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Abstract

Purpose - The overall purpose of this critical review is to provide an overview of leadership styles in the hospitality industry. It also demonstrates theories used in hospitality leadership styles research, identifies the main outcomes, and highlights gaps for future research.

Design/methodology/approach – We present a comprehensive review of the 79 articles on leadership styles in the hospitality context spanning over 13 years (2008–2020) and extend the scope in distinctive means.

Findings – Our review has demonstrated that leadership styles research in hospitality has made progress in the past 13 years; however, there are conceptual and empirical overlaps among different leadership styles in hospitality. There is a lack of research on antecedents and integrating theories in studies. Our review has revealed that several leadership styles have not been rigorously examined in hospitality research with their outcomes.

Research limitations/implications – The search strategy used to find articles published in WoS about leadership styles in hospitality was restricted to title to boost the accuracy of the subsequent literature.

Practical implications – By following the guidance presented in this review, we expect to advance and maintain hospitality leadership research to provide substantive insights into the context of hospitality leadership over the coming years.

Originality/value – The current study is one of the first to undertake a comprehensive understanding of various leadership styles in the hospitality context. We provide a comprehensive projected research agenda to demonstrate theoretical discourses and empirical research. Overall, our critical review presents a holistic idea of the focus of the prior studies and what should be highlighted in future studies.
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1. Introduction

Leadership is a concept that has been studied extensively in organizational and management sciences (Yamak and Eyüpoğlu, 2018). Leadership research has a lot of potential for developing interesting theories and policy consequences, but only if empirical studies are undertaken systematically (Hughes et al., 2018). Sloof and von Siemens (2019) argue that organizational leaders have the right to make and implement decisions formally or informally. These decisions can affect their subordinates in an organization, therefore leaders should delegate and participate with their followers (Elkhwesky et al., 2018; 2019; 2021).

Indeed, there are numerous leadership styles, such as transformational leadership (Khan et al., 2020), transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership (Sandstrom and Reynolds, 2020), and servant leadership (Karatepe et al., 2020). The consequences of the leadership styles are different in term of organizational performance (Al Khajeh, 2018), employees attrition rates (Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy, 2014), and different levels of organizational commitment (Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016). In the same vein, Rabiul and Yean (2021) called for extensive research on leadership styles in the hospitality context.

Studies in the literature support the importance of leadership for hotels (Patiar and Wang, 2020), employees (He et al., 2019; Koo et al., 2019), customers (Ghosh and Khatri, 2018), and communities (Jang et al., 2017). For instance, Stavrinoudis and Chrysanthopoulou (2017) found that charismatic leadership is vital to hotel reputation, while Tarkang et al. (2020) concluded that ethical leadership is important for hotel employees trust and job commitment. In addition, transformational and authentic leadership styles are significant to hotel customer satisfaction (Baquero et al., 2020).

Despite the increasing academic interest in leadership styles and the importance of creating a comprehensive review of the leadership styles literature in the hospitality industry and how prior studies have approached this topic and how it should be investigated in the future. To date, there is no systematic literature review for leadership styles research in hospitality including hotels, restaurants, resorts, motels, casinos, nightclubs, and food service operations. Prior systematic reviews have addressed other disciplines, such as nursing (e.g., Cummings et al., 2008; Wong and Cummings, 2007) and with reviews mostly focusing on one leadership style, such as empowering leadership in hospitality and tourism management (see, Hoang et al., 2021) and servant leadership (see, Eva et al., 2019), especially in hospitality management (see, Bavik, 2020; Chon and Zoltan, 2019).
Prior systematic reviews focused on the review of leadership in specific countries, such as Spain (e.g., Bark et al., 2014). Our review draws on recommendations from literature see Bavik (2021), Chon and Zoltan (2019), and Hoang et al. (2021) who call for more reviews on leadership in hospitality and tourism to understand theoretical frameworks, antecedents, and consequences. In their review, Gui et al. (2021) affirmed that there is a need to conduct a review on leadership styles such as servant leadership since few scholars have quantified the findings of multiple studies and presented a quantitative approximation of the relationship between servant leadership and follower achievements in the hotel industry.

In a recent study about the origin, evolution, and themes in hospitality, Köseoglu et al. (2021) identify topics of interest in hospitality management over the past 60 years. Although leadership style does not appear in the set of interest topics, it is related to topics including competitive advantage (Burke, 2018), employee and operations management (Huertas-Valdivia et al., 2019), finance (Patiar and Wang, 2016), sustainability practices (Jang et al., 2017) and innovation management (Slätten and Mehmetoglu, 2015).

Furthermore, during the last sixty years the hospitality industry is operating in a highly uncertain environment; the need to investigate the leadership styles in this sector is urgent (Kužnin and Walker, 2019; Rothfelder et al., 2012). Given the extraordinary effects of extreme events like the COVID-19 pandemic on hospitality firms, there is an added incentive for researchers to focus more on providing evidence-based information that can assist management in continuing operations in emergency situations (Köseoglu et al., 2021).

Given the importance of leadership style in hospitality management and gaps identified in previous leadership literature, our review walks through the factors that give rise to each leadership style. There are limited systematic reviews in the literature addressing leadership styles in the hospitality industry, which has raised the need to conduct our systematic review to indicate research outlets or journals that publish leadership style research in hospitality (Arici et al., 2021).

The current study is one of the first to undertake a comprehensive understanding of various leadership styles in the hospitality context. We provide an exhaustive projected research agenda in order to exhibit theoretical and empirical research. Chiefly, our critical review demonstrates a holistic idea of the focus of prior studies and what should be accentuated in future studies. We explore the research contexts and design in hospitality research, illustrate the dominant leadership styles in the hospitality research, indicate the theories utilized in hospitality leadership styles research, and map the outcomes of each leadership style. Based on our review,
a strategy for extending future studies that drives both theoretical and empirical development is presented.

Given that leadership styles could reduce the impact of the biggest problems associated with the hospitality industry related to employees’ rotation, performance and commitment, and business management in a very uncertain context. There is a further need for sustainable innovation in the sector. It remains necessary to map the present knowledge about leadership styles in the hospitality industry and identify gaps that need to be addressed. With four overarching questions in mind that embrace the four areas (CIMO framework) that contribute to the advancement of knowledge in management and organizational studies (Denyer and Tranfield, 2009), we identify and present gaps that need to be addressed to manage the main challenges in the hospitality industry (Table 1).

**INSERT TABLE 1**

2. The concept of leadership styles in hospitality

We review both positive and negative leadership styles in hospitality. Positive leadership styles in this review include pygmalion, spiritual, servant, authentic, transformational, transactional, charismatic, empowering, leader-member exchange, environmental transformational, responsible, ethical, democratic/participative, supportive, paternalistic, safety, service, entrepreneurial, and seasonal, while negative leadership styles include bureaucratic, autocratic, machiavellian, self-centered, nepotistic, and laissez-faire.

2.1. The concept of leadership styles that have positive impacts in hospitality

*Pygmalion leadership* is a type of leadership that is important to motivate followers and their effectiveness (Kim *et al.*, 2019). Based on Karakowsky *et al.* (2012), the Pygmalion effect refers to increased subordinates' performance by increased supervisory expectations, it commences with the optimistic prospects of a leader towards subordinates. The Pygmalion leader motivates her/his subordinates to perceive themselves with these high expectations.

*Spiritual leadership* is defined as “comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate oneself and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership” (Fry, 2003). In addition, *humor leadership* refers to leaders’ use of humor in the workplace as a work climate because they believe in the effective role of humor. The leader develops a sense of humor, communicates with humor, uses non-offensive humor, and enjoys and tells jokes (Decker and Rotondo, 2001; Koo *et al.*, 2019).
There is a difference between transformational leadership and servant leadership. Stone et al., (2004) indicate that the focus of a transformational leader is on an organization through building subordinates' commitment to organizational objectives, while the focus of a servant leader is on followers and organizational objectives is the subordinate outcome.

According to Bass (1990), transformational leadership means that a leader takes care of the interests of his followers, motivates them, respects their mission and views, and makes them take care of the interests of the group. The main characteristics of a transformational leader or the four dimensions of transformational leadership are charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1990; Judge and Piccolo, 2004).

Servant leadership is to nurture followers' interests and needs and direct their concern toward the needs and concerns of others inside and outside an organization (Eva et al., 2019). Van Dierendonck (2011) highlights that the six key characteristics of servant leadership behavior namely empowering and developing people, humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, providing direction, and stewardship.

There is a common characteristic between transformational leadership and charismatic leadership. Both of them focus on charisma. Charisma is defined by Waldman et al., (2006) as a relationship between an individual (leader) and one or more followers based on leader behaviours combined with favourable attributions on the part of followers. Bass (1990) argues that transformational leaders can achieve their goals by being charismatic to their followers to influence them and build trust. One of the essential components of charismatic leadership is personality, in addition to cognitive skills, interpersonal skills, business skills, and strategic skills which are charismatic leaders' characteristics (Mumford et al., 2007; Stavrinoudis and Chrysanthopoulou, 2017).

Authentic leadership can be considered as a part of servant leadership, as authenticity is regarded as one of servant leadership behaviour characteristics (van Dierendonck, 2011). Gardner et al. (2005) reveals that authentic leadership focuses on authenticity that must be achieved by an authentic leader through self-awareness, authentic actions and relationships, and self-acceptance. They also assert that an authentic leader must be characterized by transparency, trust, openness, an emphasis on subordinates' development, and orientate towards worthy goals and objectives.

Empowering leadership can be considered as a part of servant leadership because one of servant leadership behaviour characteristics is empowering and developing people (van
Dierendonck, 2011). Empowering leadership is defined by Chiang and Chen (2020), as the ability of a manager to set good examples for his/her followers, give them the chance to share in decision-making, express concern for them, as well as guide and inform subordinates.

Bass (1990) claimed that transactional leaders have some characteristics which include contingent reward (one rewards good performance and achievements of employees), management by exception (active) (i.e. the ability to search for deviations from standards and rules and to take corrective actions), management by exception (passive), which means the intervention in case standards are not met, and laissez-faire which refers to abdicating responsibilities and avoiding making decisions. Contingent rewards and management (active) by exception can be used to assess transactional leadership (Zopiatis and Constanti, 2012).

The leader-member exchange theory views leaders as giving things of value to followers in return for things of value to the leader. Further, followers who are supported by their leaders and who are committed to the organization are more likely to be innovative (Basu and Green, 1997). There are other types of leadership associated with environmental and green practices. Environmental leadership is the ability of a leader to mobilize and manage stakeholders inside and outside an organization to accomplish organizational goals and vision associated with environmental sustainability (Jang et al., 2017). Green transformational leadership is defined as “behaviors of leaders who motivate followers to achieve environmental goals and inspire followers to perform beyond expected levels of environmental performance” (Chen and Chang, 2013; Mittal and Dhar, 2016).

Environmental transformational leadership refers to managers who have a clear and strong environmental vision, act as role models for subordinates by sharing their environmental values, demonstrating the significance of sustainability, and taking actions related to environmental problems, motivate followers by informing them about the future of work activities related to environment and sustainability and building confidence in the capabilities of followers, encouraging them to ask questions about the environment, discussing novel environmental ideas with them, and providing their subordinates with training and development opportunities to be able to handle diverse environmental problems as well as issues (Graves et al., 2013; Kim et al., 2020).

Responsible leadership concentrates on the relationship of the leader with all stakeholders of an organization with whom they engage in a beneficial dialogue with them (Voegtlin, 2011), whereas ethical leadership is characterized by using a leader honesty and
morals with subordinates. An ethical leader is reliable, outstanding, fair, and righteous in making decisions (Tarkang et al., 2020).

The opposite of bureaucratic leadership, Machiavellian leadership, directive leadership, and autocratic leadership is *democratic/participative leadership* which refers to a leader who shares and delegates authority and gives their followers the chance to make decisions (Yamak and Eyüpoğlu, 2018). Similarly, Ogbonna and Harris (2000) highlights that a *participative leader* is a non-directive leader who gives their subordinates the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process through subordinates' interventions to make a quality decision and contribution. *Supportive leadership* concentrates on the leader who must be sympathetic, amicable, and considerate of subordinates needs.

Some leadership styles merge between respect, morals, and authority. *Paternalistic leadership* can be defined as a combination of “strong discipline and authority with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity couched in a ‘personalistic’ atmosphere” (Farh and Cheng, 2000). In this regard, benevolence, authoritarianism, and morality are the components of paternalistic leadership (Tuan, 2018). According to Tsai (2008), *managerial leadership* consists of *construction-style leadership and consideration-style leadership*. Regarding the construction style, the focus of a leader is on the organizational framework and he/she demands their followers to save specific levels of performance to achieve goals, whereas the leadership approach concentrates on mutual communication, trust, and respect of a leader for their followers.

There are two leadership styles associated with the nature of gender, either male or female. *Feminine leadership* is the use of female values in a leadership position to make decisions, whereas *masculine leadership* is the use of male values (Guillet et al., 2019). Feminine values are characterized by “interdependence, cooperation, receptivity, merging, acceptance, awareness of patterns, wholes and contexts, emotional tone, personalistic perception, being, intuition, and synthesizing”, while male values are characterized by “self-assertion, separation, independence, control, competition, focused perception, rationality, analysis, clarity, discrimination, and activity” (Marshall, 1993).

Due to the importance of health and safety in the workplace to both customers and employees, *safety leadership* is now used. It is described as the implementation and maintenance of high-level safety initiatives and operational safety standards. (Zhang et al., 2020) and is significant for customers' and employees' health, hotel quality, and hotel safety performance. The *service leadership* mindset of an organization is very important to survive and
to accomplish customer satisfaction and loyalty (Gronfeldt and Strother, 2005). It can be defined as “the culture that empowers an organization to strategize its promises, design its processes and engage its people in a proactive quest for competitive advantage”.

Entrepreneurial leadership, according to Pistrui et al. (2000), uses innovations to capture opportunities while taking personal responsibility, managing risks, and empowering subordinates to think and act independently in changing contexts. A steward leader is defined by prioritizing the organization's and community's interests over his or her own personal interests (Miller and Le Breton-Miller, 2006). Finally, due to the importance of satisfying seasonal employees as permanent staff members, it is recommended to adopt seasonal employee leadership (Arasli et al., 2020) that is specifically directed for seasonal employees, takes care of their needs and wants, and motivates them to come back again for the next season.

2.2. The concept of leadership styles that may have negative impacts in hospitality

There are some leadership styles related to authority and control. Guillet et al. (2012) argued that bureaucratic leadership focuses on normative procedures and rules that must be followed precisely and completely. In terms of the autocratic leadership, leaders have full decision-making authority and organizational power (Yamak and Eyüpoğlu, 2018). Nyberg et al. (2011) indicates that autocratic leadership means that the leader makes decisions in a dictatorial way and forces values and opinions on their subordinates. Directive leadership is similar to autocratic leadership where employees have no or little control and a leader has the dominant influence on the organization (Clark et al., 2009).

Machiavellian leadership refers to a leader who concentrates on power and control and develops his/her communications only with those who have the power or influence to assist him/her to achieve success (Guillet et al., 2012). In this vein, Nyberg et al. (2011) indicates that malevolent leadership refers to a leader who is insincere, vengeful, unfriendly, moody, and easily agitated, seeks to revenge when wronged, and acts negatively towards others.

Self-centered leadership means that the leader prefers his/ her own company, avoids people or groups, does not engage with others, works and acts separately from others, and pursues to achieve his/ her own best interests (Nyberg et al., 2011). Nepotistic leadership is characterized as a decision-making bias in which a leader prioritizes people based on their social network dynamics rather than their qualifications and experiences (Liu et al., 2015).

According to Bass (1997) and Judge and Piccolo (2004), Laissez-faire leadership is a distinct type of leadership that is actually non-leadership, i.e., leadership without authority,
ignoring accepting responsibilities, hesitating in taking actions and decisions, and the absence of a person in assertive situations. *Laissez-faire leadership* may be considered as a part of *passive/avoidance leadership* that can be measured by two factors; management by exception (passive) and laissez-faire behaviour patterns (Luo *et al.*, 2013; Zopiatis and Constanti, 2012).

3. Methodology

The overall purpose of this critical review is to provide an overview of leadership styles in the hospitality industry, reveal its main outcomes, and highlight gaps for future research. **Table 2** and **Figure 1** illustrate the detailed systematic review process performed in our research within distinct phases, which was adopted from Chon and Zoltan (2019) and Yang *et al.*, (2017).

To ensure comprehensiveness and to investigate studies related to leadership styles in the hospitality industry, we used the keyword “leadership” in combination with a set or keywords related with the sector (hotels, restaurants, hospitality industry, resort, motel, casino, night club, catering and food service business). This set of keywords allows reaching data saturation in the search of new papers (Saunders *et al.*, 2018). The search was performed in the web of science (WoS), one of the most well-known and well-established databases.

We accessed WoS via the Egyptian Knowledge bank with their permission to access the studies for free. First, 172 articles were found in WoS database that do not restrict the publication year and were inspected to eradicate repetitions. the following eligibility requirements, as well as reviewing the abstract and each paper's findings, were included:

- The focus is on leadership styles in the hospitality industry.
- The English language is used.
- Easy access to article through EKB.

79 studies published between 2008-2020 were suitable for the subsequent analysis. Each article from 79 was analyzed independently in detail by reviewing the abstract, literature, research methodology, results, and conclusion.

**INSERT TABLE 2**

**INSERT FIGURE 1**
4. Review findings

The findings section has been divided into four primary areas to demonstrate our research questions. Precisely, we (1) indicate research outlets or journals publishing hospitality leadership styles research; (2) provide a review of research contexts and designs used in hospitality research; (3) illustrate the dominant leadership styles in hospitality research, and (4) review empirical work on hospitality leadership styles, focusing on theories used and outcomes, to map the nomological network. We provide and advocate an agenda for widening future study through both theoretical and empirical advancement based on a review of the findings.

4.1. Research outlets publishing leadership styles research in hospitality

Leadership styles research in hospitality has attained a base in multiple various outlets (see Table 3). The majority of the publications were published in hospitality journals, despite the fact that 18 papers were published in management and leadership journals such as International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, International Journal of Hospitality Management, and International Journal of Hospitality Management, and Tourism Management gained the greatest number of publications, with 20, 6, and 5 publications, respectively.

Since 2008 (see Fig. 2), research on leadership styles in hospitality has been published in top-tier hospitality journals. Most researches were published during the year of 2019 and 2020, with 18 and 17 publications, respectively, which indicates the importance of leadership research in recent years in comparison with the period from 2008-2018.

[INSERT FIGURE 2]

[INSERT TABLE 3]

4.2. Research contexts and designs in leadership styles research in hospitality

Table 4 classifies the papers into categories based on their use in the hospitality business. The majority of the articles were about hotels. (87.3%), followed by restaurants (5%). Six studies (7.7%) shared a sample from more than one hospitality sector, hotels and restaurants, hotels and golf clubs, hotels and resorts, hotels and catering companies, lodging and foodservice. None of the studies were conducted in motels, casinos, and convention sectors.

[INSERT TABLE 4]

Table 5 summarizes the areas and samples of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method studies. The majority of the studies were conducted in China (34.2%), followed by the USA (6.3%), India (5%), Spain (5%), and Australia (5%). Only eight (10%) studies were
conducted in the Middle East (Egypt, Turkey, Palestine, Iran, and Jordan). All articles (100%) are empirical with 71 (89.9%) using a quantitative methodology. All quantitative studies used surveys for data collection. Only five (6.3%) studies were qualitative, and three (3.8%) studies used a mixed-method approach. The majority of the studies obtained the sample from only employees or managers and from supervisors with their subordinates. Only three articles included customers in the sample with managers or employees or/and supervisors.

All studies (n=5) that employed a qualitative approach, investigated transformational leadership, servant leadership, charismatic leadership, service leadership, or feminine and masculine leadership. While all studies (n=3) that employed a mixed-method approach, investigated transformational leadership, servant leadership, transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, or employee seasonal leadership.

**INSERT TABLE 5**

### 4.3. The dominant leadership styles in hospitality research

The leadership styles across the extracted hospitality studies were very diverse. Transformational leadership (25.6%) was the most researched topic, followed by servant leadership (12.4%), transactional leadership (10.6%), laissez-faire leadership (Non-transactional or Non-leadership) (6.2%), empowering leadership (5.3%), charismatic leadership (4.4%), and authentic leadership (4.4%). Other less researched leadership styles are shown in **table 6**.

**INSERT TABLE 6**

### 4.4. Nomological network of leadership styles research in hospitality

#### 4.4.1. Theories utilized in leadership styles research in hospitality context

The theoretical structures of empirical studies on hospitality leadership essentially draw from a number of theories which include social exchange theory (16.2%), transformational leadership theory (7.6%), servant leadership theory (6.7%), conservation of resources theory (5.7%), social learning theory (4.8%), self-determination theory (4.8%), path–goal theory (2.9%), full-range leadership theory (2.9%), and upper echelon theory (2.9%) (See **Table 7**).

**Social exchange theory (SET)**

SET is one of leading theories in hospitality leadership styles research. The basis of SET is the norm of reciprocity which refers to the mutual exchange of gratifications (Gouldner, 1960). Through a mediating mechanism of employee work engagement, SET has been utilized to explain how paternalistic leadership improves extra-role customer service. Furthermore,
paternalistic leaders can engage the social exchange relationship between employees and a business by beneficent or ethical actions rather than dictatorial behaviors (Tuan, 2018). Paternalistic leadership is defined "a leader who wields power with fatherly benevolence and moral integrity while operating in a 'personalistic' environment" (Farh and Cheng, 2000).

A study of Jang and Kandampullly (2018) was also based on SET to explain how employee's turnover intention is influenced by their perception of servant leadership, through the mediating role of affective organizational commitment. Karatepe et al. (2020) highlights that SET provides guidance for interpreting the association between servant leadership and innovative behavior. The focus of a servant leader is on subordinates and organizational objectives are the followers' outcome (Stone et al., 2004).

Drawing on SET, Wu and Chen (2015) investigate the relationship between empowering leadership, employee psychological contract fulfillment, employee knowledge exchange, and service performance. Empowering leadership is to give followers the chance to share in decision-making, express concern for them, and guide and inform subordinates (Chiang and Chen 2020). SET was also adopted by Tarkang et al. (2020) to develop links between ethical leadership and trust in leaders, affective commitment, and deviance behaviours toward the organization. Ethical leadership is to use honesty, reliability, fairness, and morals with subordinates (Tarkang et al., 2020).

*Transformational leadership theory*

Based on transformational leadership theory (Bass, 1990; Judge and Piccolo, 2004), the four dimensions of transformational leadership are charisma or idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Bass (1990) argues that transformational leaders can achieve their goals by being charismatic to their followers to influence them and build trust. Based on this theory, Quintana et al. (2015) investigates the association between transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership, and employee outcomes, which include perceived efficiency, satisfaction, and extra effort. The association between transformational leadership, and job stress and job burnout (Salem, 2015), and employee burnout and intention to quit has also been studied (Reddy and Mehta, 2019).

*Servant leadership (SEL) theory*

In a recent review of the current state of hospitality leadership styles research, SEL theory has been used extensively (e.g., Ghosh and Khatri, 2018; Huang et al., 2016; Karatepe et al., 2020;
Ling et al., 2016; Qiu and Dooley, 2019; Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2019), this may be because servant leadership has many positive outcomes for organizations, customers, and communities. According to Liden et al. (2014), SEL theory focuses on a tenet of that servant leaders guide and direct their subordinates to emulate the leader’s behaviours by prioritizing the needs and concerns of others over their own.

Additionally, SEL theory is based on setting goals, empowering and developing people, making work meaningful, providing direction, and expressing humility, authenticity, interpersonal acceptance, and stewardship. Empowering leadership is considered as part of SEL theory, which takes care of empowering people by giving them the authority to increase their intrinsic motivation; they are responsible for achieving organizational goals (Van Dierendonck, 2011).

Conservation of resources (COR) theory

In hospitality leadership styles research (see Ali et al., 2020; He et al., 2019; Wu & Chen, 2019) and organizational psychology, the COR theory is one of the most often recognized theories (Hobfoll et al., 2018). According to the COR theory, people attempt to protect, obtain, grow, and retain resources (e.g. supportive work practices, supportive leaders, feedback) in order to prevent losing valuable resources that might lead to mental illness, stress, and burnout (Eva et al., 2019, Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll et al., 2018). Furthermore, these resources assist them to successfully contribute in the work environment. Hobfoll (2002) claims that resources may be psychological, social, or material.

Drawing on COR theory, Ali et al. (2020) develops a model consisting of spiritual leadership and its association with workplace ostracism directly and indirectly through social support and the moderating influence of employee justice orientation between spiritual leadership and workplace ostracism. Spiritual leadership concentrates on motivating people (Fry, 2003). Furthermore, He et al. (2019) proposes that responsible leadership is important for task performance, through a mediating mechanism for employee well-being. Responsible leadership focuses on the ability of leaders to engage in a beneficial dialogue with all stakeholders of an organization (Voegtlin, 2011).

Tarkang and Ozturen (2019) draw on COR theory and SET to develop the relationships between ethical leadership, trust in leaders, affective commitment, and deviance behavior, while Wu and Chen (2019) use SLT and COR theory to investigate the association between authentic leadership, collective mindfulness, collective thriving, and prosociality at the collective level. The latter is viewed as social resources which can be invested and inspired to promote
prosociality (helping behaviour and proactive customer service behaviour) in hotels, whilst based on SLT, they proposed the association between *authentic leadership* and collective thriving. Authentic leadership concentrates on authenticity that could be achieved by a leader through self-awareness, authentic actions and relationships, and self-acceptance (Gardner *et al.*, 2005).

**Social learning theory (SLT)**

SLT has supplied an influential basis for leadership styles studies in the hospitality industry. Bandura (1971) claims that people can acquire new behaviours through experiences or observing others, in addition to punishing and rewarding individuals after actions can influence their behaviours. In this vein, leaders' behaviors in dealing with others are very critical to affect their followers in the workplace (Tuan, 2018).

SLT has been used to explicate how *paternalistic leaders* improve extra-role customer service, through the mediating role of employee work engagement (Tuan, 2018) and to explain how *servant leaders* influence their employees' personal social capital in terms of bonding (networks linking employees of a similar kind) and bridging (networks linking agents of different kinds), through fostering social interaction with peers inside and outside the group (Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara and Ruiz-Palomino, 2019). More recently, Karatepe *et al.* (2020) highlight that SLT is the theoretical focus to investigate the mediating role of climate for creativity in the association between *servant leadership*, managerial innovation and innovative behaviour.

**Self-determination theory (SDT)**

According to Deci and Ryan (1985), SDT claims that the determinants of behaviours are autonomy, control, motivation. SDT argues that there are two types of autonomous motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation relates to experiencing activities as interesting and satisfying, while autonomous extrinsic motivation relates to experiencing activities that are not as interesting, nonetheless, they are personally important for one’s self-selected aims and purposes. Both types are related to performance, satisfaction, trust, and well-being in the workplace (Gagné and Deci, 2005).

Drawing on SDT (Deci and Ryan, 2002), autonomy, competence, and relatedness are job-related needs of individuals. These needs provide the basis to describe an organization as supportive or antagonistic to humans. SDT conceives of humans as active, growth-oriented organisms, who innately seek and engage challenges in their environments, attempting to
actualize their potentialities, capacities, and sensibilities. Additionally, SDT focuses on individual motivation and self-determination. Moreover, autonomy is important to motivate employees to do their tasks and participate in activities.

Recently, Zhang et al. (2020) state that SDT proposes that self-intrinsic motivation and external environmental information underlie people's behaviours. This study was based on SDT to investigate the relationship between safety leadership and employee safety behavior, through mediating mechanism of perceived severity and perceived susceptibility. Adopting and maintaining high-level safety strategies and operational standards is the responsibility of safety leadership (Zhang et al., 2020). Chiang and Chen (2020) investigate the association between empowering leadership, and voice behaviour and knowledge sharing, via the mediating mechanism of job autonomy. Kim et al. (2020) illuminate why employees may prefer to engage in eco-friendly behavior based on SDT.

Path–goal theory (PGT)

PGT (House and Mitchell, 1975) states that “a leader's behavior is important for good performance as a function of its impact on subordinates' perceptions of paths to goals and the attractiveness of the goals. When leader behavior clarifies these goals or makes them more attractive we would expect the satisfaction, performance and leader acceptance to increase. The specific relationship between leader behavior and these criteria (satisfaction, performance, and acceptance) will depend upon the personality of the subordinate and the existing task environment” (House and Mitchell, 1975). PGT suggests that managers will do the best effort to achieve organizational goals if they are sure they will be recognized and receive rewards. These incentives, such as salary, bonus, and promotion, will motivate them to engage with their work sincerely (Patiar and Wang, 2020).

Full-range leadership theory (FRLT)

Luo et al. (2013) examined the structure and effect of the FRLT in the context of the hotel industry. They claimed that the FRLT is made up of the two principles of transformational and transactional leadership, as well as laissez-faire leadership. FRLT was selected as a framework of the study of Rothfelder et al. (2012) who examine the impact of different leadership behaviours (transformational, transactional, and non-transactional leadership or laissez-faire) of hospitality managers on employee job satisfaction.
Upper echelon theory (UET)

Hambrick and Mason (1984) indicated that UET states that “organizational outcomes-strategic choices and performance levels-are partially predicted by managerial background characteristics”. In this regard, functional area background, educational background, and formal management training are significant aspects of leadership that impact the decisions and the organizational success (Hambrick and Mason, 1984; Yamak and Eyüpoğlu, 2018). In the UET context, firm outcomes are reflections of the values of powerful actors within firms. The UET can help articulate and disentangle the relationship between CEO servant leadership and firm innovativeness (Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2019).

4.4.2. Outcomes of each leadership style in the hospitality context

The majority of empirical articles on leadership styles in hospitality have focused on the outcomes of adopting a leadership style and the impact on stakeholders. The predominant viewpoint of these interactions and related studies are shown in Appendix 1.

Transformational leadership

The relationship between transformational leadership and job satisfaction (Quintana et al., 2015) is the most scrutinized association in the transformational leadership research. Likewise, a growing body of research has linked transformational leadership to organizational commitment (Luo et al., 2017). Some of the less investigated relationships in the transformational leadership research are the association between transformational leadership and employee civic virtue behavior (Khan et al., 2020), customer satisfaction (Baquero et al., 2020), perceived supervisor support (Chen and Wu, 2020), and employee reactions (Katou et al., 2020). Additionally, transformational leadership has been noticed to be negatively correlated to employee burnout (Reddy and Mehta, 2019).

Servant leadership

Given the importance of servant leadership, it is not unexpected that servant leadership is retrieved to be positively correlated to a broad range of outcomes in the hospitality industry. These include innovative behavior and creativity climate (Karatepe et al., 2020), employees’ personal social capital (Zoghbi-Manrique-de-Lara and Ruiz-Palomino, 2019), firm innovativeness (Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2019), and leader–member exchange (Wu et al., 2013). However, these relationships are less examined in hospitality research. The most commonly
examined relationship in servant leadership research is the relationship between servant leadership and service quality (Ghosh and Khatri, 2018; Qiu et al., 2020).

**Transactional leadership**

A promising research has revealed that transactional leadership is certainly associated with department performance (Patiar and Wang, 2020) and return on assets (Tran, 2017). Most research on transactional leadership has investigated its impact on employees. It has been found that transactional leadership has been found to be positively associated with employee perceived efficiency (Quintana et al., 2015) and employee extra effort (Luo et al., 2013). In distinction, transactional leadership is negatively associated with organizational commitment (Dai et al., 2013).

**Laissez-faire leadership**

Prior works have found that laissez-faire leadership is negatively related to employee perceived efficiency (Quintana et al., 2015), positive psychological capital (Şeşen et al., 2019), and group effectiveness (Whitelaw, 2013). This is due to laissez-faire is actually non-leadership which means avoidance of leadership, neglect of responsibilities, reluctance to make decisions, and absence of the person in situations needed (Bass 1997; Judge and Piccolo, 2004).

**Empowering leadership**

Our literature search found that empowering leadership has a wide-ranging of job-associated outcomes. These comprise employee job autonomy, knowledge sharing (Chiang and Chen, 2020), service-oriented employee behaviors (Lin et al., 2019), management innovation, climate for creativity (Hassi, 2019), employees’ service innovative behavior, creative improvisation self-efficacy (Wihuda et al., 2017), and Knowledge exchange (Wu and Chen, 2015). However, empowering leadership is adversely associated with employees’ job satisfaction because empowerment may add unwanted duties and responsibilities to the job (Clark et al., 2009). Overall, it is obvious that from our literature search, not all outcomes of empowering leadership have been investigated more than one time.

**Charismatic leadership**

Even though a number of studies (N=5; % 4.4) have investigated charismatic leadership in the hospitality industry, only a few have focused on charismatic leadership outcomes. For example, charismatic leadership is positively linked with hotel reputation (Stavrinoudis and Chrysanthopoulou, 2017). Tromp and Blomme (2014) conclude that charismatic leadership is not correlated with strain-based negative work-home interference. Other scholars study
antecedents of charismatic leadership. Yamak and Eyüpoğlu (2018) examine the relationship between demographic characteristics of hotel managers and charismatic leadership, and find no significant association. Kozak and Uca (2008) conclude that there is a significant link between organizational factors, environmental factors and managers' leadership styles including charismatic leadership. Eventually, one study is qualitative and does not demonstrate statistically significant outcomes for charismatic leadership (Piuchan and Prachansit, 2019). Charismatic leadership consequences need to be explored in future research.

**Authentic leadership**

Considering the authentic leadership outcomes, our review illustrates that previous scholars reveal its positive link with customer satisfaction (Baquero et al., 2020), employee deep acting (Wang and Xie, 2020), customer-oriented organizational citizenship behavior (Qiu et al., 2019), and collective mindfulness (Wu and Chen, 2019). Researchers have recently shown that authentic leadership is negatively linked with employees’ perceived job insecurity, employee surface acting (Wang and Xie, 2020), employee cynicism, and job search behaviour (Megeirhi et al., 2018). Our review suggests that authentic leadership research is a nascent topic because the first published article is 2018 (Megeirhi et al., 2018).

Our review demonstrates the leadership styles that have not been rigorously examined in hospitality research with their outcomes. These include democratic, feminine and masculine, managerial, spiritual, environmental, Machiavellian, bureaucratic, environmental-transformational, green transformational, supportive, directive, malevolent, self-centered, seasonal employee, responsible, safety, service, paternalistic, humor, and Pygmalion leadership.

**5. Agenda and call for future research**

Fig. 3 maps the key findings extracted from the review. Drawing on the traits and patterns detected from the review, recommendations are presented for forthcoming studies. This section aims to provide an inclusive synopsis of future research potentials of leadership styles, thereby providing important clues for scholars who desire to further examine leadership styles in hospitality (see Fig. 4).

**INSERT APPENDIX 1**

**INSERT FIGURE 3**

**INSERT FIGURE 4**
5.1. New research line 1: Antecedents

The majority of empirical articles on leadership styles in hospitality have focused on the consequences of adopting a leadership style and the impact on stakeholders, but the antecedents of leadership styles are scant in hospitality literature. Yamak and Eyüpoğlu (2018) investigate the relationship between demographic characteristics of hotel managers and autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, and charismatic as leadership styles.

In addition, Kozak and Uca (2008) examine the link between organizational factors and managers' leadership styles including autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire, and charismatic leadership. In this regard, Zopiatis and Constanti (2012) study transformational, passive/avoidance, and transactional leadership styles and their correlation with the personality traits of extraversion, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism.

Given the apparent gaps in previous works, our review recommends exploring factors that give rise to each leadership style. Based on Sharma and Kirkman (2015), we propose to investigate the effect of leader power distance orientation, personality trait of narcissism, leader uncertainty avoidance orientation, leader collectivism orientation, and leader job stressors (antecedents) on leadership styles in hospitality. Antecedents of leader behaviour could be organizational culture, policies, and team culture (Eva et al., 2019) that need further investigation.

Our review affirms that the antecedents of leadership styles in hospitality demands scholarly attention. These antecedents or factors may include culture, education, training, gender, personal traits, age, years of professional experience, managerial position, and emotional intelligence. Our review suggests duplicating studies of Kozak and Uca (2008), Yamak and Eyüpoğlu (2018) and Zopiatis and Constanti (2012), in different cultural contexts; this could result in promising findings as due to the diversity in hospitality industry across countries. Moreover, the direct effect of antecedents investigated in their research has not been empirically proven yet in other studies. We also agree with the recommendation of Chon and Zoltan (2019) who advise to examine the effect of formal leadership education and leadership training in hospitality on servant leaders’ behaviours.

5.2. New research line 2: Advancing research contexts and design in leadership styles research

It is acknowledged that there are several shortcomings in research contexts of leadership styles research in hospitality. Several studies examined were conducted in China and USA. There very limited studies on leadership in hospitality from the developing and emerging nations as well as
other developed countries, such as Turkey, South Korea, Egypt, Italy, Germany, and Greek. These destinations are important in the international tourism and hospitality sector. Additionally, most of the leadership studies have been conducted in hotels. Future research should consider resorts, leisure, conventions, motels, and restaurants, specifically small and medium enterprises, targeting multiple sources including employees, customers, and managers.

In order to handle the weaknesses of the study designs, our review suggests integrating qualitative methods (e.g., focus group, case study, ethnography, interview, observation, and Delphi technique) and quantitative methods (e.g., questionnaire, secondary data analysis, and experimental design). This will allow for more in-depth data related to leadership styles in hospitality (e.g., service leadership, paternalistic leadership, safety leadership, environmental leadership, responsible leadership, humor leadership, Pygmalion leadership) from contexts such as restaurants, hotels, or resorts. This is also important to avoid criticisms directed to tourism research for favoring a positivist approach (Yang et al., 2017).

Longitudinal designs recommended by many researchers (Chiang and Chen 2020; Hassi, 2019; Lin et al., 2019; Tarkang et al., 2020), are fundamentally required in studies of driving patterns because the cross-sectional study design undermines the causal conclusions derived from the results.

5.3. New research line 3: Theoretical advancement

In addition to the importance of investigating the effect of leadership styles on followers' behaviours and outcomes in hospitality, it is critical to consider antecedents of leadership styles. In order to achieve this goal, we need more theoretical perspectives. To broaden the nomological network linked with leadership styles, we recommend integrating different theories in future research. This integration can be between social exchange theory (SET), conservation of resources (COR) theory, social learning theory (SLT), and self-determination theory (SDT).

Our review recommends that SLT should be used in future research not only to explain how leadership styles influence followers' behaviors and outcomes, but also as a structure for studying the role of antecedents such as experiences and organizational factors (e.g., culture and policies) in determining leaders' behaviours. COR theory claims, according to Ali et al. (2020), that specific resources (e.g., leadership) nurture future resource gain (e.g., job or personal resources), which then controls employees' attitudes and behaviors in the workplace. Although a number of studies (e.g., Ali et al., 2020; He et al., 2019) focus on the importance of COR theory in explaining how leadership styles influence follower behaviors and outcomes, COR theory has
been neglected as a frame for investigating the role of organizational support or resources (e.g., psychological, social, or material) in driving leaders' attitudes and behaviours in the workplace.

Overall, using COR theory is important for further research to build a multi-level conceptual model which examines the effect of some antecedents (e.g., organizational support or resources) on leadership style adopted by managers and the impact of leadership style on individuals' attitudes and behaviors in enterprises. Gui et al. (2021) recommended hospitality researchers to expand the theoretical base of servant leadership by applying COR theory.

Integrating theories is very important to build novel complicated and inclusive models on a strong theoretical basis. For example, future research could examine the effect of organizational factors on leaders' behaviours or their leadership styles through the lens of COR theory. Future studies could also test the impact of leaders' behaviours or leadership styles on followers' behaviours or outcomes through the lens of SLT or SET. So, novel conceptual models could be developed from integrating theories.

SDT has been utilized by leadership styles research in hospitality. For example, SDT was used to investigate the relationship between safety leadership and employee safety behavior, through mediating mechanism of perceived severity and perceived susceptibility (Zhang et al., 2020). In addition, Kim et al. (2020) utilized SDT to explain why employees may choose to engage in eco-friendly behavior. Nevertheless, we also suppose that there is a gain in employing SDT as a frame for examining the antecedents of different leadership styles.

Based on SDT, we can suppose that autonomy of the leader to determine how he/she leads (autonomy), his/her participation in leadership education and training programs (competence) and his/her accessibility to tutors (relatedness) can affect his/her personality traits and leadership behaviours. We claim that the gap in recognizing the antecedents of leadership styles may be due to the absence of a guiding theory, SDT may present the focus required to embark on linking this gap.

It is critical to expand research on the FRLT by investigating its antecedents (e.g., organizational factors, personal traits, and characteristics of managers) and outcomes (e.g., sustainability practices) in hospitality. FRLT is made up of the concepts of transformational and transactional leadership, as well as laissez-faire leadership (Luo et al., 2013). Because there are so many different leadership styles, further research is needed to investigate a new 'full-range' model of leadership that incorporates and distills what makes each one unique. For research on leadership style to grow and build a more cohesive grasp of the intriguing topic of leadership, such an integrated 'full-range' model is required (Anderson and Sun, 2017).
5.4. New research line 4: Variables in relation to future issues in hospitality context

The hospitality setting is influenced by environmental issues, it is critical to consider sustainability initiatives in all sectors (Chon and Zoltan, 2019). However, a limited number of scholars have investigated leadership styles and their association with environmental and sustainability issues. Jang et al. (2017) scrutinized the influence of environmental leadership on stakeholder engagement, environmental sustainability, and financial and non-financial performance in restaurant industry in USA.

Kim et al. (2020) also examined the association between environmental-transformational leadership, employees’ environmental beliefs, and organizational citizenship behaviour toward environment in hotels in Thailand. Further analysis of these topics in different contexts would be interesting. Our review also suggests investigating the association between different leadership styles and sustainability initiatives in hospitality sectors. Future scholars should investigate different styles of leadership (e.g., environmental transformational leadership, transactional, and authentic leadership) and their association with the environmental management practices to explore the most effective style for hotel and restaurant environmental management practices. Our recommendation is in line with Kim et al. (2020).

Given the importance of responsible leadership in contemporary management, especially due to the crisis of ethics (Frangieh and Yaacoub, 2017), further research is critically needed to develop a unified set of measurement tools (Agarwal and Bhal, 2020; Frangieh and Yaacoub, 2017). Tsui (2020) also makes a call for responsible leadership research at organizational level, specifically on COVID-19 crisis due that “the management literature is rather thin about (responsible) leadership during a crisis”.

Our review reveals the leadership styles that have not been rigorously examined in hospitality research with their outcomes or consequences. These include democratic, feminine and masculine, managerial, spiritual, environmental, Machiavellian, bureaucratic, environmental transformational, green transformational, supportive, directive, malevolent, self-centered, seasonal employee, responsible, safety, service, paternalistic, humor, and Pygmalion leadership. In this regard, we strongly suggest that further research can be extended.

Further research is encouraged to investigate safety leadership, safety knowledge, and safety motivation post the COVID-19 pandemic in restaurants and resorts and to correlate with employee safety behaviours and customer satisfaction and loyalty. The efficiency of feminine and masculine styles of leadership (Guillet et al., 2019) needs further investigation. Future investigations could examine ethical leadership and its association with work engagement, job
embeddedness, high-performance work practices, job stress, or innovative behavior. This
suggestion is consistent with Tarkang and Ozturen (2019) and Tarkang et al. (2020).

All studies on empowering leadership were conducted in hotels (e.g., Lin et al., 2019),
especially in China (e.g., Chiang and Chen, 2020), thus we encourage researchers to test
whether the findings can be replicated in other hospitality organizations and cultural contexts.
As suggested by Chiang and Chen (2020), the impact of empowerment leadership on voice
behaviour, knowledge sharing, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and personal
efficacy needs further investigation.

Our study reinforces the view of Karatepe et al. (2020) that further research is needed to
investigate authentic leadership with servant leadership to examine whether servant leadership
better explains climate for creativity, management innovation, and innovative behavior than
authentic leadership. Furthermore, our review suggests that authentic leadership research is a
nascent topic because the first published article is in 2018 (Megeirhi et al., 2018).

5.5. New research line 5: Mediators and moderators

Our review concluded that there are many shortcomings in studying mediating and moderating
variables in leadership styles research in hospitality. To address the limitations of the lack of
research on mediators and moderators, we agree with Ali et al. (2020) that meaningful work can
be used as a mediator between spiritual leadership and workplace ostracism, and harmonious
work passion can be used as a moderator between spiritual leadership and workplace ostracism.

Our review also recommends highlighting the association between participative
leadership and organizational citizenship behavior, with the moderating role of employee well-
being, rational identification, and personality traits, as well as mediating role of job autonomy,
intrinsic motivations, and organizational justice climate. This is in line with the recommendation
of Bhatti et al. (2019). Our review also suggests that it is necessary to examine the link between
i-deals and employee reactions through the moderating effect of transformational leadership
behaviour in the hospitality industry. This is consistent with Katou et al. (2020).

As recommended by Megeirhi et al. (2018), the causal and directional impact of
authentic leadership and negative behaviours through team psychological capital needs further
investigation. Future research can look into the effect of authentic leadership on workplace
bullying, stress, and deviant behaviours through the moderating role of team psychological
capital. Another important suggestion is to measure the impact of transformational, leader-
member exchange, ethical, and empowering leadership styles on workplace incivility, employee
cynicism, and job search behaviours through the moderating role of team psychological capital (Megeirhi et al., 2018).

According to Tuan (2018), future research should look into the effect of paternalistic leadership on extra-role customer service using work engagement as a mediator. Furthermore, the relationship between paternalistic leadership and work engagement through organizational support or service culture as moderators should be researched. On the relationship between paternalistic leadership and job engagement, the moderating influence of employees' emotional intelligence, emotional labor, and emotional weariness should also be investigated.

In service contexts, such as hotels, bigger sample size studies on the mediating effect of organizational commitment between employee perceptions of servant leadership and turnover intention may be advantageous (Jang and Kandampully, 2018). There is a crucial need to explore the mediation effect of climate for creativity in the link between servant leadership, management innovation, and inventive behavior, as validated by Karatepe et al. (2020). Other leadership styles could be investigated with service contexts, especially with airline and restaurant services.

Future scholars should gather data from multiple sources including managers and employees to examine the mediating mechanism for employee well-being between responsible leadership and task performance (He et al., 2019). Future research should look at the impact of safety leadership on employee safety behavior, as well as the mediation role of belief restoration and the moderation role of perceived risk in the relationship between safety leadership and behavior in various hospitality sectors and cultures. This agrees with Zhang et al (2020).

Chiang and Chen (2020) recommend to investigate the association between empowering leadership, and voice behaviour and knowledge sharing, via the mediating mechanism of job autonomy and to make comparison among diverse categories of hotels and hospitality enterprises in different countries. It is also beneficial to examine the moderating role of “power distance” between empowering leadership, and voice behaviour and knowledge sharing.

Future study could look at the role of employee creativity, job engagement, job happiness, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the relationship between humor leadership and organizational performance. We recommend using the measure of Koo et al. (2019).
6. Practical implications for hospitality sectors

Our study has demonstrated the impacts of different leadership styles from prior research in hospitality and their links with contemporary issues in hospitality. Based on our systematic review for 79 articles in hospitality sectors, we now stipulate practical recommendations for the entire hospitality industry and practitioners.

Practitioners need to understand the outcomes of different leadership styles (Hristov et al., 2018). Some styles have negative impacts on organizational success. Malevolent, self-centered, and autocratic leadership styles can destroy employees’ vitality and mental health and increase stress. Passive/avoidance and laissez-faire leadership styles can decrease employees’ extra effort, satisfaction, efficiency, and group effectiveness because a leader ignores responsibilities and hesitates in taking decisions. Hospitality managers should avoid autocratic leadership by not adopting its principles that are autocratic, dictatorial, bossy, and elitist, malevolent leadership principles that are hostile, dishonest, vindictive, and irritable, and self-centered leadership principles that are self-interested, non-participative, loner, and asocial (Nyberg et al., 2011).

Due to the importance of sustainability, creativity, innovation, safety, and business performance in normal and crisis times, we encourage practitioners to adopt some leadership styles. First, environmental leadership which focuses on mobilizing and managing stakeholders inside and outside an organization to accomplish goals and vision associated with environmental sustainability.

Second, environmental transformational leadership practices include having a clear environmental vision, serving as a role model for subordinates, demonstrating the significance of sustainability, taking actions related to environmental problems, building confidence in followers’ capabilities, encouraging to ask questions about environment, discussing novel environmental ideas, and providing training and development to handle environmental problems.

Third, empowering leadership is very vital to managerial innovation, climate for creativity, employees’ service innovative behavior, and creative improvisation self-efficacy. Hospitality managers could adopt empowering leadership principles through setting high standards for performance by their own behavior, leading by example, encouraging team members to express ideas/suggestions, using the suggestions of other managers to make decisions that affect employees, giving all team members a chance to voice their opinions, helping team members identify areas where they need more training, teaching them how to solve
problems on their own, explaining company goals to team members, explaining rules and expectations, showing concern for team members’ well-being, patiently discussing team members’ concerns, and showing interest in team members’ success (Chiang and Chen, 2020).

**Fourth**, servant leadership has many outcomes, such as innovative behavior, creativity climate, firm innovativeness, and business performance. Servant leaders care about followers’ interests and needs and direct their concern toward the needs and concerns of others inside and outside an organization. Hospitality managers could be servant leaders via adopting practices that include not compromising ethical principles to achieve success, giving team members the freedom to handle difficult situations in the way that they feel is best, putting subordinates’ interests ahead of their own, emphasizing the importance of giving back to the community, helping team members if they have personal problems, making team members’ career development a priority, and telling team members if something work-related is going wrong (Karatepe et al., 2020).

**Finally**, safety leadership principles can be implemented by hospitality operations during COVID-19 and post the pandemic (Salem et al., 2021; Salem et al., 2021) because this style is important for employee safety behaviours, customer and employee health, hotel quality, and hotel safety performance. This style emphasizes the adoption and maintenance of high-level safety policies and operational standards. Hospitality managers should set an example for employees’ safety behavior and provide them with safety information and guidance. Employees should be rewarded for their dedication to safety systems, participate in safety training, and contribute new safety ideas. In addition, hospitality managers have to provide protective equipment for employees and correct unsafe behaviors during employee safety performance monitoring (Zhang et al., 2020).

**7. Conclusion**

The impetus for this study was shaped by the cumulative academic interest in leadership styles, the importance of creating a comprehensive plan for the main focus of leadership styles in the hospitality literature, what it should highlight in the future and the lack of systematic review for leadership styles research in hospitality. Therefore, our study aimed to indicate research outlets publishing leadership research in hospitality, provide a review of research contexts and designs utilized in hospitality research, illustrate the dominant leadership styles in hospitality, and indicate the theories utilized and outcomes of leadership styles. Ultimately, we presented and recommended a map for developing forthcoming research through both theoretical and empirical advancement.
To achieve these aims, our study reviewed 79 articles focused on leadership styles in hospitality. Our review has demonstrated that leadership style research in hospitality has made progress in the past 13 years. However, there are conceptual and empirical overlaps among different leadership styles in hospitality. Additionally, hospitality leadership research is restricted in terms of research contexts and research design. There is a lack of research on antecedents and integration of theories in studies. Our review has revealed that several leadership styles have not been rigorously examined in hospitality research with their outcomes. Through the guidance presented in this review, our hope is to advance and maintain hospitality leadership research to provide substantive insights in the context of hospitality leadership over the coming years.

8. Limitations and future research

Due to the selective, observational, and retrospective nature of the systematic review (Petticrew and Roberts, 2006), the current study was not exempted from limitations. The search strategy used to find articles published in WoS about leadership styles in hospitality was restricted to title to boost the accuracy of the subsequent literature. Future research is recommended to modify the research strategy by applying three parameters: title, abstract, and keywords. Even though WoS is one of the most well-known databases, we suggest that future research includes Science Direct and Scopus. Regardless of these few limitations, the current study is the first to systematically review different leadership styles in hospitality studies.

Appendix 1

Outcomes of each leadership style in hospitality research can be accessed by the following link;

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lG7lUMHx7q-IKh3o9qNBNlwtKpBn-4/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=111728431936331525688&rtpof=true&sd=true
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Table 1
Research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context (C)</td>
<td>1. Which hospitality sectors are analyzed in leadership styles research? What are the research designs employed in research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interventions (I)</td>
<td>2. What are the dominant leadership styles in hospitality research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanisms (M)</td>
<td>3. What are the theories utilized in research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes (O)</td>
<td>4. What are the outcomes of each leadership style utilized in the hospitality context?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Methodology of the systematic review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Web of Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessed by</td>
<td>The Egyptian Knowledge bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key words</td>
<td>“leadership” in combination with a set or keywords related with the sector (hotels, restaurants, hospitality industry, resort, motel, casino, night club, catering and food service business).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion criteria</td>
<td>The focus is on leadership styles in the hospitality industry. The English language is used. Easy access to article through EKB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Journals (select) publishing hospitality leadership styles research year (n=79).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>No. of studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Hospitality Management</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality Research</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Management Perspectives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; Organization Development Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Hospitality Quarterly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Hospitality &amp; Tourism Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism: International Scientific-Professional Journal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work, A Journal of Prevention, Assessment &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic research-Ekonomski istraživanja</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific Management Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Intercultural Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Public Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Journal of Business Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Classification of articles based on hospitality sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of hospitality</th>
<th>No. of studies</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels &amp; golf clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels &amp; resorts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels &amp; catering companies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging &amp; foodservice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Areas and samples of qualitative and quantitative studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of studies</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country/region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees and food producers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative**

**Country/region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/region</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cyprus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden, Poland, Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample**

| Employees               | 40 |
| Managers                | 15 |
| Supervisors and subordinates | 8 |
| Managers and employees  | 5  |
| Managers and customers  | 1  |
| Employees and customers | 1  |
| Supervisors, employees, and customers | 1 |
Table 6
Leadership styles investigated in published hospitality studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>No. of studies</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire leadership (Non-transactional or Non-leadership)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/avoidance leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine &amp; masculine leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machiavellian leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental-transformational leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green transformational leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malevolent leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-centered leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal employee leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>No. of studies</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternalistic leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pygmalion leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: More than one leadership style can be considered in one single study.*

### Table 7

Theories utilized in hospitality leadership styles research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory used</th>
<th>No. of studies</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership theory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership theory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of resources theory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social learning theory</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination theory</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path–goal theory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full factor OR Full-range leadership theory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper echelon theory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic leadership theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need theory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual leadership theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived supervisor support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-enhancement theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cognitive theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contemporary leadership theories
Positive psychological theories
Social contagion theory
Innovation theory
Organizational creativity theory
Cultural psychology theory
Person-environment fit theory
Person-situation interactionist theory
Motivational theory
Item response theory
Effort-recovery theory
Demand-control-support theory
Grounded theory approach
Iso-strain theory
Herzberg’s motivation theory
Psychological contract theory
Work engagement theory
Feedback system theory
Self-efficacy theory
Agency theory
Role theory
Triad communication theory
Service profit chain theory
Trickle-down model of leadership
Implicit leadership
Theory of androgyny
The S-D logic
Trust transfer theory
Pygmalion leadership theory

Note: More than one theory can be considered in one single study.