “I really like to set goals and I like to motivate my volunteers to achieve beyond what they think they are capable of achieving”. This is further evidenced in the following statement:

It’s important that volunteers’ skills are developed and put to good use. I want them [volunteers] to feel empowered … I believe that someone who is more in control of what they are doing and is satisfied with their work, results in a better outcome not just for themselves but for the overall event.

This self-identification with an IM style of leadership underpinned many of Daniel’s responses. This is not the only other dominant style of leadership to be found in his transcribed interview data, however. CR characteristics are also evident throughout his responses. He also agreed that he can self-identify with both CR and IM leadership styles, suggesting his MLQ result had categorised him correctly. Interestingly, upon analysis of his transcribed interview, another category which seemed fitting for Daniel was the Factor 4 – IS category. Daniel was very supportive of furthering volunteers’ knowledge and skill base, inviting different opinions and new ways of looking at things. This is evident in his statement, “I encourage my volunteers to come to me with new ideas. At our monthly meeting they are encouraged to speak up and challenge things they believe aren’t working.”

This indeed is characteristic of IS leadership. While not necessarily a principal style, IS was certainly noticeable throughout Daniel’s responses. Thus, the finding is that Daniel’s perceptions of his own leadership style straddled two styles, one of those in line with the result of the MLQ, and IM scoring marginally lower than his resulted leadership style. Additionally, elements of IS leadership were evidenced in his transcribed data; however, this was to a lesser extent than the aforementioned styles.
5.4.1.2 *Mark – CR Leader*

Like other participants scoring highly in transactional leadership, Mark resulted in a single style according to the MLQ and is categorised accordingly, along with an in-depth analysis of his qualitative narrative. Mark agreed with his MLQ result, answering: “Yep definitely. I don’t see anything wrong with that style of leadership … the job needs to get done and I seek the most efficient, cost effective ways of achieving an optimum result.” He further confirmed his CR traits when he stated, “The success of this event is very dependent on the way in which we as a team conduct ourselves. I push them [volunteers] to achieve goals.”

Upon further analysis, it was found that Mark indeed shared many CR characteristics, while simultaneously displaying many IM characteristics. Mark appeared to correspond strongly with the traits of a CR leader, often referring to fulfilling the obligations of the event and continually praising his team and volunteers in order to motivate better performance. Mark noted, “I set goals for my team to strive for. Working towards something inspires them to achieve it and it’s motivating to be able to check goals off the list of things to do.” This statement combines his two dominant leadership styles where a CR leader sets clearly defined goals and an IM leader encourages and motivates their team. Although Mark’s responses during the interview seemingly reflected CR leadership, he frequently mentioned driving his team through motivation and optimism which resonated with an IM leader. For example:

> I’m all about positive energy and I think the more I show that it rubs off on the people around me you know. If my team believes they can achieve X results on the day, then they will. Positive reinforcement of a belief really pays off for my event.
In conclusion, Mark’s narratives of his leadership style were congruent with his MLQ results and were found to be his dominant line of responses. However, Mark’s narratives also evoked sentiments of IM leadership. In line with his CR MLQ result, Mark was found to reflect several CR traits dominantly; however, he also reflected IM traits to a lesser degree. Thus, CR leadership appeared to be Mark’s dominant style and is consistent with his MLQ result, however, IM characteristics shone through resulting in a combination-style of leadership.

5.4.2 Management-by-Exception Active

MBEA is an active form of corrective leadership, where the leader pays close attention to any problems or deviations and actively monitors performance in order to take corrective action before issues arise (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This leader is characterised by remaining alert for infractions of rules, closely monitoring work and taking corrective action of mistakes before or when they happen, and teaching followers how to correct future mistakes (Antonakis & House, 2002). MBEA leaders aim to minimise mistakes occurring in the first place; however, MBEA is not considered an effective form of leadership as it can make followers overly precautious and limit autonomy (Antonakis & House, 2013). A sample MLQ item is: “The leader directs attention toward failures to meet standards.”

This section discusses the results of two male event managers, Elijah and Chris, who were categorised as MBEA leaders. Both participants had a high score of 3.5 in this category, above the group average at 2.11 and significantly higher than universal and Oceania norms. Considered a negative transaction by some authors (Antonakis & House, 2002), on the FRLM it still resides in the middle of the quadrant reflecting a degree of effectiveness. This suggests that, while not considered an ideal dominant form of leadership, it still has some optimal qualities.
Elijah was categorised as being a transactional MBEA leader. When asked if he agreed with this outcome he replied, “[laughs] yeah I’m not surprised I’m categorised as this type of leader.” He countered this by adding, “I’m mindful, but at the same time I’m assertive in putting out what needs to be done. So, while I’m laidback, I’m still firm.” Elijah placed a higher importance on the overall outcomes of the event rather than on individuals’ personal agendas, stating: “I don’t think I need to take on volunteers’ personal needs all too much.” When asked if he thought he would have been better placed into a different category of leadership he said, “No. My style has been working for me for as long as I’ve been with this event, but I wouldn’t say it’s an ideal leadership style for everyone. I tend to take a getting-things-done approach.” Therefore, although Elijah agrees this is not an ideal style for every event manager, the MLQ appears to have identified his traits correctly and he believes this is the category in which he is best placed.

Elijah’s perceptions appeared to indeed reflect his MBEA characteristics. Elijah had a focus on the occupational health and safety (OH&S) requirements of the event, suggesting a need to monitor specific procedures akin to MBEA leadership. For example:

This event is host to over two thousand riders, so safety needs to be my top priority. With an event this large the opportunity for accidents is high, even death is at stake. I won’t compromise on safety. I need to be up to date on all risk-management procedures. Our volunteers know safety is our main priority. It’s my job to instil it in them.

This type of statement reflects Elijah’s MBEA nature, in that role requirements are clearly clarified and then monitored for deviations from norms. Further, he suggests
that, “You can’t manage people’s personalities. So you manage what you can. You set
goals. You put motion in place and at the end of the day everyone is satisfied.” Elijah’s
responses were concise, with his attention focused on running his event effectively and
monitoring for mistakes. For example:

Yeah, there is a degree of paying extra attention to people’s errors. I’d
personally rather they get it right straight off the bat, but we are human.
Mistakes are inevitable, it’s how you deal with the volunteers when they make
the mistake that will make the difference. Like I said, you can’t just boss
volunteers around because they don’t have to take it. I take a firm approach in
order to correct the mistake as quickly as possible, but at the same time
reassure the volunteer they are still doing a good job and mistakes happen to
the best of us.

Analysis of Elijah’s qualitative supported his positioning as an MBEA leader
and suggest that his MLQ result was accurate as no evidence of other leadership styles
were evident in his responses.

5.4.2.2 Chris – MBEA Leader

Chris’s qualitative responses tended to support his depicted MBEA style as a result of
the MLQ. Chris was very concise in his interview responses, favouring ‘yes’ or ‘no’
answers. This is evident as he said, “Yes, I’d agree that’s my style of leadership”, in
response to a question about his MLQ result. Asked to describe his own leadership style
he stated:

I’m the manager, so any mistake is a direct reflection on my management
ability. I like my event to run as smoothly as possible with minimal infractions,
that way we achieve the most successful return on investment to the business
post-event.
Chris also noted: “The event is ultimately about marketing my business. So once the event is over the success of it can be determined based on the leverage gained by the business.” Having this focus on creating a profit from the event reflects Chris’s MBEA characteristics. Further, he spoke of monitoring for infractions, explaining: “I’m firm but fair. I do monitor my volunteers’ performance in lieu of mistakes as this can directly affect the event.” The majority of Chris’s interview responses seemed to reflect MBEA characteristics, suggesting an accurate MLQ result. No other leadership styles were evident in Chris’s qualitative narratives. As an MBEA leader, deviations from norms are monitored and mistakes or errors are actively watched. So, it can be determined that Chris’s perceptions of this style of leadership are congruent with his MLQ results.

5.5 An Overview of Findings Pertaining to Research Objectives One and Two

The aim of Chapter Five was to analyse and interpret the meanings embedded within the qualitative data pertaining to participants’ perceptions of their individual leadership styles, and compare and contrast these with their quantitative MLQ results as discussed in Chapter Four. The findings in this chapter revealed that, while all 19 participants initially agreed with their MLQ result, on further examination, some participants described their leadership style using opposing strengths to those of their MLQ result. Dominant styles to shine through which differed from the MLQ results were IC, IM and CR leadership styles. For example, Daniel and Mark, both CR leaders according to the MLQ, also embodied IM characteristics. In contrast, the narratives of both MBEA leaders, Elijah and Chris, were found to strongly reflect the ideals of their MLQ leadership style.

One of the most common responses when asked to describe one’s personal leadership style was that they lead by example. Participants, including Aimee, Jenny
and Karen, displayed this lead-by-example style of leadership in their responses. Many of the event managers also claimed they were not an authoritarian or a “micro-manager.” This was evident in the responses of Sophie and Michelle when they explained the type of leader they don’t believe they are. Another common response was that they consider themselves to be flexible leaders, suggesting events are fluid and require room for movement and adaption when managing volunteers. Chris, Matt and Connor highlight this notion, saying how adaptive event managers need to be in order to adapt to ever-changing process of the event itself. Such themes are analysed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Chapter Four described the findings resulting from the quantitative data, this chapter addressed augmented those findings by infusing qualitative data from in-depth interviews with the event managers. Although, initially, nine participants exhibited an IC style from the MLQ, their narratives suggested that only six of those nine could actually be categorised as IC. No participants scored highest in the passive avoidant leadership categories of MBEP and LF. Interestingly, the only results in a leadership style that was not transformational came from males according to the MLQ; however, the event managers’ narratives suggested that some females perceived that they lead partly through transactional traits. The analysis presented in this chapter highlights that, MLQ results typically categorised males into transactional leadership styles and females into transformational styles, however, participants evoked other styles of leadership during the interviews. While females often exhibited multiple leadership styles as determined by the MLQ, male event managers were found to be dominant in a single style of leadership as per the results of the MLQ. Thus, this chapter showed that although event managers gravitated towards a preferred leadership style, usually
aligning with their MLQ result, it was common for elements of other leadership styles to be reflected within their interview responses.

5.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter aimed to address the analysed data applying to Research Objectives One and Two of this study. Participants were categorised according to their MLQ result, as determined in Chapter Four, and then qualitative findings from the data exploring their perceptions of their own leadership style were discussed. Findings revealed that, although the MLQ gives a good indication of an event manager’s style of leadership, event managers often do not neatly reflect one single leadership category, rather they can exhibit a range of different leadership styles across a variety of events. Thus, it is prudent to further explore these results through qualitative methods to probe the perceptions of each individual. Based on the results of the MLQ it is possible, however, to determine an event manager’s preferred leadership style, and in this study the event managers’ qualitative perceptions of their leadership style were generally consistent with the MLQ results.

The remaining research objectives are examined in Chapter Six, which examines the attitudes of event managers towards training event volunteers in light of their leadership styles.
CHAPTER 6: VARIATION IN ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRAINING VOLUNTEERS ACROSS EVENT MANAGERS’ LEADERSHIP STYLES

6.1 Introduction

Chapter Six is the third and final chapter of results. The two previous results chapters have highlighted the findings pertaining to Research Objectives One and Two, where event managers’ MLQ results were scored, categorising them into one of nine leadership styles according to the FRLT, and their perceptions of their own style of leadership were compared to their MLQ result. This chapter presents results pertaining to Research Objective Three: Examine if and how attitudes towards training for event volunteers varies across event managers’ leadership styles, and Research Objective Four: Identify and explore factors shaping event managers’ decisions regarding the allocation of training resources for event volunteers.

Firstly, in order to address Research Objective Three, it was necessary to ask the event managers an array of questions during the semi-structured interviews pertaining to their personal attitude towards training event volunteers (refer to Appendix C). Such responses evoked positive or negative evaluations of participants’ perceptions of volunteer training. However, before moving on to analysing the event managers’ attitudes towards training for event volunteers, Section 6.2 instructively presents a description of the volunteer training initiative offered at the case study events.
6.2 The Nature of Volunteer Training Offered at the Case Study Events

Training was a central theoretical concept in this study. Hence it was crucial that each event that was purposefully selected for participation conducted some form of volunteer training. Although training for volunteers was a prerequisite for participation in this study, participants initially seemed confused when questioned about the formality of training at their event in the online questionnaire. This was indicated by the question: “Does this event organisation have a formal training program in place for event volunteers?” to which event managers were required to tick ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Responses were varied, with only eight participants originally answering ‘yes’ in phase one data collection. This proved somewhat problematic, and the small sample necessitated lateral thinking by the researcher to further clarify the training provided and verify each event’s eligibility for participation in the study. Therefore, methods and scope for training volunteers were discussed in detail during the semi-structured interviews.

In order to clarify event managers’ responses in regards to training for volunteers, they were asked about the level and comprehensiveness of volunteer training at their events, which ultimately determined their eligibility for participation in this study. All event managers who initially indicated ‘no’ to the question of formal training changed their response when probed further in interviews. An example of this was Lyndsay, who answered ‘no’ to any formal training in her questionnaire; however, when questioned about training during the semi-structured interview she recalled several training initiatives aimed at volunteer workers. She noted, “I mean everyone does get trained, but there is no ‘training’ as such.” Likewise, Sophie originally indicated there was no formal training, though when probed further she stated, “Yeah, it’s not formal [training] … but at least a little bit of training is essential for every event.” Such findings confirmed that although initial responses varied in the
questionnaire, all event managers did in fact deliver volunteer training at their events to some degree. However, the degree of training was largely dependent on the size of the event and the number of volunteers employed at each event. As Matt confirmed, “We don’t have a large number of volunteers, and some of those volunteers have been with us for the last few years. Initial training is necessary to get them up to speed.”

This confusion surrounding the degree to which each event implemented training appeared evident across the sample. As many of the event managers did not consider their event to have a formal training program, they often conceded that training was delivered on more of a reactive basis based on the needs of their volunteers. For example, Claire noted: “Formal training wasn’t something we really considered, but volunteers are trained according to the roles they are required to fulfil.” Thus, parameters for participant inclusion were opened to all events implementing training, regardless of the degree to which training was conducted. While all of the event managers offered some form of volunteer training, ranging from informal one-on-one coaching to a formal training program and induction, the event managers were further probed during interviews to explore and clarify the comprehensiveness of the volunteer training they delivered. Here, Lesley indicated that volunteer training was conducted on a ‘needs’ basis, Mark contrastingly was hesitant to confirm any volunteer training, noting: “I suppose we do offer training. Probably not in any traditional forms, but direction and support is given. If a volunteer needs help, I’m happy to give it.”

To more accurately understand the training offered at events within the sample and corresponding event managers’ attitudes towards volunteer training, Table 6.1 describes the relevant training offered, affording insights into the comprehensiveness of actual training and the volunteer demographics at each event.
Table 6.1 Detailed Description of Training Offered Within the Events Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorised MLQ Leadership Style</th>
<th>Event Manager</th>
<th>Training Offered at Event</th>
<th>Volunteer Demographics</th>
<th>Attitude Towards Training for Event Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>Addisyn</td>
<td>Formal training program:</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49)</td>
<td>Positive: Well-trained volunteers perform at their best delivering high-quality frontline service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Role-specific training prior to event for more detailed volunteer roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-the-job training and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aimee</td>
<td>Formal training program:</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49) Young Adults (14–17)</td>
<td>Positive: Strongly believed in the worthiness of training. Achieving effective performance from volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Induction (lecture style)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Role-specific training prior to event for more detailed volunteer roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Group training (groups of 70–80) for general info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-the-job training and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>- Induction</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49) Young Adults (14–17)</td>
<td>Positive: Training was considered important to equip volunteers with the skills/knowledge to perform effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OJT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>- Meeting at club in lead-up to event</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49)</td>
<td>Positive: Believed there was no difference between training paid staff and volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorised MLQ Leadership Style</td>
<td>Event Manager</td>
<td>Training Offered at Event</td>
<td>Volunteer Demographics</td>
<td>Attitude Towards Training for Event Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>Formal training program:</td>
<td>Adults (18–49)</td>
<td>Positive: Believed a well-trained team is hard to beat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Induction (morning of event)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Role-specific training prior to event for more detailed volunteer roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-the-job training and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>- Induction (morning of event)</td>
<td>Adults (18–49)</td>
<td>Positive: Strongly believed in the importance of training. Training dependent on size of event/number of volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OJT</td>
<td>Young Adults (14–17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>- Group training prior to event for general info</td>
<td>Adults (18–49)</td>
<td>Positive: Actively recruited volunteers with skills/knowledge appropriate for volunteer roles at her event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Induction (morning of event)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-the-job training and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>- Induction</td>
<td>Aged (50+)</td>
<td>Positive: Volunteers are a representation of your event. To perform optimally training, support and direction is critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-the-job training and support</td>
<td>Adults (18–49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young Adults (14–17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>- Tour of creative space</td>
<td>Aged (50+)</td>
<td>Positive: Spends time identifying training needs of volunteers to better place them into volunteer roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Team meeting in lead-up to event</td>
<td>Adults (18–49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Group workshops</td>
<td>Kids (13 &amp; Under)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OJT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IC</td>
<td>- Team meeting in lead up to event</td>
<td>Adults (18–49)</td>
<td>Positive: Believed training volunteers was no different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Role-specific coaching prior to event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorised MLQ Leadership Style</td>
<td>Event Manager</td>
<td>Training Offered at Event</td>
<td>Volunteer Demographics</td>
<td>Attitude Towards Training for Event Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>- On-the-job support during event</td>
<td>Aged (50+)</td>
<td>Positive: Identifying individual needs of volunteers to better train and place them into volunteer roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | IM Connor      | - Induction  
- Role-specific training prior to event for more detailed volunteer roles  
- On-the-job training and support | Adults (18–49) | Positive: Training was important to keep up to date with changing volunteer roles. |
| | Matt           | - Team meeting in lead up to event  
- Role-specific coaching prior to event  
- On-the-job support during event | Aged (50+)  
Adults (18–49) | Positive: Believed the key to training was to let volunteers think problems through logically.  
Negative: Considered training too costly and volunteers to be adults not needing training for menial tasks. |
| | IS Claire      | - Team meeting in lead up to event  
- Induction (morning of event)  
- OJT | Aged (50+)  
Adults (18–49)  
Young Adults (14–17)  
Kids (13 & Under) | Positive: Higher-skilled volunteer roles require specific training, and all |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorised MLQ Leadership Style</th>
<th>Event Manager</th>
<th>Training Offered at Event</th>
<th>Volunteer Demographics</th>
<th>Attitude Towards Training for Event Volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Formal training program:</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49)</td>
<td><strong>Positive:</strong> Training is a necessary evil. Costly, but necessary. Supports training 100%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Induction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Role-specific training prior to event for more detailed volunteer roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-the-job training and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>- Induction (morning of event)</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49)</td>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong> Training is an unnecessary expense. Volunteers are adults bringing experience to elementary volunteer roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OJT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>- Induction (morning of event)</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49)</td>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong> Formal training considered unnecessary. Volunteers are mostly adults needing little training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- OJT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elijah</td>
<td>- Team meeting in lead up to event</td>
<td>Aged (50+) Adults (18–49)</td>
<td><strong>Negative:</strong> Can only afford to train volunteers fulfilling high-skilled roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Role-specific coaching prior to event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- On-the-job support during event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6.3 now goes on to analyse the event managers’ attitudes towards training for event volunteers. Section 6.3 is structured according to the event managers’ leadership styles so as to facilitate analysis of variance in attitudes across the various leadership styles. Interview questions focused on ascertaining an overall viewpoint of participants concerning training for volunteers. By analysing these particular factors, the researcher was able to afford a more comprehensive dataset which aimed to answer Research Objective Three. Key themes are delineated using italics throughout the following sections.

6.3 Event Managers’ Attitudes towards Training Event Volunteers

In order to understand the event managers’ attitudes towards training and to determine any variance in attitudes to training across their leadership styles, semi-structured interviews were conducted covering a range of questions pertaining to this topic. Questions sought to ascertain the event managers’ overall attitudes towards training for their volunteers. Appendix C contains the interview schedule for this aspect of the research. Participants’ initial responses varied, being both positive and negative in their regard for training. While the majority considered training an important aspect of their event, there were those who did not place a great deal of importance on training for their volunteers. Thus, two themes arose from participants’ qualitative narratives which determined their overall attitude to training. These were *positive attitude* and *negative attitude*.

6.3.1 Transformational Leaders’ Attitudes towards Training Event Volunteers

Analysis of the qualitative narratives of transformational event managers revealed that most generally held positive attitudes towards volunteer training, with the exception of
one expressing a negative attitude. Many participants’ narratives were characterised by positive statements reflective of the worthiness of training, including: “training is crucial” (Connor), “it’s extremely important” (Aimee) and “it’s setting them [volunteers] up to succeed” (Karen). Positive attitudes were a result of participants perceiving training to be important for their volunteers. In contrast, negative attitudes were evident within narratives, portraying training as not worthwhile through statements such as: “training is too costly” (Steph) and “we do train, but it’s not always necessary” (Lyndsay). To better understand the variance among participants’ narratives concerning volunteer training, an exploration of event managers’ attitudes according to their leadership style follows. A discussion of transformational participants’ attitudes towards volunteer training follows in the ensuing sub-sections.

6.3.1.1 Idealised Influence Behavioural Leaders

As discussed in Chapter Five, five participants conformed to an IIB style of leadership: Aimee, Jenny, Sophie, Addisyn and Amanda. Each of these IIB event managers held strong positive attitudes towards training for event volunteers, with Aimee portraying perhaps the strongest belief in the benefits of training. Aimee held a strong, positive attitude toward training for event volunteers, stating: “It’s about getting the greatest performance out of your volunteers when they’re on the job and that requires training. That’s exactly how I see it.” She further explained: “I mean training can be a really costly exercise but it’s extremely important. Without training you wouldn’t be able to run a successful event.” Aimee claimed that she leads by example, saying: “I like to give them a really clear definition of where they are going and to follow that up with some autonomy.” Aimee cited open communication, clear and precise information, being approachable and negotiation skills as core skills required to facilitate volunteer training, aligning with her categorised leadership style.
Jenny also highlighted the importance of training at her event in stating:

We train all our paid staff, so it’s no different with our volunteers. They are representing our event, so they must be well trained. There’s no point in having our volunteers working aimlessly with no direction. They tend to be older volunteers, but I find that a little training motivates them to get on board with our event goals.

However, Sophie led a younger, diverse group of volunteers and her approach to training was to “try and give people the big picture.” Sophie’s positive attitude towards training was further evident in her statement that, “Even though our training isn’t formal, skills are required to be learnt for almost every aspect of the festival.” Sophie’s attitude was more laid-back than that of Aimee, yet she was steadfast in her approach to training, stating: “Volunteers are given on-the-job training and support. Overall, a well-trained team is hard to beat.”

Similarly, Addisyn and Amanda held positive attitudes towards training, along with their other IIB participants. Both of these event managers believed that training volunteers was essential to maintain efficient running of their events. Addisyn explained:

Training is the foundation tool to achieving a winning event. Properly trained and motivated volunteers are going to be giving their best, in effect delivering high quality service which is the cornerstone of a successful event. I’d say it’s [training] the oil to our serviceable machine.

Addisyn further noted that, “We have in excess of three hundred volunteers. Assessing their current skills and training them up to be put into the right role is crucial. Training has to be succinct and specific.” Amanda also considered training as important
to her event, noting: “Training is the oil to our well-oiled machine. The machine being our event.” This oil analogy suggests that training is the tool that enables the smooth running of the event, as it equips the volunteers with skills and knowledge to carry out their roles with clarity in terms of what is expected from them.

All IIB participants shared similar attitudes towards training volunteers at their event, as evident in the examples provided above. Although these participants proffered diverse approaches to training, they all indeed trained their volunteers and perceived benefits in doing so. In conclusion, IIB participants all held a positive attitude towards training their volunteers. This was typically explicated by their support of training, considering it vital, and actively following through with training for volunteers. The following section explores in depth the attitudes of IM participants to training for event volunteers.

6.3.1.2 Inspirational Motivation Leaders

Three of the event managers interviewed identified with IM leadership. Connor, Matt and Steph. Participants conforming to IM leadership held diverse attitudes towards volunteer training. Both Connor and Matt’s attitudes aligned with their IM style and were predominantly positive; however, Steph considered training less positively, somewhat conflicting with her IM style. Connor explained that, “just because we’ve done something previously doesn’t mean we’ll continue to do it the same way. That’s why training is important because we’re constantly changing things every year.” Connor took a strong, positive stance toward training, stating:

I think it’s really crucial to provide adequate training and the right training for volunteers. Certainly, I think it’s an area where a lot of event coordinators don’t do well. Training’s a part of ensuring the volunteer does the best job for you.
He further went on to explain that:

It’s a matter of working out each volunteer’s individual learning needs and how they best respond to things. That places a huge focus on training as we’re looking at enhancing knowledge and skills to the benefit of our event.

Connor adopted a more tailored approach towards volunteer training, appearing to satisfy the training needs of individuals as opposed to a one-size-fits-all approach to training. Connor’s positive attitude towards training also resonated with Matt, as he strongly perceived training as beneficial for the volunteers at his event:

I do believe training is important … without training an event won’t flourish like it could. All volunteers need some sort of training and direction. We happen to be lucky with our volunteers, as most are already skilled in the areas needing coverage at the event. I do think larger events have to place a higher priority on training compared to a small event like ours. But in saying that, even small events require training. Without training an event won’t flourish like it could.

Further, Matt appeared to motivate his volunteers to think rationally about a problem, encouraging them to think first before coming to him with issues that could readily be answered. Analysis determined this may have been a way for Matt to minimise the need for training as volunteers were first encouraged to think rationally about solutions to problems prior to seeking learning advice. Matt’s background training with the Australian Army prompted his firm, regimented view on training and he was very matter-of-fact when discussing his expectations. He explained his training philosophy:
Basically, how I train my team is, don’t come to me with a complaint. If you have an issue with something you can’t easily fix, you need to come to me with the problem and a reasonably justified course of action for a solution to that problem. If you don’t have a problem and a solution, then you’re just complaining.

While Matt’s attitudes were consistent with IM leadership traits, as they motivate and encourage volunteers to think for themselves, they can also be linked to IS leadership in which followers are engaged intellectually by working through problems themselves to arrive at a solution. This is the ‘think, don’t “tell”’ attitude which is reflective of IS leadership behaviours. More pronounced though was Matt’s inclination to motivate his team, suggesting Matt’s and Connor’s positive attitude towards training for event volunteers aligned well with their IM leadership categorisation. Such leaders are said to provide meaning for the task at hand and clearly communicate the vision through understandable, precise and motivating training activities. Both Connor and Matt held positive attitudes towards training. This suggests they embodied their IM leadership traits, honing in on their motivational capabilities and promoting the importance of training through this style.

In contrast, however, Steph—also an IM leader—held a very different attitude to Matt and Connor. For example, she explained that, “The cost of training is just too high, especially as our event only goes for one day.” Steph further noted, “Our volunteers are adults and we treat them as such. We aren’t going to give them training on how to pick up rubbish.” Her attitude is somewhat conflicting with the ideals of an IM leader as she viewed training in a more negative light, stating:

To a degree you do have to provide some direction and supervision, yet for events like ours and other smaller events I can’t imagine wasting money on
training … It’s not really ‘training’ as such. They’re [volunteers] given
direction and if they’re unsure of something they just ask. It’s not that hard.

Steph’s attitude conveyed that training for event volunteers was unnecessary and
placed an unnecessary burden on organisational resources and, due to the unskilled
nature of volunteer roles at her event, did not justify the effort and expense of offering
comprehensive training. Steph appeared to place the onus of training on the volunteers
themselves. She suggested that, if volunteers needed training, they should come directly
to her and request necessary training. Steph’s negative attitude resonated with
transactional leaders, Elijah and Chris, both of whom were the only other event
managers opposed to training. This is quite interesting, as Elijah and Chris were both
transactional MBEA leaders, with a tendency to view training as not worthwhile—not
dissimilar to their expected leadership style behaviours—while Steph scored highly as
an IM leader, which according to the FRLT embraces positive, motivational and
supportive leadership behaviours. Steph’s attitude to training was therefore in contrast
to her leadership style result. Her negative attitude towards volunteer training
misaligned with expected IM transformational leadership characteristics, which tend to
emphasise motivating and inspiring potential performance.

In summary, the attitudes of IM event managers were diverse, with both Connor
and Matt positively enforcing the training of their volunteers and Steph downplaying
the importance of training for volunteers at her event. Steph cited budgetary and
resource constraints, as well as the age of volunteers and her perceptions of volunteer
roles as being unskilled as reasons why she considered training unnecessary for
volunteers at her event. Thus, both positive attitudes and a negative attitude were
evident among IM event managers interviewed in this study. Data revealed that event
managers did not always hold attitudes exclusively in accordance with the expected
traits of their innate leadership style. Steph’s qualitative narrative suggested that although she considered training negatively, her attitude in this respect was not the ultimate determining factor in deciding the actual volunteer training offered at her event. Next, the attitudes of IS event managers are analysed.

6.3.1.3 Intellectual Stimulation Leader

Only one event manager, Claire, identified with an IS leadership style. Her initial response to training at her event via the questionnaire was ‘no’, although further probing revealed she did conduct training for volunteers at her event. Claire’s responses to questions regarding the importance of training were generally positive. She agreed that training event volunteers was a high priority, stating: “You can’t just recruit volunteers and have them turn up on the day and send them to do jobs they have no prior knowledge of.” Claire was adamant that training for volunteers needs to be conducted; however, the level of training actually provided could vary depending on the role and skills required to fulfil the volunteer position: “At the very least volunteers should be inducted. That goes for the more unskilled positions. Volunteer roles that require cash handling, IT, or dealing with the public obviously need direction and training.”

In terms of her approach to designing and delivering training for volunteers, Claire explained that she trained her volunteers by:

… setting them up to succeed. I want to encourage them to be self-aware. They are responsible for their work and what needs to be done. Rather than saying this is what you have to do, I explain what the event is about and motivate them with the knowledge they need to do the job at hand. Essentially, a team that is motivated by a goal and their own interests to do well, not micro-managed, performs better. That’s what I’ve found.
Claire’s attitude towards training for event volunteers aligns closely with what would be expected from an IS leader, whereby the leader engages their team intellectually. Claire adopts a ‘think, don’t “tell”’ approach towards training her volunteers, again reflecting her IS leadership style. Claire was adamant, however, that training for volunteers was dependent largely on the complexity of the volunteer role. Unlike many other participants who suggested training should be dependent on the size and scale of the event, Claire reasoned that training had to be determined based on the actual roles volunteers are required to undertake:

Training, I believe, is necessary across the board but the level of training depends on how difficult the volunteer role is. For example, operating a register requires a different level of training than say, clean-up crew.

This focus on skill-based training also resonates with Claire’s IS style, which emphasises professional development of followers. Claire’s qualitative narratives around volunteer training suggest she held an overall positive attitude, as would be expected from her IS leadership style. The next section analyses IC participants’ attitudes to training volunteers at their event.

6.3.1.4 Individualised Consideration Leaders

IC was the most common leadership style among the sample of event managers. Six event managers identified with IC leadership: Karen, Lyndsay, Sally, Lexi, Michelle and Lesley. None of the IC leaders offered ‘formal training programs’ for their volunteers, although OJT was conducted at each event.

All IC participants considered training to be a necessity and commonly held positive attitudes towards volunteer training. Firstly, Karen conveyed a strong belief in the importance of training for volunteers, stating: “I’m a firm believer in training and
would think most events that aren’t small, community events would require training for their volunteers.” Karen further stated that her volunteers have no formal training, however, they all go through an induction process and are given manuals outlining their responsibilities. An induction at Karen’s event generally involved a meeting-like training scenario where a trainer lectured volunteers on topics such as background information of the event, OH&S procedures, and volunteers’ responsibilities. The complexity of volunteer roles was a training issue emphasised within Karen’s qualitative narratives. Here Karen explained that, “The highest skilled volunteer role for this event is managing the cash and wristbands at the gate. So, whilst we do need to train volunteers in what to do, the level of training is basic.” The majority of volunteer roles at Karen’s event were filled by high-school-aged children and she noted that they were often prepared at school for many of the tasks they are required to fulfil. Karen noted that training for some of her volunteers began at school:

We recruit volunteers from local schools each year. The schools play a big role getting the kids [volunteers] motivated and prepared to successfully carry out their roles. So, they come to us pre-trained to undertake a role within our event giving them practical experience. This is obviously beneficial to us as it cuts down on training costs, in turn we continually recruit volunteers from the schools each year. It’s a win-win situation.

This kind of statement regarding volunteer roles at Karen’s event suggests that training can be implemented at many levels prior to an event, with prior skills imported from previous experience and learned through other sources immediately before volunteering. The existing skills and knowledge volunteers possess are often learned from school, prior work-experience and at home, leading to a diverse range of skills and knowledge that volunteers can bring to volunteering.
Similarly, Lesley led a younger volunteer event workforce. She noted that, “A lot of the skills the younger volunteers bring they learn at school or from their first job. They already know about OH&S and interacting with the public, which makes training them that much easier.” Akin to her IC style of leadership, Lesley spoke of interacting with her volunteers and getting to know them individually in order to hone their skills efficiently, stating:

Training your team is important. I want us all on the same page. Getting to know them individually and seeing what makes them tick is what I do. It helps that we only have a small team of volunteers too. That way I can see if they are extroverted for example and like talking with people. Honing-in on their strengths helps train skills that are already there, and I can place them into a role suitable to their skill set.

Michelle’s strong focus on developing her team’s skills and knowledge because “… they are the key to this event’s success” aligns well with her IC MLQ result. Michelle described her attitude towards training in this way: “My team is the frontline of this event. When they perform well, the event is more likely to be a success. That’s why their induction and subsequent training is important.” When questioned further about her attitude to training Michelle stated: “I wholly believe that all volunteers need to be trained. You wouldn’t send your paid staff out to represent your event without the appropriate training. Why should volunteers be any different?” This sentiment resonated with Lexi, who similarly noted: “Anyone you have working at your event, volunteers and paid staff, are a reflection of your organisation. To perform at their best, training, support and direction are critical.” Here the focus was on developing individuals, no matter what their employment status is.
Lexi talked of developing rapport with her volunteers in order to make training more comfortable and less stressful for them: “I think it’s about the rapport you have with people and that relationship where they can see you as their boss but also someone who’s approachable and easy to talk to. This makes managing them a lot less difficult.” Lexi took a firm stance on her attitude to training volunteers as being essential:

It is vital. If no training is offered it is a danger to the success of the event itself. Volunteers are a direct representation of your event. The frontline if you will. Therefore, it is imperative that they represent the event to a high standard. How are they able to do that if they haven’t been given proper training? They need it as much as we do. Training is a win-win for us and the volunteers, making it vital.

Lyndsay led a diverse array of volunteers, ranging from children 13 and under all the way up to persons aged 50 and older. Considering the training needs of this complex group was potentially more difficult than for volunteers of similar ages. Lyndsay considered volunteering at her event a ‘learning experience’, stating: “I do throw people in the deep end a lot.” More aligned with her IC leadership style, Lyndsay noted:

Talking to people, helping people, and having friends is a big part of this for me. I like to take the time to actually enjoy people and listen to their training needs. It may appear time-consuming initially, but it allows me to better help them by placing them in [volunteer] roles suitable to their current level of skill and knowledge. Spending time getting to know people at first lets me identify what training they need.

Identifying the needs of individuals is important to IC leaders. Lyndsay highlighted the importance of understanding her volunteers’ needs to ensure their
experience was worthwhile. She added that those volunteers who “have great experiences come back and volunteer again. This makes training essential first time round as they know what they’re doing next time.” This line of thinking resonated with Sally, as she too believed training needed to be done right the first time and suggested that returning volunteers require little, if any, training the following year. Recruiting volunteers on an opportunistic basis appeared to be a priority for many IC leaders, as volunteers were recruited from local schools, business owners and in some instances, gaol inmates, as Sally noted:

I mentioned the gaol, which is close by the town. We actually use those inmates for volunteers. They’re low-risk criminals and volunteering is a gateway to being reintroduced into the community and building up some confidence. They’re all males and typically really strong so they are amazing at hard yakka like setting up the event.

Identifying strengths within her community, Sally explained that training was “negotiable” based on the complexity of individual volunteer roles. Highlighting having gaol inmates as volunteers was mutually beneficial for both groups, Sally stressed the importance of social inclusion, noting this was a central theme behind her event. Sally also mentioned that training was dependent on the complexity of the volunteer role and aligning with IC behaviours she listened to the needs of her volunteers, aiming “to talk to people and understand what makes them tick, ultimately helping me direct them and make sure training fulfils their role requirements.”

In sum, all of the IC event managers expressed positive attitudes regarding training for their volunteers. The attitudes expressed by these event managers strongly aligned with expected IC behaviours, which are typically centred around coaching, mentoring and providing one-on-one support to followers. This concludes the analysis.
of transformational event managers’ attitudes, and the next section analyses the attitudes of participants with a transactional leadership style concerning training their event volunteers.

**6.3.2 Transactional Leaders’ Attitudes towards Training Event Volunteers**

Most of the event managers identifying with transactional leadership styles held more negative attitudes towards training for event volunteers. Many of the transactional event managers’ narratives were carried negative connotations, for example: “the costs of training are definitely too high” (Elijah), “I don’t think every event needs training” (Daniel) and “the event budget dictates what training can be employed” (Chris). However, there was some variation within these transactional event managers’ attitudes towards volunteer training, with some more reflective of their transactional categorisation than others. The following sub-sections discuss these attitudes according to the two FRLT transactional leadership styles to which the event managers conformed.

**6.3.2.1 Contingent Reward Leaders**

Two of the event managers, Daniel and Mark, exhibited a CR style of leadership. These two event managers held differing attitudes towards training for their volunteers, with Daniel expressing a positive attitude, emphasising the benefits of training and its worthiness at his event, while Mark considered training less worthwhile. Although both provided some sort of training for their volunteers, they both framed training as a financially costly exercise. Mark grappled with the necessity of training and deemed it a calculated expense for those events with the budget to warrant such an activity: “Most of our volunteers have been with us since the event’s inception. They were thrown in
the deep end from the start and everything we did was learnt as we went along.” In contrast, Daniel advocated the importance of training at his event:

My attitude towards training is definitely that it’s almost a necessary evil. The flip side is that most people probably don’t jump at the thought of training and it can be costly. However, to learn new things and have the knowledge to share with others, training must be undertaken. I support training even at cost, 100%.

Initially, Mark stated that there was no training provided for his event; however, upon further probing, he conceded that some form of training was carried out at the event: “I wouldn’t say training is quite that big of a deal, but volunteers are given the necessary information to fulfil their roles.” Daniel, however, thoroughly discussed the training undertaken by volunteers at his event, suggesting they were more capable and knowledgeable solely due to the training they received. Though both Mark and Daniel held different stances on training for their events, they suggested that for events of similar size and financial capabilities, training for volunteers was unnecessary. Daniel’s strong opinion towards training seemed only relevant to his event, as he stated: “I don’t think every event needs training. I’m sure the majority of smaller events get by without any formal training whatsoever.” This example suggests that there can be divergence between event managers’ personal attitudes towards training for event volunteers, and their actual practices. Mark also suggested that training was only necessary for large-scale events, noting: “I know of other events run by colleagues where no training is offered. A lot of the time when you have adult volunteers training is just an unnecessary expense.” In sum, although Mark and Daniel held conflicting attitudes towards training for their own events, they shared a similar belief that training is dependent on the individual event and not to be applied across all events.
CR leaders are generally concerned with exchanging reward for effective performance, and in this study CR was one of only two leadership styles in which the event managers exhibited differing attitudes towards training; CR leaders are generally concerned with exchanging reward for effective performance. According to expected behaviours associated with CR leadership, one could reasonably assume training would be considered important as effective follower performance is sought by CR leaders. Data indicating both a positive attitude and a negative attitude show that no overriding attitude was apparent among the CR event managers in this study. Finally, MBEA participants’ attitudes are discussed.

6.3.2.2 Management-By-Exception Active Leaders

Two of the event managers in this study were classified as MBEA leaders, Elijah and Chris. Elijah appeared to consider training negatively, taking a ‘mistakes are inevitable’ mentality. He believed that learning on the job was the most befitting approach to training for volunteers at his event. Elijah was adamant that training was warranted only if an event’s budget allowed, stating:

The costs of training are definitely too high, they would outweigh the benefits. If we had a budget for training I’m sure it would go down well with many of the volunteers, but we can only afford to train those where ticketing is necessary. Most of our volunteers are older and won’t return to volunteer again next year so training would really be a waste of time.

Elijah further argued that, “They’re ad-hoc volunteers and for us to spend money on training, only for them to never return, would be a wasted investment.” He augmented this belief by adding, “A lot of our volunteers don’t want to spend time sitting through training courses for roles they can easily undertake.” He explained that
OJT is conducted for event volunteers; however, no formal training program exists, nor was it considered necessary. Elijah further went on to explain that, “Anything volunteers need to know can be learned quite easily while carrying out that role.” Elijah appeared to consider the majority of volunteer roles at his event elementary; however, other event managers seemed more prepared to train volunteers for more complex roles.

Similarly, Chris considered the costs of training to outweigh the benefits, underpinning his negative attitude towards training for event volunteers. Chris explained that the roles his volunteers were obligated to undertake required little skill: “Direction is given but, our volunteers are adults, so we treat them as such. Formal training is not necessary for the [volunteer] roles.” He further went on to state: “Why spend money on training when the volunteer roles really aren’t that hard? All our volunteers are adults and we count on them having the capability to carry out any tasks they’re given.” Chris ascertained that training can be useful for some events: “the event budget dictates what training can be employed. Like most smaller, locally-run events, there is no money for training. You do what you can.” Chris’s negative attitude towards training for volunteers was reflective of expected MBEA leadership behaviours in which the leader typically does not anticipate future problems, instead waiting for problems to arise before taking action.

Both Elijah and Chris held similar attitudes towards training. They considered training unnecessarily costly and believed that volunteer roles at their events required little skill to perform. They also explained that their volunteers tended to be older, volunteered ad-hoc and that they considered the volunteers to be adults who required only minimal direction and supervision. Although both expressed negative attitudes toward training for volunteers, they conceded the benefits of an expansive budget for
training applicable to larger events where large numbers of younger volunteers often need to be managed.

**6.3.3 Summary: Event Managers’ Attitudes towards Training Event Volunteers**

A majority of the event managers in this study held a positive attitude toward training for event volunteers, with 15 of the 19 leaders considering training a worthwhile activity. Of these, 12 were female and three were male. In contrast, approximately one quarter of the event managers held a negative attitude towards training volunteers. This belief was held by only four of the 19 participants. Interestingly, both MBEA event managers held negative attitudes toward training for event volunteers. As a whole, the event managers’ attitudes in this respect ranged across a spectrum, with highly positive attitudes convinced training was very important for their event generally associated with transformational leadership, while those displaying a negative attitude were mostly transactional leaders who considered training as overly costly and therefore unimportant for their event.

Among the event managers who rejected the importance of training for event volunteers, three were transactional leaders. Both Elijah and Chris (MBEA leaders) and Mark (a CR leader) all considered training unnecessary for their events. They believed that the financial costs of training for volunteers outweighed the benefits. Surprisingly, Steph (an IM leader) was the only female to discount the importance of training. Steph believed the costs associated with training to be too high and that it was unnecessary for her volunteers. While Steph’s attitude was somewhat unexpected given her IM leadership style, all three males who exhibited transactional leadership styles were vehement in their attitudes that training was of little benefit for volunteers at their events.
Although the transformational event managers commonly perceived training for event volunteers positively, and the opposite was found for transactional leaders, this pattern was not always universal. The data revealed that attitudes to training varied within the transformational and transactional leadership styles and that the event managers’ attitudes towards training for volunteers did not always align with behaviours associated with particular leadership styles. Findings pertaining to Research Objective Three suggest that, although most event managers were eager to support training for their volunteers, various internal and external factors within the events’ operating milieu often determined whether or not, and the degree of training that could be provided to volunteers. Consequently, the next section addresses Research Objective Four by exploring other factors which shaped the event managers’ decision about whether to resource and implement training for event volunteers.

6.4 Factors Shaping Event Managers’ Decision-Making around Resourcing Training for Event Volunteers

To build an enhanced understanding of how event managers ultimately decide whether to implement training for their event volunteers, situational variables affecting such decisions are explored in this section. While the event managers’ attitudes did not universally explain their decisions as to whether or not to implement training for volunteers, the event managers in this study did allude to several factors which impacted the actual training resourced and implemented at their events. Consequently, Research Objective Four sought to explore factors which shape event managers’ decisions to resource and implement volunteer training at their events.

Participants’ qualitative narratives revealed numerous extraneous factors which possibly affected their decisions around the degree of volunteer training they implemented for their events. The event managers’ attitudes toward training were not
found to exclusively impact the training provided to event volunteers. However, extraneous factors, such as budgetary restrictions, time and other resource constraints, differences between paid staff and volunteers, current skill/knowledge of volunteers, the complexity of volunteer roles, non-standardised training and external influencing factors such as event managers’ perceptions of training provided by other event managers, all appeared to influence their willingness and capacity to resource and implement training for volunteers at their events.

Factors that resonated most strongly among these event managers included available budget, under-standardised training, training improbability and direct involvement. These factors were often found to ultimately determine the degree of training offered by event managers, and in many cases their decisions appeared to conflict with the expected behaviours associated with the event managers’ preferred leadership styles. Data from this study therefore suggest that an event’s available resources may ultimately shape the degree of training provided to volunteers, as is explicated in the ensuing sub-sections.

6.4.1 Budgetary Restrictions

Of major concern to the implementation of volunteer training was the budget available to implement this activity. This theme resonated strongly in almost every participant’s qualitative narratives, thus suggesting that the financial resources of the event significantly constrained or enabled training to be provided to volunteers. The majority of event managers were advocates for training, though the degree to which it was implemented was restrained by an event’s budget. Most participants reasoned that although training for volunteers is important, budget would be a key determining factor affecting the delivery of training to volunteers at all events. For example, Karen noted:
Whilst in general I do consider training important and would think most of my peers would also, for most events they would have to consider if the benefits would outweigh the costs. I’d say for larger events training would be a necessary cost, but the benefits would also be far greater as larger numbers of volunteers are impacted. They’d probably have a training budget and their volunteer roles may require more skills. Whereas we take on a limited number of volunteers for non-skilled roles.

Many of the event managers commented on the costliness of training volunteers, and accordingly suggested that only those events with a budget for human resources could afford to carry out adequate training for volunteers. Sophie suggested that a larger budget for training would enable more adequate training amenities: “If we had more budget, one thing I would like to do is pay proper trainers to come and offer further training in things like safety, communication, etc.” Larger events, such as the events Aimee and Connor led, acknowledged they had a budget capable of covering the costs of volunteer training. Connor discussed his event’s budget, explaining: “We’ve got a line item or budget for volunteer incentives which covers training. Also, for our event we factor volunteers into our marketing and call on sponsors to assist with in-kind benefits, which allows more budget for training.” This suggests that larger events do take volunteer training into consideration and consequently implement a budget for those costs. Despite smaller community events potentially not having the financial resources of larger events, the managers of smaller events explained that they try to factor in training whichever way they can, within the constraints of available budget.

In further support of budget as the driving decision to implement training, Sophie exclaimed: “One of our biggest factors affecting training is budget. I can imagine most events having this issue. If the resources aren’t there to provide training it just doesn’t get done.” Such statements support the perceptions of the majority of
participants, where budget is the overriding determining factor of training delivery.

Closely linked to budget restrictions were other limited resources that events work with, often imposed by financial restrictions. These are discussed in the next section.

### 6.4.2 Time and Other Resource Constraints Impacting Training

In addition to budget restrictions, time and other resource constraints was a theme commonly embedded within the event managers’ narratives. Chris highlighted this issue, stating: “Training can only really be carried out if the resources are available to do it. The relevance of training is outweighed by the cost if there isn’t enough money to properly train volunteers, and skilled trainers or staff to conduct training aren’t available either.” Another participant concerned by the impact limited resources have on training was Elijah, noting: “The costs associated with training are definitely too high, they would outweigh the benefits … we often have to outsource training through external companies and can only afford to train those where ticketing is necessary.” Both Chris and Elijah held a negative attitude towards training for volunteers; however, even some of the event managers exhibiting a positive attitude about training held concerns regarding limited resources. For example, Sally explained that, while she advocated the necessity of training, other factors played a role in factoring training into her event, stating:

> Training might be just what is needed to get your event to that next level. But I think it does depend, case by case, on the resources and budget each event has.

> Also, the skill level volunteers currently possess. Sometimes based on these factors you can tell it’s [training] not needed, other times it can’t be done without.
Statements such as Sally’s resonated with the majority of event managers in this study, who believed that volunteer training was important; however, based on the limited resources impacting their events, advanced levels of training were not possible. Michelle stated that she led a small event organisation. To counter the costs of training, she used paid staff to run training sessions, while Jenny noted that volunteers who have been with the event for longer usually train newer volunteers. Lexi added a different perspective. Leading a charity event, she noted that reliance was largely on sponsors and donations, which affected what training was offered to volunteers at her event. She noted, “Charity events often don’t have the resources or the capacity to facilitate training.” Thus, while budget and resources are certainly factors constraining the level of volunteer training implemented, smaller events often minimise such costs by using the event manager themselves, other paid staff, or volunteers to train and delegate tasks to volunteers based on their simplicity or perceived lack of need for training.

Due to a severe lack of resources, or as a means of cutting costs, event managers often delivered training to their volunteers personally. The findings revealed that a number of participants were directly involved in their volunteers’ training, and event managers who implemented a more organised/structured training program were typically also those who considered training worthwhile. While all of the event managers were involved in their volunteers’ training to some degree, the few that considered themselves the trainer and could identify methods for training tended to be those who believed training to be of the utmost importance. Aimee, Claire, Lexi, Sophie and Sally all claimed that their role, as well as being an event manager, was to directly train the volunteers. Aimee stated, “Yes, I personally deliver the volunteer training”, while Sophie explained, “When I train I try and give people the big picture. I try and explain the context of their work … and why we want them to do things the way we
do.” All five of these participants were categorised as IC leaders, highlighting their need to be involved in coaching their followers. This finding reflects the behavioural tendencies of IC leaders, who aim to develop and empower their followers, which is achieved through coaching.

Although an advocate for training, Michelle noted: “Training is important. Determining the level of training necessary isn’t based just on if I want to do it or not. I have to factor in age and skill level of volunteers and most importantly the costs associated.” In Elijah’s case, a lack of resources was a significant contributor in determining training feasibility. In summary, limited organisational resources were a significant contributing factor to the event managers’ decisions pertaining to the scope of training offered to volunteers at their events. Another influencing factor was the event managers’ perceptions of their industry peers’ attitudes towards volunteer training. This theme is reviewed in the following section.

### 6.4.3 Event Managers’ Perceptions of their Peers’ Attitudes towards Training Event Volunteers

Event managers’ perceptions of their peers’ attitudes towards volunteer training emerged as a factor impacting the volunteer training provided at their events. Participants held varied perceptions of their industry peers’ attitudes towards training, which were usually similar, opposed, or they simply were not aware of their peers’ attitudes. A similar perceived belief of training was reflected by a large number of participants, as they generally believed their peers shared a comparable belief towards training as themselves. There were also event managers in this study who believed that their peers considered training differently to their own beliefs. A small number of event managers explained that they had no idea about their peers’ attitudes regarding volunteer training. Similar and opposing beliefs were almost evenly divided, with a few
not even considering what their colleagues offered for volunteer training. Seven participants perceived that they shared like-minded attitudes towards training as their peers, while ten participants believed they held a different attitude to their colleagues, and two were generally unopposed to considering their peers’ attitude to training at all.

Just over half of the event managers believed that their peers’ perceptions of training were different from their own. For example, Connor stated: “I don’t think they’d feel the same as me … it makes it hard to see training in a uniform way across the board.” He emphasised that he believed “training is of the utmost importance”, yet felt his peers did not share his values in this area. This opposing view was further supported by Lesley, whose own belief was that training is a worthwhile activity; however, she believed that her peers did not consider training a necessity. She noted, “I’d say they [peers] see training as less important than me. A lot of other event managers I know do not provide any training … it’s just not considered important.” Daniel also supported volunteer training, yet believed his peers would consider training on a needs basis depending on the size of the event itself. He noted: “I would say for the larger-based events they’d see it [training] as very important. But if it’s just a small event they [peers] might not consider training warranted.” Aimee, a strong advocate for the importance of training, declared:

I honestly just don’t think training is important to some managers … it can be a second thought sometimes. For managers of small-scale events it’s harder. If they don’t have the procedures in place or someone dedicated to personnel or volunteer management, I think they tend to overlook training.

In contrast, just under half of the event managers perceived their peers as having similar attitudes towards training as themselves. Of these participants, four held a negative attitude towards volunteer training. This finding revealed that all participants
holding a negative attitude to training also believed their peers held the same attitude as them. Contrastingly, the other three similar beliefs were participants holding positive attitudes to training who also considered their peers to believe training was indeed important. True to her personal beliefs, Jenny also believed her peers would consider training to be important, explaining: “I do believe other event managers consider training their volunteers as part of their event. It’s just something that gets done regardless of the size of your event or how many volunteers you have.” Additionally, Lexi, who also had a positive attitude towards training, believed her peers would see training in a positive light also, stating: “The event managers I know all carry out some form of training. It might not be formal training as such but, nevertheless, they won’t let a volunteer work at their event without some form of training.”

It was interesting to observe that, although most event managers held positive attitudes to training, the majority felt that their peers would not give much thought to training. Connor believed that training was, “certainly an area where a lot of event managers don’t do well … I don’t think training for event volunteers or staff is done well across the board.” Sally agreed, stating:

Specifically, with volunteers, I think most people are of the opinion that they’re doing it for free, so if they turn up great. Instead of thinking how can we invest in this person? How can we ensure that they stay, if they’re good volunteers obviously? How can we keep them on and if they’re getting bored what can we do to remedy that?

Additionally, Michelle had a strong view on the importance of training volunteers; however, she believed her peers would not share this perception, noting: “I don’t think they’d feel the same as me … there’s so many small events that are just struggling to get by and there are so many elements associated with an event that it’s
difficult to see training in a standardised way for all events.” This perception that other
event managers (peers) don’t see the potential in training volunteers was largely
believed by many participants, which is in stark contrast to their own beliefs about
training. Following is a closer look at the impact volunteers themselves have on the
training they are offered. The complexity of volunteer roles, variability in age among
volunteers, the differences between paid staff and volunteers, and the current
skill/knowledge of volunteers are all discussed within the ensuing sub-section.

6.4.4 Complexity of Volunteer Roles and Differences between Paid Staff and Volunteers

The event managers were asked about the roles volunteers were required to undertake at
their events. Volunteer roles were described as being diverse in their complexity,
ranging from lower-skilled tasks (garbage collection, for example) to more
comprehensive jobs, including supervision and cash handling. This led to the emergence
of a common theme around the complexity of volunteer roles. Training was often found
to be determined based on the skill needed to enact volunteer roles. Less complex
volunteer tasks, such as ticket collection, cleaning and product stocking, were described
by the event managers as generally requiring less training to undertake compared with
volunteer roles carrying higher levels of responsibility, such as supervisors, IT
maintenance and volunteer coordination. Training for more unskilled volunteer roles
was typically delivered more informally or on the job, while skilled volunteer roles
usually required training prior to the event or some coaching. Most of the event
managers agreed that higher-skilled volunteer positions required a higher degree of
training or training to a more formal standard, and that the volunteer’s previous
skill set was advantageous.
Participants’ narratives revealed different perspectives of training based on the complexity of volunteer roles. This was evident in Connor’s response: “If they have experience in roles where those skills would be put to good use, it would be in our best interest to take those volunteers than say someone who has no skills in that area.” Connor noted that recruiting volunteers with prior skill sets to fulfil roles requiring a specific skill set was advantageous as the event would not have to train them formally. Additionally, Connor’s approach to recruiting volunteers revealed this level of concern regarding volunteers’ skill sets, stating:

With our volunteers we don’t just accept them because they put their hand up to be a volunteer. We actually outline specific tasks we need volunteers to be able to fulfil … then we’ll sit them down and have a conversation based around their experience, their personality, those types of things.

Further, Lyndsay noted with regard to volunteer roles that, “It depends on the person and what skills they already possess” and “We have [volunteer] roles that don’t need much skill and some that need more training. Not many people need a step-by-step guide on how to pick up rubbish, but supervising a team needs quite a bit more direction.” Elijah also noted:

It all depends on the event. For events like ours I don’t believe training is a necessity. The roles volunteers are required to undertake aren’t highly skilled. For things like our computer system most people require a tutorial, but in-depth training isn’t needed.

Statements such as these showcase the influence complexity of volunteer roles can play in event managers’ decisions around training for volunteers. Volunteer roles were not a sole indicator of training implemented, although this variable did appear to
significantly affect the degree to which training was delivered dependent on the roles
volunteers needed to undertake.

Daniel also admitted that, “Training isn’t required for all volunteer roles. An
example of that might be general equipment set-up and pull-down or cleaning up after
the event.” Aligning closely with another core theme, the current skill/knowledge of
volunteers was found to be another significant factor impacting event managers’
attitudes towards volunteer training. Skill levels for volunteers employed by the case
study events in this study varied significantly, ranging from no prior skill level required
at all to higher degrees of responsibility such as cash handling and HRM. Some events
provided rigorous training for all volunteer roles, regardless of the volunteers’ prior skill
set; while other events recruited volunteers based on these prior skill sets, possibly to
avoid the need for training. Sophie explained that volunteers with prior skill sets are
sought after to avoid training costs. The event she leads operates a bar, and Sophie
explained that, “We tend to pick people who have worked in a bar before, so they
already know what they’re doing.”

Volunteers who had prior skills appropriate for their role were found to be
sought after for many events. This was particularly noticeable for smaller events that
may not have had a large budget for training. Thus, volunteers could be recruited having
already learnt the skills necessary to perform the role at the event. This eliminated the
portion of training normally set aside to teach the requisite skill, while also allowing
volunteers with a greater depth of experience to perform more optimally during the
event. Daniel explained:

I think we are lucky to have many volunteers who already possess the skills
required for our volunteer roles. For example, the volunteers looking after the
floats have backgrounds in financial management. This cuts out a lot of the
nitty-gritty training and you only have to show them the procedures for the way we want it done.

Connor agreed, stating: “Skill set is important. With our volunteers, the golden rule is that we only put those on who can assist us.” Elijah also noted the importance of volunteers with requisite skills, stating the volunteer who runs the IT for the event has a background working in that field, so their skill set is put to good use. It is revealed that while a volunteer’s prior skill set can be advantageous for the event, it is often not a prerequisite for volunteering. The three participants who most adhered to this idea of recruiting volunteers based on prior skill sets, were all males. As discussed here, Daniel (categorised as a CR leader), Connor (categorised as an IM leader) and Elijah (categorised as an MBEA leader) all had strong opinions regarding this prior skill set of applying volunteers.

The differences in volunteer ages were also a determining factor in whether event managers perceived volunteers required training and was another theme to emerge from the data. Some of the event managers perceived that younger volunteers are more capable of performing their roles without intense training and that they brought with them skills in newer technologies and social media used in many events, whereas older volunteers were perceived as volunteering to support their community or because they had been a returning volunteer with a particular event over years. Thus, additional training to undertake certain roles may be required, however, older volunteers were often considered ‘adults’ who would ask if they were unsure how to perform a certain task. Lyndsay, who described her volunteer demographic as typically middle-aged, noted:

I consider all our volunteer tasks capable of any adult with the right attitude. Let’s face it, most adults don’t want to be bossed around either. So, we train
them in the things they don’t know. Saving time and unnecessary effort on training.

Jenny, who also considered her volunteers to be middle or older-aged suggested: “While training is necessary to perform the role, we like to consider all our volunteers as capable adults and if there is something they are unsure of they would ask.” Additionally, she noted: “All our volunteer roles are pretty basic … we wouldn’t ask them to do anything we thought them incapable of doing.” This finding suggests that event managers with more mature volunteer workforces typically consider those volunteers adept at undertaking volunteer roles without the need for overcomplicated training.

Next, many participants distinguished between volunteers and paid staff training, noting that they were more likely to train paid staff. The differences between paid staff and volunteers was therefore another emergent theme notable in this study as it highlights the impact of considering paid staff more disposed to training than volunteers. This study focuses on volunteers, excluding paid staff at each event, consequently many event managers expressed differing attitudes when considering training for each. Elijah explained:

Most of our volunteers are older and won’t return to volunteer again next year so we’d be training them only to have that go to waste … whereas paid staff would require training because they would be serving in that role throughout the entire year.

Sophie spoke of the large numbers of volunteers required for her event and the difficulty in organising training, countering that her paid staff are typically hired and trained solo prior to the event, thereby gaining the proper benefits of training. She further went on to state: “I believe the benefits of training our paid staff would outweigh
the benefits to volunteers as the roles they are required to undertake are more skilled than those of our volunteers.” Findings such as these were notable, as perceptions of training volunteers were often in stark contrast to considerations of training for paid staff. This factor notably altered the event managers’ attitudes towards training event volunteers, although it did not appear to be the ultimate deciding factor.

For example, Elijah considered training for volunteers less important than for paid staff. He reasoned that the ad hoc nature of event volunteers eroded the business case for training volunteers as they tend not to return for future events. Overall, Elijah held a negative attitude towards training, and this is reflected in his consistent negative evaluations relating to volunteer training. Alternately, Karen, who held a largely positive attitude towards training also discounted the importance of training volunteers over paid staff, noting: “Volunteer training is important, but I mean our staff must be trained. We are paying them to provide efficient service. Sometimes volunteers don’t even turn up on the day.” However, this statement somewhat conflicts with Karen’s overall positive attitude, highlighting the presence of factors beyond the event managers’ control that affect what volunteer training is offered. In summary, complexity of volunteer roles, existing skill and knowledge of volunteers and differences between paid staff and volunteers all shaped the event managers’ actual training practices and in some cases their attitudes regarding training.

### 6.4.5 Non-Standardised Training

While a majority of the event managers supported training for event volunteers, it became evident that the training implemented was not uniform across all 19 events. Aimee reflects the thoughts of most event managers, stating: “Training isn’t standard across the board. It’s very dependent on the size and scale of the event and the number of volunteers required.” She attempted to explain why formalised training is not offered
at all events by suggesting that: “For small-scale events that don’t have a dedicated HR manager, training can be a second thought sometimes. Without that person there isn’t going to be adequate training programs.” Elijah supported this view, stating: “I do think event managers of major events, like the Olympics, would see training as a compulsory activity. The more volunteers you have the more training would become a necessity.”

Also, Karen led a small-scale community-based event and believed that the way smaller events operate would be in stark contrast to large-scale events. Sally also warranted concern for the comprehensiveness of training at her event and her peers’ events, explaining that adequate volunteer training often consumes a considerable amount of time and energy on behalf of the event organisers: “I know training isn’t always considered important for every event. I think some [event managers] might take the attitude that they’re only volunteers so they don’t need training, when in fact I think that’s the worst thing you could think.” The very nature of training offered at events in this study demonstrated that training was diverse, with OJT, one-on-one coaching, induction and formal training programs evident across the events. Participants’ narratives revealed that the majority of participants perceived training to be largely dependent on the size of the event and the number of volunteers. Findings suggest that participants believed the larger the event and the more volunteers required, the more necessary training is.

The impact of non-standardised training was also a determinant for event managers when considering the training offered to volunteers. Aimee held strong beliefs on this issue, stating: “Without training you wouldn’t have the right people doing the right job and the event falls apart.” Similarly, Lexi noted that training:

… is vital. If no training or poorly conducted training is offered it is a danger to the success of the event itself. Volunteers are a direct representation of your
event. The frontline if you will, therefore it is imperative that they represent the event to a high standard. How are they able to do that if they haven’t been given the proper training? They need it as much as we do. Effective training is a win-win for us and the volunteers which makes it vital.

Karen further explained that her event’s volunteer training “… is basically to get them going on their shift, so they understand what needs to be done. It is crucial though as we need them to be alert to what’s going on at the event”, while Daniel stressed that: “Volunteers are in a sense a direct reflection of our organisation and event, so they need to be properly trained and managed. Quite literally, without effective training their performance can have an impact on the success of the event.” These types of responses were typical of many participants, reflecting a collective belief that without the appropriate training, volunteers may be unable to perform their role effectively, thus affecting some portion or success of the overall event.

6.4.6 Summary: Factors Impacting Volunteer Training

The themes identified with direct relation to the event managers’ decision-making around the degree of training provided to volunteers included budget restrictions, time and other resource constraints, event managers’ perceptions of their peers’ attitudes towards volunteer training, the complexity of volunteer roles, current skill/knowledge of volunteers, differences between paid staff and volunteers, and non-standardised training. Though the event managers’ attitudes towards training did not appear to solely shape their decisions around the training provided to volunteers, a closer examination of their qualitative narratives revealed a number of extraneous factors that often shaped the training event managers resourced and implemented for their volunteers.
6.5 Chapter Summary

Chapter Six was the third and final results chapter of this thesis. This chapter explored the findings pertinent to Research Objectives Three and Four. Here, event managers’ attitudes towards volunteer training were explored according to their categorised leadership styles and extraneous factors shaping the event managers’ decisions around resourcing and implementing volunteer training at their events was discussed. Chapter Seven now goes on to present a discussion of the findings presented in Chapters Four, Five and Six in light of the relevant literature.
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION

7.1 Introduction

Chapter Seven discusses the findings of this research presented in Chapters Four, Five and Six in light of the literature pertinent to this thesis: leadership, the FRLT (as operationalised by the MLQ), and the training of volunteers in event contexts. As the research was exploratory in nature, additional concepts are drawn upon where necessary to augment the literature reviewed in Chapter Two in interpreting emergent findings. The chapter firstly discusses the findings of Research Objectives One and Two. Both of these objectives were interrelated in that they aimed to identify and categorise, and subsequently explore leadership styles of event managers who participated in this study. An overview of closely related studies pertinent to this research is presented, while Section 7.2.1 discusses event managers’ leadership styles and how findings relate to the literature. Following this section, Section 7.2.2 delves into the varying related contexts leadership has been examined in. Section 7.3 addresses the triangulation of quantitative and qualitative findings. Age and gender-based differences that emerged from results are then discussed in Section 7.3.1.

Research Objective Three is then discussed in Section 7.4, as its aim was to explore variance amongst event managers’ attitudes towards training volunteers with respect to their style of leadership. Sections 7.4.1 and 7.4.2 describe the differences among attitudes towards volunteer training of participants, respectively categorised as transformational and transactional. Section 7.4.3 addresses if there is potentially a universal leadership style applicable for event managers. Lastly, Research Objective
Four is addressed in Section 7.5, exploring factors affecting participants’ decisions in
allocating training for event volunteers.

7.2 The Leadership Styles of Event Managers

Research Objectives One and Two called for the identification and subsequent
exploration of event managers’ styles of leadership utilising an established theoretical
framework, which was then triangulated by a qualitative interpretation of their
perceptions of their leadership style. The FRLT underpins this study and is
operationalised by the MLQ instrument (refer to Section 2.2.5.11).

There is a growing body of literature addressing leadership in the context of
event management, including sustainable leadership, effective leadership, coaching
styles of leaders and leader responsibilities such as volunteer management (Goldblatt,
2005; Parent, Beaupré, & Séguin, 2009; Pernecky, 2015). However, such writings are
largely conceptual in nature and lacked empirical evidence. Consequently, there is little
research in the event management literature that has offered empirical insights into the
leadership characteristics of event managers. Studies deploying the MLQ, underpinned
by the FRLT (Bass & Avolio, 1994), have examined leaders in a variety of contexts,
including sports coaching, schools, hospitals, hotels and small and medium enterprises;
however, none have analysed event managers. The advantages of using the MLQ, in
leadership research were outlined in Chapter Two, where arguments were made for the
validity, reliability and ease of use of the MLQ instrument.

Olsen (2011) and Boonyachai (2011) examined leadership styles utilising the
MLQ, albeit in different contexts to event management. Each of these previous studies
employed a mixed-methods approach of a questionnaire and interviews to enhance
validity of the findings. Additionally, Abson (2017) examined how event managers lead
using the leadership dimensions questionnaire (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2003), administered to a sample of event managers in the business sector. Abson also employed a mixed-methods approach, with her results revealing that event managers ranked managing resources, motivation, recognising people’s feelings, encouragement and control as high priorities of leaders within the events sector. A discussion of the event managers’ MLQ results in relation to pertinent literature now ensues.

**7.2.1 Event Managers’ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Categorisations**

As presented in Chapters Four and Five, participants were initially categorised using quantitative methods according to their MLQ result. This initial analysis allowed the 19 event managers to be categorised into multiple leadership styles; however, upon further analysis taking into account their personal perceptions, a singular style was then determined for those participants that was most befitting the characteristics of their leadership style. The MLQ categorised participants into their ‘dominant’ style, however, further analysis of some participants’ qualitative insights sparked a re-categorisation of their MLQ result, with some findings evoking characteristics of other leadership styles not solely categorised through the MLQ. Individual styles are described in terms of the singular or decisive style as a result of the MLQ. The majority of participants (n=6), resulted in an IC style of leadership. This style of leadership encapsulates leaders who emphasise teaching and coaching by assessing their followers’ individual needs (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008). Although this is a form of transformational leadership, it rates lower on the FRLM continuum compared to the other four transformational styles of leadership. The IC style may also be more difficult to implement within event settings. Indeed, results of this study suggest events with significant paid staff and volunteer workforces means a leader’s access to every individual would require higher
numbers of supervising/managerial staff in order to provide the more individualised coaching associated with IC leadership. Limited resources within event organisation contexts may therefore constrain IC leaders in their efforts to provide highly individualised leadership—an issue elaborated upon in Section 7.4.

IIB leadership was the second most prevalent leadership style amongst the sample of event managers, with five participants categorised as IIB. IIB leadership encapsulates leaders who lead through charismatic actions centred on values, beliefs and a defined mission (Antonakis et al., 2003). Ranking highly in terms of leadership effectiveness on the FRLM, participants categorised as IIB reflected characteristics including demonstrating an inclusive vision, developing trust and confidence in followers, and clarifying organisational objectives (Barbuto & Cummins-Brown, 2007). This study suggests that an IIB style of leadership may be more effective for event managers as participant narratives suggested they led by example, provided a strong sense of purpose, and centred on the values and beliefs set in place to guide an event, typical of IIB traits. Further, unlike IC leaders who typically take on coaching/mentoring of their followers (often considered time-consuming tasks), IIB leaders would be able to more efficiently allocate their limited time across diverse competing priorities. Time management is a crucial concern for event managers, as events are typically run to tightly defined, non-negotiable timeframes (Van der Wagen, 2007); thus, managers who are not consumed by individual coaching tasks may have more time available to meet the myriad of competing priorities associated with event management.

Eleven participants exhibited IIB and IC leadership styles, which accounted for the majority of participants in this study. The group-average score was identical across these two styles at 3.16. This high mean score suggests participants strongly align with
their IIB and IC characteristics as described by the MLQ, with only two other leadership styles scoring higher in group-average scores. Even though four event managers were categorised into transactional leadership styles—CR and MBEA—transformational leadership is said to reign superior in performance among leaders (Bass, 1991). Bass (1991) also concluded in his research that transformational leaders are often considered more effective leaders, with employees also being more likely to exert extra effort when their manager is transformational in nature.

Few event managers resonated with transactional leadership styles in this study, although CR leadership resulted in the highest group-average score of 3.25. The CR style of leadership reflects more traditional forms of leadership, whereby roles/tasks are clarified, and performance is rewarded (Antonakis et al., 2003). The MBEA leadership style refers to leaders who actively correct mistakes before they happen, ensuring performance standards are met (Antonakis et al., 2003). CR and MBEA styles may be advantageous in event management contexts as any errors by those responsible for delivering frontline service, particularly volunteers, may hinder the short-term performance of an event, and such leaders typically do not hesitate in correcting errors. However, the nature of volunteering often hinges on some positive affirmation of performance where no monetary reward is offered (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010).

Although it cannot be claimed that this sample is representative of all event managers, it was interesting to note that no event managers were categorised as IIA, MBEA or LF leaders. IIA leadership—regarded as the most optimal form of transformational leadership on the FRLM—was the only transformational style that did not emerge as a dominant leadership style within the sample. While initially evident in one participant’s shared dominant style of leadership, further analysis led to Jenny being re-categorised as an IIB leader. Results in this category were considered less likely, as
attributes are ascribed by a leader’s followers (Stafford, 2009); a limitation of this study is that volunteers’ perceptions of their leaders were not explored. Likewise, MBEP leadership was the only category of transactional leadership that did not manifest within this study. Antonakis et al. (2003) refer to MBEP leadership as passive, with corrective intervention occurring only after mistakes have occurred. Lastly, the LF leadership style rates as the most ineffective form of leadership on the FRLM continuum.

Unsurprisingly, its characteristics were not reflected among this sample of event managers, as these leadership styles imply an avoidance of responsibility and an unwillingness to take necessary initiatives (Bass, 1997), arguably a leadership style simply incompatible with event management.

Stafford (2009) argues that, although LF leadership is not a goal, in strenuous circumstances, leaders are often distracted by other situations or overwhelmed by numerous tasks often resulting in this form of leadership. Given the immediacy of service consumption at events, passive or avoidant approaches to leadership may reduce service delivery capacity (Bowdin et al., 2011). No event managers in this study were categorised as LF from their MLQ results, subsequently LF was the lowest scoring leadership style overall. LF leaders typically avoid decision-making, hesitate taking action and are often absent when needed—a style noted to be used seldom, if ever (Antonakis et al., 2003; Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Thus, most participants were keen to disassociate themselves with such an ineffective style, except Sally, who contrastingly described her leadership style at another event (not part of this study) as LF. Sally openly related to some LF traits, stating that for the other event she managed she held limited responsibility and many volunteers were returnees from previous years, and these required less direction. Sally further explained that this other event relied less on volunteers and, consequently, paid staff required less direct management than
volunteers—who were typically not offered the same in-depth training as full-time employees. Sally’s statement suggests that event managers may have to adjust their leadership style depending on the number of volunteers employed at an event.

A stigma surrounds LF leadership, which leads to perceptions that it is a less traditional style, more commonly instituted as a managerial approach and at times considered a lack of leadership altogether; however, more recently it can represent destructive leadership behaviour (Buch, Martinsen, & Kuvaas, 2015). Therefore, although it was uncommon to portray any sense of disillusionment in their leadership authority, it was even less common for participants to label themselves as LF or to confer a sense of non-leadership in their authority. Additionally, as volunteers are heterogeneous in their motivations and often exhibit low levels of organisational commitment and loyalty (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000), passive or micro-managing styles of leadership could cause volunteers to become disengaged or leave altogether. As volunteers are often essential to events (Green & Chalip, 2004), flow-on effects of ineffective leadership may include low volunteer retention, poor performance or demotivated volunteers (Hager & Brudney, 2004).

At the more effective end of the transformational FRLM continuum, an absence of dominant results in an IIA style of leadership suggests that participants were modest in their responses, and were maybe hesitant to overly portray the most effective leadership capabilities. These types of leaders rely on their charismatic social skills and ethical stance to appear confident and powerful (Antonakis et al., 2003). Evident at the opposite end of the FRLM, the absence of MBEA and LF leadership styles suggests that these event managers did not want to play down their leadership characteristics or responsibilities either. MBEA leadership scored 0.87 as a group mean; however, exhibiting an even lower group mean was LF on 0.72. The sample exhibited a middle
ground of leadership styles as per the FRLM. This suggests that participants perceived their capabilities as somewhat satisfactory without being exceptional or indifferent, possibly because participants were being overly modest in their self-assessment. As only the self-assessment report of the MLQ was employed within this study, it is a noted limitation.

### 7.2.2 Leadership in Varying Situational Contexts

Leadership is an extensively researched topic; however, within the context of event management, empirical studies are sparse. In order to help develop this research, literature from a related field of research, project management, was consulted to further unpack the findings. By virtue of the fact that events typically have pre-defined milestones along with prescribed start and end dates, they are very similar to projects (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013). Smit (2012) suggests that event managers adapt project management principles to accomplish complex tasks on budget and to a timeframe, managing events akin to a project. Project management therefore bears some resemblance to event management, and in such time-bound environments effective leadership is stressed as important, particularly when volunteer labour is involved (Van der Wagen, 2007). Turner and Muller’s (2005) review of project management literature notes leadership styles have been examined in an array of studies. They suggest that task-oriented leadership styles are preferred by project managers. Like projects, events have a defined start and end (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013). Further, leadership styles are increasingly explored within the project management literature (Turner & Muller, 2005). Sharing affinities with event management, project management has a distinct collection of literature itself and, as a consequence, a deep analysis of the literature pertaining to it was beyond the scope of this research.
Keegan and den Hartog’s (2004) study examining leadership styles of project managers found no one style to be more prevalent than another. Using an adapted Dutch version of the MLQ, they found that transformational leadership positively correlated with motivation and commitment in employee line teams; however, IC leadership had a strong negative correlation with employee stress (Keegan & den Hartog, 2004). Their study aimed to assess the transformational leadership style in a project management context and suggested that transformational leadership resonated with the demands of project-based management. Similarly, the present study found that transformational leadership styles were more prominent among event managers. Fast-paced work environments overseeing diverse workforces that make frequent use of volunteer labour often require a shift away from traditional transactional styles, where control and compliance are key practices, to transformational styles that focus on loyalty, identification and commitment (Keegan & den Hartog, 2004). This is evident in this study’s findings, as transformational styles were more dominant, and evidently, conducive to the short-term, fast-paced timeframe of events.

Leadership is recognised as a core competency for event managers (Goldblatt, 2008; Van der Wagen, 2007). Successful event managers must articulate vision and a strong affinity for leadership traits in order to lead projects that are “creative, complex, problematic, dynamic, or stakeholder reliant” (Van der Wagen, 2007, p. 216). Although leadership styles have been scarcely researched in the event management context, this may be attributable to the manager/leader debate in which the two concepts are erroneously used interchangeably, or leadership is often viewed as a process of management. Abson (2017) identified this noticeable absence of leadership in the event management context. She identified a list of key leadership practices that event managers can employ to deliver and lead successful events, including engaging
communication, strategic perspectives, critical analysis and judgement, resource management, emotional resilience and interpersonal sensitivity. Abson highlighted the tension at the heart of event leadership, which resulted from the stress managers feel in their attempt to control all aspects of an event that is both intangible and temporary in nature (Abson, 2017). Echoing Abson’s (2017) findings, event managers in this study widely reflected on the stressful nature of leadership, citing competing priorities, decision-making and the large number of responsibilities they had. They noted characteristics of their leadership, spanning democracy, motivation, enthusiasm, organisation, decisiveness, inspiration, and opportunism, which align with key characteristics leaders of events are suggested to possess (Damster & Tassiopoulos, 2005).

Abson (2017) explored leadership practices of event managers utilising Dulewicz and Higgs’ (2003) leadership dimensions questionnaire, augmented by semi-structured interviews from which style profiles could be drawn. Abson’s study concluded that event managers perceived soft skills and effective HRM skills are essential to delivering successful events, as opposed to technical skills such as financial planning and event design. Event success was not explored in the current study, however, financial resource constraints were frequently discussed as limiters on the delivery of training to volunteers and thus could affect the service capabilities of those volunteers. Essentially, the practices identified for successful event managers by Abson are conducive to transformational leadership styles and permeate all five transformational styles. Although such practices are not exempt from transactional styles of leadership, they bode well with transformational styles that seek to motivate, engage, stimulate and coach followers. Event managers in the present study seemed to embody some of the key leadership practices advocated by Abson, such as engaging
communication and interpersonal sensitivity as displayed by IC leaders—the dominant style of leadership categorised.

With regard to previous studies that have applied the MLQ in related contexts, this study’s findings support a contention that transformational styles appear more prominent than transactional styles. Boonyachai (2011) utilised a comparable methodology combining the MLQ and in-depth interviews to explore leadership styles of Thai hotel middle managers. He found that the majority of participants reflected a hybrid transformational/transactional style of leadership, suggesting that this was due to a move towards Western leadership styles, with Thai leaders appearing more consultative rather than authoritarian. Boonyachai also found that female leaders tended to be more careful and gentler when dealing with people, whereas male leaders were more decisive. Boonyachai’s findings are echoed by select findings of the present study, where transformational leadership was dominant; however, some participants exhibited characteristics of both transactional and transformational styles. MLQ results of this study also reflected Boonyachai’s findings, in that only female event managers were dominant in IC leadership reflecting concern for individuals, and male event managers were dominant among transactional leadership styles that reflect the decisive nature.

Similarly, Olsen’s (2011) study deployed the MLQ and follow-up interviews to gauge the leadership styles of leaders in organisations that implemented a Future Search conference. Olsen’s research indicated participants scored higher in transformational styles, particularly IC leadership, which was also reflected in this study of event managers. The present study extends this knowledge by exploring the leadership styles prevalent amongst event managers. Although transformational styles were dominant, the sample was not homogenous, and there was considerable variance according to age and gender. In another study, Parent, Olver, and Séguin (2009) used stakeholder theory
to theorise effective leadership styles for managing large-scale sporting events. Parent et al.’s study highlights the importance of charismatic leadership for delivering successful events. However, Parent et al. note that a challenge for transformational leaders is giving individualised attention to followers, thus, they also suggest transactional styles may be appropriate for the planning phase of events. The current study did not assess leadership styles during different stages of event life cycles, yet, the event managers often referred to motivating and using praise and rewards to encourage good performance by event workers on the job. This suggested that both transformational and transactional styles were indeed employed by participants, which reflects the advice proffered by Parent et al.

Results from studies exploring similar concepts reveal that there is a gap in the literature examining leadership styles of event managers utilising the MLQ. Thus far, no universally preferred leadership style has been advocated for event management or project management. In just the examples provided, researchers advocate HRM skills akin to IC, task-oriented leadership reflective of CR and charismatic behaviours noted in IIB leadership. Such styles were reflected in participants’ MLQ responses in the present study and were among the top four ranking group-average styles. Research exploring volunteers and leadership (Dwyer, Bono, Snyder, Nov and Berson’s, 2013) found that transformational leadership positively correlates with volunteer satisfaction, although not volunteer contributions. However, studies utilising the MLQ as a basis for exploring leadership styles among event managers overseeing volunteer workforces are scarce.

While exploring volunteer satisfaction was beyond the scope of this study, the event managers were probed regarding the complexity of volunteer roles at their events, thus a comparison of the level of skilled volunteer roles with event managers’
leadership styles is possible. An analysis of leadership styles and skill level in volunteer roles allows comparison of leadership style characteristics to the critical skills required to successfully oversee volunteers at their event. IIB leaders typically led high proportions of volunteers performing highly skilled positions—positions including ‘team leader’, ‘manager’ and ‘coordinator’, that is, roles carrying high levels of responsibility. IIB leadership bodes well with these types of skilled roles as their followers are said to want to identify with their leader and the mission they are wanting to accomplish (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Participant narratives, in particular Sophie’s and Addisyn’s (IIB leaders), aligned well with this manifestation of leadership, as they described their volunteers performing roles requiring high levels of skill and autonomy. This finding suggests that leading in idealistic ways that foster an affinity with the team is helpful in order to manage skilled volunteers.

IM and IS leaders in this study tended to lead volunteers working in roles requiring medium- to low-skill levels. Characteristics of such leaders include motivating and inspiring, and stimulating compelling ideas and values, which suggests that skill levels for their volunteers are not required to be high as the leaders motivate and inspire performance (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Similarly, IC leaders had varying skill-level volunteer roles at their events. However, due to the coaching nature of such leaders, their tendency was to spend time developing volunteer skills, particularly where volunteer roles required a more complex skillset.

Lastly, transactional leaders (CR and MBEA) tended to oversee lower-skilled volunteer roles at their events, such as rubbish collection, ticket handling or post-event clean-up. Management of low-skilled roles resonates with transactional leaders as they encourage followers to maintain the status quo; however, their leadership does not encourage or foster growth, unlike transformational leaders who motivate, inspire or
coach their team (Barbuto, 2005). Instead, transactional leaders work to agreed objectives and actively monitor mistakes—ideal for volunteer roles carrying minimal responsibility or low-level difficulty (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Although volunteer skill levels were not restricted, as depicted for each leadership style mentioned above, they tended to group similarly according to styles.

Through the above discussion, this thesis contributes to a gap in knowledge by providing empirical insights into the leadership styles of event managers in the context of volunteer management. Section 7.3 turns attention to discussing event managers’ MLQ results in the light of qualitative data regarding their perceived leadership style collected through semi-structured interviews.

### 7.3 Participants’ Qualitative Perceptions of their Leadership Styles: Triangulation of MLQ Findings

In order to address Research Objective Two, results of the MLQ were triangulated by conducting semi-structured interviews to explore event managers’ perceptions of their leadership styles. Hersey and Blanchard (1974) define leadership as the influencing behaviour which one exhibits, as perceived by others. Regarded as one facet of defining leadership and one which may influence followers’ responses to their leader, another is to analyse traits and characteristics pertinent to leaders’ behaviour. The qualitative findings of this research make an additional original contribution by offering rich, nuanced insights into how MLQ categorisations manifested among event managers. An aim of this study was to contribute empirical insights into event managers’ self-perceptions of their leadership style through the MLQ and semi-structured interviews, in order to confirm a single FRLT leadership style best reflecting their traits and practices. Hersey and Blanchard note, however, that there may be a difference between
a person’s self-perception of their leadership style and their actual style of leadership, which is a major justification for the mixed methods used for this study.

The event managers initially completed an online questionnaire and follow-up semi-structured interview which may have been open to individual-rater bias on behalf of the respondents. A potential limitation of this research, the influence of social desirability bias, is raised here as a reminder that measures were indeed taken to counteract any potential bias. Discussed in further detail in Section 3.6.4, social desirability bias may potentially affect this research as participants were asked to self-report on characteristics of their own leadership style. Methods relying upon self-reporting may be undermined by a tendency for participants to overestimate their characteristics/abilities (Arnold & Feldman, 1981). Indeed, it is possible that the responses that participants gave during interviews may have been tailored to appeasing the researcher as the reality of the event context altered their perceptions.

Within interview settings, most participants were initially hesitant to acknowledge that they were a leader; however, they generally believed they led in a positive manner. Ideals such as ‘leading by example’ and taking a ‘democratic approach’ were prominent in participants’ descriptions of their personal leadership styles and were repeatedly brought up as core traits participants wished to emulate as ideal leadership traits. Additionally, many participants likened their leadership behaviours to coaching, building team motivation, supporting, problem-solving and team-based decisions. DuBrin et al. (2006) note all of the above traits as expected behaviours of a leadership role.

Transactional leaders were more accepting of their MLQ categorisation, and seemingly less surprised at their results than their transformational colleagues. For example, Elijah (an MBEA leader) stated that, he was easy-going, yet, he was also
assertive and firm, initially setting a clear agenda prioritising what needed to be done. Such characteristics are true to transactional leadership which he agreed befitted his nature. Similarly, Daniel (a CR leader) described his characteristics as measurable and based around goal setting and progress monitoring, akin to transactional leadership traits. These self-reflections were illustrative of the narratives of transactional participants describing their personal leadership characteristics, which were typically congruent with their MLQ categorisation. Narratives of transactional event managers aligned with conceptualisations of transactional leadership as advocated by multiple authors (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Den Hartog et al., 1997; Wilde, 2011).

Transformational leaders, in contrast, tended to be more surprised with their MLQ result. However, during the interviews, when their categorised style was described in further detail, they became more reflective, acknowledging strengths and weaknesses—often described as strengths of other leadership styles. For example, Sophie (an IIB leader) expressed unease with her MLQ result. She laughed off IIB traits which suggested that she had people emulating her and that her moral and ethical orientation was a source of admiration for her team. She agreed with other IIB characteristics more easily, describing her strengths as building rapport with her team, keeping confidences and getting out what you put in. Similarly, Claire hesitantly agreed with her IM MLQ outcome, as she 'hoped' that was how she leads. Although initially hesitant to label herself a leader, Claire became more accepting as she opened up during the interview, delving into personal characteristics she uses to lead her team. Such hesitation towards leadership responsibilities can be referred to as ‘reluctant leadership’. This resonates with the thoughts of Grassi (2014), who argues that those who are reluctant to lead often lead from a desire to serve as opposed to a desire for power. Grassi suggests that “reluctant leaders are the best leaders” (p. 18), while also noting
that peers are said to seek their advice, they focus on team success and are truly passionate about their work.

Of the transformational styles, the only category not present in this sample of event managers was IIA leadership; however, all other transformational styles were represented. Though most participants’ qualitative narratives reflected their MLQ result, a few were also found to resonate with other leadership styles. Firstly, five IIB leaders were further analysed according to their interview data. The narratives of Aimee and Amanda closely aligned with their IIB MLQ result, which suggests they strongly reflected IIB leadership characteristics. It was determined that the other three IIB leaders also shared behaviours that could be linked to other leadership styles. Jenny and Sophie, while categorised as IIB dominant, also exhibited a likeness to IC leadership as they spoke fondly of their volunteers. Barbuto and Cummins-Brown (2007) suggest that leaders are generally most effective when they regularly use all of the transformational behaviours built on a foundation of CR leadership. Addisyn, also categorised as an IIB leader, also evoked elements of CR leadership as she talked about offering reward/praise for volunteers’ performance. This alignment with CR leadership shows how readily transformational and transactional leaders can enact the qualities of one another and fluidly adopt different leadership styles when necessary.

All three event managers categorised as IM were found to strongly correspond with their MLQ result; however, Matt and Steph could also be linked to other styles of leadership according to their interview responses. Matt perceived that he could be likened to CR leadership and Steph spoke of how she brings creativity into her leading methods, thus exhibiting a similarity to IS leadership. This flexibility between leadership styles reflects a core trait of communication. Vaari (2015) stresses that effective leaders are flexible. He ascertains that in order to achieve organisational
effectiveness and maintain influence over followers, leaders need to be flexible in various situations (Vaari, 2015). Event managers in the present study who reflected varying degrees of different leadership styles may be more adaptive to their dynamic event environments and, according to various leadership researchers, more effective leaders in event contexts (Bryman, Bresnen, Beardsworth, & Keil, 1988; Hill, 1973; Vaari, 2015).

One leader, Claire, an IS leader according to the MLQ, evoked IM leadership characteristics in her qualitative responses. A total of six participants resulted in IC leadership, the most prevalent category. Although four participants were strongly in agreeance with their IC result, two exhibited similarities to other leadership styles. Resonating with IC characteristics, Lexi however, also displayed a likeness to IM leadership. Similarly, Lesley, while IC dominant, was also found to relate to CR leadership. Thus, qualitative data suggest that, although transformational participants agreed with their leadership styles as determined by the MLQ, some spoke of characteristics reflective of other leadership styles in their qualitative responses. These findings reflect Bass’s (1985) ideals of leadership, where the most effective leaders are capable of enacting behaviours associated with both transformational and transactional leadership. In addition, CR MLQ items have been found to co-vary with transformational items (O’Shea, Foti, & Hauenstein, 2009). This suggests that, while transformational leadership styles are noted to be optimal, traits associated with positive transactional styles are indicators of higher-order leadership, as associated with transformational leadership.

Research suggests that effective leaders often display varying degrees of both transformational and transactional styles of leadership (Aarons, 2006; Bass & Avolio, 1997; Marturano & Gosling, 2008). Indeed, some participants’ qualitative narratives
reflected behaviours that were both transformational and transactional in nature.

Although effective leadership is stated to be a combination of transformational and transactional leadership, the evidence suggests that transformational leadership correlates with leader effectiveness, adding value compared to even the positive effects of transactional leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2008). Van der Wagen (2007) highlighted the need for event managers to transform situations through a creative vision and strong decision-making skills first and foremost. These characteristics encompass transformational leadership and, on that basis, the dominance of transformational styles among these event managers was perhaps unsurprising.

Participants categorised as transactional appeared most attuned to their transactional leadership traits. This is noteworthy as, although some transactional leaders were found to enact transformational traits, this was less likely than those participants categorised as transformational enacting transactional traits. Both MBEA participants were found to be predominant in their categorised MLQ style, whereas both CR participants reflected transformational styles along with their transactional result. Those event managers categorised as CR also reflected IM characteristics in their interview narratives. An exclusively transactional approach to leadership is not overtly advocated by researchers. Bass and Avolio (1997) argue that a purely transactional approach may be deficient as a basis for fostering long-term development and any individual/organisational change due to resource constraints under which leaders operate. Further, the role of leaders in ever-changing environments is argued to be different from the more traditional leadership roles evident in transactional styles (Den Hartog & Koopman, 2001). This suggests that transactional event leaders may be adopting outdated leadership behaviours and may need to revisit their style to
accommodate transformational qualities that are more relevant in contemporary event business environments.

Research examining effective leadership is widespread, although there is little research depicting the precise styles that yield the most positive outcomes (Goleman, 2000). Bass (2000) argues that the future of leadership for learning organisations will be transformational. Different authors advocate varying ideas of which style is most beneficial, though most often a combination of transformational and transactional styles is said to enhance effective leadership (Aarons, 2006). Bass and Riggio (2008) note that transformational leadership is more appealing to researchers in today’s ever-changing, complex environment as it provides a “better fit” (p. 1), using inspiring and motivational attributes to engage and influence followers. What is clear in the literature is that transformational and CR behaviours consistently lead to positive organisational outcomes and should thus be enacted most often (O’Shea et al., 2009). Indeed, the present study found that event managers were most prevalent within transformational and CR categories—a finding which was further supported by the event managers’ qualitative narratives.

The findings of this study resonate strongly with the event management literature, as event managers extensively resonated with the challenges of managing events and event workforces, particularly volunteers (Cuskelley & Auld, 2000). Taking a more personal approach to building relationships with their team were the IC leaders. Accordingly, female event managers in this study generally held their relationships with their followers in high regard. As suggested by Rosener (1990), more non-traditional styles of leadership are becoming better suited to the conditions of some work environments. This is apparent here in this research, as events seemingly require
contextually-appropriate styles of leadership, not solely traditional, transactional styles or transformational leadership.

Limited literature examines leadership styles and their influence on volunteer retention. Smith’s (2017) thesis examining the relationship between leadership style and volunteer retention suggests that leadership style plays an important role in the retention of volunteers. Smith ascertains that servant leadership skills should be incorporated into volunteer training programs. Servant leadership was not explored within the current study, although behaviours associated with servant leadership, such as open communication, vision, participative decision-making and empathy, can be associated with transformational styles. Consequently, event leaders should embrace more empathetic and understanding behaviours—typical of transformational styles—when developing training programs and liaising with volunteers (Smith, 2017).

The following section addresses the differences in leadership style apparent in the age and gender demographics of participants interviewed in this study. Not a specific research objective, the differences pertaining to leadership style according to age and gender were highly evident, and thus worthy of discussion.

### 7.3.1 Age and Gender Differences in Leadership Style

Research examining behavioural differences in leadership styles between men and women is contentious (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). While some studies suggest that there are likely gender differences in styles of leadership (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Thacker, 1995), most contend that formal leadership behaviours should be of primary importance as they legitimise authority and cement the position of influence and support. In the present study, cross-case analysis suggested there were some notable age and gender-based differences in leadership style across the sample.
Women were more prevalent amongst the MLQ transformational leadership styles, with all 13 female event managers exhibiting transformational styles. Female sex-role traits of ‘communion’ are identified by Grant (1988) to refer to qualities including empathy, nurturance, compassion, gentleness, affection, sensitivity, cooperativeness and interdependence. In contrast, male event managers tended to conform to transactional styles, with four of the six male participants categorised as transactional leaders. Grant (1988) refers to qualities of male sex-role traits of ‘agency’ as including aggression, independence, autonomy, initiative, competitiveness, ambition, dominance and analytical thinking. The findings here reflect Grant’s (1988) research, as male and female event managers typically reflected their respective sex-role traits.

Further analysis revealed that the older male participants, Elijah and Chris, both conformed to the MBEA style of leadership. Within the FRLM the MBEA leader is portrayed as an active-corrective form of leadership. Although considered core traits of full-range leaders, this style of leadership is characterised by systematic monitoring for mistakes (Asrar-ul-Haq & Kuchinke, 2016; MLQ International, 2008). Similarly, another older male event manager, Mark, conformed to a CR leadership style. This is also a transactional style of leadership; however, constructive clarification of objectives and rewarding performance are associated with this style (MLQ International, 2008). According to the FRLM, transactional styles are portrayed as less effective and more passive than their transformational counterparts. Data indicated that males aged 41 and over tended to align with transactional leadership styles, thus suggesting that this age group’s leadership characteristics contrasted with their female colleagues of similar age, who typically conformed to transformational styles.

Older women (56 or older) also tended to conform to transformational leadership styles. Both Lyndsay and Lexi aligned with IC styles, Jenny aligned as an IIB leader,
and Steph aligned as an IM leader. The youngest event managers (25 years or under) were all females who conformed to IIB and IC transformational styles. Interestingly, over half of the sample fell into the 26–40 year age group and exhibited the greatest variance in styles, with males also reflecting transformational styles. However, this distribution is likely due to the non-random sampling techniques used to recruit participants from this difficult-to-access population. In this age group, both Connor and Matt were categorised as IM leaders—the only males to reflect transformational leadership styles.

The older participants in this study were more set in their ways of leading, having constructed their style over many years of practice in event management. However, female participants, regardless of their age, tended to exhibit positive characteristics of transformational leadership such as leading by example, building strong rapport with their team and motivating team members to follow a set goal/vision. This outcome aligns with Carless’s (1998) study, which found that female managers were more likely to rate themselves as transformational than male managers. She also found that female managers were more likely to associate with IC leadership characteristics, including: taking a personal interest in individuals’ needs, encouraging self-development and using participative decision-making (Carless, 1998). This also conforms with Eagly et al.’s (2003) research, which concluded that women favoured transformational styles—said to be more effective in today’s contemporary work environments.

In contrast, male participants typically aligned with transactional tendencies, monitoring for errors and rewarding effective performance. This seemed particularly the case for the two oldest male participants (56 or older), who both exhibited MBEA leadership, reflecting a more rigid, traditional approach to leading their team through
managerial traits. Male participants’ qualitative narratives and MLQ results typically reflected Rosener’s (1990) research, which argues that men often characterise themselves as transactional leaders.

IC stood out as the dominant categorised leadership style in this study. This suggests that nurturing, empathetic leaders indeed have a place in event environments. Rosener (1990) found that women ascribed their power with personal contacts, describing this as ‘interactive leadership’ because the women actively work to build positive interactions with their subordinates. IC leaders in this study most often spoke of their followers as being a priority of their leadership. For example, Jenny stated, “I like to consider different people and personalities and the way in which they learn.” This type of narrative was common amongst IC leaders, which suggests that this style of leadership could have the ability to transform leader–follower relationships within the context of events. Rosener’s (1990) work is directly relevant to findings of this study, which found that only females were categorised as IC leaders—a reflection of ‘interactive leaders’.

These findings suggest that leadership styles of event managers may vary significantly according to age and gender, and is suggested as an important avenue for future research. Age and gender characterised many differences in participants’ leadership styles, however, experience allows leaders to develop their skills and styles over time (Rosener, 1990). Findings in this study substantiate this position, as older participants tended to discuss that their style has evolved over time. Future research may therefore consider examining age and gender-based differences of event managers’ styles of leadership. Having discussed the leadership traits of event managers who participated in this study, attention is now turned to another core objective of this thesis:
to explore how event managers’ attitudes towards allocating resources for training event volunteers varied according to the event managers’ leadership styles.

### 7.4 Variance in Attitudes to Training of Event Volunteers among Different Leadership Styles

Research Objective Three sought to explore event managers’ attitudes towards training volunteers according to their leadership styles. This is a centrepiece in the contribution of this thesis, as previous research has paid little attention to exploring interplay between leadership styles, attitudes, training and volunteers in the context of event management. To date, there has been a paucity of research analysing the adoption and implementation of training by event managers, and in particular the influence that managerial attitudes towards volunteer training may have on the implementation of training for volunteers at events.

Human resources, when managed effectively, are often an organisation’s key competitive advantage (Asrar-ul-Haq & Kuchinke, 2016). The same can be said for event workforces. However, the pulsating, episodic, complex and often volatile nature of events and their workforces are quite different to traditional organisations, making human resource practices such as training crucial to facilitating effective service quality (Hanlon & Cuskelly, 2002; Yeoman et al., 2004). Indeed, the short-term and episodic nature of events was continuously alluded to by event managers in the present study as influencing how they led their workforces. The ‘pulsating’ nature of events (Hanlon & Jago, 2000) mean that events require an influx of volunteer labour for the core duration of the event, which then subsides upon completion. Consequently, volunteers would be quickly trained and deployed into the event environment. Hanlon and Cuskelly’s (2002) research characterises events by this ‘pulsating’ state and, consequently, they suggest that event managers face substantial challenges in delivering quality service. The heavy
reliance on volunteers to fulfil frontline service roles at events evokes another dimension of difficulty for event management (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010).

Volunteers are often crucial to the running of events and are invaluable in terms of an event’s continuity and success (Heitmann & Roberts, 2010; Holmes, 2009). However, the management of volunteers, which is often episodic, has been reported as being problematic both in previous literature, and was raised by event managers in the present study. Participants often identified managing their volunteers as one of their most demanding tasks. They implied that the task often hinges on the enthusiasm and motivation of the volunteers. Heitmann and Roberts (2010) further suggest that training event volunteers has its difficulties, however, this can be overcome through strategic and operational management. Broader research examining training often only accounts for volunteers’ perceptions of training (Baum & Lockstone, 2007; Kemp, 2002), thus overlooking managerial perspectives. In contrast, the present study exclusively explored event managers’ attitudes to training volunteers at their events. Facteau et al. (1995) conducted research examining trainees’ perceptions of the training environment, noting incentives, perceived training reputation, career development and organisational commitment as antecedents to attitudes towards training. Their study centred around motivation, as research has shown that trainees entering organisational training with high levels of pre-training motivation learn more and are more likely to complete the prescribed training (Facteau et al., 1995). Trainees’ attitudes towards training are therefore fairly well researched; however, to date there is minimal research to date concerning managerial attitudes towards training, especially in relation to volunteers.

The benefits of training for both paid and volunteer employees are well documented and can include increased trainee confidence, quality service provision, increased commitment and engagement of trainees, reduced operational risks,
knowledge of the role and skill upgrade/transfer (Deslandes & Rogers, 2008; Maynard, 2007). The time-bound framework that events in this study ran to indicated that training was mostly administered immediately prior to the event or was undertaken ‘on the job’. Fortunately, for event volunteers, the limited timeframe to undertake training, coupled with the limited degree of difficulty volunteer roles typically entail, rarely required a significant investment in training, which aligns with Macduff’s (1995) research. The event managers’ narratives indicated that many of their volunteer roles required minimal training, including tasks such as rubbish collection, wristband checking or ticket handling at arrival. However, training some event workforces necessitates a higher-than-usual focus on planning (Van der Wagen, 2007). Since events vary in their time constraints and difficulty level of volunteer roles, volunteers typically commence their duties on the day before, or day of, the event; therefore, training needs to be succinct, timely and on a need-to-know basis (Leigh, Lamont, & Cairncross, 2013). Good volunteer management practices suggest that an induction, including an introduction to the organisation, health and safety information, and specification of the roles required to undertake the position, be offered at the very least (Holmes & Smith, 2009). Further, volunteer job descriptions should delineate responsibilities and a working timeframe for task completion, crucial for the timely running of an event (Peacy, 2006). Overall, volunteer training at events needs to be regular enough to keep volunteers motivated and engaged, yet timely so that retention of knowledge and momentum is not lost (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013).

The benefits of training for event volunteers, and volunteers in general, are widely acknowledged (Costa et al., 2006; Heitmann & Roberts, 2010), however, the consequences of providing inadequate training, or not providing training at all, are less well understood. For example, research conducted by Lamont, Kennelly and Weiler
(2018) found that volunteer tour guides who lacked training and support from their tour operator employer were constrained in performing their role, thus leading to widespread customer dissatisfaction. They further indicated that tour operators were hesitant to perceive expenditure on training as worthwhile due to the transient nature of its volunteer workforce and associated high volunteer turnover rates. The findings of the present study reflected those of Lamont et al.’s (2018) in that the event managers interviewed were not entirely positive regarding the necessity of training for their event volunteers. This is further reflected in Nagy’s (2018) work, who contends that volunteers are often unreliable, can take a long time to train, and may leave at short notice. Findings of the present study revealed that event managers often perceived volunteers as episodic and one-off. As a result, many of the event managers were less inclined to invest organisational resources into training for their volunteers. However, such attitudes clash with the need to advance volunteers’ skills and knowledge as they often perform frontline service roles at events. Thus effective volunteer performance is paramount (Nassar & Talaat, 2009).

Research examining managers’ attitudes towards training is minimal, with event managers’ attitudes towards training of volunteers being a notable gap in existing literature. Reid and Ritchie (2011) examined the attitudes of event managers in planning for or implementing risk-management practices and found that most participants held positive attitudes toward risk management. Reid and Ritchie’s (2011) work is relevant here because their findings suggest that event managers’ attitudes can indeed shape their willingness toward implementing certain operational initiatives. The theory of reasoned action (TRA), used by Reid and Ritchie (2011), attempts to explain how performing a particular behaviour is shaped by particular antecedents (Madden, Scholder, & Ajzen, 1992). Developed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1985), the TRA postulates that a combination
of positive attitudes and subjective norms (social influence) towards a particular behaviour will lead to increased behavioural intention. In other words, a person’s attitude towards a behaviour and their perceived social pressure to perform the behaviour will lead to heightened intent to perform the behaviour (Ajzen, 1991).

Although employing the TRA as a framework for exploration was beyond the scope of this study, the theory posits that attitudes and perceived social endorsements are immediate antecedents to behaviour (Madden et al., 1992). Upon considering Reid and Ritchie’s (2011) work, it became apparent that TRA concepts could also be drawn upon within the present study to further unpack findings around the event managers’ attitudes towards resourcing training for volunteers; for example, attitude was a key factor to be explored within Research Objective Three and is also a key concept within the TRA.

The event managers were questioned about their attitude towards training volunteers, and also their perceptions of their peers’ attitudes towards training volunteers during semi-structured interviews. Attitudes varied among the sample, although the majority of participants’ narratives suggest that they believed training was indeed important for their volunteers. Participants generally also perceived that their industry peers considered training for volunteers as important; however, many were of the view that other events may have more available resources which may allow for more comprehensive training. Attitudes and perceived social pressure to provide training for volunteers were explored within this study, with data revealing that a positive attitude towards resourcing training, coupled with perceived endorsement of training among participants’ industry peers, did not always result in actual resourcing for implementing training for event volunteers, as would be expected according to the TRA. However, on closer analysis of the qualitative data, it was identified that other
factors played a role in the intent to perform training. Related literature notes that other factors can indeed influence the TRA’s propositions. These can prevent an action being performed, even when the intent is strong (Sheppard, Hartwick, & Warshaw, 1988). Other factors identified by the event managers interviewed, such as budget and other limited resources, are highly likely to shape event managers’ decisions around the extent of training provided to volunteers, and are therefore specifically discussed in Section 7.5.

With such a focus on leadership and training as key antecedents for effective volunteer performance, questions may be asked about whether event managers’ leadership style shapes their attitudes to offering training opportunities for volunteers at their event. Abson’s (2017) study found that managing human resources was a significant leadership priority for event managers. Meanwhile, Peacy (2006) argues that volunteers require strong and inspired leadership to contribute effectively to organisations. Transformational leadership was found to contribute to the overall success of an event in Parent, Olver and Séguin’s (2009) research. Parent, Olver and Séguin found that, to lead event volunteers effectively, the volunteers require a strong sense of leadership, adequate training and to be considered in terms of their episodic nature. Research Objective Three attempts to understand the attitudes of event managers towards training for their volunteers in order to better understand the level of training they actually provide to volunteers at their events. Sections 7.4.1 and 7.4.2 discuss variants in the event managers’ attitudes towards offering training opportunities for volunteers according to the transformational and transactional styles of leadership recognised in the FRLT.
7.4.1 Transformational Leaders’ Attitudes towards Training Event Volunteers

Business success can largely depend on a leader who projects high charisma, inspires followers, is intellectual and has good communication skills (Aydogdu & Asikgil, 2011). Such characteristics are typified as transformational leadership. The leadership literature characterises transformational leaders as those who typically broaden and elevate the interests of their workforce, motivate and create awareness of the goals and mission of the project, and encourage their teams to look beyond self-interests to better the group (Bass, 1991). Among the transformational leaders in this study, there were diverse attitudes towards training volunteers. However, there was general consensus that training was important, with these participants suggesting that, although training was a costly activity, it was also crucial to facilitate volunteers delivering effective frontline service. Although all transformational leaders alluded to the importance of training for volunteers at their event, there were often caveats expressed within their responses. For example, Karen stated: “Training is very important. I want to have good first impressions of service quality, but we can only offer limited training due to our budget and training resources.” Karen’s response reflected common narratives concerning attitudes towards training. Therefore, transformational participants largely viewed training positively, although they often spoke of other factors which curtailed their ability to provide training. These intervening factors are unpacked further in Section 7.5.

Although leadership literature commonly depicts transformational leadership as an optimal style of leadership (Bass, 1991), of the limited studies in event management concerning leadership, there are some that are hesitant to suggest transformational leadership as a universally superior style of leadership in event management contexts. In their study of large-scale sporting events, Parent, Beaupré and Séguin (2009) found that
devoting time and attention to individuals would be difficult for a single leader. Hence adhering strictly to transformational leadership traits may prove challenging in an event context where management is largely different to traditional organisations. Parent, Beaupré and Séguin’s findings highlight the need for both charismatic and transformational leadership traits, including creating a vision, motivating followers and fostering commitment and teamwork as key for event managers. Thus, while transformational traits may be critical to lead an effective team, the time-consuming nature of such characteristics may not be feasible given the time constraints of event environments. This was evident in Lyndsay’s narrative, as she described her leadership style as an “obsessive mother”, saying that:

Work isn’t just work to me … I’m enthusiastic and that often overwhelms others. I care a lot about my team, but it’s about trying to find that balance between giving people enough room to move and possibly feeling unsupported, and micro-managing. It’s always a bit of a dance. You need to care about people. I think that’s my bottom line.

Data from the present study suggest that participants’ attitudes towards training were often shaped by resource constraints, as well as their personal perceptions concerning training itself. For example, narratives of some participants, particularly IC and IM leaders, implied that they perceived training as unimportant, citing non-returning volunteers and limited budgets as key constraints. Although advocated as admirable styles of leadership, it is possible that exclusively transformational leadership may not be suited to the episodic, dynamic operating environments of events. Characteristics such as seeking group input to decision-making, coaching/mentoring volunteers individually, brainstorming solutions to problems and developing volunteer skillsets in depth (which are associated with transformational styles) are potentially
lengthy processes and not conducive to fast-paced event environments. Such traits may typically be conducive to nurturing human resources in traditional organisations, though they may in fact hinder facilitating training in event environments due in part to inherent time and budget constraints.

During data analysis, it became interesting to note broad variance in the degree of training offered at each event. Training regimes ranged from formal training programs, to one-on-one coaching, to day-of-event run downs and OJT. Those participants providing formal training to their volunteers particularly perceived training to be of the utmost importance. Aimee, Connor, Sophie, Addisyn and Daniel all specified that volunteer training was delivered formally at their events, with inductions, role-specific training, and on-the-job support and training forming part of their training curricula. Of these participants, only Daniel conformed to a transactional leadership style. This suggests that transformational leaders offering formal training programs regard training as important. The remaining transformational participants offered varying degrees of training for their volunteers, including meetings, workshops, inductions, role-specific training and OJT. All the transformational leaders in this study, aside from Steph, offered varying degrees of training, even though many held positive attitudes towards training for their volunteers. Although an IM leader, Steph did offer training at her event but expressed a contradictory, negative attitude towards offering volunteer training. She stated: “Training is a costly exercise. For our volunteer roles I believe the costs far exceed the benefits.” Her attitude to training for event volunteers was unexpected, as the leadership characteristics she identified with on the MLQ associated with transformational ideals, such as coaching, motivating and inspiring, which would typically suggest a more positive attitude towards training as a benefit for
volunteers. Section 7.4.2 now discusses transactional participants’ attitudes towards training volunteers.

### 7.4.2 Transactional Leaders’ Attitudes towards Training Event Volunteers

Although little is known of transactional leaders in event management contexts, broader literature concerning transactional leadership styles is well developed. Emphasis has been placed on transformational characteristics of event managers as they have been found to positively associate with the delivery of a successful event (Parent et al., 2013). However, more traditionally, event managers are seen to be focused on achieving outcomes, emphasising planning and succession, and task/goal completion, which are reflective of management traits and resonate with transactional leadership qualities (Marturano & Gosling, 2008). Greenwell et al. (2014) state that sports event leaders are often transactional due to the exchange of resources which must occur in order to create a successful event. Of the four participants in the present study who identified with transactional leadership styles, three held largely negative attitudes towards training. The narratives of MBEA leaders (Elijah and Chris) and one of the CR leaders (Mark) suggested that, for them, training was merely an afterthought. Moreover, their accounts often portrayed a position that the costs of training outweighed its benefits.

While an attitude portraying training as unimportant would appear to be reflective of a transactional style of leadership rather than a transformational style, transactional leaders are typically associated with improving follower performance through set goals in exchange for reward (Marturano & Gosling, 2008). An effective training program may effectively aid this exchange, as Turner and Muller (2005) suggest that task-oriented transactional leaders may be inappropriate in project-oriented situations. Thus, it appears unclear from the literature whether an exclusively
transactional leadership approach is appropriate in event contexts given transactional leaders’ focus is typically centred on task completion rather than being people-oriented. The findings of the present study suggest that the majority of transactional event managers interviewed held negative attitudes towards training, which may be in stark contrast to typical transactional traits. Although transactional leadership traits are not as positively desired as transformational traits, they advocate clarifying role requirements and praising desired outcomes and are thus considered effective in motivating followers, although to a lesser degree than transformational leaders (Antonakis & House, 2013).

Despite the widely espoused benefits of training for both individuals and organisations, including short- and long-term skill/knowledge development, increased performance and quality service, and contributions to organisational success, training does not always receive proper priority, particularly in service-oriented hospitality operations (Hayes & Ninemeier, 2009). The research devoted to the importance of training, particularly for volunteers, for organisational success is extensive (e.g. Deslandes & Rogers, 2008; Lulewicz, 1995; Maynard, 2007; Naik, 2007; Sims, 2006). For leaders to not consider training positively arguably constitutes an outdated way of thinking, characteristic of a more operational managerial approach rather than a style of leadership; that is, a managerial style more typical of transactional leadership.

Transactional leadership styles, however, are often associated with brisk decision making, setting clear objectives and demanding fast results, which are all traits conducive to the nature of events. It is these characteristics of transactional leaders which are well-suited to the time-bound nature of events. Only a minority of event managers in this study were categorised as transactional, however, they unanimously believed that their style worked well for their event. Elijah, Chris and Mark, although
holding training in more of a negative light, suggested that their volunteers were mostly returning volunteers with skillsets appropriate for roles at their events. This suggests that the negative attitudes of these participants towards training may not have influenced what training was actually delivered at their events. Indeed, further analysis of the qualitative data revealed that negative attitudes were not a representation of the training offered, but factors beyond the event managers’ leadership style, including budgetary and other resource constraints, current volunteer skills/knowledge, returning volunteers and the skill level of volunteer roles, were more important factors in determining the training required.

In summary, neither transformational nor transactional leadership styles were consistently found to be associated with positive or negative attitudes towards training. What was found was that a flexible approach towards volunteer training is needed in order to appropriately determine the level of training necessary for particular volunteer event workforces. The following section further considers this flexible/adaptable nature of leadership evidently required for event management contexts.

### 7.4.3 Is there a Universally Ideal Style of Leadership for Event Management?

Events are temporary, complex and ever-changing, thus managing event workforces presents a unique set of challenges (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000; Hanlon & Cuskelly, 2002). Additionally, the unconventional/pulsating nature of an event workforce is often extensively comprised of volunteers (Hanlon & Cuskelly, 2002). With rapid growth in recent years, the management of events has become an identifiable and unique profession requiring managers to lead diverse paid and volunteer workforces in short-term, volatile environments (Bowdin, Allen, O’Toole, Harris & McDonnell, 2011). These unique HRM challenges suggest, too, that leadership of events is distinctive.
Pernecky (2015) notes that, in comparison to other industries, events produce experiences—often intangible—that cater to the unique needs of customers attending an event.

Although both transformational and transactional leadership styles exhibit traits beneficial to event environments, an exclusively transactional or transformational approach to leadership may not be appropriate within event management contexts for a number of reasons. A flexible approach to leadership is advocated by Parent et al. (2013), who suggest that: “event managers must be flexible and adaptable, as well as able to self-manage in an arena where hand-holding is not available” (p. 40). Shamir (1999) also notes that a push towards ‘boundaryless’ organisational forms requires a more flexible leadership approach. He further goes on to note that a common central characteristic of newer leadership theories is the emphasis of leaders as change agents (Shamir, 1999). This means that, although transformational and transactional leadership traits are necessary, other factors imposed upon event managers necessitate them to adapt their leadership style to dynamic and emergent circumstances.

This flexibility in leadership style was evident amongst the event managers in the present study, as many exhibited traits associated with varying styles of leadership within the FRLT, as opposed to one singular style. Participants’ narratives alluded to a more diverse range of characteristics reflective of both transformational and transactional styles of leadership that are seemingly distant from those associated with their preferred leadership style. This suggests that event managers must enact varying, and sometimes conflicting, styles of leadership contingent upon emergent circumstances. For example, Lexi (an IC leader), contrastingly aligned with transactional leadership characteristics, as well as reflecting transformational characteristics in her interview narrative. For example, she stated: “I’d say I’m a
mentor, I like to empower people I’m working with. On the other hand, I do like to give volunteers some autonomy, clarifying task requirements and praising a job well done.” This contrast between transformational and transactional leadership traits suggests that both approaches are possibly necessary in different situational contexts.

The role of leadership in pulsating organisations, such as the short-term nature of events, has been specified by Den Hartog and Koopman (2001) as an area for future research. They suggest that the role of these types of leaders will be different from more traditional leadership roles in stable environments. Findings of the present study suggest that event managers exhibited a diverse range of transformational and transactional leadership styles. This suggests that event leadership roles require flexible and adaptive behaviours and a more diverse range of full-range leadership behaviours. Shone and Parry (2004) called for more leadership research in the ‘short-life’ organisation, typical of events. This study contributes to this gap in knowledge by providing empirically-derived insights into manifestations of different leadership styles enacted by event managers.

The changing dynamics of today’s work environments calls for a rethink regarding how managers lead their workforces. Increasingly, rarely are exclusively transactional leaders required; instead contemporary organisations must adapt, and their leaders too must adapt. Transformational leadership characteristics are undeniably advocated as more effective and perceived as more desirable than transactional or laissez-faire styles of leadership, however, alone they may be insufficient to effectively manage within event business environments. Bass (1999) suggests that, in the current organisational workplace, there is a need for leaders to become more transformational and less transactional to remain effective. Transactional leadership strategies can be used when appropriate by transformational leaders; however, utilising transformational
qualities should be the basis of effective leadership (Lowe et al., 1996). Thus, it is without question that a majority of event managers in this study were inclined to perceive their leadership characteristics as transformational in order to be seen as an effective leader.

Overlap between transformational leadership styles has been previously discussed in Section 7.2.3 and these inter-relationships were often evident in an individual’s style. Event managers in this study often embodied traits associated with differing styles, suggesting that, while they organically gravitate towards an innate, preferred style of leadership, inevitably they may deviate from that style according to particular and emerging circumstances. This demonstrates the flexible, adaptive nature that event managers need to adopt in their leadership style, which is consistent with the ever-changing, erratic program occurring in daily event experiences. Participants often described their attitude towards training and management of their volunteers using terms such as being flexible in their approach, adaptable to change, easy-going and working under pressure. Thus, it is highly evident that flexibility is critical to successful leadership in events.

7.4.4 Summary: Leadership Styles and Attitudes to Training

Event managers in the present study held diverse attitudes towards volunteer training that were, occasionally, not reflected in the actual training delivered at their events. Although the event managers generally regarded training as important, the data revealed numerous situational variables that appeared highly influential in affecting event managers’ decisions around resourcing training for volunteers, which also forced these event managers to adapt their natural leadership style and view of volunteer training accordingly.
Overwhelmingly, it was found that intervening variables, such as financial resources, time constraints and motivation of volunteers, were limiting factors affecting the scope and comprehensiveness of the training that could be provided to event volunteers. Thus, for participants in this study, individual attitudes towards training alone were but one of a number of variables influencing the actual training provided to event volunteers. Section 7.5 discusses the data pertinent to Research Objective Four in association with the relevant literature.

7.5 Intervening Variables Shaping Event Managers’ Decisions around Resourcing Training for Volunteers

Research Objective Four sought to explore factors shaping event managers’ attitudes to ultimately resource and implement training for event volunteers. The findings of this study suggest that, a transformational approach to leadership was in fact evident and dominant, though intervening variables could significantly shape event managers’ resourcing decisions around volunteer training and force them to adopt different leadership styles to their preferred, innate leadership style to suit particular circumstances. Analysis of the participants’ qualitative responses identified seven emerging themes (identified in italics below) in which the event managers identified factors including budget restrictions, time and other resource constraints, differences between paid staff and volunteers, the complexity of volunteer roles, current skill/knowledge of volunteers, unstandardised training, and external influencing factors such as the perception of training provided by other event managers. These factors all potentially affect the event managers’ willingness and capacity to resource and implement training for volunteers at their events. Table 7.1 lists the key findings and a brief description of relevant literature.
Table 7.1 A List of the Seven Key Findings with Relevant Literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencing Factors</th>
<th>Key Finding</th>
<th>Related Literature Supporting Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget restrictions</td>
<td>Data indicated that budget constraints was a determining factor when implementing training (e.g. Sally: training may be necessary but it’s dependent on budget).</td>
<td>Finance and budgeting are identified as critical for event managers, with many organisational decisions often hinging on such financial resources (Cuskelly, Hoye, &amp; Auld, 2006; Parent, Beaupré, &amp; Séguin, 2009). Training volunteers may require substantial financial support (Chen et al., 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time and other resource constraints</td>
<td>A lack of resources, such as time to train, a qualified trainer and other facilities, were found to be contributors to what level of training was offered. As a consequence, some participants personally delivered training to their volunteers (e.g. Chris: lack of available resources; Sophie: trains her team personally to avoid extra costs and keep under budget).</td>
<td>Training is often delivered by the volunteer supervisor (McCurley &amp; Lynch, 2009). Finding the time and resources to implement training is viewed as important; however, it is not always possible due to a lack of resources and pressures of pulsating organisations (Abson, 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstandardised training</td>
<td>The complexity of training was diverse amongst the sample. The level of training was often dependent on if/when volunteers were available to attend training prior to the event (e.g. Sophie: volunteers are often sourced from out of town making training prior to the event almost impossible; Aimee (formal training): without training you wouldn’t be able to run a successful event; Steph (informal training): our volunteers are adults and we rely on them having the capability to carry out volunteer roles at our event).</td>
<td>Until recently, the training of event workforces has largely been informal, and the very nature of events being time-limited and ad-hoc suggests highly formalised training may be unlikely to emerge (Oakley, 2011). Volunteers receive most of their training pre-event (Costa et al., 2006). Lack of time is noted to be a barrier to increased volunteer activity (Holmes &amp; Smith, 2009). A clear shift towards short-term volunteering (McCurley &amp; Lynch, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing Factors</td>
<td>Key Finding</td>
<td>Related Literature Supporting Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current skill/knowledge of volunteers</td>
<td>Participants largely expressed that volunteers were recruited based on current skillsets (e.g. Karen: large number of volunteers to fulfil unskilled roles; Sophie: volunteers with prior skills are sought to avoid training costs; Michelle: level of training determined by factors including age and current skillset; Connor: interview process to fulfil volunteer roles based on prerequisite skills).</td>
<td>The foundations of an effective volunteer training program include identifying what skills need to be developed (Lulewicz, 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The complexity of volunteer roles</td>
<td>Participants sought to offer training to volunteers based on the difficulty of volunteer roles at their event (e.g. Lyndsay: diverse range of volunteer roles requiring differing levels of skill).</td>
<td>Training should be offered to ensure a common minimum knowledge base and universal understanding of organisational objectives (Spencer-Gray, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between paid staff and volunteers</td>
<td>Data indicated that event managers often considered training for volunteers as less important than for paid employees (e.g. Elijah: many are non-returning volunteers, required only for event time, whereas paid staff serve in the role year-round).</td>
<td>Many organisations still do not view their volunteers as strategic assets and are less willing to develop them through training (Eisner et al., 2009). The relationship between leadership and paid employees has been explored, with suggestions that transformational leadership and servant leadership enhance productivity (Smith, 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event managers’ perceptions of their peers’ attitudes towards training</td>
<td>Most participants perceived their industry colleagues to hold similar attitudes towards volunteer training as they themselves did (e.g. Karen: perceived another event to have formal training; however, it was a larger event with the budgetary capabilities to provide comprehensive training; Amanda: unconcerned with what her industry peers were offering for volunteer training).</td>
<td>Perceived social pressure to engage in training is a factor associated with the TRA (Fishbein &amp; Ajzen, 2011). It was not found to stand within this context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Such findings indicate that, while certain leadership styles and attitudes may suggest a heightened willingness to resource and implement training for volunteers, there are wide-ranging intervening variables beyond event managers’ preferred leadership style that ultimately determine the actual level of training provided, or to provide training at all.

Appelbaum et al. (2015) suggest that quantifying the financial impact associated with leaders’ behaviour would be highly challenging. The effects of leader behaviours on volunteer commitment and satisfaction are well documented; however, uncertainty remains as to why certain people engage in positive leadership behaviours yet others do not (Bommer, Rubin, & Baldwin, 2004). Attitudes reflect one’s feelings about people, information and situations at an affective level (Caldwell, 2012). However, qualitative data in this study suggest that the event managers’ decisions to implement training were not solely influenced by their attitude, but rather were a culmination of numerous extraneous factors as summarised in Table 7.1. The event managers’ attitudes towards training for event volunteers were discussed in Section 7.4 and, importantly, the data indicated that, although a positive attitude towards volunteer training was generally observable, negative attitudes were also present.

Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009) suggest that, although transformational leadership characteristics may be most suitable for event contexts, situational variables may also constrain and influence managerial behaviour. Using multiple-linkage leadership theory, they were able to determine which leadership style is better suited for an event context, as it includes intervening variables such as resources and support, ability and role clarity, task commitment, organisation of work, cooperation and mutual trust, and external coordination (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). Developed by Yukl (1971), multiple-linkage theory posits that each of the six aforementioned variables is
the key to good leadership (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). Thus, arguments can be made for both transformational and transactional styles as best suited for event managers, however, the dynamic nature of event business environments and event management organisations’ frequent reliance on volunteers, whose motivations are often extrinsic, suggests that event managers would need to be flexible in their approach (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). Indeed, these notions are supported in the present study.

Reflecting upon the situational variables found by Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009), this study highlighted financial resources as playing a major role in the event managers’ decision around whether or not training was implemented and/or the comprehensiveness of training offered at their events. Abson (2017) also identified that management of limited resources ranked highly on the list of leadership priorities in her study. Event managers in the present study spoke extensively of budget constraints as a key determinant as to what training was implemented at their events as opposed to their own attitudes towards training volunteers being the key determinant. For example, Aimee stated that:

Training can be a really costly exercise, however, it is extremely important. Without training you wouldn’t be able to run a successful event. But it does come back to costs. You can only work with the budget provided and often it’s inadequate. I know a lot of smaller events that don’t have much in the way of budget to support training.

Aimee’s example is reflective of recurring narratives pertaining to budget constraints which shaped participants’ decisions regarding training for their volunteers. The event managers typically viewed training for volunteers as important, although budget restrictions often played a determining factor in shaping their decision to
implement training. Budget constraints could undermine the good intentions of event managers in wanting to provide good-quality training. Consequently, event managers may have been forced to enact non-preferred leadership styles in order to meet budgetary imperatives that were indeed a high priority for these event managers.

Formal training for volunteers has increased in importance in recent years for both volunteer role requirements and as a motivation to volunteer (Hughes, 2006). Formal training focuses on the roles and responsibilities of the position and conveys a message that the organisation is willing to offer the right tools to achieve effective performance (Acevedo & Yancey, 2011). However, formal training was not always implemented at events in this study, with only half of the participants revealing formal training programs for volunteers at their events. Unstandardised training was a common issue raised by the event managers, as no standard training format was recognised across all 19 events. The findings of the present study suggest that the degree of training is often determined by extraneous factors; however, it seems crucial that formal training be implemented in order to give volunteers the best possible chance to deliver effective performance at events. It is noteworthy that only a minority of participants held negative attitudes towards volunteer training, and some other participants only conducted minor levels of training. Participants’ narratives also suggest that volunteers were often viewed differently by event managers to paid employees, believing that because their employment was episodic in nature, they did not require comprehensive training. This finding reflects literature suggesting that many organisations do not view volunteers as strategic assets and further do not offer training that would develop them, thereby helping to ensure high-quality frontline service and consequently propelling their events to their full potential (Eisner, Grimm, Maynard, & Washburn, 2009).
Literature concerning perceived social pressure to engage in a particular behaviour aligns with the subjective norm factor of the TRA. In order to further unpack findings relating to this factor, the TRA was considered in limited application. The theory posits that intentions are a function of two determinants: an individual’s attitude toward a behaviour and their perception of social pressure to perform that behaviour (Ajzen, 1988). Over half of the participants believed that their peers’ perception of training was dissimilar to their own. This finding is in contrast to what the TRA states, suggesting the theory would not stand within this context. It would appear in this study that there was no relationship between event managers’ decisions to resource and implement training and their perceived opinions of their industry colleagues about volunteer training. It was common for participants to be envious of the training that other events could provide to their volunteers, and often participants noted they had used training methods sourced from other events. However, the implementation of training within the event sample could not entirely be determined based on any social pressure to engage in training, despite perceived social pressure to implement training being referred to continuously during interviews.

Qualitative data further suggested that the event managers appeared to make decisions about training their volunteers that conflicted with traits associated with their identified leadership style. Competing priorities within organisational management can force leaders to act out of their natural preferences and enact conflicting leadership characteristics. The contradictory nature inherent in organisations and the complexity of choices faced by event managers when dealing with competing priorities is addressed within a widely-recognised organisational theory, the competing values framework (CVF) (Belasen & Frank, 2008; Quinn, Hildebrandt, Rogers, & Thompson, 1991). Thus, tenets of the CVF are referred to briefly here to explain findings surrounding the
event managers’ apparent deviation from their natural preferred leadership style under certain circumstances.

The CVF serves as an organising mechanism to explore how leaders perceive their work environment and the behaviours they display in response (Belasen & Frank, 2008; Cameron, Quinn, DeGraff, & Thakor, 2006). Proposed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983), the CVF was based on research identifying indicators of organisational effectiveness (Yu & Wu, 2009). The literature on leadership is organised into the CVF depicting eight leadership roles, categorised under: transformational leadership (Facilitator, Mentor, Innovator and Broker), and transactional leadership (Producer, Director, Coordinator and Monitor) (Melo, Silva, & Perreira, 2014). Thus, to create value (e.g. trained volunteers, effective leadership or a successful event), the outcomes of these benefits being produced should exceed the costs of producing those benefits (e.g. training). Further, the competing priorities faced by event managers and the way these are prioritised can ultimately shape their behaviour, including their decision making around the allocation of resources.

Although beyond the scope of examination for this study, the CVF was consulted as it explores the paradox of conflicting messages evident in organisational environments. Conflicting messages were indeed apparent in this research, as although the event managers widely believed training to be of the utmost importance, they were often constrained by the combinations of the intervening variables presented in Table 7.1. The CVF was designed to measure leadership to determine the presence of high or low behavioural complexity, which in turn clarifies a leaders’ roles and expectations (Zafft, Adams, & Matkin, 2009). When applied in the present study, it was evident that, under ideal circumstances, some of the event managers consistently conformed to their leadership style. They exhibited typically positive attitudes towards volunteer training,
thus aligning with constructive elements associated with that style of leadership. Event managers have numerous responsibilities spanning several different functional aspects of management, including human resources, budgeting, planning and production (Van der Wagen, 2007). These different functional responsibilities may require different leadership styles in order to be effectively managed.

However, the event managers described often being faced with conundrums regarding resource-allocation decisions for training volunteers. Event managers have a responsibility to facilitate delivery of quality customer service, which is often performed by volunteers and is thus contingent on high-quality volunteer training. This vexed relationship is recognised within stakeholder–agency theory (Hill & Jones, 1992), which seeks to explain contractual relationships between all stakeholders connected to an organisation. As an event attendee, one has certain expectations that the service will be timely, knowledgeable and friendly. Perceived high levels of service quality can increase consumer satisfaction, in turn generating potential organisational revenue (Tsuji, Bennett, & Zhang, 2007). Thus, the question arises as to why event managers would not act on this by providing adequate resources for volunteer training.

Event managers in the present study often questioned the return-on-training investment. Lamont et al.’s (2018) study utilised stakeholder–agency theory to examine multi-layered relationships within service delivery within the context of volunteer tour guides. The findings revealed that untrained or poorly trained volunteer tour guides compromised service delivery and inflicted repercussions on the reputation of the tour operator’s business. Although service delivery was not examined within the current study, the flow-on effect of not providing satisfactory training to event volunteers could potentially produce negative consequences for the overall event. The risk of not training volunteers thus appears to affect the success of the event, as the quality of service
delivery evidently depends on the comprehensiveness of training provided (Lamont et al., 2018).

It could be assumed, not unlike the TRA, that attitudes directly influence behaviour, however, the findings of the present study indicate that it is other intervening variables such as those in Table 7.1 that primarily shape event managers’ decisions to offer volunteer training, and the comprehensiveness of the training that is provided. Using established theories from the literature, such as the TRA, CVF and stakeholder–agency theory, to unpack data suggests that management of event volunteers requires a more flexible leadership approach depending on the volatile environment and emergent circumstances. The contractual relationships between volunteers and event managers are also contingent upon the level of resources and development devoted to obtaining organisational success. Directly affecting such stakeholders are extraneous factors that must be given due consideration under individual circumstances.

### 7.6 Chapter Summary

Chapter Seven has presented a theoretically informed discussion of the qualitative and quantitative data collected to inform this research, exploring leadership among event managers and its links with training event volunteers. This study has extended the leadership literature by applying leadership theories to the context of event management. Results of this research often aligned with several suggestions of leadership researchers, while also contributing new nuances to the existing literature. Traditionally, leaders have led from a more transactional standpoint; however, the ever-changing nature of contemporary business environments suggests a more transformational approach is indeed required. The findings of this study show that transformational styles were dominant and indeed relevant for event managers.
Transactional styles, while less dominant in this study, also appeared to be effective in the relevant situations. Thus, transformational leadership is often viewed as the epitome of leadership styles, though a more diverse range of leadership styles are required to effectively lead future teams. The next chapter concludes this thesis by providing an overview of the data discussed herein.


CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION

8.1 Introduction

Chapter Eight concludes this thesis by summarising the findings in light of the research objectives addressed in this study. Implications for theory and the practice of event management are discussed, along with the limitations of this research. This is followed by this study’s contribution to available leadership and event management knowledge. Areas for future research are recommended and a concluding statement finalises the thesis.

8.2 Summary of the Research

This study aimed to explore the leadership styles of event managers and also examined if and how their attitudes varied according to leadership style in relation to training for event volunteers. Event managers’ leadership styles were examined in 19 case study events along the East Coast of Australia. Events varied in size and style, including music, arts, cultural and sporting events. Initially event managers completed an online questionnaire consisting of demographic questions and the MLQ to determine their innate, preferred leadership style. MLQ questionnaires were followed-up with semi-structured interviews conducted for the purpose of eliciting in-depth information from event managers regarding their personal leadership style and exploring their attitudes towards volunteer training.

The ensuing sub-sections summarise the key findings as they relate to the four research objectives. The aim of this chapter is to highlight prominent and emergent findings and reflect on whether they meet the overall aim as stated in Chapter One.
8.2.1 Research Objective One: The Leadership Styles of Event Managers

Research Objective One aimed to identify and categorise leadership styles of event managers according to an established leadership theory. The overarching theory, the FRLT, underpinned this study as event managers were categorised according to one of nine full range leadership style. The instrument used to operationalise the FRLT, Bass and Avolio’s (1995) MLQ, was implemented to measure participants’ style of leadership. The MLQ 5X short is the instrument purported by the FRLT to measure a broad range of leadership styles. The MLQ was chosen as it is an extensively validated instrument across different cultures and types of organisations (Bass & Avolio, 2018).

Event managers were purposively selected to participate, and they initially completed an online questionnaire containing demographic information and the 45 MLQ items. After initial analysis, the event managers were categorised into their dominant style/s of leadership from nine FRLT leadership styles, the outcomes of which were presented in Section 4.5.

Event managers’ demographic information was obtained from the questionnaires to accurately present the study’s sample population. The largest group was the 26–40 age group, followed closely by the 56 or older age category. Most worked as full-time event managers (more than 35 hours/week). All but two participants had completed some form of higher education, ranging from TAFE qualifications to postgraduate degrees. Initial findings from phase one data collection revealed a diversity of FRLT leadership styles, as MLQ results accounted for high scores in seven of the nine styles of leadership. This indicated that event managers were not readily confined to a certain style of leadership. The majority of the event managers were female, constituting just over two-thirds of participants in this study. Almost half of the sample exhibited an equally high score in two leadership categories, meaning that not all event managers
were readily able to be categorised into a single FRLT category based on their MLQ results.

According to the MLQ analysis, around 80% of event managers conformed to transformational leadership styles. Ideally, transformational leadership is said to build on a transactional leadership foundation (Den Hartog et al., 1997). Transactional leadership centres around a contingent exchange of rewards for effective performance, while transformational leadership focuses on engaging and motivating followers to a higher level of performance (Calloway & Awadzi, 2008). A single event manager scored highly in IIA, although the dominant leadership category was IC, with IIB a close second. Common characteristics of IC leaders include: open, two-way communication; individual support/coaching; achievement and growth is encouraged; and personalised interaction (Wilde, 2011). Although transformational leadership is advocated as an essential characteristic of contemporary leaders (Ambrose, 2009), this style of leadership is labour-intensive. This is because it requires leaders to give individualised attention to followers, whereas the complex nature of event management often means leaders simply cannot allocate the demanding attention transformational styles often dictate (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). In contrast, four event managers, all male, exhibited transactional styles of leadership. Although transactional leaders accounted for less than one quarter of the sample, the CR category resulted in the highest group-average score overall. CR leadership is considered a constructive transaction based on an exchange process, typically rewards/praise in return for optimal performance (Antonakis & House, 2002). A transactional style is suggested to be appropriate in situations where reward can be directly linked to performance, such as the planning phase of events (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). None of the event managers conformed to MBEA or LF leadership.
MLQ analysis gave instructive initial insights into event managers’ preferred leadership styles. However, to more accurately determine event managers’ singular preferred style of leadership and to explore the nuances of leadership styles in the context of event management, follow-up semi-structured interviews were conducted. In this sense, Research Objective Two sought to explore participants’ MLQ results in light of their own perceived style of leadership as assessed by in-depth semi-structured interviews, as well as contributing rich, descriptive insights into the manifestation of various leadership styles within the context of event management.

8.2.2 Research Objective Two: Comparing MLQ Results and Event Managers’ Perceptions of Leadership Style

The second research objective was to explore event managers’ perceptions of their leadership style and how leadership styles manifest in event management contexts. Event managers were invited to participate in a semi-structured interview in order to explore and confirm their preferred leadership style. Quantitative analysis initially revealed dominant leadership styles of event managers, although some respondents also enacted multiple leadership styles. The event managers’ qualitative narratives largely reflected initial quantitative findings, revealing that, although most participants identified with a single FRLT leadership style, some could align with other styles of leadership on the FRLT other than their MLQ result. Therefore, this study demonstrated that the MLQ is not an infallible means of emphatically determining one’s leadership style.

The qualitative data revealed that most event managers perceived their MLQ result to be a true reflection of their leadership style. Some participants’ qualitative narratives, however, suggested that they shared affiliations with other leadership styles, in addition to their dominant style. Immediately, this suggested the possibility of
leadership being flexible rather than fixed to one particular style. The event managers
often referred to their leadership style during interviews as flexible, further highlighting
the need for fluidity and adaptation to other styles of leadership dependent on emerging
circumstances. Participants were hesitant to downplay their responsibilities as leaders,
as shown by no preferred LF or MBEA high scores, considered the least effective
leadership styles along the FRLT continuum (Michel, Lyons, & Cho, 2011). This was
equally as evident, with many of the event managers cautious not to overly portray their
leadership characteristics, resulting in no high scores in IIA after qualitative data
analysis.

The most common leadership styles to shine through within the qualitative
analysis, not as a direct result of participants’ MLQ responses, were IC, IM and CR.
Many of the event managers highlighted building relationships and developing their
volunteers as important objectives in crafting their leadership approach. Reflecting an
IC leadership style, which was the most common leadership style amongst the sample,
the event managers’ qualitative narratives further emphasised building rapport with
volunteers, identifying volunteers’ individual needs and coaching as important traits for
leading their teams. Additionally, inspiring motivation among volunteers was repeatedly
brought up during interviews to be a trait many leaders aspired to. IM leaders encourage
and inspire their teams, which are transformational qualities advocated to be the most
important skill event leaders must master (Goldblatt, 2005). Lastly, CR attributes, such
as goal setting, exchanging reward for effective performance and working to a deadline,
may be more easily reflective within an events context as event leaders should provide
strategic planning, standardised operations and procedures, and supervision of the
event—traits associated with transactional leadership (Goldblatt, 2008).
Although gender differences were not an intentional topic of exploration within this thesis, the qualitative analysis revealed observable differences between male and female participants worthy of discussion. Initial MLQ results and participants’ qualitative narratives suggested that generally females tended to adopt a feminine style of leadership, characterised by caring and nurturing typical of transformational leadership, while males were more masculine in their approach, adopting typical transactional traits including domination and task-orientation. This is reflective of available gender research within the leadership literature (Boonyachai, 2011; Carless, 1998; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Rosener, 1990). Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) suggest that female transformational leaders can enhance organisational effectiveness, as women are typically associated with a nurturing nature, while Carless (1998) notes that it can be expected for males and females to differ in their use of transformational characteristics. This appeared to be the case in the present study, as females tended to portray more nurturing, considerate, interpersonal transformational characteristics such as IC traits. Male participants resulting in transformational categories tended to reflect traits attributing autocratic and direct characteristics, which can be linked with IM leaders who ‘talk the talk’ (Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, & Marx, 2007; Stafford, 2009).

Findings pertaining to Research Objective Two revealed that, although the MLQ was a broad indicator of the event managers’ leadership style, subsequent qualitative analysis indicated that some participants also leaned towards other leadership styles also. Initial quantitative analysis suggested participants indeed aligned with their MLQ style, revealing that it is possible to determine a leader’s preferred leadership style via the MLQ. However, semi-structured interviews highlighted some participants in fact reflected styles other than their MLQ style. This suggests that the constantly changing,
time-sensitive and service-oriented nature of event management, along with pulsating, temporary event environments necessitates a more flexible, adaptable leadership approach (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013). The event managers’ qualitative narratives were also necessary to address Research Objective Three, which sought to explore event managers’ attitudes towards volunteer training.

8.2.3 Research Objective Three: Variance in Attitudes towards Training Volunteers across Event Managers’ Leadership Styles

The aim of Research Objective Three was to examine if and how attitudes towards training for event volunteers varies across event managers’ leadership styles. The frontline service volunteers deliver relies on efficient training (Flood, Gardner, & Yarrell, 2005), and their motivation and performance can be affected by the leadership actions of their manager; therefore, it is imperative to understand how leaders with different styles perceive volunteer training. The findings revealed that the event managers held varying attitudes towards training, with both positive and negative perceptions of volunteer training emerging from the qualitative data. The event managers generally held positive attitudes, with less than one quarter expressing negative opinions of training for their volunteers. Transformational leaders typically expressed positive attitudes to volunteer training. Participants’ narratives often conveyed their firm belief in the worthiness of training for their volunteers. However, many conceded that training was in fact a costly activity, though most transformational leaders believed that the benefits outweighed the costs. The qualitative analysis suggests that there were some exceptions to this pattern, in that one transformational leader who believed the costs of training to exceed the benefits of training volunteers and, conversely, one transactional leader who was adamant about the importance of training...
for volunteers. This suggested that not every event manager can be pigeonholed towards a certain attitude towards volunteer training according to their leadership style.

Negativity towards training largely stemmed from considering the costs of training to outweigh the benefits. Although there was no definitive pattern linking particular leadership styles with particular attitudes, most negative attitudes towards event volunteer training stemmed from transactional leaders. Four event managers perceived volunteer training negatively, with three of those four being transactional leaders. These event managers perceived training for volunteers negatively on account of factors including budget constraints, resource limitations, complexity of volunteer roles and due to the fact that volunteers were episodic (often not returning to volunteer) or, contrastingly, returning volunteers suggesting annual training was unnecessary. Interestingly, the majority of negative attitudes towards training were expressed by male event managers. Without being able to generalise much further, these participants were aged 41 and over, and tended not to have any formal qualifications in event management.

However, the event managers frequently spoke of factors which influenced their decision making around what training was implemented for event volunteers. Most of the event managers, although generally supportive of training as a worthwhile investment, frequently considered other factors—aside from their own personal attitudes—that ultimately shaped their actual decisions to resource training for their volunteers. Consequently, the fourth research objective of this thesis sought to explore factors that shape event managers’ decisions to resource training for volunteers.
8.2.4 Research Objective Four: Factors Shaping Event Managers’ Decisions around Resourcing Training for Volunteers

Research Objective Four sought to identify and explore factors shaping event managers’ decisions regarding the allocation of training resources for event volunteers. The event managers’ qualitative narratives suggested that their personal attitudes did not adequately explain the scope of training offered to event volunteers, or whether training was offered at all. The qualitative data highlighted seven intervening variables which shaped event managers’ decisions to resource volunteer training. Factors found to influence event managers’ decision to resource and implement training included: budget restrictions, time and other resource constraints, the complexity of volunteer roles, the differences between paid staff and volunteers, current skill/knowledge of volunteers, non-standardised training and participants’ perceptions of training provided by other event managers. These factors indicate that certain leadership styles and attitudes held by event managers may suggest a heightened willingness to resource and implement volunteer training, however, there are intervening variables that emerge that can force event managers to enact behaviours that may conflict with their preferred style of leadership in order to achieve organisational objectives.

Intervening variables were found to constrain and influence event managers’ decisions to resource and implement volunteer training. The event managers’ narratives highlighted budget constraints as a key determinant of resourcing training for volunteers at their events. Qualitative data revealed that the event managers held varying attitudes towards volunteer training, though they all mentioned factors found to influence the actual training resourced and offered to volunteers at their event. Further, participants noted other constraints imposed by limited time and organisational resources that impacted what training could be implemented. The mitigating effects such intervening
variables had on event managers’ attitudes towards training suggest they often make managerial decisions that conflict with traits associated with their preferred leadership style. Competing priorities within organisational management suggest that event managers are forced to enact other leadership characteristics that contradict their naturally preferred style of leadership; for example, some transformational leaders who thoroughly believed in the importance of volunteer training spoke of having to make uncomfortable managerial decisions around what training was offered, which was largely shaped by factors including budget and current skill/knowledge of volunteers. Although the event managers widely endorsed training as important for their volunteers to effectively function in their roles, conflicting messages were apparent, as the event managers were often constrained by the realities of limited resources in offering training to their volunteers.

### 8.3 Implications for Theory

This thesis presents numerous implications for theory. Event management and managing volunteer workforces both present different challenges, as event volunteers tend to exhibit short-term commitment and require a nuanced management approach compared to paid employees (Cuskelly & Auld, 2000; Cuskelly, Taylor, et al., 2006). Further, leadership within the context of events is multifaceted and, although transformational leadership has been previously advocated as the superior style, this study has shown that effective modes of leadership may be dependent on contextual situations (Bass, 1991; Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009). This presents challenges for training event volunteers and for event managers in resourcing training for volunteers. The ensuing sub-sections explicate the key theoretical implications stemming from this thesis.
8.3.1 Implications for Leadership Theory within Event Management Contexts

Literature addressing volunteer management and event volunteer management suggests that there are nuances in approaches to the traditional management of paid employees contrasted against what is required to effectively manage volunteer workforces (e.g. Fallon & Rice, 2015; Heitmann & Roberts, 2010). Event business environments are often unstable, temporary and service is intangible and therefore require a unique approach to leadership, with leaders requiring a different set of skills and competencies which contrast with traditional organisational leadership (Abson, 2017). Leadership in event contexts is complex and, as highlighted in the present study, is highly dependent on prevailing contextual situations (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009; Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013). Transformational leadership styles were most prevalent among the sample of event managers in this study; however, Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009) suggest that transformational leadership may be challenging to apply in event settings as giving individualised attention to followers and stakeholders, commonly associated with transformational leaders, may be difficult. They also hold that transactional styles may be appropriate in event environments (Parent, Olver, & Séguin, 2009); however, transactional styles were only apparent within a minority of event managers in this study.

The findings from the present study suggest that event managers may have to adopt leadership characteristics outside of their preferred style contingent upon emerging circumstances. Therefore, an exclusively transformational or transactional style may not be as effective, as it restricts the leader from enacting traits reflective of other leadership styles which may be required to achieve organisational objectives. Consequently, these findings extend the leadership literature, specifically the FRLT and MLQ, by applying these leadership theories within the context of events. The FRLT
suggests that leaders reduce passive leadership behaviours, such as MBEA and LF leadership, while increasing the frequency of transformational leadership in order to improve leadership performance (Bass, 2000). The data from the present study suggest that although strongly conforming to transformational leadership styles, many of the event managers often described their leadership style during interviews as needing to be flexible and adaptable. This aligns with the FRLT, which advocates that leaders use a full range of leadership behaviours (Antonakis et al., 2003). As event environments are constantly changing, theory concerning event managers as leaders needs to acknowledge the need for flexibility in approaches to leadership, which aligns with the research of Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009).

8.3.2 Event Managers’ Decision-Making around Resourcing Training for Event Volunteers

This research also has implications for theoretical understandings around the resourcing of training for event volunteers. External intervening variables were found to significantly shape event managers’ decisions around resourcing training for event volunteers. Addressing the leadership styles of event managers, while important in understanding effective styles for leading event workforces, appears not to be a key factor in explaining event managers’ decisions around the degree to which training resources are allocated for event volunteers. This study found that leadership styles were diverse amongst event managers, as a result the attitudes they expressed during qualitative narratives around resourcing volunteer training did not consistently align with what would be expected according to their leadership style. Extraneous factors, including budget restrictions, limited resources, perceptions of industry peers’ attitudes towards training volunteers, volunteer roles, the differences between paid staff and volunteers, current skill/knowledge of volunteers and absence of leadership training for
event managers, appeared to exert strong influences on event managers’ decisions to allocate volunteer training. Such variables may force event managers to adopt different styles of leadership to their naturally preferred, innate leadership style. These findings evoke theoretical implications, as leadership style does not suffice in explaining complex questions concerning event managers’ attitudes and decision-making around training volunteers.

A positive attitude held by an individual towards a particular behaviour is widely regarded as a key antecedent to enacting that behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1985); however, in this study, attitudes were not solely found to shape event managers’ decisions to resource volunteer training. Although Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1985) TRA was not employed as a framework for exploring attitudes, it is a useful theoretical framework for examining attitude as an antecedent of behavioural intention as it was drawn upon during analysis. The theory posits that intention is the best single predictor of behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2011), although the findings of the present study revealed that the event managers’ attitudes towards training did not fully explain the actual training implemented. Participants’ positive attitudes towards volunteer training, coupled with perceived endorsement of training among participant’s industry peers, did not always result in actual implementation of resourcing training for event volunteers, as may have been expected according to the TRA. Replication of this study’s factors examined by the TRA on a larger scale may offer a different set of findings. However, results of this study found that intervening factors exerted a strong influence, even though these factors are not considered within the TRA.

### 8.3.3 Implications for Leadership Research within Events

Traditionally, leadership has been conceived around the idea that there is one person in charge, usually with the highest-ranking position within the organisation, and the rest
are followers (Pearce, Manz, & Sims, 2009). However, this hierarchal, vertical-leadership as universal conceptualisation of leadership is being increasingly contested, with the future of leadership diversifying into team, shared and rotating leadership roles (Pearce et al., 2009). This presents numerous challenges for leadership researchers as exploring leadership roles of multiple hierarchical positions is timely and requires contrasts. This study focused on senior event managers of 19 different events across the East Coast of Australia. The MLQ was the instrument supporting the FRLT and was chosen to measure leadership styles of event managers. Although it is contended to be equally effective when only measuring direct leader reports, ideally the MLQ would also be used for 360-degree feedback, taking into account followers’ reports of their leader (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

While findings of the MLQ were triangulated with follow-up qualitative interviews to ensure trustworthiness, the voice of event managers’ volunteers was not captured. A focus on event managers’ leadership styles and their own perceptions of their leadership style meant that excluding the MLQ 5X short rater form made sense for this research. This research has provided qualitative insights into the manifestations of the different FRLT leadership styles enacted by event managers. It therefore forms a foundation for future theory building capable of explicating how the various styles of leadership are enacted by event managers and can inform future research efforts exploring the effectiveness of different leadership styles within different event settings.

8.4 Implications for Practice

8.4.1 Implications for Event Managers as Leaders

Event management and the management of volunteers evoke challenges that extend beyond traditional organisational management (Cuskelley & Auld, 2000). Dynamic, fast-
paced work environments that require overseeing diverse workforces, which frequently use volunteer labour, often require a shift away from traditional transactional leadership styles in which key practices include control and compliance, to a more transformational approach where the focus is on commitment, loyalty and identification (Keegan & den Hartog, 2004). Transformational leadership traits may be typically more time consuming as they include motivating followers, acting as mentors, aiding follower growth and development, stimulating creative solutions to problems and exerting genuine influence over followers (Bass, 1991). The present study revealed that most event managers were transformational leaders; however, typical transformational traits may conflict with the fast-paced, volatile nature events run to. Conversely, an exclusively transactional approach excludes the positive advantages transformational leadership brings to overall organisational success. As Bass (1991) notes, “Transformational leadership is not a panacea. In many situations it is inappropriate…” (p. 30).

Therefore, exclusively adopting only a transformational or transactional style of leadership in an event context may be detrimental, as traits associated with each of the styles are excluded. Hence, a more flexible approach to leadership where leaders can transition between styles would allow fluidity in different contexts. For example, event managers might leverage transformational leadership characteristics to motivate followers and offer coaching and support where necessary, all the while adopting transactional leadership characteristics to actively monitor volunteers and offer rewards and praise in exchange for efficient performance. Both transformational and transactional leaders perform active leadership, with transformational leadership building on transactional leadership (Den Hartog et al., 1997). This is reflective of
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Parent et al.’s (2013) research, which highlights that event managers need to be flexible and adaptable, and exert effective leadership contingent on the situation.

Event managers may benefit from completing the MLQ and also having their followers rate their leadership via the MLQ. Doing so would allow event managers to better understand and self-reflect on their style of leadership, and perhaps identify a need to undertake leadership training to enhance their performance as a leader. The MLQ offers directions a leader may pursue in order to be a more effective leader (Bass & Avolio, 1997). A retesting program may allow event managers to monitor their effectiveness and overall changes in their leadership style, a useful benchmark process to enhance leadership (Bass, 2005–2013). According to Bass and Avolio (1995), leaders would ideally measure and assess their current leadership style, benefit from following the program in the MLQ Trainer’s Guide, retest according to the MLQ, and analyse areas for further improvement. This would allow event managers to hone their transformational leadership skills and build on transactional leadership behaviours to optimise their overall leadership performance.

8.4.2 Implications for Event Volunteer Training

The benefits of training for both paid employees and volunteers are widely acknowledged within the literature (Costa et al., 2006; Deslandes & Rogers, 2008; Maynard, 2007), however, the degree of training provided at the case study events in this study were highly diverse. The time-bound framework that events typically ran to suggested that training was mostly delivered immediately prior to the event or on the job. Although Macduff (1995) holds that a significant investment in training is rarely required due to the limited degree of difficult roles volunteers typically undertake, while the event managers explained that volunteers can fulfil a diverse range of roles within their events. Training for more complex volunteer roles in this study was usually
delivered via one-on-one coaching, a task regarded as more difficult due to the limited
duration of events. However, event managers face a conundrum, as volunteer training
should be regular enough to keep volunteers motivated and engaged, while seizing
opportunistic time immediately prior to the event in order to retain knowledge and
maintain momentum, a benchmark difficult to achieve given the often transient nature
of volunteer workforces (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013).

More standardised training programs for volunteers might be implemented
across the events sector. Although this may prove challenging due to factors impacting
training, as pointed out within this study, standardised training may improve frontline
service as provided by event volunteers, with additional follow-on benefits such as
improved volunteer retention. Although no single training method is regarded as
superior (Read & Kleiner, 1996), considerations should be made based on the number
of trainees, their existing level of skill and knowledge, budget and time constraints, and
requirements of the volunteer role. Leigh, Lamont and Cairncross (2013) devised a
four-step process for training young volunteers which may be considered a training base
to work from and possibly fine-tune to account for all volunteer ages, this process:
begins with an induction to the event, providing necessary information; followed by a
demonstration with hands-on experience; practice; and, lastly, OJT. After careful
consideration of all impacting factors, event managers would benefit from a more
standardised training format.

As a result, there may well be implications for volunteer industry organisations,
Vocational Education Trainers (VET), such as TAFE, and possibly also policy makers
too. O’Dwyer (2015) highlights the volunteer sector may be worth around $200 billion
to the Australian economy, a figure that which probably grown since that study (see
Section 2.7). Having such fragmented non-standard training regimes in sectors requiring
volunteers has the potential to adversely affect wider socio-economic growth. As a result, there is scope to consider standardised VET volunteer training as outlined above for both volunteers and their managers, in the event sector at least, as something that may become more important in the near future and become something that policy makers may need to consider more seriously than is currently the case.

8.5 Contribution to Knowledge

The findings of this study contribute to knowledge in the fields of event management practices, leadership styles and training for event volunteers. To date, only limited research has been conducted within the context of events that examines skills, qualities or attributes of successful managers (Bowdin et al., 2011). While this research did not specifically examine these qualities, it examined the leadership styles of event managers using the FRLT, as measured by the MLQ, which aimed to the range of leadership styles exhibited by event managers. Further, there is little research in the leadership literature offering empirical insights into the leadership characteristics of event managers. The cognitive elements associated with leadership have largely been ignored due to the dominance of quantitative studies (Dulewicz & Higgs, 2005). Thus, the qualitative findings of the present study extend leadership theory into the study of event management. This study has made an original contribution by offering rich, nuanced insights into the leadership styles of event managers by building upon an established theoretical framework from the broader leadership literature, namely the FRLT (Avolio & Bass, 1991).
8.5.1 Mixed Methods: A New Approach to Event Management Research

A mixed-method research design employing a quantitative questionnaire and follow-up semi-structured interviews was implemented in the present study in order to more thoroughly explore the leadership issues at hand. Leadership research has largely been examined from a quantitative perspective, and seldom are participants asked to critically think about leadership (Alvesson & Sveningsson, 2003). Stentz et al. (2012) suggest that leadership may be best researched through a mixed-methods design. A related interpretive study by Abson (2017) explored leadership within an event management context using semi-structured interviews. Building on this qualitative approach within an event context, the mixed-method design deployed in the present study provided rich, experiential data and new insights into leadership among event managers.

The MLQ was chosen as it is the instrument purported to operationalise the FRLT, the underlying theoretical framework of this research. Being a valid and reliable instrument, data gleaned through the quantitative component of this thesis has contributed to both the broader leadership literature focusing on leadership styles measured by the MLQ, as well as expanding knowledge around leadership among event managers. Semi-structured interviews were then conducted in order to build on the data obtained from the MLQ. Triangulation of research data fostered the use of innovative methods, allowing findings to be inductively derived (Avolio et al., 2003). Approaching leadership research via this mixed-method approach contributed diverse data and built upon existing knowledge in event management.

8.5.2 Fluidity in Event Managers’ Leadership Styles

This study suggests event managers’ leadership styles should not necessarily be seen as fixed, but rather flexible, fluid and malleable, with effective event leaders being those
who are able to morph into an array of different leadership styles contingent upon prevailing circumstances. Event managers were found to conform to a diverse range of leadership styles, both transformational and transactional styles of leadership. Bass (1995) has argued that effective leaders display both transactional and transformational leadership characteristics (Antonakis & House, 2002). Den Hartog and Koopman (2001) suggest that the role leaders undertake in ‘pulsating’ organisations will be different from more traditional leadership roles in stable environments. Transactional leaders were found to gravitate towards offering basic or lower-skilled volunteer roles which require less leadership effort, while transformational leaders typically managed volunteers undertaking higher-skilled roles. This highlighted the differing degrees of volunteer management which transactional and transformational leaders assumed. While leaders conformed to FRLT leadership styles in theory, mitigating organisational constraints often shaped the style of leadership they had to project to facilitate successful events. Consequently, this study has contributed rich empirical insights and has highlighted a need for flexibility across leadership styles among event managers.

8.5.3 Optimal Leadership Style for Event Managers

While a particular leadership style has not been truly advocated for the events sector, researchers support varying degrees of transformational and transactional styles of leadership. Parent, Olver and Séguin (2009) suggest that a purely transformational approach may be challenging, although they highlight that transactional styles are indeed appropriate in certain situations. Bass and Avolio (1997) have shown that females tend to score predominately higher in the transformational categories and lower in transactional leadership than their male colleagues. The findings of this research align with this notion. Meanwhile, Bass and Avolio (1996, 2002) deduced that
transformational leadership is in fact beneficial for followers and their organisation, regardless of the situation (Yukl, 1999).

This study found the majority of event managers were transformational, and that transformational leadership has its place in event contexts as participants’ narratives affirmed their current leadership style worked well for their event contexts. Participants’ qualitative narratives, although aligning with MLQ results in some instances, were reflective of other leadership styles. Transformational styles appeared to be preferred upon initial analysis, however, flexibility was evident upon further in-depth analysis, which extends the literature concerning flexibility across leadership styles. Thus, the data of the present study suggest event managers should naturally lean towards more transformational leadership styles, although they should feel comfortable enacting transactional behaviours when needed. Event managers should therefore maintain an openness to combining transformational and transactional leadership styles to achieve optimal leadership outcomes within the context of events.

8.5.4 Resourcing Decisions about Volunteer Training Shaped by Organisational Constraints

Research concerning attitudes to training has typically been examined from the trainee’s viewpoint, thereby excluding managers’ perceptions of training (Facteau et al., 1995). This study has contributed to the human resource development literature pertaining to events, as it has contributed empirical insights into event managers’ perceptions of training for volunteers, as well as insights into volunteer training offered at events. This study found that, in order to minimise the financial costs of training, many of the event managers explained that they themselves conducted training delivery. Staging costs for an event are often minimal (Walo, Bull, & Breen, 1996), while this study’s findings revealed that costs associated with providing a trainer are often overlooked, thus
necessitating event managers to assume the responsibility of training their volunteers. This oversight appears to contrast with literature noting training costs to be an important part of HRD (Naik, 2007).

The data revealed that the event managers often do not have the skills/knowledge/training in designing and conducting training programs. This in turn can lead to poor training outcomes. Moreover, participants’ narratives suggested they would abstain from responsibility for the design and delivery of training to their volunteers, and would engage in tactics strategically designed to avoid conducting the training themselves. This was evident as event managers often recruited volunteers based on existing skill sets. Event management educational programs in vocational and tertiary institutions may not provide event managers with requisite skills and knowledge in training their workforces. Further, considerations for outsourcing training for their volunteers may advantage event managers and their events overall; however, this may have budgetary implications.

Findings also revealed that, although some event managers held positive attitudes towards training, the realities of managing a competitive event suggest that they did not always follow through with providing adequate training for their volunteers. Attitudes alone were not deemed to exert a strong influence on event managers’ decisions to implement training for their volunteers. Extraneous factors were found to potentially shape event managers’ attitudes to resourcing and implementing training, including budget restrictions, time and other resource constraints, absence of leadership training, differences between paid staff and volunteers, motivation and attendance of volunteers, volunteers’ current skill/knowledge, and external influencing factors such as the attitudes of other event managers. Despite behaviours that might be
expected on the basis of preferred leadership style, event managers were often forced to enact different leadership traits due to these extraneous factors.

With this study’s contribution to knowledge now highlighted, the following sections declare the limitations of this study and provide recommendations for future research.

8.6 Limitations of this Research

8.6.1 Purposive, Non-representative Sample
There were several limitations to the study that should be acknowledged. Firstly, the findings of this study pertain only to the 19 events purposively selected from the eastern coast of Australia. While every effort was made to gather a diverse sample of event managers, challenges were encountered in obtaining a sample of this event management population. Accessing this group and developing the trust and rapport necessary to conduct in-depth interviews proved difficult. The need to access event managers occupying senior roles within event organisations, and who played an active role in training a volunteer workforce compounded these sampling challenges.

As participation required completion of both the online questionnaire and a follow-up interview, participants were limited to those who were willing to participate in both data collection phases. In addition, due to the relatively time-consuming nature of participating in the study, some event managers were discouraged from participating. Purposive sampling was useful in accessing some initial participants, although snowballing was deployed due to the limitations of the original sampling technique. A gender imbalance also resulted as only six males participated within a final sample of 19. This appeared to reflect a possible gender imbalance within the event management industry as the majority of potential participants contacted were also female. This, along
with the relatively small number of participants, meant that data saturation may not have been reached, thus the generalisability of this study’s findings are to some degree limited. However, as the study was predominantly qualitative, generalisability was not an objective of the research design.

8.6.2 A Western Cultural Perspective

This study encapsulated a Western cultural perspective, focusing only on events within a particular geographical location, this being the East Coast of Australia. This limitation was primarily due to time and research constraints, and further hindered by the challenges of accessing suitable event managers as discussed above. The MLQ has been validated across many cultures, and translated into several languages, for example in a Thai study of hotel managers (Boonyachai, 2011), however, no studies have employed the MLQ to explore leadership styles of event managers in a Western cultural context. Although a limitation of this research, this study has broadened the pool of cultural contexts within which the MLQ has been implemented.

8.6.3 Time and Research Constraints

The time and research constraints imposed on the researcher limited various aspects of the study. Restrictions that were a direct result of time and research constraints included the timeframe for data collection, conducting semi-structured interviews face-to-face with all participants, attempting follow-up interviews after phase two data collection was completed, and reaching data saturation as a result of the number of participants and limited data analysis time. Acknowledging these limitations, the researcher made every possible effort to ensure trustworthiness of the research by mixing methods, which aimed at data triangulation. This was done by widening the initial sample to include recommendations for potential participants from event managers, conducting
interviews via phone for participants unable to meet with the researcher face-to-face, and analysing data using an in-depth thematic approach.

8.6.4 Exploratory Research Design

Hindered by a lack of previous research specifically examining leadership within an event context, the present study was predominantly exploratory in nature. Although an established leadership theoretical framework—the FRLT—guided the research, unexpected findings emerged that were not adequately accommodated by the original theory, thus necessitating the use of additional theoretical concepts to unpack emergent findings. The complex nature of leadership makes it a challenge to understand and research (Stentz et al., 2012). Further, a review of the literature highlighted quantitative methods at the heart of leadership, events and volunteering studies (Holmes, 2009). This research employed a mixed-method design utilising a quantitative online questionnaire and qualitative semi-structured interviews, which allowed the voices of individual event managers to be represented. An overarching pragmatic research paradigm supported the mixed methods which were chosen, as they were considered to be the most complementary to the study’s research objectives. Data analysis necessitated a reactive use of augmenting theory, drawing on other theoretical frameworks to effectively unpack findings. The complexity associated with understanding all relevant literature meant theories such as the TRA, CVF and stakeholder–agency theory were considered in a minor role to aid data analysis. The findings are limited by the overall research design chosen and should thus be considered within such a context, although this research design provides a platform for future research. Future research could use any of the aforementioned theories to better understand attitudes of event managers towards training volunteers.
8.6.5 Researcher Subjectivity

This study was open to bias due to the methodological design employed. Qualitative research has been criticised for being biased (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004) because of the subjectivity inherent in interactions between the researcher and research participants. As qualitative analysis is largely constructivist in nature, bias can occur as data collection and analysis can be shaped based on the reality as the researcher perceives it (Antonakis, Schriesheim, et al., 2004). In order to limit such bias, multiple methods were employed to complement one another and triangulate findings further. In addition, as participants were questioned about personal leadership characteristics in both the quantitative and qualitative phases of this study, social desirability bias was deemed an issue. The data analysis suggested that participants generally gave answers that they perceived the researcher wanted to hear, rather than the realities of the everyday running of the event. Such findings were evident, as participants were hesitant to overly reflect the most ideal transformational leadership qualities nor the most ineffective LF characteristics. Efforts were made to triangulate results of the MLQ with semi-structured interviews in order to flesh out potential biases; however, the MLQ rater form was unable to be administered, which evaluates how frequently, or to what degree, followers observe their leader engaging in specific behaviours (Bass & Avolio, 1997). Results are limited to the self version of the MLQ as self-perceived by participants in this study.

8.6.6 Exploring Event Managers’ Perspectives

Only event managers’ perspectives were obtained within the present study. Event managers completed the MLQ 5X short self form and participated in follow-up semi-structured interviews. Transformational leadership theory has been noted to be biased toward favouring some stakeholders, namely top management (Yukl, 1999). As only
event managers were researched in relation to their leadership styles, the absence of volunteers’ perspectives is a key limitation of this study. Further, the MLQ 5X rater form was not used within the present study.

8.7 Recommended Areas for Future Research

8.7.1 Replication in Related Contexts

While contributing to knowledge in the fields of leadership and event management, the limitations of the present study highlight areas for future research. Firstly, this study could be replicated on a larger scale in order to more thoroughly explore the leadership styles of event managers and their attitudes towards training volunteers. As the study was limited to a Western cultural context, future studies may be replicated in other cultural contexts. Secondly, while there were no limitations placed on the organisational governance of the participating events, considering the event within a particular sector (e.g. public, private, non-profit) may have revealed further nuanced insights additional to the findings of this thesis. Additionally, while maintaining anonymity was a key concern, it may have been worthwhile to include organisational contexts as an additional level of comparison.

The proportion of male and female participants was limited by the sampling technique employed. Research may consider employing alternative sampling techniques to recruit a larger and more diverse sample of event managers, particularly in relation to gender. Further, within this study as two participants worked as full-time event managers on a voluntary basis, future research could focus on this volunteer aspect alone or as a comparison to paid event managers. Doing so may contribute additional insights into event leadership, particularly at the community level. A delimitation of this study was volunteers, thus excluding paid event staff; however, future research may
consider paid staff as an alternate or comparison for data collection. This may also include the training paid staff receive as a comparative point of the research. This study has provided foundational, exploratory knowledge concerning the leadership styles of event managers and their attitudes towards training volunteers, however, further research is needed to build upon this body of work.

8.7.2 Using the MLQ as a Tool for 360-Degree Feedback

This study employed the MLQ as the instrument used to measure leadership styles of event managers according to the FRLT. The MLQ 5X short leader self form was completed by event managers in the present study. The MLQ 5X short is essentially a 360-degree feedback tool used to obtain self-reports from the leader and rater-reports from followers, not only to develop the leader themselves but also to identify the thoughts of followers to better understand leadership effectiveness (UKessays, 2003-2014). Due to time and resource constraints, event managers’ followers, that is, volunteers, were beyond the scope of this study. However, in order to increase feedback accuracy and better identify leaders’ effectiveness through their followers’ perceptions of their leader, future studies could employ both the self and rater forms in conjunction to obtain 360-degree feedback. Obtaining followers’ responses using the rater form measures leadership as perceived by people at different levels of the organisation (Bass & Avolio, 2018). Bass and Avolio (2018) suggest that the ideal number of raters would be 8–10 per leader. Self-ratings are prone to bias; thus, the rater form would allow for a different perspective and insight into how followers perceive their leader to behave (Bass & Riggio, 2008). These authors further advocate the rater form to be more important than the self form, as leadership is said to be in the ‘eye of the beholder’ (Bass, 1995; Bass & Riggio, 2008).
8.7.3 Encouraging Greater Methodological Diversity in Leadership Research

The methods used within this study—being the self-administered questionnaire and semi-structured interviews—could be employed in future research studies examining event managers’ leadership styles. As previous research has largely examined leadership via quantitative methods, a mixed-method approach allows the voice of the leader to be better understood (Bryman, 2004). Although replicability is typically not a criterion of qualitative research (Bryman, 2004), similar methodological approaches would ensure a greater diversity of results within leadership literature. Limitations of these methods could be offset by other research methods, for example focus groups. Focus groups may have allowed additional exploration of results, and would have triangulated the data even further. Other methodological designs could also offer different insights into this topic. Additional measures of an event manager’s style of leadership through other quantitative instruments could strengthen this study’s findings. In addition, research exploring event managers’ attitudes towards training volunteers could be linked with volunteers’ satisfaction, commitment of volunteers and their motivation. Examining these additional concepts could broaden the insights afforded through the present study.

8.7.4 Diversity in Future Event Leadership Research

As noted, the event managers purposively selected to participate in the present study were chosen based on their status as an event manager. Further participation criteria included training volunteers as a key component of selection, and event managers’ willingness to participate in follow-up semi-structured interviews. Gordon and Yukl (2004) suggest leadership research at all levels of organisations, as well as research in the context where the leadership occurs. This suggests that leadership may also be
found at other levels of event organisations; for example, within different areas of the one event such as food and beverage managers. An additional avenue for research might consider the different employment statuses of event managers, particularly volunteers, although consideration of solely full-time or part-time event managers may also reveal additional insights not found within the present study. Future studies might widen the selection criteria to obtain a sample more generalisable to other leadership research. Exploration of leadership styles at various levels within event case studies and exploring followers’ perceptions of their leader would build upon the present study’s findings. This may offer a new perspective regarding leadership styles at varying levels of management.

8.7.5 Age and Gender Differences of Event Managers’ Leadership Styles

A significant emergent finding of the present study was the age and gender-based differences of event managers’ leadership styles. While further research is needed to verify these results, they contribute to the literature regarding gender differences in leadership research (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Burke & Collins, 2001; Rosener, 1990). Gender differences among leaders is a contested topic, with researchers having previously considered whether men and women behave differently in leadership roles (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001). However, there is currently little agreement on the gender debate. Future research may consider more thoroughly examining age and gender differences of leaders within the context of event management.

8.8 Concluding Statement

The events sector has experienced rapid growth over the last decade, with leadership increasingly being recognised as a core competency of event managers (Abson, 2017).
The need for effective leadership in contemporary event environments is becoming more crucial as a variable for organisational success. Additionally, an event’s success is largely dependent on intangible, high-quality frontline service, often delivered by a volunteer workforce. Competitive advantage is gained when volunteers are trained effectively, thus investigation concerning event managers’ attitudes towards volunteer training and factors likely to affect the allocation of adequate time and resources to training is warranted. Leadership itself is complex yet crucial (Parent & Smith-Swan, 2013), and understanding the leadership styles of event managers and their attitudes towards training volunteers contributes to the fledgling knowledge within this field. The findings of this study highlight the need for flexible leadership styles among event managers. Event managers should predominantly adopt a transformational style of leadership; however, they are urged to be flexible in this approach, adopting other transformational styles and transactional leadership when appropriate.
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Appendix A: Cover Letter Emailed to Potential Participants
Dear Potential Participant,

My name is Jacqueline Leigh and I am a postgraduate student at Southern Cross University, Lismore. My research project aims to explore leadership styles of event managers, and to subsequently examine the variance in attitudes towards training volunteers across event managers’ leadership styles. In order to carry out my research I am contacting event organisations, like yours, in the hope you will spare the time to help me achieve my research goals. Due to your position within the organisation, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached online questionnaire.

By participating in this study, you will learn about your own leadership style as measured by the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ). This may potentially provide you with an insight into your personal leadership style, of which you were not previously aware, and may also benefit how you choose to lead your event organisation in the future. Your responses will contribute to an important part of the research dedicated to leadership within the context of events.

Scroll down and click “>>” to commence the questionnaire. It will require approximately 15 minutes to complete. To exit, finish the page you are on and click “>>” to save your answers. When you are ready to return, submit via the link sent to you by the researcher. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk.

Before commencing the questionnaire, please read the information below regarding informed consent. By completing and submitting this questionnaire, you are indicating your consent to participate in this research and that you understand the information provided.

********************************************************************
Informed Consent Information

Project Title
Leadership and Training: How do the leadership styles of event managers influence training event volunteers receive?

Confidentiality
All data collected will be held and handled in a strictly confidential manner. In order to ensure anonymity please do not include your name on the questionnaire. Pseudonyms will be used in this project’s thesis and any future publications arising from this study. The researcher will make every effort to ensure that your confidentiality is protected.

Potential Risks
The researcher envisages minimal risk and/or discomfort from participating in this research.

Responsibility of the Researcher
All data collected will remain confidential and be securely stored personally with the researcher. Only the researcher and her supervisors will have access to the information you provide and confidentiality is assured in all future publications.
Responsibility of the Participant
If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible and return the completed questionnaires promptly via the link provided. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw your consent at any time.

Dissemination of research outcomes
The results of this research may be submitted for publication in scholarly, peer-reviewed journals and/or presented at conferences. Data will be presented anonymously so there can be no trace back to the respondent.

Feedback
A summary of the outcomes of this research will be compiled once the data have been analysed. You are entitled to receive a copy of this summary. If you wish to do so, please contact the researcher.

Research Approval
This study has been approved by the Southern Cross University Human Research Ethics Committee. Approval number ECN-14-181. Complaints about the ethical conduct of this research should be addressed in writing to the following:

Ethics Complaints Officer
HREC
Southern Cross University
PO BOX 157
Lismore NSW 2480
E: ethics.lismore@scu.edu.au

Contact Details & Enquiries to:
Jacqueline Leigh
PhD Candidate
School of Tourism and Hospitality Management
Southern Cross University, Lismore

E: j.leigh.11@student.scu.edu.au
T: 0412 XXX XXX

**********************************************************************

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavours. The data collected will provide useful information regarding the leadership styles of event managers. If you require any additional information or have questions, please contact me on the number provided. The study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (ECN-14-181).
Appendix B: Example Leadership Profile Report

Example leadership profile report as emailed to participants prior to semi-structured interviews.

Hi Connor,
Thank you again for taking the time to complete the online questionnaire portion of this research. Your responses have contributed valuable information towards the Research Objectives of my study. I have attached your profiled leadership style as a result of your multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) responses for your perusal.

As per the results of the MLQ your leadership style was found to be a Factor 3 – *Inspirational Motivation* (IM) leader. This is a form of transformational leadership where the leader inspires and motivates followers to reach ambitious goals that may have previously seemed unreachable. IM leaders embody the term “team spirit”, showing optimism and enthusiasm, providing both meaning and challenge to the work at hand. Key strengths of the IM leader include: clearly communicating expectations, demonstrating commitment to goals and a shared vision, and inspiring, motivating and challenging followers to ultimately create a self-fulfilling prophecy.

In order to compare your leadership style, as determined by your responses to the MLQ, all nine factor scales of the MLQ are listed here with a short description of each.

**The Nine Factor scales of the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ):**

Factors 1 & 2, *Idealised Influence (Attributes & Behaviours)* indicates whether you hold subordinates’ trust, maintain their faith and respect, show dedication to them, appeal to their hopes and dreams, and act as their role model. Followers identify with and want to emulate this leader, who is trusted, respected and seen as having an attainable mission and vision. This type of leader becomes a role model for his/her followers and encourages them to share common visions and goals by providing a clear vision and strong sense of purpose.

An IIA leader is the ideal role model, considered very trustworthy and someone who “walks the talk”. Values are core to this leader, as they emphasise taking a stand for them, a search for shared values, the moral consequences of such values, and putting followers’ values above their own.
Sample attributional item is: “The leader reassures others that obstacles will be overcome.”

The IIB component refers to the charismatic actions of the leader that focuses on values, beliefs and a sense of mission. These charismatic actions include talking about your most important values and beliefs, emphasising the collective mission and purpose, as well as considering the ethical implications of your decisions.

Sample behavioural item is: “The leader emphasises the importance of having a collective sense of mission.”

Factor 3. Inspirational Motivation measures the degree to which you provide a vision, use appropriate symbols and images to help others focus on their work, and try to make others feel their work is significant. This leader is focused on emotional stimulation by using strong and evocative language, expressing confidence, articulating compelling visions/goals and encouraging followers to achieve goals, and aligning individual and organisational goals. This type of leader aims to express the importance of desired goals in simple ways, where communication is key to high levels of performance and reaching expectations through meaningful and challenging work. Inspirationally motivating leaders often succeed in elevating the expectations’ of followers so that they achieve more than they thought was attainable.

A sample item is: “The leader articulates a compelling vision of the future.”

Factor 4. Intellectual Stimulation shows the degree to which you encourage others to be creative in looking at old problems in new ways, create an environment that is tolerant of seemingly extreme positions, and nurture people to question their own values and beliefs and those of the organisation. They emphasise the value of followers’ intellect and rational thoughts. This leader challenges followers’ ideas and values and encourages problem-solving in new ways. While this style is less common in organisations favouring a “telling” approach, it creates a readiness for changes in thinking. Followers feel comfortable in expressing their ideas, which leads to greater autonomy, as there is no risk of punishment.

A sample item is: “The leader gets others to look at problems from many different angles.”
Factor 5. *Individualised Consideration* indicates the degree to which you show interest in others’ wellbeing, assign projects individually, and pay attention to those who seem less involved in the group. This type of leader treats followers based on their individual needs, however equitably on a one-to-one basis, and spends more time teaching and coaching. Individually considerate leaders are active listeners who encourage two-way communication and promote self-development, listens to followers needs and concerns, shows genuine compassion, and actively and regularly coaches. This leader often feels needed and important, facilitating autonomy through enhancing followers internal frame of reference.

*A sample item is:* “The leader spends time teaching and coaching.”

Factor 6. *Contingent Reward* is the classic transactional style where the leader sets clear goals, objectives and targets and clarifies what rewards can be expected for successful completion. Essentially, it is ‘dangling the carrot’ to elicit desired performance and is considered an effective way to lead. This leader quite literally exchanges rewards for follower effort and performance and in contrast discipline or punishments for tasks unmet. The contingent rewarding leader: sets goals together with followers that are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and time-bound; monitors progress toward goals actively and provides supportive feedback; suggests pathways to meet performance expectations; and provides rewards when goals are attained. This leader is highly goal-directed resulting in high levels of trust from followers when rewards are delivered upon specified expectations. When this style is effectively deployed it tends to produce performance at required levels.

*A sample item is:* “The leader makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.”

Factor 7. *Management-by-Exception Passive* assesses whether you tell others the job requirements, are content with standard performance, and are a believer in “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” This leader intervenes only when standards are not being met or tasks are not being completed. Followers tend to have a wide performance acceptance range under this leader, while the leader places greater focus on achieving status quo.

*A sample item is:* “The leader takes no action until complaints are received.”
Factor 8. *Management-by-Exception Active* is an active form of corrective leadership, where the leader pays close attention to any problems or deviations and actively monitors performance in order to take corrective action before issues arise. This leader is characterised by remaining alert for infractions of rules, closely monitoring work and taking corrective action of mistakes before or when they happen, and teaching followers how to correct future mistakes. This leader aims to minimise mistakes occurring in the first place; however, it is not considered an effective form of leadership as it makes followers too precautious and limits autonomy.

*A sample item is:* “The leader directs attention toward failures to meet standards.”

Factor 9. *Laissez-Faire* measures whether you require little of others, are content to let things ride, and let others do their own thing. This leader is essentially classified as a non-leader and avoids conflict, clarifying expectations and making decisions. With laissez-faire leadership: there are generally neither transactions nor agreements; decisions are often delayed; feedback, rewards and involvement are absent; and no attempt is made to motivate others or to recognise and satisfy their needs. This leader is particularly ineffective, as they create confusion and conflicts resulting in substandard effort and low trust and satisfaction in their followers. Followers are often confused regarding roles and responsibilities, seeking direction and clarification from elsewhere in the organisation.

*A sample item is:* “The leader avoids getting involved when important issues arise.”

Please take a moment to read through your resulted leadership style prior to your scheduled interview and reflect on whether this style truly resonates with how you lead. This will afford you a better insight into possible questions to be asked during your interview.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Leigh

Jacqueline Leigh  
PhD Researcher  
School of Tourism and Hospitality Management  
Southern Cross University, Lismore

E: j.leigh.11@student.scu.edu.au  
T: 0412 XXX XXX
Appendix C: Semi-Structured Interview Schedule

Interview Questions Guideline

PART I: Leadership

1. How long have you been in this role?
2. Do you consider yourself a leader? If so, what kind of leader?
3. What attributes do you possess which you consider to be leadership?
4. What does leadership mean to you?
5. What leadership style do you feel volunteers respond best to?
6. What do you consider to be the most important attribute of a leader?
7. What is the hardest challenge of being a leader?
8. Could you explain some of the leadership techniques you use to motivate staff?

PART II: Training

9. Do you believe training is a worthwhile investment for event volunteers? Why?/Why not?
10. Do you believe training is necessary for this event?
11. Is training necessary for all volunteers involved in this event?
12. Are you directly involved in training?
13. What do you believe training should entail for your volunteers?
14. Do you believe volunteers’ performance increases with effective training?
15. Do you ask for feedback from volunteers regarding the training program? If so, does this encourage any changes or will the program remain the same?
16. Would you change anything or do something differently in regards to your volunteer training?
17. Do you think your peers’ attitudes towards training are the same as yours?
18. Do you believe your peers consider training a worthwhile investment? Why?/Why not?
19. Do you feel pressure to do what other event managers are doing in regard to training?
Appendix D: Copy of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)
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MLQ  Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Leader

Form (5X-Short)

My Name: _____________________________________________ Date: __________
Organization ID #: __________________ Leader ID #: ________________________

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you.

The word “others” may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five Statement items are provided as an example of what one could expect on the MLQ:
1. I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts................................. 0 1 2 3 4
2. I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished................................. 0 1 2 3 4
3. I get others to look at problems from many different angles ................................... 0 1 2 3 4
4. I emphasise the importance of having a collective sense of mission.......................... 0 1 2 3 4
5. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others .......................................................... 0 1 2 3 4

© 1995 Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass. All Rights Reserved. 
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MLQ  Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Scoring Key (5X) Short

My Name: _____________________________________________ Date: __________
Organization ID #: ______________ Leader ID #: ___________________________

Scoring: The MLQ scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale. The score can be
derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale. All of
the leadership style scales have four items, Extra Effort has three items, Effectiveness has four
items, and Satisfaction has two items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Idealized Influence (Attributed) total/4 =
- Idealized Influence (Behavior) total/4 =
- Inspirational Motivation total/4 =
- Intellectual Stimulation total/4 =
- Individualized Consideration total/4 =
- Contingent Reward total/4 =
- Management-by-Exception (Active) total/4 =
- Management-by-Exception (Passive) total/4 =
- Laissez-faire Leadership total/4 =
- Extra Effort total/3 =
- Effectiveness total/4 =
- Satisfaction total/2 =

Five example statement scoring items are shown as they would appear in the MLQ Scoring Key:
1. Contingent Reward .................................................................0 1 2 3 4
2. Inspirational Motivation ..............................................................0 1 2 3 4
3. Individualized Consideration ......................................................0 1 2 3 4
4. Intellectual Stimulation ..............................................................0 1 2 3 4
5. Idealized Influence (Behavior) .....................................................0 1 2 3 4
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