



Developing a competency model for private club managers

Jason P. Koenigsfeld^{a,*}, SeungHyun Kim^{b,1}, JaeMin Cha^{c,1}, Joe Perdue^{d,2}, Ronald F. Cichy^{e,3}

^a Professional Development, Club Managers Association of America, 1733 King Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, United States

^b 204 Eppley Center, The School of Hospitality Business, Eli Broad College of Business, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, United States

^c 234 Eppley Center, The School of Hospitality Business, Eli Broad College of Business, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, United States

^d Global Hospitality Initiatives, School of Hospitality Administration, Georgia State University, 35 Broad Street, Atlanta, GA 30303, United States

^e 231 Eppley Center, The School of Hospitality Business, Eli Broad College of Business, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Key words:

Managerial competencies
Private club industry
Club managers
Confirmatory factor analysis
Exploratory factor analysis

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the psychometric properties and factor structure of the competency model for private club managers. This study developed and identified a valid and reliable model for managerial competencies that can be applied to private club managers. A total of 596 club managers responded to the survey, and the respondents were randomly divided into two subsamples: sample A was used for the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and sample B was used for the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). EFA resulted in 58 items, consisting of 10 dimensions, and the CFA confirmed the 10 dimensions of managerial competencies model (51 items), consisting of (1) golf, (2) facility maintenance, (3) human resources–legal, (4) leadership–interpersonal, (5) food and beverage, (6) club governance, (7) sports and recreation, (8) accounting, (9) marketing, and (10) strategic management. A model was developed in order to further understand important managerial competencies needed for managing a private club operation in the United States. This model can be used to update certification requirements and professional development programs for club managers, as well as update university curricular offerings.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

A competency model and/or competency framework has been used for various types of organizations, including those in the hospitality industry. A competency model is defined as “a descriptive tool that identifies the knowledge, skills, abilities, and behaviors needed to perform effectively in an organization” (Chung-Herrera et al., 2003, p. 17). Numerous researchers have listed advantages of using competency models. These advantages include: developing training programs tailored to improving management and staff performance (Hofrichter and Spencer, 1999); selecting, rewarding, and promoting managers (Boyatzis, 1982; Chung-Herrera et al., 2003; Goleman et al., 2002; Zenger and Folkman, 2002); predicting individual job performance (Spencer and Spencer, 1993), unit-level performance (Russell, 2001), and organizational performance (Antonacopoulou and Fitzgerald, 1996; Hollenbeck and McCall, 1997); planning professional development and career progression (Kent and Perdue, 1989; Epstein and Hundert, 2002); and

empowering staff members to make managerial decisions (Menon, 2001).

Managerial competencies, in particular, refer to skills, knowledge and behaviors to be demonstrated at a specific level of proficiency by managers (Evers et al., 1998). Boyatzis (1982) was one of pioneer researchers to address the topic of managerial competencies by developing a comprehensive list of competencies that relate to managers' performance effectiveness, regardless of the types of organizations. While many management competencies can be similar across all industry segments, managers and leaders in different occupations may display different behavior characteristics and skill sets (Zagar et al., 1983). Jirasinghe and Lyons (1995) also argued that competencies need to be generated by studying a profession or a particular position.

The emphasis of the present study was to address important managerial competencies, applied to the private club industry. Perdue (2007, p. 3) defined a private club “as a place where people of a common bond of some type (similar interests, experiences, background, and professions) can congregate for recreational and social purposes.” While some facilities of private clubs may be open to the public, private clubs are usually selective in that there is a requirement for an initiation fee to join, as well as the payment of monthly dues to maintain membership. Private clubs present an atmosphere based on familiarity and offer a high level of service and experience to their members (Gustafson, 2002). Types of clubs can vary within the private club industry, and can include golf and

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 703 739 9500.

E-mail addresses: jason.koenigsfeld@cmaa.org (J.P. Koenigsfeld), kimseung@bus.msu.edu (S. Kim), jcha@bus.msu.edu (J. Cha), joeperdue@msn.com (J. Perdue), cichy@bus.msu.edu (R.F. Cichy).

¹ Tel.: +1 517 353 9211; fax: +1 517 432 4503.

² Tel.: +1 702 595 8876.

³ Tel.: +1 517 355 5080.

country clubs, as well as city, yacht, athletic, university, beach, and resort clubs (Fjelstul and Tesone, 2008).

The Club Managers Association of America (CMAA), the professional association for managers of membership clubs, reports it has members in over 3000 clubs nationwide, and that clubs represent a payroll of \$5.3 billion, while employing almost 291,000 staff members (CMAA, 2008). Despite the important economic impacts and unique characteristics of the private club industry, several researchers (Barrows and Walsh, 2002; Cichy et al., 2009) have noted that relatively little academic research has been conducted about the private club industry, as opposed to other segments of the hospitality industry (Cichy et al., 2009; Cha et al., 2011). Barrows and Walsh (2002), for example, observed that the lack of knowledge of the private club industry, in general, was also reflective of the lack of research publications addressing current issues in the private club industry.

Perdue et al. (2000, 2001, 2002) were the first group of researchers who identified important competencies applied to private club managers. While they helped identify important competencies required for successful private club managers, these previous studies failed to address some of the most important managerial knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for effective club management. For example, Sandwith's (1993) competency domain model examined conceptual-creative, interpersonal, leadership, administrative and technical skills. Previous studies of club managers' competencies by Perdue et al. (2000, 2001, 2002) have examined the importance of administrative and technical competencies, but have neglected the importance of leadership, interpersonal, and conceptual-creativity skills. These skills have been identified in other professions as some of the most important skills by organizational leaders (Oss, 2003).

The intent of the current study was to identify new competencies that were not addressed in previous managerial competencies studies in the private club industry, based on Perdue et al. (2000, 2001, 2002) and Sandwith's five domain competency model (1993). The primary purposes were to explore the appropriate dimensions of managerial competencies, and then validate the identified dimensions of managerial competencies that private club managers perceived to be important. Thus, this study was constructed to examine the psychometric properties and factor structure of the competency model for private club managers.

2. Literature review

2.1. *Generic competencies applied to business*

Within a wide range of businesses offering numerous products and services, managerial competencies have become increasingly important to address the challenges and opportunities of leading a business. Managerial competencies applied to the business sector have been examined by numerous researchers and companies. One of the most frequent debates in business literature is the value of generic versus organization-specific competency models (Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1997; Hayes et al., 2000; Holmes and Joyce, 1993; Mansfield, 1993). Canning (1990) and Stewart and Hamlin (1992) had issue with developing generic competencies because each organization is unique. It is important to note that if a manager can function in one environment and be successful, that might not necessarily translate into success in another environment (Jacobs, 1989). Position responsibilities can differ from one organization to another.

Generic management competencies can be helpful to an entire profession but will vary greatly from company to company. Generic competencies provide a starting point for companies to tailor a competency model for their organizations and managers.

For example, managers of a private city club who leave their club to manage a country club must understand golf and how it relates to their memberships needs and expectations. It is very important that managers of similar organizations acquire similar competencies in the event that they move into other organizations or take new positions within their existing organization. Opponents to the generic models argue that organizations are unique, and therefore, the competencies required to manage one business cannot be generically applied to all managers (Stewart and Hamlin, 1992). While this is clear, generic models do provide a common basis for companies to develop and tailor company-specific competency models (Iles, 1993). Businesses can develop a tailored set of competencies by building on generic industry competency models (Wills, 1993). Developing competency models is time consuming and costly. Therefore, companies can use specific competencies of the generic competency models as a starting point for an in-depth company-specific competency model.

2.2. *Competencies applied to the hospitality industry*

Each segment of the hospitality industry is unique. As a result, different competencies are required by managers and leaders in each segment. Thus, competencies and competency models have been generated by studying a particular profession or position. For example, Tas (1988) conducted one of the earliest studies on management competencies in the lodging industry. This was the first survey of management competencies in the hospitality industry. Ever since, management competencies have been used to address trends, challenges, and developments within the hospitality industry, including hotels and resorts (Chung-Herrera et al., 2003; Hsu and Gregory, 1995; Siu, 1998; Woods et al., 1998), food and beverage operations (Graves, 1996; Reynolds, 2000; Muller and Inman, 1996; Wilson et al., 2000), the tourism sector (Swedlove and Dowler, 1991; Legohere et al., 2004), and the private club industry (Perdue et al., 2000, 2001, 2002).

In terms of practical applications, competencies have also been used in the hospitality industry to develop sets of core competencies for companies (Roberts, 2003). Both Marriott International and Choice Hotels International are examples of hotel companies that have used the competency approach to build and assess leadership capabilities among their senior-level managers (Chung-Herrera et al., 2003). The Buckhead Beef Company, a food service supplier, used core competencies to develop a competency model that was used by the company to develop a structural interview in order to hire excellent sales performers (Warech, 2002). Many professional associations have used competencies to develop and implement certification designations (Gilley and Galbraith, 1986). Hospitality associations such as CMAA and the American Hotel and Lodging Association (AHLA) use competencies to develop certification standards. Golf-related associations such as the Professional Golf Association (PGA) and the Golf Course Superintendents Association of America (GCSAA) also use competencies as the basis for their certification process. When developing a certification designation for managers, it is important to understand what knowledge, skills, and attributes are important for success in that particular industry. Competency-based education has also been used within hospitality curriculum as a means to examine if students were prepared for the workforce upon graduation (Tesone and Ricci, 2005; Raybould and Wilkins, 2005; Lowry and Flohr, 2005; Cho et al., 2006; Annaraud, 2006)

2.3. *Competency use in the private club industry*

Club managers are viewed as the link between the board of directors and the staff. Club managers are called upon by the board of directors to lead the club into the future by maintaining the

clubs' values and traditions and by developing new traditions that will help lead to membership growth, membership retention, and member usage of the club and its facilities. Thus, it is important to identify the management competencies for club managers that can contribute to the club's success. Management competencies have historically served as the basis for professional development programs conducted by the CMAA (Kent and Perdue, 1989). Barrows and Walsh (2002) conducted a study to investigate bridging the gap between hospitality management programs and the private club industry, using a sample of Canadian clubs. They found that hospitality educators were not reaching out to the private club industry, indicating that educators were not doing a good job of trying to understand this segment of the industry. This lack of knowledge of the private club industry was also reflective of the lack of research publications addressing current issues in the private club industry (Barrows and Walsh, 2002).

Perdue et al. (2000, 2001, 2002) examined competencies required for club managers. Many of these competencies were obtained from a CMAA certification task force which originally developed 11 competencies that was believed to be needed for success by club managers. Fjelstul and Tesone (2008) recently determined competency expectations for entry-level supervisory staff members in the golf and club management industry. Previous studies of competencies in private club management (e.g., Fjelstul and Tesone, 2008; Perdue et al., 2000, 2001, 2002) did not validate the scales or dimensions that represent private club managerial competencies. Furthermore, previous studies need to be regularly updated for professional development and certification purposes.

2.4. Model development

Competencies are grouped into clusters or domains to keep similar managerial tasks linked together (Pickett, 1998). Katz (1955) believed that administrator success was based on three skills domains: technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills. Sandwith (1993) expanded Katz's domains to include leadership, administrative, and interpersonal domains. Previous studies on management competencies in the private club profession have examined the importance of administrative and technical competencies, but have not addressed managers' additional necessary skills, including three of Sandwith's (1993) competency domains (leadership, interpersonal, and conceptual-creative competencies). This study examines the importance of Sandwith's five domain competency model as applied to the private club industry.

2.4.1. Administrative and technical domains

These two domains were included in previous studies of the club manager competencies by Perdue et al. (2000, 2001, 2002). The administrative domain is characterized by four managerial functions including accounting and finance, human and professional resources, marketing, and external and government influences. The human resources function under this domain includes personnel management, and effectively recruiting and training staff members, as well as making sure the organization is compliant with labor laws. The accounting and finance cluster includes compensation issues, auditing procedures, and the development of operating budgets. The technical domain, on the other hand, was defined as "the actual work that the organization does" (Sandwith, 1993, p. 50) and included skills in food and beverage management, building and facilities maintenance, club governance, golf, and sports and recreation.

Three other domains including conceptual-creative competencies, interpersonal competencies, and leadership competencies were added to this current study.

2.4.2. Conceptual-creative competencies

According to Sandwith (1993), the "conceptual aspect of this domain refers to cognitive skills associated with comprehending important elements of the job" (Sandwith, 1993, p. 46). These competencies related to an individual's role within the organization. The creative part of this domain was added to address the creative aspects of the position. These competencies relate to the organization's mission, strategic environment, development of new ideas, and adaptation to changing circumstances

2.4.3. Interpersonal competencies

Interpersonal skills can also include interactions with others, as well as including negotiation and providing feedback to staff members. In a service organization such as a private club, these skills are important for interactions with members, guests, and service staff. Interpersonal competencies also relate to communication functions such as writing, speaking, and listening.

2.4.4. Leadership competencies

The leadership domain "turns thought and ideas into action as well as providing a strategic link between the conceptual-creative domain and the other domains" (Sandwith, 1993, p. 47). Leaders must be a trustworthy role model and should be able to influence their followers to become involved in the work environment. This is a distinct managerial domain separate from other administrative tasks and roles (Sandwith, 1993). This domain includes knowledge, skills, and abilities such as managing time to ensure productivity, building networks inside and outside the work place, treating people with respect, inspiring and motivating others, leading the organization through conflict, delegating, and considering ethical implications before making decisions.

3. Methods

3.1. Scale development and measurement

Perdue et al. (2001, 2002) and Sandwith's competency study (1993) provided the basis for the items included in the present competencies model. *The Management to leadership model*, a part of the CMAA Business Management Institute (BMI), developed and sponsored by the Club Managers Association of America, was developed to better explain the ever evolving role of the private club manager. The base of the model has served as the foundation for the Certified Club Manager (CCM) designation, signifying dedication and comprehension of managerial competencies as a private club manager. In particular, the base of the current model in this study represents: (1) two domains (administrative and technical) from the Perdue et al. (2001) study, consisting of seven competency clusters: private club management, human and professional resources, management, marketing, food and beverage management, building and facility management, and government and external resources, and (2) three new domains of leadership, interpersonal, and conceptual-creative competencies from Sandwith's competency study (1993). As a result, a total of 151 managerial competencies were generated and developed to be rated regarding the importance of managerial competencies for private club managers. Each competency was rated in terms of importance using a five point Likert scale where five (5) represented critically important and one (1) represented no importance. By measuring how important a competency is, managers can show how critical these competencies can be within a particular profession.

The content validity and face validity were supported by having the scale reviewed by a panel of industry experts and hospitality academicians with expertise in the area of private club industry. The panel of experts consisted of six club managers, five professors who were experts in club management, and the chief executive

officer of the CMAA. Panel members were mailed a cover letter, a feedback form, and a copy of the proposed survey instrument and asked to evaluate each competency statement for clarity, conciseness, accuracy, and relevancy to the private club industry. Each panel member was also asked to provide any additional comments on the feedback form. Based on the panel input, the competency study was revised and new competencies were added. Scale items were revised based on the feedback and evaluation from these experts.

3.2. Sample and data collection

The participants in this study were all members of the CMAA. The data were collected from a mail survey as well as surveys distributed at professional development programs offered by CMAA. More specifically, eight hundred managers of CMAA were randomly selected to be included in the mail sample. Of the 800 club managers surveyed, 372 responded through mail for an overall response rate of 47 percent. Seven incomplete surveys were dropped from the study, leaving 365 responses through mail for a participation rate of 46 percent. Another 231 surveys were obtained through CMAA professional development programs and CMAA chapter education sessions. All participants in CMAA educational programs were asked not to complete a second survey, if they had previously completed the survey at a professional development program or through the mail. In sum, there were a total of 596 usable responses used in this study.

In terms of club characteristics, seventy-two percent ($N=426$) of the participating managers managed country clubs, while thirteen percent ($N=76$) managed golf clubs, six percent managed city clubs, and three percent managed yacht clubs. On average, managers reported having 85 full time employees working at their club. Two hundred and twenty-two managers (37%) reported having a gross annual dollar volume excluding initiation fees of from \$3,000,002 to \$6,000,000. The majority of managers, 83%, reported that their private clubs were member owned. Sixty-seven percent of respondents ($N=399$) reported that their club was a non-seasonal operation.

In terms of demographic information, eight-six percent of the responding managers were male; the average age was 45.6 years; and 64% had at least a bachelor's degree. Sixty-three percent ($N=376$) reported that they were either the general manager or chief operating officer (COO) of their club. The second largest percentage of participants, 12% ($N=73$), reported that they were the clubhouse managers. Managers reported having seventeen years of management experience in the club industry. Managers also reported being employed at their present position for six years on average. Fifty-two percent of the sample had obtained the designation of Certified Club Manager (CCM) through CMAA.

4. Findings

4.1. Index development through exploratory factor analysis

The sample was randomly divided into two groups. The first-split ($N=298$) was used to conduct the exploratory factor analysis, while the second-split sample ($N=298$) was used for the confirmatory factor analysis.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed to initially identify underlying dimensions of the competency model and to reduce a large number of variables to a smaller number – in other words, for scale refinement. A principal components analysis with varimax rotation was performed on 151 items, using the data from the first-split sample ($N=298$). The data met Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy ($MSA=.92$), exceeding the value of .60

recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001. This number (.92) shows that the patterns of correlation are relatively compact, and so factor analysis should produce distinct and reliable factors. The chi-square value of Bartlett's test indicated 8480.0, which was statistically significant at $p < .01$ level. Both these results show that the first split sample can be subjected to factor analysis to identify the underlying patterns of the competency model.

To select the numbers of factors, we used a criterion in which eigenvalues were greater than 1.0 (Kaiser, 1960) and Cattell's (1966) scree test. These tests showed that a ten-factor model was most appropriate. Items with factor loadings of less than .45 were removed and cross-loading items greater than .4 also were deleted, based on recommendations by Hatcher (1994) and Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). In addition to these statistical criteria, most importantly, each item was evaluated for interpretation of meaning or clarity to examine face validity regarding the item's relationship to the appropriate dimension. In total, 58 items remained from the original 151 items, and all remaining items had factor loadings of greater than .51. The ten factors derived from the EFA accounted for 66.4% of the variance in scores. These dimensions are labeled as golf management (6 items), facility maintenance (8 items); human resources–legal (8 items); leadership–interpersonal (8 items); food and beverage (6 items); club governance (4 items); sports and recreation (4 items); accounting (4 items); marketing (3 items) and strategic management (3 items) (Table 1).

4.2. Index validation through confirmatory factor analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted on the second split sample ($N=298$) using maximum likelihood estimation, with the AMOS 19.0 program. The chi-square statistic/degrees of freedom (less than 3) was used to evaluate the model fit. The model fit indices such as comparative fit index (CFI; Bentler, 1990; higher than .9), non-normed fit index (NNFI; Bentler and Bonett, 1980; Tucker and Lewis, 1973; higher than .9), and root-mean-square residual (RMSEA; Nevitt and Hancock, 2000; less than .1) were examined to evaluate the adequate fit of the model. Furthermore, χ^2 difference tests were used to compare and evaluate an adequate model and other alternative measurement models. Both modification indices provided by AMOS output and the standardized residual matrix were examined to modify the competency model for private club leaders.

The first measurement model to be examined was an initial model of the competencies, namely, initial first-order ten-factor model, consisting of 58 items, specified based on EFA results. As shown in Table 2, the initial first-order ten-factor model of competencies did not produce a good fit with the data, $\chi^2(1179) = 1884.6$, $p < .01$ ($\chi^2/df = 1.86$, CFI = .86, NNFI = .87, RMSEA = .05). The values of the CFI and NNFI with 58 items were marginally below what is considered adequate (higher than .9). Thus, the initial measurement model needed further modifications. As a result, seven observed variables were identified with low factor loadings (below the suggested level of .50 for the expected constructs), shared factor loadings, and shared large residuals with other observed variable loadings (above MI suggested level of 100). Thus, those variables were removed from the initial first-order ten-factor model of the competencies, and then the revised first-order ten-factor model of the competencies was re-estimated.

That is, after removing observed variables based on three criteria, overall fit measures (CFI, NNFI, RMSEA, and χ^2 difference) of the revised first-order ten-factor model were used iteratively to determine whether the CFA model fitted these data well. Results from running this revised model showed that all fit indices suggested a good fit of data, $\chi^2(1179) = 1884.6$, $p < .01$ ($\chi^2/df = 1.60$, CFI = .908, NNFI = .901, RMSEA = .044). The χ^2 difference test showed that the improvement in fit between the initial first-order and revised

Table 1
Exploratory factor analysis for the competency model of private club managers ($n = 298$).

Items (58)	Factor loadings									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Factor 1. Golf (10 items)										
Golf course maintenance costs	.824									
Organizational structure golf operations	.774									
Golf course architecture	.768									
GCSAA	.766									
Selection of a golf pro importance	.750									
Golf course etiquette	.736									
Golf shop ownership	.715									
Tee time policy	.711									
Managing tee times	.682									
Payroll laws and independent contractors	.614									
Factor 2. Facility maintenance (8 items)										
Electricity consumption		.820								
Lighting systems		.786								
HVAC systems		.772								
Waste management		.750								
Water usage		.725								
Building components		.700								
Managing equipment		.664								
Understands blueprints		.549								
Factor 3. Human resources–legal (8 items)										
Civil rights act 1964			.819							
Overtime and tipping issues			.751							
Compliance with federal laws/ADA			.743							
Duty to protect			.719							
Truth-in-menu			.707							
Privacy			.695							
Public health and safety requirements			.679							
Common law			.643							
Factor 4. Leadership–interpersonal (8 items)										
Deals with failure and mistakes importance				.680						
Presents effective presentations importance				.634						
Quality standards for employees importance				.634						
Speaks in a variety of situations importance				.620						
Gives others authority to accomplish object				.601						
Ideas in a convincing manner				.599						
Positive working relations with employees				.577						
Confidence in others competence				.505						
Factor 5. Food and beverage (6 items)										
Controls F&B products					.655					
Wine list					.649					
Creative member functions					.639					
Labor costs F&B					.600					
Dining strategies					.551					
Organizational structure F&B					.510					
Factor 6. Club governance (4 items)										
Governing boards						.711				
Managing meeting						.645				
Responsibilities of directors						.588				
Bylaws						.538				
Factor 7. Sports and recreation (4 items)										
Fitness							.835			
Spa							.833			
Tennis							.645			
Swimming							.639			
Factor 8. Accounting (4 items)										
Compensation								.715		
Financing capital projects								.621		
Audit procedures								.614		
Cash flow and budgeting								.591		
Factor 9. Marketing (3 items)										
Promotions									.703	
Local media									.593	
Differentiation									.589	
Factor 10. Strategic management (3 items)										
Trends in the private club industry										.782
Stays informed about industry practices										.656
Develops ideas										.544
Eigenvalue	17.6	4.0	3.2	2.6	2.3	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.3
Variance explained	30.4	6.9	5.6	4.5	4.0	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.4	2.2
Reliability coefficient	.928	.923	.895	.828	.845	.848	.876	.779	.717	.610

KMO = .92 ($\chi^2 = 8480.0$, $p < .05$), Total variance explained = 66.4%.

Table 2
Comparison of overall fit indices for two competency models ($n = 298$).

Models	χ^2	df	χ^2/df	NNFI	CFI	RMSEA	$\Delta\chi^2$
First-order ten-factor model (58 items)	2886.93	1550	1.86	.874	.862	.053	–
Revised first-order ten-factor model (51 items)	1884.63	1179	1.60	.901	.908	.044	1002.3

Note: NNFI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

first-order ten-factor model of the competencies was statistically significant, ($\Delta\chi^2(371) = 1002.3$, $p < .05$), after deleting seven items. The revised first-order ten-factor model also surpassed the initial measurement model on all fit criteria, which confirmed that the modifications were meaningful. Through this process to evaluate a model's fit, the revised first-order ten-factor model of the competencies resulted in ten factors, consisting of 51 items. These results suggest that the revised first-order ten-factor model of the competencies, consisting of golf management (6 items), facility maintenance (8 items); human resources–legal (6 items); leadership–interpersonal (8 items); food and beverage (6 items); club governance (4 items); sports and recreation (3 items); accounting (4 items); marketing (3 items) and strategic management (3 items) provides the best representation of the data in this study.

4.3. Descriptive statistics

Reliability can reflect the internal consistency of the indicators measuring a given latent variable (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Means, standard deviations and reliability scores of the total index and its ten factors, based on the second half split sample of CFA are presented in Table 3. Observed variables should have a Cronbach's alpha of .7 or higher to be judged reliable measures (Nunnally, 1978). Except for the strategic management dimension (alpha = .61), the other nine dimensions are robust, demonstrating reasonable reliability from the revised first-order ten-factor model (alpha = .7–.92).

When looking at the mean scores and standard deviations, it was found that the ten dimensions have a hierarchical order for the competency model. As shown in Table 3, the human resources and legal was identified as the most important dimension for club management competencies ($M = 4.44$), as followed by leadership–interpersonal dimension ($M = 4.43$) and club governance ($M = 4.35$).

4.4. Evaluating convergent and discriminant validity of the competency model

Convergent validity is evaluated by examining whether all indicators effectively measure their corresponding construct (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). Thus, the factor loadings of the t -test were examined in terms of the size and statistical significance

Table 3
Means, standard deviations, and reliabilities ($n = 298$).

Factors	Number of variables	Mean	SD	Inter-item correlations	Reliability (α)
Factor 1. Golf	6	3.99	.042	.570	.888
Factor 2. Facility maintenance	8	3.91	.009	.578	.916
Factor 3. Human resources–legal	6	4.44	.003	.579	.887
Factor 4. Leadership–interpersonal	8	4.43	.010	.417	.850
Factor 5. Food and beverage	6	4.22	.021	.448	.827
Factor 6. Club governance	4	4.35	.007	.513	.857
Factor 7. Sports and recreation	3	3.69	.071	.528	.777
Factor 8. Accounting	4	4.22	.018	.441	.758
Factor 9. Marketing	3	3.83	.031	.436	.700
Factor 10. Strategic management	3	4.15	.026	.343	.610

Note: Cronbach's α provides an estimate of the inter-item reliability or consistency; mean scores are based on a scale of 7 = critical important to 1 = not important.

(Kline, 1998). As presented in Table 4, values of factor loadings for the revised first-order ten-factor model of the competencies had relatively high loadings (statistically significant at $p < .05$), ranging from .512 to .929, which is supporting evidence of the convergent validity.

Discriminant validity was examined by the pair-wise correlations between factors obtained from the revised first-order ten-factor model of the competency (51 items). As a rule of thumb, Kline (1998) suggests that each pair-wise correlation between factors should not exceed .85. As Table 5 shows, estimated correlations between factors were not excessively high, and none of the pairs for the 95% confidence interval approach 1.00, thus providing support for discriminant validity (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988).

5. Discussion

Competencies have been identified and used in business, training, education, hospitality, and private club management fields. This study provided club managers with information on what competencies are important to manage private clubs. The main purpose of this study was to examine and develop a valid and reliable managerial competency model that can be used for private club managers. This main objective was accomplished through conducting both exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) by splitting the sampling into two groups. The EFA showed that the ten-factor model of competency was identified as the most statistically stable solution. Using the CFA, a competency model of ten factors with 51 items was obtained, and this paper demonstrated that the 51-items is a useful model for identifying dimensions of competencies for private club managers. Findings of the factor analysis suggest that a set of common managerial competencies may exist for private club managers in the United States, consisting of (1) golf, (2) facility maintenance, (3) human resources–legal, (4) leadership–interpersonal, (5) food and beverage, (6) club governance, (7) sports and recreation, (8) accounting, (9) marketing, and (10) strategic management. This is the first study to examine the psychometric properties of the competency model for private club managers.

This study laid the ground work for other competency studies in the private club industry. An additional purpose of the study was to compare the results of important rated competencies from the current study to important rated competencies of previous studies conducted by Perdue et al. (2000, 2001, 2002). Since these previous

Table 4
Confirmatory factor analysis results for the competency model of private club managers ($n = 298$).

Factors and items	Standardized loading	t-Value
Factor 1. Golf		
Organizational structure golf operations	.766 [*]	–
Golf course architecture	.762 [*]	13.57
GCSAA	.812 [*]	14.72
Golf course etiquette	.650 [*]	11.42
Golf shop ownership	.791 [*]	13.88
Managing tee times	.732 [*]	12.76
Factor 2. Facility maintenance		
Electricity consumption	.848 [*]	10.57
Lighting systems	.821 [*]	10.52
HVAC systems	.840 [*]	10.59
Waste management	.791 [*]	10.32
Water usage	.743 [*]	9.86
Building components	.736 [*]	9.90
Managing equipment	.744 [*]	9.92
Understands blueprints	.571 [*]	–
Factor 3. Human resources–legal		
Civil rights act 1964	.746 [*]	–
Compliance with federal laws/ADA	.701 [*]	12.36
Duty to protect	.770 [*]	13.22
Truth-in-menu	.783 [*]	13.66
Public health and safety requirements	.788 [*]	13.68
Common law	.774 [*]	13.16
Factor 4. Leadership–interpersonal		
Deals with failure and mistakes	.706 [*]	–
Presents effective presentations importance	.629 [*]	9.80
Quality standards for employees importance	.709 [*]	11.40
Speaks in a variety of situations importance	.647 [*]	10.24
Gives others authority to accomplish object	.628 [*]	10.04
Ideas in a convincing manner	.595 [*]	9.29
Positive working relations with employees	.590 [*]	9.34
Confidence in others competence	.654 [*]	10.40
Factor 5. Food and beverage		
Controls F&B products	.661 [*]	10.40
Wine list	.812 [*]	12.59
Creative member functions	.649 [*]	10.29
Labor costs F&B	.514 [*]	8.23
Dining strategies	.690 [*]	10.85
Organizational structure F&B	.701 [*]	–
Factor 6. Club governance		
Governing boards	.810 [*]	–
Managing meeting	.749 [*]	14.02
Responsibilities of directors	.780 [*]	14.43
Bylaws	.770 [*]	14.06
Factor 7. Sports and recreation		
Fitness	.929 [*]	–
Spa	.811 [*]	13.57
Tennis	.523 [*]	8.99
Factor 8. Accounting		
Compensation	.637 [*]	–
Financing capital projects	.657 [*]	9.27
Audit procedures	.739 [*]	9.62
Cash flow and budgeting	.618 [*]	8.61
Factor 9. Marketing		
Promotions	.696 [*]	–
Local media	.512 [*]	7.42
Differentiation	.797 [*]	9.99
Factor 10. Strategic management		
Trends in the private club industry	.550 [*]	5.50
Stays informed about industry practices	.777 [*]	5.27
Develops ideas	.443 [*]	–

* Factor loadings were all significant at $p < .001$.

studies did not include leadership, interpersonal, and conceptual-creative competencies, there was no basis for comparison in these competency domains. However, all the other competencies were included in the Perdue et al. competency studies for club managers. In previous studies, managers rated human and legal resources, as the most important competencies (Perdue et al., 2000, 2001, 2002). The present study also determined that “human and legal resources” was the most important managerial competency for private club managers. It is important to note that the model created

in this study is specific to the private club industry in the United States. It is probable that certain competency dimensions may be more important than other dimensions, depending on the types of clubs. The CMAA members are required to have an array of competencies, even if not needed in the present club, because clubs may merge (e.g., golf and city) or managers may move to a different type of club.

Numerous studies have documented the advantages of industry specific competency models for managers in a specific business environment (Koustelios, 2003; Chung-Herrera et al., 2003; Hurd and McLean, 2004). An advantage to the club manager competency model created in this study is that it can be adopted by the club managers and club boards of directors as a foundation for creating an organization-specific competency model in which human resource functions of hiring, training, and developing can be required (Dalton, 1997). It is important to observe that the management of these human resource functions and activities may be somewhat different from other types of hospitality segments. Most clubs do not have a full-time human resource director, but instead human resource responsibilities are often shared by other managers, and in fact, these human resource activities are overseen and delegated by the general managers/COOs (Barrows and Ridout, 2010).

The findings of this study are also expected to be used as a means for evaluation of certification and professional development programs. This study also may help educators address important managerial competencies within the private club industry in their course development for students in higher education. Lastly, this research provides information for private club managers who want to further understand senior levels of management in the private club industry.

Some limitations need to be addressed when interpreting this study's findings. Just because an individual masters all the elements in a competency model does not necessarily mean that the individual has the ability to effectively perform in the position (Hayes et al., 2000). The use of a behavior event interview may be useful in predicting superior and effective managers (Spencer and Spencer, 1993); however, conducting BEIs on participants of this study was not feasible due to the cost and time that would be required. Another limitation to this study is that the participants were limited to active members of CMAA. This study did not include inactive members, retired members, new members, or previous members of the association. Bias may have entered the study since non-members of CMAA were not able to participate in the study. Since the current sample consists of active members of CMAA, they are more likely to have access to material that will enable them to be successful operators (Kaufman et al., 1996). The study provided an evaluation of managerial competencies in the private club industry. The results of this study may not be generalizable to other segments of the hospitality industry or other industries outside of the hospitality industry. However, this study does provide a basis for similar studies in other segments of the hospitality industry.

There are several directions of study that may be pursued in the future with the competency model for the private club managers. Private club boards and managers may need to develop individual and organizational competencies that are tailored to their particular private club, since the proposed model may not address individual competencies required to manage certain private clubs. Since clubs differ on what they require of their managers, this industry-specific competency model helps manager's explain their roles to their members, as well as their board of directors, who might not understand the role of the general manager or chief operating officer of the club. Barrows and Ridout (2010) recently published an article reviewing the club literature in academic journals from the period 1994 to 2005. They recognized that strategic

Table 5
Correlations among factors ($n = 298$).

	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10
F1	–									
F2	.530	–								
F3	.474	.561	–							
F4	.405	.439	.518	–						
F5	.451	.723	.555	.501	–					
F6	.572	.557	.685	.534	.571	–				
F7	.344	.321	.241	.217	.225	.273	–			
F8	.548	.497	.659	.468	.496	.590	.366	–		
F9	.367	.434	.523	.403	.474	.500	.305	.640	–	
F10	.297	.346	.401	.643	.429	.453	.133	.400	.401	–

Note: F1 = golf; F2 = facility maintenance; F3 = human resources–legal; F4 = leadership–interpersonal; F5 = food and beverage; F6 = club governance; F7 = sports and recreation; F8 = accounting; F9 = marketing; F10 = strategic management.

management is “a relatively new development in clubs, and it now seems to be attracting the attention of researchers” (p. 449). Future research needs to investigate this under-researched area in club management.

No single competency model can capture the entire position of managers or leaders of companies (Antonacopoulou and Fitzgerald, 1996). Competencies and competency models have limitations including that the behavior identified in current studies might not be appropriate in the future (Winterton and Winterton, 1999). These studies can become dated with the advent of new management trends and new technological developments (Antonacopoulou and Fitzgerald, 1996). Thus, future studies need to be directed to identify new trends and challenges that are not present in this current study, but are important for becoming competent private club managers. For example, understanding sustainable business practices applicable to the private club industry may be an aspect to include in the future studies. Furthermore, it would be interesting to compare managerial competencies of private club managers between the USA sample and other international samples, by utilizing a validated brief survey (51 items).

References

- Anderson, J., Gerbing, D., 1988. Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin* 103 (3), 411–423.
- Annaraud, K., 2006. A comparison of skills necessary for successful careers for American and Russian hospitality students upon graduation. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education* 18 (4), 33–44.
- Antonacopoulou, E., Fitzgerald, L., 1996. Reframing competency in management development. *Human Resource Management Journal* 6 (1), 27–48.
- Barrows, C., Walsh, J., 2002. Bridging the gap between hospitality management programs and the private club industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 14 (3), 120–127.
- Barrows, C., Ridout, M., 2010. Another decade of research in club management: a review of the literature in academic journals for the period 1994–2005. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management* 19 (5), 421–463.
- Bartlett, C., Ghoshal, S., 1997. The myth of the generic manager: new personal competencies for new management roles. *California Management Review* 40 (1), 92–116.
- Bentler, P., 1990. Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin* 107 (2), 238–246.
- Bentler, P., Bonett, D., 1980. Significance tests and goodness-of-fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin* 88 (3), 588–606.
- Boyatzis, R., 1982. *The Competent Manager: A Model for Effective Performance*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.
- Canning, R., 1990. The quest for competence. *Industrial and Commercial Training* 22 (5), 12–16.
- Cattell, R., 1966. The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 1, 629–637.
- Cha, J., Cichy, R., Kim, S., 2011. Commitment and volunteer-related outcomes among private club board and committee member volunteer leaders. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 35 (3), 308–333.
- Cho, S., Erdem, M., Johanson, M., 2006. Hospitality graduate education: a view from three different stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education* 18 (4), 45–55.
- Chung-Herrera, B., Enz, C., Lankau, M., 2003. Grooming future hospitality leaders: a competencies model. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 44 (3), 17–25.
- Cichy, R., Cha, J., Kim, S., 2009. The relationship between organizational commitment and contextual performance among private club leaders. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 28, 53–62.
- CMAA, 2008. 2008 Economic Impact Report. Club Managers Association of America Economic Impact Survey.
- Dalton, M., 1997. Are competency models a waste? *Training and Development* 51 (10), 46–49.
- Epstein, R., Hundert, E., 2002. Defining and assessing professional competence. *Journal of American Medical Association* 287, 226–235.
- Evers, F., Rush, J., Berdrow, I., 1998. *The Bases of Competence*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Fjelstul, J., Tesone, D., 2008. Golf and club entry level management competencies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 20 (6), 694–699.
- Gilley, J., Galbraith, M., 1986. Examining professional certification. *Training and Development Journal* 40 (6), 60–61.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., McKee, A., 2002. *The New Leader*. Bloomsbury Publishing, London.
- Graves, N., 1996. Personality traits of successful managers as perceived by food beverage human resource executives and recruiters. *Hospitality Research Journal* 20 (2), 95–112.
- Gustafson, C., 2002. Employee turnover: a study of private clubs in the USA. *The International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 14 (3), 106–113.
- Hatcher, L., 1994. *A Step by Step Approach to Using the SAS System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling*. SAS, Cary.
- Hayes, J., Rose-Quirie, A., Allinson, C., 2000. Senior managers' perceptions of the competencies they require for effective performance: implications for training and development. *Personnel Review* 29 (1), 92–101.
- Hofrichter, D., Spencer, L., 1999. Competencies: the right foundation for effective human resource. *Compensation and Benefits* 28 (6), 21–23.
- Hollenbeck, G., McCall, M., 1997. Leadership development: contemporary practices. In: Kraut, A.I., Korman, A.K. (Eds.), *Evolving Practices in Human Resource Management*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Holmes, L., Joyce, P., 1993. Rescuing the useful concept of managerial competence: from outcomes back to process. *Personnel Review* 22 (6), 37–52.
- Hsu, J., Gregory, S., 1995. Developing future hotel managers in Taiwan: from an industry viewpoint. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 14 (3/4), 261–269.
- Hurd, A., McLean, D., 2004. An analysis of the perceived competencies of CEOs in public park and recreation agencies. *Managing Leisure* 9, 96–110.
- Iles, P., 1993. Achieving strategic coherence in HRD through competence-based management and organization development. *Personnel Review* 22 (6), 63–80.
- Jacobs, R., 1989. Getting the measure of management competence. *Personnel Management* 21 (6), 32–37.
- Jirasinghe, D., Lyons, G., 1995. Management competencies in action: a practical framework. *School Organization* 15 (3), 27–281.
- Kaiser, H., 1960. The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 20, 141–151.
- Kaufman, T., Weaver, P., Poynter, J., 1996. Success attributes of B&B operators. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 37 (4), 29–33.
- Katz, R., 1955. Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review* 33 (1), 33–42.
- Kent, W., Perdue, L., 1989. Professional education in hospitality industry associations: the club managers association of America's conceptual breakthrough. *Hospitality Educational and Research Journal* 13 (3), 397–405.
- Kline, R., 1998. Principles and practices of structural equation modeling. In: Guilford, New York.
- Koustelios, A., 2003. Identifying important management competencies in fitness centers in Greece. *Managing Leisure* 8, 145–153.
- Legohere, P., Callot, P., Gallopel, K., Peters, M., 2004. Personality characteristics, attitude toward risk, and decisional orientation of the small business entrepreneur: a study of hospitality managers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 28 (1), 109–120.

- Lowry, L., Flohr, J., 2005. No student left behind: a longitudinal assessment of the competency based framework used to facilitate learning in a capstone tourism course. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education* 17 (4), 28–35.
- Mansfield, B., 1993. Competence-based qualifications: a response. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 17 (3), 19–22.
- Menon, S., 2001. Employee empowerment: an integrative psychological approach. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 50 (1), 153–180.
- Muller, C., Inman, C., 1996. Characteristics and behavior of top chain-restaurant CEOs. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 37 (3), 64–69.
- Nevitt, J., Hancock, C., 2000. Improving the root mean square error of approximation for non-normal conditions in structural equation modeling. *Journal of Experimental Education* 68, 251–268.
- Nunnally, J., 1978. *Psychometric Theory*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Oss, M., 2003. Looking forward to change: guidelines for approaching new management system challenges. *Behavioral Health Management* 23 (1), 13–16.
- Perdue, J., Ninemeier, J., Woods, R., 2000. Competencies required for club managers. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 41 (2), 79–85.
- Perdue, J., Woods, R., Ninemeier, J., 2001. Competencies required for future club managers success. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 42 (1), 60–65.
- Perdue, J., Ninemeier, J., Woods, R., 2002. Comparison of present and future competencies required for club managers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 14 (3), 142–146.
- Perdue, J., 2007. *Contemporary Club Management*, 2nd ed. Educational Institute of the American Hotel and Lodging Association, Lansing, MI.
- Pickett, L., 1998. Competencies and managerial effectiveness: putting competencies to work. *Public Personnel Management* 27 (1), 103–115.
- Raybould, M., Wilkins, H., 2005. Over qualified and under experienced: turning graduates into hospitality managers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 17 (3), 203–216.
- Reynolds, D., 2000. An exploratory investigation into behaviorally based success characteristics of foodservice managers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 24 (1), 92–103.
- Roberts, C., 2003. Creating core competencies to develop service excellence. *Praxis: Journal of Applied Hospitality Management* 6 (1), 102–113.
- Russell, C., 2001. A longitudinal study of top-level executive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86, 560–573.
- Sandwith, P., 1993. A hierarchy of management training requirements: the competency domain model. *Public Personnel Management* 22 (1), 43–62.
- Siu, V., 1998. Managing by competencies a study on the managerial competencies of hotel middle managers in Hong Kong. *Hospitality Management* 17, 253–273.
- Spencer, L., Spencer, S., 1993. *Competence at Work*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.
- Stewart, J., Hamlin, B., 1992. Competence-based qualifications: the case against change. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 16 (7), 21–32.
- Swedlove, W., Dowler, S., 1991. Competency based standards: an investment in the future of tourism. *Hospitality Research Journal* 14 (2), 627–628.
- Tabachnick, B., Fidell, L., 2001. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights.
- Tas, R., 1988. Teaching future managers. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 29 (2), 41–43.
- Tesone, D., Ricci, P., 2005. Job competency expectations for hospitality and tourism employees: perceptions of educational preparation. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism* 4 (2), 53–64.
- Tucker, L., Lewis, C., 1973. The reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika* 38, 1–10.
- Warech, M., 2002. Competency-based structured interviewing at the buckhead beef company. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 43 (1), 70–77.
- Wills, S., 1993. MCI and the competency movement: the case so far. *Journal of European Industry Training* 17 (1), 9–11.
- Wilson, M., Murray, A., Black, M., 2000. Contract catering: the skills required for the next millennium. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 12 (1), 75–78.
- Winterton, J., Winterton, R., 1999. *Developing Managerial Competence*. Routledge, London.
- Woods, R., Rutherford, D., Schmidgall, R., Sciarini, M., 1998. Hotel general managers: focused on the core business. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 39 (6), 38–44.
- Zagar, R., Argit, J., Falconer, J., Friedland, J., 1983. Vocational interests and personality. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 56 (3), 203–214.
- Zenger, J., Folkman, J., 2002. *The Extraordinary Leader: Turning Good Managers into Great Leaders*. McGraw Hill, New York.