This dissertation has been microfilmed exactly as received

GEORGE, Norman, 1927-
SUPERVISORS' IDENTIFICATION WITH MANAGEMENT: A STUDY OF COMPARATIVE VALUES AND JOB EFFECTIVENESS.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1962
Economics, commerce—business

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan
SUPERVISORS' IDENTIFICATION WITH MANAGEMENT:

A STUDY OF COMPARATIVE VALUES

AND JOB EFFECTIVENESS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Norman George, B. A., M. B. A.

The Ohio State University
1962

Approved by

Michael J. Jucius
Adviser
Department of Business Organization
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to a number of persons and organizations who have aided in this study. While it is impossible to cite all of them, it is a pleasure to note several whose assistance has been particularly helpful. My adviser, Professor Michael J. Jucius, provided invaluable guidance and inspiration throughout. Dr. Ralph M. Stogdill of the Bureau of Business Research offered important suggestions and advice in the design of the research. Thanks are also due the National Management Association which was instrumental in obtaining the sample.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background of the Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Approach of this Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Comments on Scope and Limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning of &quot;Value&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Objectives of the Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>A SURVEY OF THE RESEARCH LITERATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Behavior and Supervisory Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor-Superior Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility of the Duality Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisory and Higher Management Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biographical Factors in Supervisory Behavior and Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>SCOPE, METHOD, AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope and General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of the Social and Economic Value Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratings of Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration of Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS: VALUE ORIENTATIONS AND EFFECTIVENES</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors(^{t}) and Top Managers(^{t}) Value Orientations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trends of Mean Scores Among the Three Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Identification and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relationships Among Particular Values and Performance Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Superior Relationships and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS: INTER-RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE VALUE DIMENSIONS AND THE EFFECTS OF BIOGRAPHICAL FACTORS</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-relationships Among the Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-relationships Among the Biographical Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Factors and Value Orientations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Factors and Effectiveness Ratings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors(^{t}) and Top Managers(^{t}) Value Orientations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors(^{t}) Value Orientations and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor-Superior Value Differences and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-relationships Among the Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Factors and Value Orientations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Factors and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective on the Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTOBIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Reliability Coefficients for Nine Value Scales Derived Through the Method of Kuder-Richardson</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Value Scores of Supervisors and Top Managers</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations of Value Scores of Supervisors and Immediate Superiors</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Correlations of Five Value Scores with Effectiveness Ratings of One Hundred Twenty-Three Supervisors</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Correlations of Four Value Scores with Effectiveness Ratings of One Hundred Twenty-Three Supervisors</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Correlations of Differences in Value Scores Between Supervisors and Superiors with Effectiveness Ratings of Supervisors</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Inter-Correlations of Value Scale Scores for One Hundred Twenty-Three Supervisors</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Inter-Correlations Among Seven Biographical Factors for One Hundred Twenty-Three Supervisors</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Correlations Between Biographical Factors and Value Scale Scores of One Hundred Twenty-Three Supervisors</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Correlations Between Biographical Factors and Performance Ratings on Fourteen Factors</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, the problems of the first level supervisor in industry have been the concern of many management scholars and practitioners. Judging by the quantity of research literature, no segment of management has been more thoroughly analyzed. And yet many questions concerning the supervisor's organizational role, behavior, and attitudes remain either unanswered or not completely resolved. One of these, the question of whether or not the supervisor identifies himself with management rather than workers and how this may be related to his job effectiveness, is the subject of this study.

It is frequently contended, particularly by top level executives, that the supervisor should identify himself with management since he is, in fact, a member of that group rather than the worker group.

---

1 The term "supervisor" is defined specifically later. For the present, it is defined generally as the first echelon of management. The term "foreman" is to be considered synonymous with supervisor.
Furthermore, the argument continues, the supervisor who considers himself "part of management" is generally more effective than the one who does not.  

This viewpoint has been contested, however, particularly by certain researchers. The results of recent studies, they assert, suggest that it may be more desirable for the supervisor to identify himself with the worker group or even, perhaps, with both the worker group and management. Several of the same researchers have indicated, furthermore, that a factor far more important than the supervisor's group affiliation, as far as his effectiveness is concerned, may well be his relations with his immediate superior. If differences in attitudes and approaches to the job are prevalent between the supervisor and his own boss, the detrimental effect upon his performance is severe, according to their analysis.

The evidence is far from conclusive on the relative importance of both the supervisor's identification with management and his relations with his immediate superior. It is the purpose of this study, therefore, to illuminate both problem areas. Specifically, the intent is to determine, first, whether or not the supervisor who identifies himself more strongly with management tends to be the more effective one and, second, whether or not the relationship between the supervisor

---

2 The reasoning behind this contention is discussed in Chapter II.
and his immediate superior is a relatively more critical factor, as far as his effectiveness is concerned.

With this general statement of the problem and objectives, it is in order now to consider the background of the problem, discuss the general approach and limitations of the study, and define the terms used throughout the dissertation. Having done this, it will then be possible to state the objectives more precisely in terms of the specific hypotheses to be tested.

Background of the Problem

While it may seem that concern about the two related questions involved in the study is a recent development, the problem is rooted in events of the last several decades. Two developments, in particular, figured prominently. The first was the steady dissipation of the supervisor's area of authority. The second was the increased attention given the human relations aspect of industry which resulted in, among other things, a closer scrutiny of the supervisor's role, especially as it affected worker satisfaction and productivity.

The deterioration of the supervisor's area of authority can be attributed largely to the increasing specialization of the management function. Taylor's concept of the "functional foreman," advanced soon after the turn of the century, was a portent of things to come.
for the supervisor. The foreman's job had become too complicated, he said. The solution was to break it down into eight specializations with a foreman assigned responsibility for each. This meant, then, that each worker had eight bosses. This approach was not accepted since it violated one of the cannons of organization theory, unity of command. But Taylor's vision became a fait accompli, nevertheless, as segments of the supervisor's authority were progressively par-tialed out and reassigned to staff specialists.

The growth of labor unions caused further encroachment upon traditional supervisory authority. As procedures, such as hiring, firing, promoting, and disciplining, came within the scope of the union contract, management felt compelled to entrust parts or all of these functions to the personnel specialist.

If the continual loss of authority raised the question of whether or not the supervisor was, in fact, a member of management, human relations research raised the question of whether he should be. Noting the effect of the supervisor on worker morale and productivity, re-searchers began to question whether the supervisor could be strongly management oriented and still be sensitive to the worker's needs and

---

goals. Put simply, is it not better for him to be more like "one of them" instead of management?

The interpersonal orientation of human relations research also drew attention to the supervisor's relationship with his immediate superior. The critical relationship was not that between the supervisor and some nebulous management group. Far more important was the man to man relationship of the supervisor and his immediate superior. Several later studies seemed to support this theory.4

It is clear that, at one point, the role of the supervisor had become ambiguous. Furthermore, there is evidence, as will be pointed out later, that this condition still exists. The nature of the ambiguity is suggested by several vivid terms used to describe the supervisor's situation. Roethlisberger saw him as the "man in the middle" who became the "master and victim of double talk," alluding to his dilemma in trying to resolve conflicting views and attitudes between management and workers.5 Wray described him as the "marginal

4Some representative studies will be discussed in Chapter II.

man," a full-fledged member of neither the management nor worker group, but merely a peripheral member of both. Walker, Guest, and Turner used the term "shock absorber" in describing his role as one who had to absorb pressure from above, but refrain from passing it on below lest he jeopardize good relations with the workers.

Perhaps the clearest evidence of the ambiguity of the supervisor's organizational role was the development of foremen's unions during the early nineteen forties. It is difficult to estimate just how widespread this development might have become since the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly called the Taft-Hartley Act, defined the foreman as part of management for collective bargaining.

---


bargaining purposes. Furthermore, it is generally held that since the "scare" of foremen unionization, management has taken steps to clarify the supervisor's role and enhance his status. However, Mann and Dent probably put the problem in the proper perspective when they commented:

Whether the supervisor is a member of management is an unsettled question. Sometimes he seems to be, and sometimes he seems not to be. The Taft-Hartley Act has defined the supervisor as legally a member of management, but psychologically there still remains an ambiguity that disturbs management and supervisors as well.  

General Approach of this Study

Although specific objectives will be discussed later in this chapter and method, scope, and limitations will be discussed at length in Chapter III, it will help to indicate the general approach in studying the problem. Of prime importance is the method of determining management identification, since this is at the core of the study. The approach adopted was essentially that of reference group theory. That is, an individual's identification with a particular

---

group is held to be dependent upon the extent to which he shares the
group's values ("value" is defined and discussed below). The
assumption is that there are certain values on which managers and
workers differ and these dissimilarities tend to differentiate the two
groups. For example, it is generally held that managers place
greater value on "achievement" or the desirability for advancement
and increased responsibility, than do workers. On the other hand,
it is commonly accepted that workers value job security more highly
than do managers.

Using a paper and pencil questionnaire containing items scaled
by a procedure described in Chapter III, measures on nine values
were obtained for three groups: supervisors, their immediate
superiors, and top managers. The top management group provided
the criteria for management values. A supervisor's tendency to
agree with these criteria were compared with his effectiveness. The
criterion for his effectiveness was a rating completed by his immed­
iate superior. This analysis was the basis for determining the re­
lationship, if any, between the supervisor's management identity
and his effectiveness.

The next step was to determine the differences in values be­
tween the supervisor and his immediate superior and compare these
differences with his effectiveness ratings. In this manner, it was
possible to analyze how the supervisor's effectiveness might be affected by his relationship with his immediate superior, at least in terms of similar or dissimilar values.

General Comments on Scope and Limitations

Although scope and limitations of the study are discussed more fully in Chapter III, a few general observations should be noted. No attempt was made to study all the values that may be relevant to the supervisor's effectiveness. Rather, the aim was to select those which would seem to differentiate management from workers. It should be noted, also, that only one aspect of the relationship between the supervisor and his immediate superior was studied, that of comparative values. This excludes, of course, such factors as attitudes on specific approaches to the job. Finally, it should be noted that the values of workers themselves were not studied. The tendencies of workers' values as compared to management's are inferred. The basis for the inference is discussed later.

Meaning of "Value"

Since the independent variables have been labeled "values," it is essential to clarify the meaning of the term, especially its distinction from "attitude." The distinction is not easily made. The various
definitions of attitude suggest that the common element is a state of mental readiness, or a predisposition, to respond to a stimulus in a characteristic manner. Although value, on the other hand, is usually defined in terms of "desired action," "preference," or something considered "good" or "bad," the meaning appears very similar to that of attitude.

The difference, essentially, is one of degree. Shartle views value as the more stable response, attitude being at the less stable end of a continuum if a reliability measure were applied.\textsuperscript{10} Stogdill notes that a personal value system is a "highly generalized set of expectations" and very resistant to modification.\textsuperscript{11}

For the purposes of this study, differences in degree is considered the basis for distinguishing between the two concepts. Value is viewed as a more stable response, relatively less modifiable, and more generalized than attitude. Thus, for example, "authority" is considered a value when it refers to an individual's

\textsuperscript{10}Carroll L. Shartle, "A Theoretical Framework for the Study of Behavior in Organizations," (Paper for discussion at the Seminar, Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, Nov. 11-13, 1957), p. 5.

general feeling about authority, rather than his feeling about authority in a specific case. This general feeling, furthermore, is not likely to be easily altered.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms are used throughout the study, and it is necessary, at this point, to define them.

The terms first level supervisor, supervisor, and foreman are used interchangeably to refer to that person occupying a position in the first management echelon whose prime function is the day to day task of planning, organizing, and controlling, within prescribed policies and objectives, the job-related activities of a group of hourly workers.

Top manager refers to an executive occupying a position in the highest levels of the organizational units studied. The units studied were manufacturing divisions of multiplant corporations.

Supervisor's superior or immediate superior are used interchangeably to refer to the next higher manager to whom the supervisor reports. His title usually is general foreman or superintendent.

Job performance factors and performance factors are used interchangeably to refer to those responsibilities identified as sub-units of the supervisor's total responsibility. Fourteen such factors are used in this study, including: inspection; research; planning;
preparation of procedures; coordination; evaluation; interpretation; supervision; personnel activities; public relations; professional consultation; negotiations; scheduling, routing, and dispatching; and technical and professional performances.\textsuperscript{12}

Effectiveness ratings refer to judgments of how effectively the supervisor performs on the job factors enumerated above.

Value dimension refers to a group of related value items in a questionnaire that have been scaled and are described by a descriptive term such as "authority" and "security."

Value score refers to the mean score on each of the scales developed.

Value orientation refers to the tendency of a subject to score in a certain direction on the value scales.

Eight value dimensions were scaled and comprise the independent variables used in most of the study. They are defined as follows:

1. Security is a measure of the degree to which the subject places emphasis on steady and assured employment in preference to other values, such as promotional opportunity.

\textsuperscript{12}These performance factors are described in the rating form used to measure effectiveness which will be discussed in Chapter III.
2. **Achievement** is a measure of the degree to which the subject desires to advance occupationally, to "go up" in an organization or assume greater responsibility.

3. **Group membership** is a measure of the degree to which the subject prefers being considered a member of the group and doing things through group activity rather than individually.

4. **Efficiency** is a measure of the degree to which the subject feels that getting things done efficiently and economically is a "good thing" in preference to other values.

5. **Management controls** is a measure of the degree to which the subject feels that control procedures are a "good thing" and should be adhered to rather rigidly.

6. **Authority** is a measure of the degree to which the subject feels authority relationships in general are "good" and are to be preferred to a highly permissive climate or situation.

7. **Enterprise** is a measure of the degree to which the subject feels that risk taking and innovation by the organization or individual is a good thing in preference to "playing it safe."
8. **Government control** is a measure of the degree to which the subject feels that government planning and control of business and economic factors and forces is good and preferential to a tendency toward "laissez-faire."

One last dimension may not clearly be defined as a value. This is **perceived mobility**. This is a measure of the degree to which a subject feels that there are opportunities for advancing and "going up" in our society today as compared to conditions earlier. While many social scientists infer a value from a scaled response on this dimension, it may seem more correct to label it a belief. It does seem to refer to what the subject **thinks actually exists** rather than to what he would **prefer to exist**. Regardless of what it is called, this dimension is included because of its close connection with the first two dimensions above. Purely for the sake of convenience, it will be referred to as one of the values.

**Specific Objectives of the Study**

With the foregoing background, it is now possible to state the objectives precisely in terms of the specific hypotheses to be tested. Before doing this, however, it is well to review the general statement of the objectives. The first objective is to determine whether or not the supervisor who identifies himself more strongly with management,
in terms of sharing similar values, tends to be the more effective supervisor. The second objective is to determine whether or not the supervisor's relationship with his immediate superior, in terms of similar or differing values, is related with his effectiveness.

While these are the major objectives, a supplementary objective is noted at this point. This is to determine what other factors, within the limitations of the data collected, may serve to explain differences, if any, in the supervisor's values and effectiveness. The factors to be examined are biographical data and the inter-relationships among the values themselves. The purpose of this supplementary analysis is simply to bring out any factors that may help to explain differences in values and effectiveness for whatever light they may throw on the problem.

It was proposed to achieve the objectives by testing the following three major hypotheses:

1. There is a difference in value orientations between supervisors and top managers on those value dimensions generally associated, positively or negatively, with top management.

2. There is a relationship between supervisors' value orientations and their effectiveness ratings. The closer the supervisor's value scores approximate those of the top managers, the higher their effectiveness ratings tend to be. Conversely, the greater the differences, the lower their effectiveness ratings tend to be.

3. There is a relationship between supervisors' effectiveness ratings and differences between their value orientations and
those of their immediate superiors. The greater the differences, the lower the ratings tend to be. Conversely, the smaller the differences, the higher the ratings tend to be.

Before testing the second hypothesis, it was necessary to test several minor ones. This was simply a matter of hypothesizing in which direction the differences in value orientations between supervisors and top managers would occur.

The supplementary objective was met by testing the general hypothesis that some relationships exist between biographical factors and values, and between biographical factors and effectiveness ratings. Also hypothesized was that some relationships exist among the value dimensions themselves.

Order of Presentation

Having outlined the problem and discussed the approach and objectives of the study in this chapter, a survey of previous research bearing on the problem will be summarized in Chapter II. In Chapter III, the scope, method, and limitations will be discussed. In Chapter IV, the data compiled will be presented to test the three major hypotheses. In Chapter V, the data for analyzing the effects of biographical factors and inter-relationships among the value dimensions will be reported. In Chapter VI, the results will be discussed and interpreted. In Chapter VII, the study will be summarized, conclusions drawn, and recommendations made for action and further study.
CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF THE RESEARCH LITERATURE

A survey of the research literature will help place the problem in proper perspective, indicating in greater detail what work has been done and what remains to be done. The survey will show considerable basis, the writer believes, for the logic of the approach adopted in this study. It will also indicate which of the variables in this study have some research basis for their selection. The review will cover the research pertinent to the problem under the following headings:

1. Leadership behavior and supervisory effectiveness
2. Supervisor-superior relationships
3. Supervisors' group identification
4. Supervisory and higher management values
5. Biographical factors in supervisory behavior and values

Leadership Behavior and Supervisory Effectiveness

The heaviest emphasis of research on supervision has been upon the factors that differentiate the effective from the less effective supervisor. This was the case in three groups of studies often regarded among the most important in recent years. These were the
researches undertaken at the University of Michigan, The Ohio State University, and the University of Southern California. At first glance, it seems that all of these studies have provided evidence for one basic generalization about the behavior of effective supervisors. This is that, generally, those supervisors whose behavior reflects more sensitivity to the interpersonal rather than the technical aspects of the job appear to perform better. The Michigan studies described two contrasting types of behavior as "personnel-centered" and "production-centered." The Ohio State studies used the terms "consideration" and "initiating structure" in describing a similar dichotomy. The kind of behavior described by both groups is roughly the same. The supervisor registering high on the personnel-centered and consideration dimensions tends to perform in a manner that shows concern for the feelings and personal relations among his work group. The supervisor who scores high on the production-centered and initiating structure dimensions tends to perform in a way that is characterized by emphasis on the technical aspects of the job such as planning the work, defining functional relationships, and directing activities. Some of the earlier results seemed to support the conclusion that the personnel-centered and consideration-oriented supervisor performed more effectively. Kahn and Katz, summarizing the studies of the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center, said that
one of the four main characteristics of supervisory behavior consistently related to high productivity and work group morale was the quality of "supportiveness" or "employee-orientation." Pfiffner, reporting on the work at the University of Southern California, summarized the findings as tentatively indicating that the better supervisors: are good team workers; practice the art of personnel counseling; communicate to others and listen to workers; and are effective disciplinarians, but not "martinet." Results of the Ohio State studies were not nearly so conclusive as the foregoing seemed to be. Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt found a relationship between a high score on the consideration factor and the worker performance factors of absenteeism, accidents, grievances, and turnover. However, using the criteria of supervisors' ratings for effectiveness, initiating structure correlated higher in the case of supervisors connected with the production units, especially where the pressure of a demanding time schedule in the work was prevalent.


15 Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt, op. cit., p. 86.
It is hazardous to conclude that the employee-centered or consideration type of supervisory behavior is more effective, even in a general sense. The Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt study did not support this. Even Kahn and Katz, noting the exceptions in the Michigan studies, suggest that supervisors tending toward both types of behavior can be effective. 16

Other researches also tend to contradict the notion that the employee-centered and consideration types of supervisory behavior are generally more effective. Fiedler, for example, studied a large number of organizations of a variety of types, including many industrial concerns, and found that the psychologically distant leaders of task groups are more effective than leaders who tend toward warmer, psychologically closer, interpersonal relations with their subordinates. 17 Although not in an industrial setting, Halpin found, in a

16Kahn and Katz, _op. cit._, p. 558.

study of eighty-nine commanders of B-29 aircraft flying missions over Korea, that initiating structure correlated highly with superiors' ratings. 18

With so many qualifications and exceptions, one can now readily accept Shartle's judgment, made in 1956, that the findings justified only hypotheses. 19 Furthermore, the above studies themselves revealed that many other factors weighed heavily on supervisory effectiveness, especially the supervisor's relationship with his own superior, as will be discussed below.

One final observation concerning this area of research is pertinent to the present study. Even though researches attempted to concentrate primarily on behavior, attitudes and values could not be disassociated. Many of the studies dealt with the supervisor's and his superior's perceptions and opinions of the leader behavior observed and their concept of the ideal pattern of supervisory behavior. Those perceptions and opinions proved of prime importance,


19 Shartle, op. cit., p. 148.
often a determinant of the kind of behavior adopted. Thus, value judgments entered in, even when observable behavior was the focus of the study.

Supervisor-Superior Relationships

Perhaps the classic study reflecting the great importance of the supervisor's relations with his own superior as a factor in his behavior and effectiveness is the work of Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt. The prime purpose of this very intensive study was to evaluate the effects of the International Harvester Company's two-week foreman training school. The elaborate design included data from the foremen, their superiors, and their work groups. The immediate effect of the training was to cause foremen to favor the consideration mode a little more and initiating structure a little less. Foremen behavior and attitudes were then studied after they had been back on the job for several months.

An elaborate design provided a wealth of information. Information obtained from foremen themselves included: their opinion on how a foreman should lead; their description of how their superiors actually did lead; and, their description of how they think their boss wants them to lead. The foremen's superiors provided information on how they think foremen should lead, and how they think they should

\[20\] Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt, op. cit.
lead their foremen. The foremen's workers described how they think the foremen should lead, and how their foremen actually do lead. It is seen, then, that the design provided for not only perceived actual behavior, but, also, value judgments on what supervisory behavior should be like. Relationships of these factors with supervisory effectiveness were then observed. The criteria for effectiveness included both ratings of the foremen by their superiors and "hard criteria," including data on absenteeism, accidents, grievances, and turnover.

The analyses produced many very interesting results. Of prime concern here are those dealing with the foremen's relations with their superiors. In fact, the authors concluded that the most important factor affecting the foremen's leader behavior was "organizational climate," denoting, essentially, relations between the foremen and their bosses. When foremen operated under superiors who themselves were high in consideration, their workers described them as high in consideration. The same relationship prevailed for initiating structure. Furthermore, in the case of those foremen who did change attitudes immediately following the training, if the change conflicted with the attitudes and behavior of their superiors, they reverted to their old patterns. In other words, if the old way
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21 Ibid, p. 44. 22 Ibid, pp. 54-55.
was still the preferred way, that was the way the foremen would do it. 23

These findings prompted the researchers to find out whether or not conflict was induced by training foremen in ways contrary to those of their bosses. They did this by developing a "discrepancy score" through comparing foremen's attitudes and their reported behavior. The results verified that conflict was induced. 24

The above research is indicative of a tendency of practically all studies of supervisors' effectiveness. Inevitably, the supervisor-superior relationship emerges as one of the most important factors. Pfiffner, in the study cited earlier, reached this conclusion. He found that the effective supervisors invariably tended to reflect confidence in their superiors which, in turn, was reciprocated. 25 Kahn and Katz, in their summary of the Michigan studies, emphasized the importance of "climate," in terms of supervisor-superior relationships, as a determinant of supervisory behavior. 26 As one example, they point to a study of an insurance company, in which the lower-producing supervisors revealed the effects of restrictive supervisory

25 Pfiffner, op. cit., p. 534.
methods by their superiors. As a contrasting example, they cite a study of an agricultural equipment factory, in which higher-producing supervisors reflected a more permissive and compatible attitude by higher management.

Buchanan, studying the effects of a training program involving 154 first level supervisors, reached conclusions similar to Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt. Ghiselli and Barthol confirmed the hypothesis that members of lower echelons of management who are like members of higher echelons in their self-perceptions are most likely to win approval by their superiors.

Rosen, prompted by previous work suggesting the necessity of managers integrating their roles as both subordinates and superiors, set out to verify that the integration process is heavily weighted toward satisfying the demands of the immediate superiors, rather than those of the immediate subordinates. His study of three managerial levels confirmed that managers tend to have an upward

\[ \text{27}^{\text{Paul C. Buchanan, "Factors Making for Effective Supervisory Training," Personnel, XXXIV, 5 (March-April, 1958), p. 53.}} \]

orientation, although they still are aware of and seem receptive to
the demands placed on them by their subordinates. 29

In summary, the evidence is impressive that the supervisor's
relations with his own superior is a vital factor in his effectiveness
and style of leadership. The pressure upon the supervisor to think
and act like the boss is considerable. If conflict in perceptions
exist, the organizational climate is detrimental, weighing negatively
on the supervisor's effectiveness.

Supervisors' Group Identification

The concern of many for keeping first level supervisors identi-

cified with management has already been noted. The Opinion Research
Corporation has periodically conducted surveys to determine the
foremen's feelings about being "part of management." The fact
that these surveys are financed by many companies representing a
very large portion of industry is indicative of top management's
interest in the problem. 30 In one of the reports, for example,

29 Hjalmar Rosen, "Managerial Role Interaction: A Study of
Three Managerial Levels," Journal of Applied Psychology, XLIV, 1
(1961), p. 30-34.

30 This information is based on the author's discussions with
officials of the Opinion Research Corporation at Princeton, New
Jersey and at Dayton, Ohio, in meetings taking place during 1959
and 1960.
management was warned that foremen-management relations showed signs of strain. The percentage of responses indicating that foremen were part of management dipped from sixty-nine, in 1954, to sixty-five in 1957.  

Perhaps symbolic of management's attitude toward the problem are the remarks of Glenn Gardner, long associated with the problems of foremanship, made in a special report published by the Foremanship Foundation. The need for developing better foremen, he said, is to insure efficient production of quality goods and services at competitive prices.  

To accomplish this, the company needs:

1. Foremen who regard themselves as members of management, so that they command the respect of those who work for them and hence get effective results at a minimum cost.

2. Foremen capable of assuming higher management responsibility. No company can long remain competitive unless it grows, nor can it grow unless people at the bottom of the management ladder are growing and infusing higher echelons with a vital supply of management talent.

---


A logical question is whether or not foremen who do identify with management are the more effective supervisors. In a definitive study on this problem, Balma, Maloney, and Lawshe found that there was a significant, but low, relationship between foremen identification with management and their effectiveness, as determined by superiors' ratings of the productivity of the foremen's work group. However, they found a great deal of variability on the degree of management identification from plant to plant. Among the nineteen plants studied, the mean scores of each plant group, compared with the over-all mean score in the total sample, broke down as follows: Seven were about average; six were considerably above average; and six were considerably below average. Viewing the relationship between foremen identification with management and their effectiveness on a plant to plant basis, it was found that in some instances the relationship was positive, in some it was not significant, and in some, it was even negative.

In the same study the authors found no relationship between the workers' attitudes toward the foremen and the work group's

---

productivity. Nor did they find any relationship between worker's attitudes toward the foremen and the foremen's identification with management.

In short, this study provided very little support for either side of the question of whether or not the better foremen identify themselves more with management or with the workers. Although some relationship was found tending to favor management identification, it was so low and the variability among plants so great that no conclusion could be drawn.

In view of the similarity between the study described above and this research, some further observations are warranted. Although the basic problem was similar, the methods of measuring management identification were different. The method used by Balma, Maloney, and Lawshe to measure management identification was a type of questionnaire construction commonly called error-choice method. The method, basically, is to confront the subject with a choice of several statements, relating to some business or economic question of fact, none of which is correct, but some of

---

which are more nearly correct than others. The degree of error, then, is the basis for measuring management identification.

A discussion of the effectiveness of this method is beyond the scope of this dissertation, except to note that it has been questioned, as has practically every scaling device. But it should be noted that the result is a unidimensional measure of identification. An advantage of the "values" approach of this study is that several dimensions can be examined, permitting a wider range of areas of identification or agreement.

Some support is found for the hypothesis that supervisors should identify themselves with both management and the workers. Mann and Dent argue strongly for its feasibility and desirability. They found a positive relationship between those supervisors who "pull both for the company and the workers" and their effectiveness ratings. The supervisors exhibiting this attitude in the eyes of the workers were also rated highest by management. On the other hand, those seen by workers to be "pulling only for the company or themselves" were rated lower by management. The authors concluded that it is both possible and necessary for supervisors to identify themselves with both the workers and management, and management must recognize and accept this dual role. Furthermore, the

---

\[35\text{Mann and Dent, op. cit., pp. 103-112.}\]
supervisor's effectiveness in successfully fulfilling this dual role
may be hindered by programs designed by top management "to ensure
that the supervisor feels he belongs to management." 

As to the feasibility of the duality theory, the authors suggest
that the proportion of supervisors who feel "caught in the middle" has
been overstated. Their research revealed that only forty-seven per­
cent of the supervisors felt this way. Nevertheless, this still seems
a rather high percentage.

Feasibility of the Duality Theory

One can readily accept, as a general statement, that an individ­
ual can identify himself with several groups. But what about identify­
ing himself with two groups that are often in conflict? Supporters
of the duality theory concede that for their theory to work, conflict
between management and the workers must be at a minimum.
Argyris, for one, doubts that such conditions exist generally. For
example, he says, the supervisor often is in the middle of a conflict
between different worker and management values regarding efficiency
and controls. Only when management-employee relationships are

\[36\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 112.}\]
compatible, he asserts, is the conflict situation not likely to be felt by the supervisor. 37

If basic values are in conflict, it appears difficult for the supervisor to identify himself with both groups. As Merton and Kitt put it, if a group with which an individual has identified himself ceases to reinforce his values and attitudes, he tends more to orient himself to an outgroup, the detachment from the former group becoming more or less complete. 38

In summary, it appears likely that if the line between management and the workers is sharply defined and conflicting attitudes and viewpoints are prevalent, the supervisor is likely to feel great pressures for identifying himself with one or the other group. The dualists do not dispute this. They say it simply emphasizes management's responsibility for fostering integration of the goals of the two groups. Furthermore, they assert, the supervisor is the logical agent through whom this can be accomplished to a considerable extent.


Accordingly, management should sympathize with and encourage a dual role for the supervisor.

But it seems to the writer that the dualist theory is faced with one possible pitfall. Even if management is sympathetic with this approach, there is the possibility that the supervisor's role will become ambiguous, not only to higher level managers and workers, but to the supervisor himself. It is not difficult to imagine managers and workers alike wondering where the supervisor stands, or should stand, on certain important issues. If such a condition exists, the most confused party is likely to be the supervisor himself.

That ambiguity in the role of a manager can be quite detrimental to his effectiveness was confirmed by Wispe and Thayer in a study of agents and managers in a life insurance company. They found that when the role of the assistant manager was unclear, not only to him, but to agents and other managers, the result was that the assistant manager became anxious and his effectiveness decreased. Lending further support to the undesirability of role ambiguity, Evans found that widespread disagreement between the

---

supervisor and his superior over his areas of responsibility had a bad effect on his performance.  

Supervisory and Higher Management Values

The similarities and differences between supervisors' and higher managers' values can often be traced to basic cultural values which seem to pervade our society. Williams' studies identified certain value orientations in American society, some of which are particularly pertinent to this study. He found a very strong sentiment toward "achievement" as a good thing. The idea clearly pervades our society, he said, that personal achievement, especially in the form of occupational success, is to be honored and valued. Williams also noted a "love of bigness," a high regard for "activity" or "work," "efficiency and practicality," and a strong orientation toward "progress."

---


The variation in value orientations among different occupational strata is of prime significance in this study. Viteles documented evidence showing that the lower socio-economic classes value security more than do the higher strata. Stagner's survey also confirmed that the lower socio-economic classes show a much stronger orientation toward economic security.

Stagner, however, cautioned against over-generalization in contrasting executives' and workers' values. While workers are more security conscious, and this difference stands out rather markedly, most differences are a matter of degree, he argues. Noting executives' emphasis on mobility, prestige, and status, he held that workers also value "moving up." But the level of aspiration of the workers, he acknowledged, is far below that of executives. Hyman supported Stagner's conclusion that the lower strata place more emphasis on job security and have lower aspirations for prestige and status.

---


44 Ibid., pp. 146-147.

Gardner and Rainwater drew similar conclusions on the security factor in describing the "middle major" or "mass market group" which includes 65% of the market group. This group includes the families of clerical and white collar workers, salesmen, craftsmen, small business proprietors, semi-skilled workers, and service employees. Among other differences, this group was more inclined to favor government as a strong power to oppose big business and counter-balance its influence. It was not that they opposed bigness as such, but they sensed that its power required regulation.

Since it is reasonable to assume that most supervisors came from the ranks of hourly workers, it is logical to expect differences in value orientations between them and higher level managers. Before considering the evidence, however, it is well to note the results of some studies on occupational mobility since this may be an important factor in executives' values, as will be explained later. Several studies indicated that occupational mobility, or opportunities for advancement, had increased over the past several decades. For example, Newcomer found that an increasing percentage of executives


47 Ibid.
achieved their position by working their way up, rather than by virtue of inheritance, investment, or having organized the company. \(^{48}\) The trend was steady. In 1900, it was 17.9 percent; in 1925, it was 37.4 percent; and in 1950, it was 50.8 percent. Warner and Abegglen reached the same conclusion, noting that between 1928 and 1952, more lower status people were becoming business executives, regardless of background. \(^{49}\) In view of this, it would seem that some of the bases for differences in values and attitudes between managers and workers have been removed, or at least reduced, since the trend is toward a more similar socio-economic background. Nevertheless, the differences are still there. In fact, the differences themselves are frequently cited as the factors that explain why some people advance to higher positions and some do not.

One approach to identifying the differences is to consider the motivational factors that set high level executives apart from others.

---


in our society. Henry, in a clinical study of over one hundred business executives, found three such characteristics that predominated: a very strong desire and drive for achievement; a strong mobility motivation, that is, the desire for increased status and responsibility; and a positive feeling toward authority as a necessary environmental element for organizational success.  

Pellegrin and Coates attempted to identify the specific differences between supervisors and higher level executives. They studied samples of fifty top executives and fifty first level supervisors, carefully selected and matched according to age and length of company service. These subjects represented a variety of industries in a large southern industrial city. The study focused on the two groups' definition of career success. They found that the executives considered mobility to upper levels essential for success and for satisfying feelings of esteem and accomplishment. Supervisors, on the other

---


52 Ibid., p. 517.
hand, showed far lower aspirations and less mobility drive. They considered success to have been achieved upon attainment of personal and family security, respect, and happiness. The authors generalized that, for executives, the job is a goal in itself. For supervisors, it is simply a means to an end. Furthermore, it was also noted that supervisors do not tend to revise their goals upward after attaining a supervisory level position, seeming to contradict a widely held theory that, as lower level and more basic needs are satisfied, higher level ones replace them as the source of motivational drives.

One other factor is worth noting regarding supervisors' levels of aspiration. Stagner, surveying the literature, cautioned that while the level of aspiration typically set by the worker is far below that of the executive, the desire to move up is still important to him. It is essential, then, that perceived opportunities for promotion be present.

In summary, the research lends good support to the achievement and perceived mobility values in contrasting executive motivation with that of other segments of the population, including first level supervisors. Also, the indications are substantial that the executive places less value on job assurance and security than does the worker.

53 Ibid., p. 517. 54 Ibid., p. 512. 55 Ibid., p. 513. 56 Stagner, op. cit., p. 147.
Beyond these values, the evidence seems fragmentary, justifying hypotheses rather than conclusions.

Biographical Factors in Supervisory Behavior and Values

Few of the studies in supervisory behavior and values focused on biographical factors primarily, but some evidence concerning their effects were noted. Balm a, Maloney, and Lawshe found that the supervisors' age seemed to be related negatively to management identification. The differences in scores between each category of age group was not statistically significant, but the trend was consistent. On the other hand, education did correlate significantly with management identification, with the more educated supervisors showing a consistently stronger management orientation. Pellegrin and Coates found that age was a crucial factor in supervisors' levels of aspiration, the relationship being negative. Numerous studies, including several cited above, seemed to establish clearly that age is positively related to the job security value.


58 Pellegrin and Coates, op. cit., p. 513.
Summary

In summary, two factors seem to stand out in the research reviewed. The first is the apparent relevance of basic motivational factors in all aspects of supervisory and managerial behavior. Even when the research attempted to concentrate on purely behavioral factors, the significance of attitudes and values could not be avoided. The second factor is the strong indication that basic attitudes and values are the discriminating elements in explaining why some people advance to higher positions and others do not, and, also, why, at the same positional level, certain individuals appear more successful than others. Both of these factors suggest that the study of values as an important factor in supervisory effectiveness is a valid approach to the problem.
CHAPTER III
SCOPE, METHOD, AND LIMITATIONS
OF THE STUDY

Having outlined the problem, discussed the general plan of the study, and reviewed the pertinent research literature, it is now appropriate to consider the scope, method, and limitations of the study. These aspects will be discussed in this chapter under the following topic headings:

1. Scope and general plan
2. Development of the social and economic value scale
3. Ratings of effectiveness
4. Sample design
5. Administration of data collection
6. Statistical analysis
7. Limitations of the study

Scope and General Plan

As indicated earlier, the general objective of the study was to determine, first, whether or not the supervisor who identifies himself more closely with management tends to be the more effective
supervisor and, second, whether or not the supervisor's relationship with his immediate superior may be a relatively more critical factor than management identification, as far as his effectiveness is concerned. To accomplish this objective required, at the very outset, decisions on two matters: first, how to measure management identification; and, second, what aspect of the supervisor's relationship with his superior to study. In both cases, the approach adopted was to study the value orientations of the groups involved. The rationale of this approach, in the case of measuring management identification, is that an individual's group identification is determined by the extent to which he shares the group's basic values. In the case of the second phase of the problem, the theory is that relations between the supervisor and his superior are conditioned significantly by similarities or conflicts in value orientations.

The selection of the values was an important factor, since the assumption was that differences on these values tend to discriminate between a management orientation and a worker orientation. The nine values finally selected were the following: perceived mobility, security, achievement, group membership, efficiency, management controls, authority, enterprise, and government controls. As was seen in Chapter II, there is considerable research evidence that managers and workers differ on security and achievement. The
evidence on the others is fragmentary at best and their selection was made, essentially, on an a priori basis.

Since value scales for all nine dimensions were either not available from other sources or were unsatisfactory for purposes of this study, it was necessary to develop a measuring instrument.\textsuperscript{59} The development of the instrument will be discussed below, but it should be noted at this point that the questionnaire, labeled "Social and Economic Value Scale," provided for biographical data of each respondent in addition to the measurement of his value orientations.

Another problem that had to be resolved before proceeding with the research was the decision on what criteria to use for determining the supervisor's effectiveness. It was finally decided to rely on ratings by the supervisor's superior, using a form developed by the Bureau of Business Research at The Ohio State University. The form calls for ratings on each of fourteen performance factors. The rating form, and the decision to use it, will be discussed more fully below.

These basic decisions having been made, and the scales having been developed, the procedure for carrying out the research was, first, to select the subjects to be included in the study; next, to arrange for the collection of the data; and, finally, to analyze the

\textsuperscript{59}A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.
data. Each of these steps will be discussed more fully, but an outline of the general approach at this point will help maintain the proper perspective of the complete task.

The sample design included three groups: supervisors, who completed the value scales questionnaire; the supervisors' immediate superiors, who, in addition to the value scales questionnaire, completed a rating form on each of the supervisors; and, top managers, who completed the value scales questionnaire.

The distribution and collection of the forms within each company was handled by an official designated by the top management of each participating firm to act as coordinator for the project. The coordinators were all briefed by the writer on all aspects of the study, particularly procedures to be used in distributing and collecting the data.

The final phase of the research, exclusive of reporting and interpreting the results in this dissertation, was the statistical analysis of the data. The first step was to compare the means of the value scores of the supervisors with those of the top managers. This disclosed on which values the two groups differed and, thus, which ones should be used as the criteria of management value orientations. The supervisors' scores were then correlated with their effectiveness ratings. This was the method used to determine the
the relationship between management identification and effectiveness. Then the supervisors' effectiveness ratings were correlated with differences in value scores between them and their immediate superiors. This was the method of determining what effect the relationship with superiors had upon the supervisors' effectiveness. The correlations of biographical factors with value scores and with effectiveness ratings were used to determine what relationship biographical factors may have had with these two variables. Finally, inter-correlations among the value scores indicated what relationships may exist among the values themselves.

With this over-all picture, attention may now be turned to a more detailed examination of the methods and procedures.

Development of the Social and Economic Value Scale

The method of summated ratings was used to develop the nine scales. The procedure consisted of obtaining or writing a number of statements for each scale, and, then, applying a five point scale by instructing the respondent to indicate the degree to which he agreed or disagreed with each statement. A total of one hundred and sixty-five items was used, most of which were written by the author.

The only items included which were not written by the author were several standard statements for the authority scale, selected from Adorno's basic work on authoritarianism. 61

The value scales were item-analyzed to measure their reliability. This was done by computing coefficients of reliability for the scales, using the method of a modified Kuder-Richardson formula, Number Eight. 62 Low correlations for eleven of the items resulted in those items being dropped from the scales. This caused an improvement in the Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients for three of the scales. The final reliability coefficients for each of the nine scales are listed in Table I.


TABLE 1

Reliability Coefficients for Nine Value Scales Derived
Through the Method of Kuder-Richardson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dimension</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Mobility</td>
<td>.8178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>.8178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.7153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>.7617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>.7387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Controls</td>
<td>.6970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>.7074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>.7154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Control</td>
<td>.8247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Kuder-Richardson coefficients were probably as good as could be expected in the initial development of a group of scales. However, if the scales are to be used in the future, it is desirable to work at improving the items in order to achieve an even higher reliability, particularly for those scales with the lower coefficients.
Certain factors should be kept in mind about the kind of information produced by the method of summed ratings. The data are best used to show relationships rather than the strength of feelings on each of the values. In other words, what will be indicated by the statistical data is, for example, how supervisors feel about security relative to the feelings of top managers. What is not indicated is whether supervisors have a generally strong or weak feeling toward security per se. Had it been the purpose to obtain a more generalized measure of the values, that is, an indication of the "highness" or "lowness" of feeling on each scale, it may have been better to use a procedure called the "method of equal appearing intervals." In this method, the items are weighted in advance by a panel of "judges" to establish a measure of "highness" or "lowness." But even here, there is a question on how validly this method measures the various degrees of feeling. At any rate, since the problem of this research centers on relationships, the method of summed ratings seemed to best serve the purposes.

One final factor regarding the data should be noted. A comparison between values is not meaningful. One should avoid, for
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example, comparing supervisors' mean scores on authority with those on achievement. This is because the data involves sums and, since the number of items in each scale was not standardized, the basis for comparison is lacking.

Ratings of Effectiveness

As indicated earlier, it was decided to rely upon the supervisors' ratings of the supervisors as the criteria of the supervisors' effectiveness. Some comment is in order on why this decision was made. While the method adopted has obvious limitations, no alternative seemed either feasible or desirable. The only alternative, basically, was to try to collect some "hard criteria." These would be data on such factors as production, quality, and so forth. While, at first glance, these may seem to be more objective criteria than the supervisors' ratings, the objectivity can be quite deceiving. How, for example, can it be said that one supervisor's production record is better than another's when the difference might well be attributed to such extenuating circumstances as a high number of "rush" orders, or a shortage of skilled labor?

Even when such "contaminating" factors are reduced or eliminated, the validity of the hard criteria can be questionable. For example, Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt, in the work cited previously,
found that, after eliminating contaminating factors, hard criteria were valid only on four factors: absenteeism, accidents, grievances, and turnover.\textsuperscript{64} The obvious question is how can it be certain that these are the most important criteria of the supervisor's effectiveness? It is interesting to note that the authors of that study recognized this shortcoming by adding superiors' ratings as another criteria of supervisors' effectiveness.

At any rate, as Shartle pointed out, the difficulty of obtaining valid hard criteria is such that there seems little alternative but to use superiors' ratings.\textsuperscript{65} Furthermore, there are some studies to show that such ratings, in spite of their apparent subjectivity, are generally quite valid, perhaps far more so than many believe.

The form used in this study was the "Ratings of Individual Effectiveness" developed by the Bureau of Business Research at the Ohio State University. This rating form had been used in a number of studies with satisfactory results. It calls for an evaluation of the supervisor's effectiveness in fourteen areas of job responsibility which were found, by previous research, to be descriptive of the supervisor's main functions. The fourteen factors included the following: inspection; research; planning; preparation of procedures;

\textsuperscript{64}Fleishman, Harris, and Burtt, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 68.

\textsuperscript{65}Shartle, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 145-146.
coordination; evaluation; interpretation; supervision; personnel activities; public relations; professional consultation; negotiations; scheduling, routing, and dispatching; and technical and professional performances.

The form contains an explanation of each factor in familiar terminology to assist the rater. The rater's procedure was, first, to rank the responsibilities in order of the supervisor's effectiveness in carrying them out. For example, if the rater felt that the supervisor in question was best at planning, he ranked that factor first. Next, the rater indicated how the supervisor compared with the company average on each responsibility by marking a scale whose opposite limits were labeled "low" and "high."

Scores were derived by averaging the value assigned to the rankings and the value assigned to the comparisons. The result was a score for each of the fourteen performance factors, rather than a single score for over-all effectiveness. While something is lost by foregoing the over-all rating, the compensating advantages more than make up for this, in the writer's view. The multidimensional ratings permit an analysis of the relationships between value scores and specific job areas. The advantage of this approach will be seen more clearly when the data are presented in subsequent chapters.
Sample Design

The nature of the sample is, of course, of crucial importance in any research. As indicated earlier, the research design called for data from three groups: supervisors, their immediate superiors, and top managers. The first group consisted of one hundred and twenty-seven first level supervisors. The second group included thirty-three second echelon managers, whose titles usually were general foreman or superintendent. The third group was comprised of twenty-seven top managers, whose titles, typically, were vice president, general manager, or works manager.

In selecting the companies, steps were taken to minimize bias. In all, seven companies participated. Five of these were located in Ohio, one in Texas, and one in Illinois. The Texas and Illinois firms together provided almost one half of the total sample, thus minimizing possible "Ohio bias." The companies ranged in size from five hundred employees to twelve thousand. They represented a diversified line of products, including aircraft parts, steel gears and pinions, laminated plastics, office paper forms, paints, missiles, and power equipment.

66 Some of the analyses made use of the data from only one hundred and twenty-three supervisors, four having been dropped because of insufficient data for purposes of that part of the research.
To minimize bias in selecting the individual supervisors, it was decided to include all supervisors in a single unit, rather than sample several different units. To explain further, the unit, in the case of the smaller company, was the entire plant. Therefore, all their supervisors were included. In the larger company, however, the unit was one manufacturing department. Accordingly, all the supervisors of only that one department were included. In such cases, every effort was made to avoid selecting an atypical department. Using this approach, then, the size of company samples ranged from thirteen to forty-three. The returns from within each unit were not complete, primarily because of such factors as illnesses, vacations, and transfers. In spite of these factors, however, the rate of return still averaged from eighty to ninety percent. Furthermore, the company coordinators reported that they saw no indications that the supervisors who did not return the questionnaires were in any way atypical.

Although indisputable representativeness cannot be claimed, it is felt that a satisfactory and useful degree of representativeness was achieved in the sample.

Administration of Data Collection

A simple method of data collection was used which proved both convenient and effective. As mentioned earlier, a coordinator was
designated in each company to administer the data collection. Through personal visits, telephone calls, and letters, the coordinators were thoroughly briefed by the writer on the procedure to be followed. The plan was to give each participant the proper material in a large envelope. Upon completion of the questionnaire and, where appropriate, the rating forms, the individual was to return them in a sealed envelope. It was suggested that the coordinator, or his assistant, distribute and collect the data personally. This would permit a verbal explanation of instructions to reinforce the written instructions on the first page of the value scales questionnaire. This was done in all cases except one. In that one instance, the material was routed through company mail, with a note attached to each envelope providing specific instructions and emphasizing company approval of the study.

It is always difficult to assess how much a participant may be influenced in his responses by the thought that his anonymity might not be protected. In this study, the coordinators observed no evidences of anxiety. In fact, several of them reported considerable interest in the study to the extent that numerous requests were received for a copy of any publication of the findings. Based on such reports, and the fact that the value scales questionnaire contains no reference to specific company practices or situations, it seems reasonable that bias of this nature was minimal.
Statistical Analysis

If any confidence was to be had in the conclusions that might be derived, it was decided at the outset, then all data should be subject to the strictest standards of statistical analysis. In testing the significance of relationships, therefore, a minimal five percent level was established. No interpretation is based on a mean difference or correlation failing to meet this standard. Statistical significance at both the five percent and one percent level is noted in all the data reported in the study. Significant relationships among the value scores were tested by the method of the significance of the difference between two means. Relationships in all other instances involved correlational analysis and significance in those cases was by reference to Fisher's tables of values of the correlation coefficients for different levels of significance.  

Limitations

As is true in all researches, there are limitations in this study and the most important ones should be noted. First, the number of companies included in the study is relatively small. It cannot be said, therefore, that scientifically this is a representative sample. On the other hand, steps were taken, as indicated above, to minimize the
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possible biases. Another limitation is the fact that the sample of supervisors and their superiors is confined to manufacturing personnel. This is a factor to consider when reaching conclusions since, as pointed out earlier, there is some indication that production and non-production supervisors differ in attitudes and behavior patterns. Finally, certain limitations are inherent in the focus of the study. In selecting the nine values, other possibly important ones are excluded. Likewise, by using values as the focal point of the supervisor-superior relationship, other aspects of that relationship are excluded.

In spite of the limitations, the study does promise to throw light on a considerable problem area. Within the bounds of the scope, method, and limitations, much can be learned. What this is will be noted in the next and following chapters.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS: VALUE ORIENTATIONS

AND EFFECTIVENESS

It is now appropriate to examine the data compiled specifically in connection with this study. All relevant data will be reported in this chapter to test the three major hypotheses. Thus, the evidence uncovered by this research will be reviewed for determining whether or not the supervisor who identifies himself with management tends to be more effective than the one who does not. Likewise, the evidence for determining whether or not the supervisor's effectiveness is influenced by his relationship with his immediate superior will be considered. The data in this chapter will be discussed under the following headings:

1. Supervisors' and top managers' value orientations
2. Trends of mean scores among the three groups
3. Management identification and effectiveness
4. Relationships among particular values and performance factors
5. Supervisor-superior relationship and effectiveness
Supervisors' and Top Managers' Value Orientations

In order to test the main theories of this study, it was necessary first to establish the criteria of management values. This was done by determining on which values supervisors' and top managers' scores differed significantly. The assumption is that the supervisors' value orientations lie somewhere between those of workers and top managers. Accordingly, supervisors' value scores should differ from top managers' scores in the same manner that those of workers would, but to a smaller degree. The differences, and therefore the criteria, were determined by testing the first major hypothesis, which was stated as follows:

There is a difference in value orientations between supervisors and top managers on those value dimensions generally associated, positively or negatively, with top management.

To comply with appropriate statistical procedure in testing this hypothesis, it was also necessary to hypothesize the direction in which the differences would occur. It is pointed out, however, that even if the differences occur in the direction other than that hypothesized, the values still serve as criteria. All that is required is that a difference in either direction occurs. Accordingly, it was

[68 A test of this assumption is described in the next section of the chapter. The test of the first hypothesis was necessary first in order to carry out the test of the assumption.]
hypothesized that top managers would score higher than supervisors on perceived mobility, achievement, efficiency, management controls, authority, and enterprise. It was hypothesized that they would score lower than supervisors on security, group membership, and government control.

Some comments are warranted for the reasoning behind these predictions. In the case of security and achievement, previous research, noted earlier, was the premise for the direction of differences predicted. The research evidence on perceived mobility and authority was far less conclusive but, nevertheless, was the basis for these hypotheses also. Efficiency and management controls, it was theorized, are closely related to company objectives and, therefore, more closely associated with top managers. Enterprise seems similar to achievement and, accordingly, was linked with top managers. Group membership seems inimical to the "rugged individualist" image of executives and, thus, was associated with supervisors. Finally, government control seems to contradict the free enterprise philosophy and, consequently, was identified with supervisors. It should be emphasized that the differences contemplated are matters of degree only and the degree may be quite small.

Turning now to the data contained in Table 2, it can be seen that statistically significant differences in mean scores occur on five of
the value dimensions: perceived mobility, security, achievement, authority, and enterprise. These five dimensions, therefore, should hereafter be considered the criteria of management values.

Some further comments are in order regarding the data in Table 2. Except in the case of authority, the differences are all in the direction hypothesized. Thus supervisors, in comparison with top managers, tend to see fewer opportunities for advancement, have lower aspirations for achievement or "going up," and are less oriented toward enterprise or risk-taking and innovation. On the other hand, they are more security-conscious and more receptive to authority. But the differences are small. And it may well be that supervisors are much more "like top managers" than "like workers" as far as value orientations are concerned.

Two other observations are worth mentioning. The largest statistically significant differences occurred on achievement and security, amplifying the mounting evidence of many other researches that these two values do differentiate managers and workers. The largest actual difference occurred on government control, but the difference was insufficient to be statistically significant. The lack of significance is easy to explain, statistically. This was simply a matter of the standard deviations being too large, indicating a wide dispersion of scores. In view of this, one is tempted to question the reliability of the scale. But recall that this scale had the highest of
TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Value Scores of Supervisors and Top Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dimension</th>
<th>Supervisors N = 127</th>
<th>Top Managers N = 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Mobility</td>
<td>58.65¹</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>52.61²</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>58.24³</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>51.41</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Controls</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>40.00⁴</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>61.28⁵</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Control</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Difference significant at the .05 level.
²Difference significant at the .01 level.
³Difference significant at the .01 level.
⁴Difference significant at the .05 level.
⁵Difference significant at the .05 level.
the reliability coefficients. Apparently, then, there is considerable variation in philosophy, even among top managers, about the role that government should play in the economy.

In concluding this part of the analysis, it is well to restate the main findings. Top managers and supervisors were found to have small, but statistically significant, differences in value orientations on perceived mobility, security, achievement, authority, and enterprise. These, therefore, are to be used as the criteria of management values. The supervisor's tendency to score higher on perceived mobility, achievement, and enterprise, but lower on security, will indicate a leaning toward identifying himself with management.

Trends of Mean Scores Among the Three Groups

Before proceeding to the second hypothesis, it is essential to test an assumption, mentioned earlier, that is basic to the entire research. The assumption is that value orientations of supervisors like somewhere between those of top managers and workers. To elaborate, the theory is that the difference between workers' and management's value orientations is a matter of degree, with workers at one end of a continuum and top managers at the other end. If this is the case, then, each progressively higher level of management
should more closely approximate the top managers' values orienta-
tions. A test of this assumption can be made by examining the trend
of value scores among the three management groups in this study.
This will be done in two steps. First, the supervisors' and super-
iors' value scores will be compared to see if the differences are
similar to those between supervisors and top managers. Then the
value scores of all three groups will be considered simultaneously to
observe if consistent trend patterns exist.

The value scores of supervisors and their immediate superiors
are contained in Table 3. The relationships are generally similar to
those involving supervisors and top managers, although some differ-
ences are apparent. Thus, while significant differences are found
on security, achievement, and authority, such is not the case on
perceived mobility. Furthermore, the difference on efficiency this
time was significant, where it was not in the case of supervisors and
top managers.

A more complete picture of the trend is gained by observing the
mean scores of all three groups in Table 4. Without considering
statistical significance, it can be seen that the trend is generally
quite consistent. This is especially true in the case of the five
criteria values. In every instance, the immediate superiors' scores
fall between those of the supervisors and the top managers. The
TABLE 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Value Scores of Supervisors and Immediate Superiors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dimension</th>
<th>Supervisors N=127</th>
<th>Immediate Superiors N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Mobility</td>
<td>58.65</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>52.61(^1)</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>68.24(^2)</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>51.41(^3)</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Controls</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>40.00(^4)</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>61.28</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Control</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Difference significant at the .01 level.
\(^2\) Difference significant at the .01 level.
\(^3\) Difference significant at the .05 level.
\(^4\) Difference significant at the .05 level.
pattern also holds true for government control. On the three remaining values, however, the trend is not maintained, but it must be remembered that differences on these dimensions lacked statistical significance. In view of the general consistency of the trend, and especially since the pattern was steady on the five criteria values, it seems reasonable, therefore, to accept the validity of the assumption.

Management Identification and Effectiveness

Having established the criteria of management values and tested the assumption regarding supervisors' value orientations in relation to those of management and workers, the next step is to test the second hypothesis. The reason for taking this step, it will be recalled, is to provide a basis for determining whether or not the supervisor who is more inclined to identify himself with management tends to be more effective than one who does not. The hypothesis was stated as follows:

There is a relationship between supervisors' value orientation and their effectiveness ratings. The closer the supervisors' value scores approximate those of the top managers, the higher their effectiveness ratings tend to be. Conversely, the greater the differences, the lower their effectiveness ratings tend to be.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dimension</th>
<th>Supervisors N=127</th>
<th>Immediate Superiors N=33</th>
<th>Top Managers N=27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Mobility</td>
<td>58.65</td>
<td>60.70</td>
<td>61.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>46.42</td>
<td>45.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>68.24</td>
<td>73.76</td>
<td>74.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>40.59</td>
<td>39.61</td>
<td>40.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>51.41</td>
<td>49.24</td>
<td>49.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Controls</td>
<td>65.73</td>
<td>63.09</td>
<td>67.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>37.55</td>
<td>37.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>61.28</td>
<td>63.61</td>
<td>64.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Control</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>56.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlations in Table 5 provide the measures necessary for testing the hypothesis. But before examining the data, it is necessary to lay out some ground rules for evaluating whether or not the hypothesis should be accepted. First, only the five criteria value dimensions should be considered. Next, since there are fourteen performance factors, a sufficient number of significant relationships should be found to establish that a definite pattern exists. Finally, the relationships must be in the proper direction to support the theory. This means that perceived mobility, achievement, and enterprise should correlate positively with the ratings, since top managers' scores on these dimensions tended to be higher. Conversely, security and authority should correlate negatively with the ratings, since top managers' scores tended to be lower on those dimensions. With these guidelines in mind, the data in Table 5 can now be examined.

An analysis of the data leads to a rejection of the hypothesis. Not only is the number of significant correlations too small to establish a pattern, but some of them are in the wrong direction. Only six correlations are statistically significant and two of them are in the direction opposite from that hypothesized. In view of these factors, then, it can hardly be said that a pattern exists.
TABLE 5

Correlations of Five Value Scores* with Effectiveness
Ratings of One Hundred Twenty-Three Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dimension</th>
<th>Inspection</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Preparation of Procedures</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Personnel Activities</th>
<th>Public Relations</th>
<th>Professional Consultation</th>
<th>Negotiations</th>
<th>Scheduling, Routing, Dispatching</th>
<th>Technical and Professional Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Mobility</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at the .01 level.

*Mean scores of supervisors and top managers differed significantly beyond the five percent level in each of the five value dimensions.
But while the data do not confirm that a management orientation is related to supervisory effectiveness, neither do they indicate that a worker orientation is conducive to effectiveness. This would have been reflected by a large number of correlations in the direction opposite from that hypothesized. Thus, no support is accorded those analysts who contend that supervisors should identify themselves with workers rather than management.

Before leaving this part of the analysis, it may be of some value to examine the relationships between ratings and the other four values. The data for this analysis are found in Table 6. The results seem even less meaningful, with only two significant correlations observed. In a negative way, however, this may be considered to support the theory slightly. A large number of correlations here would certainly have cast an even darker cloud on the significance of the criteria values in relation to effectiveness.

The Relationships Among Particular Values and Performance Factors

It may be beneficial to digress, for a moment, from the main thesis of this study in order to examine the data in Tables 5 and 6 from another point of view. While the number of relationships found were not sufficient to support the theory, it is worthwhile to assess the importance of those that do exist. In doing this, it should be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dimension</th>
<th>Inspection</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Preparation of Procedures</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Personnel Activities</th>
<th>Public Relations</th>
<th>Professional Consultation</th>
<th>Negotiations</th>
<th>Scheduling, Routing, Dispatching</th>
<th>Technical and Professional Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Controls</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Control</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.  **Significant at the .01 level.

|Mean scores of supervisors and top managers did not differ significantly beyond the five percent level in each of the four value dimensions.
understood that it is the significance of particular values, rather than management identification, that is being considered.

Some of the relationships defy plausible interpretation, but a few are suggestive. Two pairs of correlations seem particularly meaningful, perhaps to the extent of developing hypotheses. The first involves authority. This dimension correlates significantly and negatively with inspection and research. The authority-oriented supervisor, therefore, tends to be rated less proficient in these two functions. Assuming inspection and research to be somewhat similar or related functions, a credible theory may be that the authoritarian type of individual is not suited for positions heavy in this general area. The relationships are small, but they seem sufficient to warrant further investigation.

The second pair of correlations centers on one of the performance factors, coordination. Two values correlate significantly with this factor, but in opposite directions. Enterprise correlates positively, while group membership correlates negatively. Taken together, these two relationships seem to suggest a certain type of individual who is generally proficient in coordinating, integrating, and controlling work groups. Such an individual may be characterized

---

69 Integrating and controlling are terms used on the rating form to further describe the coordination function. See Appendix B.
as individualistic, enterprising, and somewhat distant from the work group. This thesis is similar to Fiedler's conclusion, cited previously, that the psychologically distant leaders of task oriented groups were more effective than those who maintained warmer and more personal feelings toward their subordinates. 70 Again, the correlations in the present study are not high, but they are statistically significant, indicating that further investigation of this theory may be merited.

Supervisor-Superior Relationships and Effectiveness

The second theory advanced in this study was that the relationship between the supervisor and his immediate superior is a critical factor that affects his effectiveness. Using similarities, or dissimilarities, in value orientations, the assumption was that the more the supervisor differs from his superior in value orientations, the less effective he tends to be. The validation or rejection of this theory will be accomplished by testing the third major hypothesis, which was stated as follows:

There is a relationship between supervisors' effectiveness ratings and differences between their value orientations and those of their immediate superiors. The greater the differences, the lower the ratings tend to be. Conversely, the smaller the differences, the higher the ratings tend to be.

70 Fiedler, op. cit.
The data for testing this hypothesis are contained in Table 7, which consists of a matrix of correlations of the differences between supervisors and their superiors on each of the value scores with the fourteen performance factors. As in the previous case, verification of the hypothesis requires that a sufficient number of significant relationships be found to conclude that a pattern exists. Furthermore, the relationships should be negative, i.e., the smaller the differences, the higher the rating.

An analysis of the data leads to the conclusion that the hypothesis must be rejected. Not only is the number of relationships too small to establish a consistent pattern, but several of the correlations occur in the wrong direction. Of the thirteen correlations significant at or beyond the five per cent level, seven are positive. In other words, in over half the cases, the greater the difference between the supervisor and his superior, the better the supervisor tends to be rated on the performance factor. Therefore, the data not only fail to support the hypothesis, but to some extent, they contradict it.

Some of the relationships are intriguing, but their meaning is not clear, especially since the direction of difference is not known.
TABLE 7
Correlations of Differences in Value Scores Between Supervisor
And Superior with Effectiveness Ratings of Supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dimension</th>
<th>Inspect</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Preparation of Resources</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Personal Activity</th>
<th>Public Relations</th>
<th>Professional Consultation</th>
<th>Negotiations</th>
<th>Scheduling</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Technical and Professional Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Mobility</td>
<td>.14 *</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-.20 *</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.22 *</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.22 *</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.19 *</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.28 **</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21 *</td>
<td>-.18 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Controls</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.22 *</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.25 **</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.24 **</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Control</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21 *</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18 *</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level. ** Significant at the .01 level.

Note: A positive correlation indicates that the more the supervisor and the superior differ in that value, the better the supervisor tends to be rated on the performance factor. Conversely, a negative score indicates the less the supervisor and his superior differ on the value score, the better the supervisor tends to be rated on the performance factor.
The only general conclusion that can be drawn is that differences between supervisors and their immediate superiors on these nine values seem to have little bearing on how the superiors evaluate the supervisors' effectiveness.
CHAPTER V

RESULTS: INTER-RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE
VALUE DIMENSIONS AND THE EFFECTS
OF BIOGRAPHICAL FACTORS

Since value orientations and job effectiveness would seem to be strongly influenced by one's background and experiences, it is highly desirable to examine the relationship among these variables. Likewise, it is worthwhile to determine whether or not any patterns exist among the value dimensions themselves. These matters will be taken up in this chapter under the following topic headings:

1. Inter-relationships among the values
2. Inter-relationships among biographical factors
3. Biographical factors and value orientations

Inter-relationships Among the Values

That the values are inter-related seemed to be suggested by the data considered in the previous chapter. An examination of Table 8, which consists of a matrix of the inter-correlations among the nine value dimensions, confirms this to be the case. Not only is the number of significant correlations large, but the relationships
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived Mobility</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Group Membership</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Management Controls</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Government Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Mobility</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Membership</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Controls</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Control</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at the .01 level.
are often relatively high. This, plus the fact that the distribution between positive and negative correlations is fairly even, implies that some distinct patterns exist.

With sixty-four correlations to examine, some orderly procedure is needed to extract the patterns of relationships. One good approach is to select variables that more or less contrast with each other and observe which of the others are related to each of them. Security and achievement seem to meet this requirement best. Using these two value dimensions as the fulcrums, two well-defined patterns emerge. The supervisor who places heavy emphasis on security also tends to see less opportunity for advancement, has lower aspirations for advancement, places a little more stock in group activity, puts more emphasis on efficiency, is considerably more authoritarian, favors more government direction of the economy, and is considerably less inclined toward risk-taking and innovation. By contrast, the highly achievement-oriented supervisor tends to value security less, places considerably less faith in group action, is not so favorable toward government direction of the economy, is somewhat less authoritarian, sees more opportunities for advancement, and is considerably more bent toward risk-taking and innovation.
Another approach to identifying patterns of relationships is to use, as the two reference points, those values which correlate most frequently and highly with the other eight dimensions. Authority and enterprise best meet these conditions. Thus, the supervisor with a high authority orientation tends to value security rather strongly, is a little more favorable toward group activity, feels more positive about efficiency and management controls, favors government direction of the economy a little more, is somewhat less achievement-oriented, is less inclined toward risk-taking and innovation, and is not so optimistic about advancement opportunities. On the other hand, the supervisor high on enterprise places considerably less value on security, leans away from group activity, is not as receptive to authority, tends to be more opposed to government direction of the economy, places somewhat less emphasis on efficiency, is fairly highly achievement-motivated, and is more optimistic about his advancement opportunities.

The similarity between this pair of relationships and the previous one is obvious. The authority-oriented supervisor scores almost identically with the security-oriented one. The enterprise-oriented supervisor is very similar to the achievement-oriented one. The similarities are so great that, in reality, only two basic patterns exist. Either pair of values would serve equally well as the reference
points. Purely as a matter of choice, the first two will be selected. Hereafter, the types of supervisors described by the patterns will be referred to as "security-centered" and "achievement-centered."

Inter-relationships Among the Biographical Factors

It will help in later analyses involving biographical data to consider the inter-relationships among these factors themselves. The inter-correlations for this purpose are contained in Table 9. Most of the relationships are predictable. Thus, for example, the older supervisor has spent more time in his present position and was a manager for a longer time than the younger one. The more highly educated supervisor, as one might expect, spent less time in factory employment and was a union member for a shorter period.

But while most of the correlations confirm the obvious, a closer scrutiny reveals some interesting aspects. Although the supervisor's age does correlate with longevity in factory employment, the relationship is not particularly high. Apparently many of the older supervisors spent considerable time in other occupations, such as sales and clerical, before going into industry. The younger supervisors, on the other hand, tended to have entered industry earlier in their careers. Another interesting situation is the slightly negative relationship between age and union membership, indicating that...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Longevity in Present Position</th>
<th>Longevity in Management Position</th>
<th>Longevity in Factory Employment</th>
<th>Union Membership</th>
<th>Longevity in Union Membership</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Present Position</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Management Position</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Factory Employment</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Union Membership</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.  **Significant at the .01 level.
fewer of the older supervisors were union members. While this might readily be explained by the fact that unionization was not as extensive two or three decades ago, it is a factor to keep in mind when considering some of the data discussed later in this chapter. Anticipating discussion later, it will be seen that age has little relationship with value orientations, but union membership does.

One final aspect of the inter-relationships among the biographical factors is worth noting. The supervisor with a more extensive union background, while having had relatively more factory experience, was a manager for a considerably shorter period. He also tended to have less education. The obvious conclusion, at first glance, is that such a supervisor is simply older. But age does not correlate with longevity in union membership. Apparently, then, education is the key factor. This seems to imply that, while it is quite possible to come "up through the ranks" having had relatively less education, the road is neither easy nor quick.

Biographical Factors and Value Orientations

The inter-relationships among the biographical factors having been observed, it is in order now to consider how these factors may be related with the two main groups of variables in this study, value orientations and effectiveness. Value orientations will be considered
first by examining the data in Table 10. The findings are summarized in the paragraphs below by taking up each biographical factor, in order, and noting its relationships, if any, with the value dimensions.

The first two factors have little relationship with value orientations. The length of time the supervisor has held his current position appears unrelated with any of the nine values. The length of time in all management positions shows a small negative relationship with government controls, indicating that the longer the supervisor was a manager, the less he favored government direction of the economy.

Longevity in factory employment appears to be an important factor. The supervisor who has spent more time in factory employment tends to place a little more value on security, efficiency, and management controls. At the same time, he seems a little less enterprise-oriented.

The supervisor who has been a member of the union, compared with one who has not, tends to place a little more emphasis on efficiency and management controls. Interestingly, this emphasis is more marked among supervisors with a more extensive union background, as the length of union membership correlates significantly with both efficiency and management controls. On the other hand, the longer the supervisor was a union member, the more he tends to value
TABLE 10
Correlations Between Biographical Factors And Value Scale Scores of One Hundred Twenty-Three Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Perceived Mobility</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Group Membership</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Management Controls</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Government Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Present Position</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Management Position</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Factory Employment</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Union Membership</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.  **Significant at the .01 level.
security and the less he is inclined toward enterprise, or risk-taking and innovation. The relationships, however, are small.

Age and education both show surprisingly few relationships with the nine values. Age correlates significantly with only enterprise, the older supervisor tending to be somewhat less inclined toward risk-taking and innovation. Education relates negatively with both security and authority. The more education the supervisor has, the less security-conscious and authority-oriented he is. But the relationships are small.

All in all, the connection between the biographical factors considered by this study and value orientations is not as pronounced as might have been expected, judging by the results reported in a number of other studies. The one factor that does seem significant is the length of time in factory employment. But even here, the relationships are quite small. Apparently, other aspects of the supervisor's background and experience exert a greater influence on his value orientations.

Biographical Factors and Effectiveness Ratings

Table 11 provides the data for determining the relationships between biographical factors and effectiveness ratings. The significant correlations are few, suggesting the most important finding is the lack of connection between these two variables.
TABLE I

Correlations Between Biographical Factors and Performance Ratings on Fourteen Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inspection</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Preparation of Procedures</th>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Personnel Activity</th>
<th>Public Relations</th>
<th>Professional Consultation</th>
<th>Negotiations</th>
<th>Scheduling, Dispatching</th>
<th>Technical and Professional Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Present Position</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Management Position</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Factory Employment</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Membership</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity in Union Membership</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.  **Significant at the .01 level.
One rather consistent pattern is revealed, however. The supervisor who is rated less proficient on the research function is characterized by having spent more time in factory employment, having been a union member for a longer time, and having had less education. Perhaps the key relationship is that involving education, since the more highly educated supervisor was shown previously to have spent less time in factory employment and to have had a more limited union background. Furthermore, a connection between education and proficiency in research seems logical, considering that education does, or at least should, condition one to be more inquiring and observant.

In summary, the relationships between biographical factors and both value orientations and effectiveness ratings are relatively few. Thus, the relative lack of relationships appears to be the most important finding of this part of the research.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

With all of the data compiled for this study having been examined in breadth, it remains now to analyze the findings in greater depth. It is the purpose of this chapter to probe for possible explanations, not only for the relationships that were found, but, perhaps just as important, for those that were not found. The discussion in this chapter will be taken up under the following headings:

1. Supervisors' and top managers' value orientations
2. Supervisors' value orientations and effectiveness
3. Supervisor-superior value differences and effectiveness
4. Inter-relationships among the value dimensions
5. Biographical factors and value orientations
6. Biographical factors and effectiveness
7. Perspective on the study

Supervisors' and Top Managers' Value Orientations

The main findings in connection with testing the first major hypothesis, it will be recalled, were that supervisors and top managers differed on perceived mobility, security, achievement,
authority, and enterprise. The differences were relatively small but statistically significant, nevertheless. These five dimensions, therefore, constituted the criteria of management values. In testing and verifying an assumption underlying this approach to establishing a criteria of management values, the value scores of supervisors, their immediate superiors, and top managers were found to form a generally consistent pattern of gradations. This was taken as evidence that differences in value orientations among the various organizational levels between workers and top management form a continuum, with supervisors falling somewhere between the two extremes.

A question that immediately arises is why the differences that did occur were relatively small. An obvious answer would be that supervisors are generally oriented more toward management than workers. While this seems a reasonable conclusion, it is not a certainty, since the data do not include workers’ value scores for comparison. What does seem reasonable to conclude, however, is that supervisors, as well as their superiors, are oriented upward. That is, they tend to emulate the managers immediately above them. The bases for this conclusion are that the differences among all three groups were small and a consistent gradation of scores was found.
Another question raised by the data is why differences were found on some values but not on others. The answer lies, perhaps, in the nature of the values themselves. Consider, first, the values on which differences were found. At least three of them, perceived mobility, security, and achievement, seem closely related to personal goals. On the other hand, efficiency and management controls, on which differences did not occur, both seem more directly connected with company goals. The remaining four values appear unrelated to personal or company goals. The conclusion suggested, then, is that supervisors are likely to share completely those values associated with organizational goals, but not necessarily those linked with personal objectives. It hardly needs to be added that the former are more immediately pertinent to job responsibilities. It seems advisable, therefore, to distinguish between these two categories of management values, the inference being that one is more essential than the other, as far as the supervisor's effectiveness is concerned.

But even though values associated with personal goals may not be directly related to the supervisor's job responsibilities, one cannot avoid contemplating why the differences on them occurred. The explanation is not difficult, in the writer's view. It seems perfectly reasonable that the typical supervisor should be a little less achievement-oriented, more security-conscious, and a bit more pessimistic.
about opportunities for advancement. Generally less educated than the higher level executive and often seeming to have "crested" at his present level, he has good reason not to expect to advance very high in the organization. If his expectations are lower, and this seems a reasonable assumption, then psychological theory holds that he will likely lower his aspirations, or achievement goals. This is an ego protection mechanism, according to the theory. Thus, to state it rather extremely, if the supervisor thinks advancement is unlikely, he can avoid mental conflict by not aspiring for it. An extension of the same basic psychological theory would also explain the supervisor's tendency to see fewer advancement opportunities. Again stating it rather extremely, if the supervisor does not expect to advance, it is usually more soothing to the ego to think that lack of opportunities, rather than any personal shortcoming, is the reason. These are over-statements, of course, the psychological effects being far more subtle in operation. Furthermore, it is not suggested that supervisors rationalize in this manner to any greater extent than others.

The realities of actual conditions would also seem to explain the supervisor's somewhat greater concern for security. The man at the bottom rung of the management ladder, with less education and lower expectations of advancement, has reason to concern himself about
assured income and steady employment. His situation is not in fact as secure as that of higher managers, it would seem.

It must be kept clearly in mind, however, that in all of the above cases, only tendencies of value differences are involved, and these were shown to be relatively small. To repeat an earlier observation, it seems likely that supervisors are much more management-oriented than worker-oriented.

Supervisors' Value Orientations and Effectiveness

The test of the second major hypothesis, it will be recalled, resulted in rejecting the theory that the supervisor's management identification is related to effectiveness, either positively or negatively. It did indicate, however, that certain values seemed to be related to specific performance areas. These findings are explored further here.

Little can be added, it seems, to the simple observation that management identification, as defined by this study, apparently has no relationship with the supervisor's effectiveness. On the other hand, neither can it be said that his effectiveness is enhanced by a worker orientation. By comparison, in fact, there is a little more support for management identification in this regard. Perhaps it is desirable for the supervisor to identify himself with management for
reasons other than its relationship with his effectiveness. Whether it
is or not is beyond the scope of the problem studied and must, there­
fore, remain for others to evaluate.

But while no general pattern was apparent linking management
identification with effectiveness, the individual relationships between
values and specific performance factors may be enlightening. It was
suggested earlier, for example, that the authority-oriented supervisor
may not be well-suited for work heavy in the research and inspection
functions. It was also pointed out that the supervisor rated high on
coordination seemed to lean toward enterprise, or risk-taking and
innovating, and away from group activity. The fact that relation­
ships are found between specific performance areas and one or two
values suggests that there may be too much of a tendency to over­
generalize on the successful executive personality. Rather than
search for common values and personality factors that pervade all
managers, it might be more fruitful to consider several different
patterns of executive personality in relationship to particular areas
of the executive function. In the present study, for example, two
contrasting sets of value orientations were found among supervisors,
one described as "security-centered," the other, "achievement-
centered." There were some traces of evidence, furthermore, that
supervisors characterized by one or the other may be more proficient
in some types of jobs. If further investigation can refine these patterns and establish a relationship between them and specific areas of performance, then a valuable tool can be added to the existing ones for selection and placement.

Supervisor-Superior Value Differences and Effectiveness

The third major hypothesis postulated that differences in value orientations between the supervisor and his superior would be negatively associated with his effectiveness. The data provided no support whatsoever for the theory. Of the thirteen significant correlations found, seven actually contradicted the postulate. In those seven instances, a greater difference in value scores correlated with a higher effectiveness rating. This finding seems inconsistent with the evidence from other studies that the supervisor's relationship with his superior greatly influences his behavior.\footnote{The other studies did not always measure the effect of the relationship upon effectiveness specifically, however. See Chapter II.} In view of this, it is well to probe for explanations for the lack of support here for the theory. This will not be easy since the data do not indicate the direction of the differences in value scores. Nevertheless, several possibilities are suggested.
One obvious explanation is that value orientations, at least those encompassed in this study, are not important elements in the supervisor-superior relationship. Perhaps values are too general in scope. It may be recalled that other studies dealt with attitudes more specifically related to job procedures and approaches. And yet it would seem that an individual's modus operandi is greatly influenced by his basic values. Furthermore, several of the values used in this study were job-centered in a broad sense.

Another factor may be that the superiors did not perceive the differences that existed. The data do not provide any indication of what value orientations the superior thought his supervisor had, and vice versa. It is not far-fetched to assume that many subordinates do and say things to please the boss. This not uncommon practice of telling the boss what he wants to hear may well conceal differences in basic philosophies.

Finally, the explanation may be simply that the typical superior is tolerant toward differences in outlook with his subordinate, even on specific job procedures. Perhaps he is far more objective and judicial in appraising performance than he is given credit for.

All of the above possibilities, it must be admitted, are purely speculative. Whatever the reason, the only conclusion that can be drawn from the data of this study is that the theory hypothesized was not proved.
Inter-relationships Among the Values

As might have been expected, a large degree of inter-relatedness was found among the values, suggesting the existence of well-defined patterns. Two such patterns were identified and described as "security-centered" and "achievement-centered."

The value of focusing on several different patterns of values rather than one broad one purporting to differentiate managers as a group from workers was discussed earlier. The potentialities of this approach are predicated on the theory that individuals with particular value patterns may be better suited for some types of jobs and situations rather than others. An indication of this possibility was the finding that the authority-oriented supervisor tended to be less proficient in the research and inspection functions. Another finding was that the supervisor high on enterprise, but low on group membership, appeared more skilled in the coordination function.

The reasons for these relationships are not fully evident, but a possible explanation for each is suggested. The authoritative individual would seem to lack the permissiveness necessary in research and inspection. A tendency to see everything as either black or white is not suitable in such areas. In the case of the coordination function, it would seem that a desired quality is the ability to be somewhat detached from the group, perhaps even to the extent of a degree
of insensitivity to personal feelings. An inclination toward enterprise and away from group activity would seem consistent with this type of behavior. It must be admitted that both of these explanations involve a large element of conjecture. They are mentioned, however, as plausible hypotheses that may merit further investigation.

Biographical Factors and Value Orientations

Since the focal point of the study was personal values, it was important to determine what factors might have influenced their development. Perhaps the most important aspect of this part of the study was the relative lack of relationships found. For example, although a positive relationship was found between a supervisor with a long background as an hourly employee and his feelings toward security, the correlation was not nearly as high as might have been expected, judging from the reports of many other studies. Other researches also indicated a higher relationship than was found here between some of the values and both age and education.

In view of the small number and low degree of relationships, it must be concluded that other factors are much more potent in shaping an individual's value orientations. These may be elements of the supervisor's background not included in this study. But it may also be that factor given prime consideration in this study —— his reference group, which presumably is top management.
Biographical Factors and Effectiveness

As in the previous case, the most significant result of this part of the analysis undoubtedly was what was not found. The significant correlations were few and not very high. The obvious conclusion is that managerial skills are largely a matter of innate qualities which must be developed. That they can be developed is indicated to some extent by the fact that, in probably the most significant finding in this section, education was found to be the key factor in a high proficiency on research.

Perspective on the Study

It is well to take a broad view of the study at this point and place the findings in proper perspective. The most significant findings were that the two main theories were not proved. It was not found that the supervisor who identifies himself more closely with management, in terms of sharing similar value orientations, was necessarily the better performer. Nor was it found that differences in value orientations between the supervisor and his immediate superior related negatively with his effectiveness. With regard to the first finding, however, even less evidence was found that a worker orientation is conducive to effectiveness. Also regarding the first finding, there was evidence that management value orientations may be sub-divided into two or more rather distinct categories. Beyond these main
findings, the relationships uncovered were merely suggestive, at best. Their chief values lay in developing hypotheses for further research.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Having described and analyzed the subject under consideration in detail, it is now appropriate to summarize the content and results of this study. This will be done by, first, surveying briefly the scope of the study, second, indicating the conclusions that seem warranted, and, third, making such recommendations as seem appropriate on the basis of the findings.

Summary

It was noted that while much research on the role of the first level industrial supervisor has been undertaken, many problems remain unresolved. It was the aim of this study to shed some light on one problem involving two related questions. The first question was whether or not the supervisor who identifies himself more closely with management than workers tends to be a more effective performer than one who does not. The second question was whether or not the relationship between the supervisor and his immediate superior might be a relatively more critical factor affecting his performance.
Assuming that determining the extent to which a common set of values are shared is a valid method of establishing group identification, the general approach of the study was to measure and compare the value orientations of supervisors, their immediate superiors, and top managers. Thus, the closer the supervisor approximated top managers' value orientations, the closer he could be said to identify himself with management rather than workers. Similarly, the closer he approximated his superior's value orientations, the more harmonious, presumably, were his relations with his superior. A comparison between these tendencies and the supervisor's job effectiveness, as indicated by ratings made by his superior, would provide the answers to the questions in the preceding paragraph.

The objectives of the research were to be achieved by testing three major hypotheses. The first hypothesis served to establish the criteria of management values by determining on which values statistically significant differences were found between supervisors' and top managers' scores. This method of establishing criteria values was based on the theory that supervisors' value orientations lie somewhere between those of workers and top management, an assumption which was tested and held verified by noting the trend of the scores of the three levels of management studied. The second hypothesis centered on the relationship between management identification and effectiveness, postulating that the supervisor's tendency to approximate
top management value orientations would be found to correlate positively with his effectiveness ratings. The third hypothesis served to indicate the effect of the supervisor's relations with his superior by theorizing that similar value orientations would be found to be related positively with his effectiveness ratings.

A supplementary objective of the study was to determine what other relationships, within the scope of the data compiled, might tend to explain the variations in the supervisor's value orientations and effectiveness ratings. This was to be accomplished by, first, analyzing the inter-relationships among the values themselves, and, then, comparing both the supervisor's value scores and his effectiveness ratings with biographical factors.

Nine value dimensions and fourteen job performance factors comprised the two main sets of variables in the study. The value dimensions were described as follows: perceived mobility, security, achievement, group membership, efficiency, management controls, enterprise, authority, and government control. The fourteen job performance factors on which each supervisor was rated were designated as follows: inspection; research; planning; preparation of procedures; coordination; evaluation; interpretation; supervision; personnel activities; public relations; professional consultation; negotiations; scheduling, routing, and dispatching; and, technical and professional performance.
A survey of previous research pertinent to the problem disclosed considerable basis for arriving at the three major hypotheses as well as selecting the nine value dimensions. The results of several studies indicated the need for determining more conclusively the effect of the supervisor's group identification upon his effectiveness. Other researches pointed to the supervisor-superior relationship as possibly a more critical factor. A number of studies, dealing with the broader problem of identifying attitudes and values that characterize executives, found that managers and workers differ significantly in their outlook on security and achievement goals. As for the other values, the research evidence seemed suggestive, at best, for hypothesizing differences in values between top managers and lower organizational levels, including supervisors.

The design of the present study called for administering a paper and pencil questionnaire to three groups, including one hundred and twenty-seven supervisors, their thirty-three immediate superiors, and twenty-seven top managers. The questionnaire, called the Social and Economic Value Scale, provided the measures of the value orientations as well as biographical information for each of the participants. In addition to this questionnaire, the immediate superiors completed a rating form for each subordinate supervisor. To assure that only meaningful data would be used in the analysis of the results, a minimal
five percent level of significance was required for all mean differences and correlations upon which interpretation was based. Certain limitations, however, were inherent in the research design. Selecting the sample involved an element of judgment. Furthermore, the choice of variables necessarily excluded aspects of the problem that may have been important. It was held, nevertheless, that a useful degree of representativeness had been achieved in the sample and that the variables that were incorporated in the design provided a broad area for investigation.

The test of the first hypothesis led to the establishment of a criteria of management values that included perceived mobility, security, achievement, authority, and enterprise. The differences in value scores between supervisors and top managers were relatively small, but statistically significant, nevertheless. The trend of differences among all three management groups formed a consistent pattern, supporting the theory that supervisors' value orientations lie somewhere between those of managers and workers.

Neither the second nor the third major hypotheses were verified. There was no support for the theory that the supervisor who identifies himself more closely with management tends to be the more effective performer. On the other hand, there was even less indication that identification with workers is conducive to supervisory effectiveness.
The rejection of the third major hypothesis was even more emphatic. No support at all was provided for the theory that value orientations similar to those of his superior would contribute to the supervisor’s effectiveness. In fact, higher effectiveness ratings were found to be related with differences in value orientations just as often as with similarities.

But while the main theories were not proved, the data did reveal some interesting and potentially meaningful relationships. It was found, for example, that a few specific values were related, either positively or negatively, with particular performance factors. It was also found that supervisors tended to share completely those management values that seem to be associated with company objectives, but not those that appear more directly connected with personal goals. Still another significant finding was the high degree of inter-relationship among the values, with two rather well-defined patterns or value profiles emerging.

In discussing the results, it was suggested that there may be good reasons for the tendency of supervisors to differ with top managers on those values associated with personal goals. The typical supervisor, it would seem, is not likely to advance very high in the organization. Furthermore, his situation is not as secure as that of the higher level manager. In view of these factors, one would expect a
supervisor to be somewhat more security-conscious and less achievement-oriented than a top manager.

The possibility of relating specific values or patterns of values to performance in particular areas was explored further. It was noted that the authority-oriented supervisor showed a tendency to be rated somewhat less effective in the inspection and research functions. It was also observed that a high rating on coordination was related positively with enterprise, but negatively with group membership. These findings, plus the emergence of two rather well-defined patterns of values, were held to be sufficient to justify further investigation along such lines.

Conclusions

It seems clear that the supervisor is management-oriented to a considerable degree, whether or not this enhances his effectiveness. But it is important to note that management identification, in terms of shared values, is apparently not undimensional. Considering all nine dimensions, at least two categories of management values were identified in this study. One group reflected the individual's personal goals; the other seemed more relevant to company objectives. Conceivably, further research might uncover other classes of management values, such as that indicating the individual's philosophy of government and power.
The significance of recognizing the multidimensional nature of management identification, as far as the supervisor is concerned, is the fact that it seems perfectly reasonable for him to share top managers' values in some aspects, while differing on others. As already noted, this was evidenced by the data compiled here. In view of this, it would seem that much of the talk about the supervisor's being "part of management" and "thinking like a manager" is meaningless, at best, and misleading, at worst. It would serve to clarify the situation, in the writer's view, to think in terms of the supervisor's sharing company objectives, as distinguished from his sharing top managers' personal goals. The importance of this distinction goes far beyond merely the use of correct terminology. The suggestion here is that management would be better advised to concentrate on encouraging the supervisor to share company objectives, rather than exhorting him to embrace the same personal goals held by top managers.

These observations seem, at first glance, to support the aforementioned dualist theory, which holds that the supervisor should identify himself with both management and workers. Perhaps it does to some extent. As noted earlier, the supervisor does not embrace top managers' values in every respect. One might surmise, therefore, that the supervisor is more worker-oriented in such areas as security and achievement goals. But the relatively small size of
the differences in value scores on these dimensions does not augur well for this conclusion. Furthermore, it should be recalled that the supervisor was shown to be rather uncompromising on efficiency and management controls, a stance that may often be at odds with some workers' attitudes. The indications, therefore, are that the supervisor appears far more management-oriented than worker-oriented, even though shades of differences between him and the top manager are discernible. The key question, of course, is whether this is good or bad, as far as his effectiveness is concerned. The only answer suggested by this study is that, while the evidence favoring management identification is slight, the case for worker identification is even weaker.

Another conclusion follows from the preceding discussion. It seems advisable to dispense with the concept of management identification altogether when the aim is to identify factors related to supervisory effectiveness. A more meaningful relationship appears to be that between specific performance areas and value patterns, such as those defined earlier as security-centered and achievement-centered. This suggestion, furthermore, would appear applicable in the case of all management levels. It seems ill-advised, for example, to search for a single personality profile of the successful executive. A more realistic approach would be that employed in psychological testing,
in which specific personality factors, which would be values in this case, are related to particular abilities.

Finally, it must be concluded that, while the supervisor-superior relationship probably is a very important factor influencing the supervisor's effectiveness, care should be exercised in generalizing too freely on the nature of that relationship. Recognizing the limited aspect of the relationship studied here, it still seems that the typical superior is considerably more tolerant toward differences in philosophy between the supervisor and himself than has been suggested or implied by some researchers. It is conceivable, in fact, that the superior may often approve of differences in value orientations. He may feel, for example, that a particular supervisory job calls for greater attention to details and closer controls than his own temperament would permit him to exercise.

Recommendations

In view of the nature of the relationships uncovered by this research, the recommendations, particularly those directed to management, must be suggestive and general in scope. For management, they involve, essentially, suggested viewpoints on the problem. For researchers, they entail proposals for further investigation.

Three recommendations are offered for management's consideration. First, it is suggested that managers should re-orient themselves on the meaning of management identification. It should be
recognized that there are several aspects of management identification, including the manager's personal goals and his philosophy of what is vital and desirable in achieving company objectives. It should be accepted, furthermore, that supervisors and other managers can differ on these elements to a considerable extent with little effect upon their performance. The differences, in some cases, are not only to be expected, but may well be desirable.

The second recommendation for management is an expansion of the first. This is that management should concentrate on encouraging the supervisor to identify himself with essential company objectives rather than with the personal goals of top managers. For reasons indicated in previous discussion, this should help to avoid confusion concerning what is expected and desired of the supervisor. It should be added, in regard to this recommendation, that it is the responsibility of top management, as well as the supervisor, to work toward the integration of company and worker goals.

Finally, it is recommended that management re-examine very carefully all formal and informal procedures used in selecting, training, and developing supervisors to determine the extent to which these may be colored by theories regarding the supervisor's identification with management. Needless to say, a realistic attitude, in accordance with the conclusions drawn from this study, should prevail.
Three recommendations are submitted for further research along lines suggested earlier in the dissertation. First, it is suggested that the study of managers' and supervisors' value orientations be continued, with particular emphasis on redefining the value dimensions and refining the scales. The first task may be accomplished by factor-analyzing the present scales and, possibly, adding new value dimensions that appear related to the problem. The second task is a matter of adding new items to the scales and item-analyzing them again.

The second recommendation is that further investigation be undertaken into the possible relationships between patterns of interrelated values and specific performance areas. Such research should aim toward the development of tests that can be added to the present methods for selecting, placing, and developing supervisors and other managers.

Finally, it is recommended that future research in this general area be designed to consider the effects of environmental conditions. Included might be such factors as the company's competitive position, the rate of managerial turnover, and whether or not the company is characterized by growth or relative stability.

In conclusion, the approach of studying value orientations to illuminate the problem area defined by this research seems a valid
one. It is hoped that this study will be considered merely the initial step and that further work will be prompted by this effort.
INSTRUCTIONS

Managers in American industry are reputed to have different attitudes and value concepts toward certain economic and social phenomenon. We are interested in learning how managers view some of these factors.

Please evaluate each of the following statements in terms of the extent to which you agree or disagree. Circle the symbol that best reflects your feeling or thinking.

Your name is needed only for purpose of correlating the data. All information is kept confidential. The report that will be written upon completion of the research will reveal no individual, unit, or organization.

KEY

SA .................................................... Strongly agree
A .................................................... Agree
N .................................................... Neutral or not sure
D .................................................... Disagree
SD .................................................... Strongly disagree

Your help in this research is greatly appreciated.

Norman George
The Ohio State University
1. A person without a college education might as well forget about getting a top job.

2. The United States is still a country of unlimited opportunity.

3. The man with exceptional ability can expect to advance to top management jobs.

4. Even if a wage earner has exceptional ability, he still needs a lot of luck to go higher than a foreman's job.

5. The average worker today has to work much harder to get ahead than the average worker thirty years ago.

6. There is practically no limit to how high an ambitious young person can go these days.

7. Only men from upper-class families are likely to get the top jobs.

8. There are more opportunities for advancement in industry today than there have been at any time.

9. Going "from rags to riches" is pretty much a thing of the past.

10. The person anxious to get ahead would do better in other countries where industry and trade are just beginning to develop.

11. A high school graduate with a lot of ability has just as much chance of getting a top job as a college man.

12. There are likely to be fewer newly-made millionaires in this country as time goes on.

13. Getting ahead depends more on who you know than what you know.

14. It takes a lot of luck to advance to the higher level management jobs.

15. The day of the "self-made man" is pretty much a thing of the past.

16. It's just as easy to succeed in a business of your own today as it was years ago.

17. It's harder for small companies to grow into large ones than it was years ago.
1. The last man hired should be the first laid off.
2. Promotions should depend strictly on ability to do the job rather than seniority.
3. A man with a family should not take a new job if he is not sure how steady the work will be.
4. When work is slack, it is better to reduce hours and pay rather than lay anyone off.
5. A worker should save all he can for a rainy day.
6. Going into business on your own is too risky these days.
7. A man with fifteen years seniority with a company ought to look around for another job if chances for advancement on his present job don't seem good.
8. Steady work is more important than more pay.
9. A person with many years on the same job, even though the job may be uninteresting, is generally better off than most others.
10. A better job is almost always worth the risk.
11. Good and steady pay is the most important factor in any job.
12. Parents ought to encourage their children to prepare for careers in which they will never have to worry about being out of work.
13. When a man has a family to take care of, the most important thing is a steady job.
14. In choosing a company to work for, the first thing to consider is how steady its business is.
15. A man owes it to his family to consider job security as the most important factor in a job.
16. If a person has a job he does not like, he ought to make a change regardless of other considerations.
17. A person with a moderate income should not consider investing in stocks.
18. A person who has reached a comfortable income level should be satisfied with what he has and not take unnecessary risks.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A man ought to forget about his job after quitting time.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Working too hard causes a person to be tense and irritable.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Generally, trying to get a job with more prestige is not worth the effort.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I'm pretty well satisfied with what I have and trying to do better is not worth the effort.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A person who accepts the responsibility of doing something he doesn't have to do is unnecessarily &quot;sticking his neck out.&quot;</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Working with people you like is more important than getting a promotion.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A person should try to do a reasonably good job and let it go at that.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Individual achievement is more important than teamwork.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The &quot;lone wolf&quot; operator is not likely to get ahead.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A job with more responsibility is always a desirable thing.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A person should not accept a job that he is not sure he can do.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It's hard to feel worthwhile if you are not trying for more responsibility and importance.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A person who has been on the same job for ten years probably is not making the best use of his abilities.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If a person finds himself constantly working overtime on his job, he should consider making a change.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rest and relaxation is the best way to spend your leisure time.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>There isn't enough time to do all the things I would like to do.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I wouldn't feel right if I didn't spend my spare time improving myself.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A person who has reached the age of forty should not consider changing his occupation, even if he is not completely satisfied.</td>
<td>SA A N D SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Once you have found a job you like, you should stick with it.

20. More education is primarily for the young people who are preparing for their careers.

21. A man's earnings is a good indication of how successful he is.

22. A well paid skilled job is better than the average supervisor's job.

IV

1. You can't accomplish much unless the group is behind you.

2. Good teamwork is better than a group of individualists.

3. A supervisor should always consider how his decisions affect the feelings of the members of the work group.

4. You accomplish more when you work alone rather than with a group.

5. You shouldn't consider going ahead with a plan until you are certain everybody is behind it.

6. The member of a work group should turn out good production but not so good that it makes the others look bad.

7. When a group of workers is used to working with each other you shouldn't break up the group unless it is absolutely necessary.

8. It is important that a supervisor be well liked by his workers.

9. It is important that a supervisor be well liked by his fellow supervisors.

10. A supervisor who is not well-liked by his workers will find it difficult to get things done.

11. A person who doesn't participate in any civic or social organizations is likely to be hard to get along with.

12. To be well liked by your friends and associates is more important than most other things.

13. Generally, it isn't worth the time or bother to belong to most organizations.
14. Time and money spent on improving yourself through education is worth far more than belonging to social and fraternal groups.

15. A person who has few friends cannot consider himself very successful in life.

16. The person who is aggressive and tries too hard to get ahead is likely to be very unpopular.

17. A person who is active in social and civic groups probably makes better management material than one who is not.

1. Older workers ought to be required to keep up the same pace as all others.

2. If a manager is not performing up to standard, the company should remove him from his position.

3. New cost saving methods ought to be delayed if it seems it will upset the people involved.

4. A person who doesn't get along with others should be released regardless of how much ability he has.

5. Competition between departments on efficiency is a good thing.

6. Production costs are the best basis for judging a supervisor.

7. The company should not hesitate to bring in men from the outside if they can do the job better.

8. High costs are usually an indication of a poorly managed company.

9. Nothing else is nearly as important as controlling costs.

10. A man ought to be judged on results, not time or effort.

11. Wages and salaries ought to be raised automatically as productivity increases.

12. The supervisor's main job is to keep his people happy.

13. What his workers think of him will generally indicate how good a supervisor he is.
14. The supervisor's main job is to come up with cost saving ideas.

15. No new method or policy ought to be put in if it doesn't pay for itself.

16. Cutting costs is the best way for the company to progress.

17. The man who doesn't produce up to standard ought to be let out.

18. Strict budget control often makes more problems than it is worth.

19. Men who have strong backgrounds in finance and accounting usually make the best top managers.

20. A good course in cost accounting would do a production supervisor more good than a course in human relations.

VI

1. Production figures often don't tell the true story of how well a department is operating.

2. Tight production controls often create more problems than the good they do.

3. Budgets don't really tell you much about the performance of a department.

4. If budgetary control were not so close, things would be better all around.

5. The budget picture is the best indicator of how well a supervisor is doing.

6. It's a good thing to have as many things as possible covered by written policy statements.

7. A good many of the reports required could be cut out without hurting operations.

8. A worker's output ought to be up to standard every day.

9. It's a good thing to have some flexibility in production control to allow for workers having an "off" day because of various types of personal problems that come up.

10. The value of budgetary control is often questionable.
11. A large number of standard procedures will hinder more than they help.  

12. Workers get little chance to use their creative abilities in most jobs.  

13. If workers aren't following standard procedure, it's usually a matter of not having been properly instructed.  

14. Most workers want to be told exactly what to do and how to do it.  

15. Most workers would tend to slack off if you don't check regularly.  

16. If you don't keep close control, the work wouldn't get done on time.  

17. Defining a man's authority and responsibility in detail stifles initiative.  

18. It's up to the boss to make the decisions as to what is to be done and how.  

19. No company should be without a policy manual.  

20. Most workers need to be told exactly what is expected of them.  

VII  

1. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.  

2. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.  

3. A person who has bad manners, habits, and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.  

4. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.  

5. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.  

6. No sane, normal, decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.  

7. When a person has a problem or worry it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.
8. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas but as they grow up they learn to control themselves better.

9. A good worker generally keeps his problems to himself and never complains much.

10. If a person is given an order he doesn't like, he should carry it out promptly and ask questions later.

11. No person should be made a manager who can't get people to like and respect him.

12. If people would keep their minds strictly on the job assigned them, the whole organization would be better off.

VIII

1. If a firm has a good product line which is selling, it should stick to it.

2. If the company is on straight time and production is pretty good, the company shouldn't attempt to install an incentive system.

3. If the company's business is good and steady, it shouldn't worry about expanding.

4. The company should make no changes in policies and procedures unless it is absolutely sure the changes are for the better.

5. Once company policy on a matter is set, it ought not be changed.

6. If a new plan or program is like to upset people, it ought to be put off for a while, at least.

7. Before a new method or plan is put into effect, the company ought to make sure nobody will be hurt by it.

8. A company should not expand if it is not sure it can provide steady employment for all the new people.

9. A company should avoid a big strike at practically any cost.

10. Plans and programs involving many changes and problems probably aren't worth the trouble they could cause.

11. It's not a good thing to jump into a new product line before all the bugs are worked out.
12. It's unhealthy for the company to have to borrow a great deal of money to finance new programs and plans.
13. It's better to work for a small company than a big one.
14. It's better to have a quality product with steady customers even though prospects for growth are not great.
15. Once a good production method is found, management should stick to it.
16. If trying to improve things upsets too many people, the company shouldn't bother as long as a reasonably good job is being done.
17. It isn't good for the company to get spread out into too many different products and markets.
18. A company whose sales and employment have remained steady over the years is doing very well.

IX

1. Taxes ought to be reduced even if it means cutting down such things as social security benefits.
2. In slack times, the government ought to provide jobs for the unemployed.
3. The Federal government spends too much money.
4. If the government weren't watching, monopolies would be far more widespread than they are now.
5. When prices on some goods and services get too high, the government ought to step in and put ceilings on them.
6. The best way to stimulate business would be to reduce taxes on business.
7. Big government is necessary to offset the power of big business and big labor.
8. Unemployment compensation is a good thing.
9. It is up to the government to see that everyone has a job.
10. The government should never spend more than it takes in.
11. Whenever business profits get too high, the government should tax the excess.
12. If it weren't for government taxes, many large firms would be making very large profits.

13. The best thing for encouraging good business and high employment is competition in the free market.

14. What's good for business is almost always good for the country.

15. Practically all the goods and services needed by the people can best be provided through private industry and commerce.

16. The government can do a lot to keep business and employment up.

17. Nobody should be allowed to make too much money.

18. It's up to the government to see that people have enough to live on.

19. Social benefits, such as aid in financing housing, social security, and unemployment benefits, are good for the country.

20. The government should regulate bad advertising practices.

21. The Federal government should provide money to raise the pay of school teachers.
1. Title of your present position.

________________________________________

2. How long have you held this position?

   ______ Less than a year
   ______ 1 - 5 years
   ______ 6 - 15 years
   ______ 16 - 25 years
   ______ Over 25 years

3. How long have you held a management position?

   ______ Less than a year
   ______ 1 - 5 years
   ______ 6 - 15 years
   ______ 16 - 25 years
   ______ Over 25 years

4. Have you ever been a wage earner?

   ______ Yes
   ______ No

5. If you have been a wage earner, what types of jobs have you held and for how long?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th>No. of Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>______ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>______ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>______ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>______ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Have you ever been a member of a union?

   ______ Yes
   ______ No

7. If you have been a member of a union, how long did you hold membership?

   ______ Less than a year
   ______ 1 - 5 years
   ______ 6 - 15 years
   ______ 16 - 25 years
   ______ Over 25 years

8. What is your age?

   ______ Under 25
   ______ 25 - 35
   ______ 36 - 50
   ______ Over 50

9. How many years of formal schooling have you completed?

   ______ 8 or fewer
   ______ 9 - 11
   ______ 12 (High school grad.)
   ______ 13 - 15
   ______ 16 (College grad.)
   ______ Over 16
APPENDIX B
RATINGS OF INDIVIDUAL EFFECTIVENESS

NAME OF SUPERVISOR BEING RATED:______________________________

DIRECTIONS: Please rank and rate the effectiveness of the above-named supervisor
or executive in carrying out the responsibilities listed below.

1. On which of the 14 responsibilities is he most effective? Which the least
effective? Rank the responsibilities in order by placing numbers from 1 to 14 in the
brackets at the left of the items. A rank of (1) means that he does better in this than
in the other 13 responsibilities. A rank of (2) means that this is his next most
effective performance. A rank of (14) means that this is his least effective performance.
Use a dash (-) if the item is not a responsibility.

2. Decide how this individual stands on each item in relation to the average of
other men who occupy parallel positions in the company. Mark an X on the ratings
scale after each item to show how this individual compares with the Company average
for men of his position, status, or level of responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>How does this man compare with the company average?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspection - Observation to determine conditions.</td>
<td>LOW   AVERAGE HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research - Gathering and preparing data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning - Short term and long range planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation of procedures - Outlining methods for operating plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination - Integration and control of operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation - Evaluation of reports, decisions, performance, results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation - Clarifying and explaining.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision - Supervising work of subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel activities - Selection, discipline, training, motivation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public relations - Informing public to create good will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional consultation - Giving technical advice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiations - Purchasing, selling, negotiating agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduling, routing and dispatching - Determining the time, place and sequence of operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical and professional performances - Using tools, equipment, and professional techniques.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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