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INTRODUCTION

The fundamental unit of interaction is two people in an action-response situation. The major objective of this study is concerned with worker-supervisor interaction in the work environment. Both the supervisor and the worker hold positions in an economic organization that may be described in terms of roles. The total role system of a given supervisor is different from all other supervisors. Each supervisor, as a person, may interact with several other individuals. Thus, one supervisor may have a set of role behaviors that encompasses his relationships with a wife, other family members, friends, supervisors, superiors, and subordinates. Another supervisor may not be responsible for a family, thus his role constellation is basically different from the first supervisor. However, in his relationships with workers,
the supervisor is evaluated by those workers on the basis of certain expectations as held by the workers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

If a supervisor's behavior (role performance) is not consistent with the worker's expectations of what it "ought to be" (ideal behavior), will that worker's performance and job satisfaction be affected? If the worker's perception of the supervisor's behavior (the actual behavior as perceived by the worker) agree with or conform to the worker's estimate of the ideal behavior of a supervisor, will the supervisor be more successful in influencing the behavior of the worker?

The above comments form the foundation for the development of certain hypotheses concerning the effect of "real" and "ideal" supervisory behavior on worker performance and job satisfaction.

Specifically, this study will examine:
1. Difference between the "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior and the effect on group performance (productivity, drive, and cohesion).
2. Difference between the "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning supervisor's behavior and the effect on worker job satisfaction (satisfaction with company, management, pay, advancement, job security, and freedom on
3. The relationships between the "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior and leadership behavior relating to initiating structure and consideration and its affect on group output and individual satisfaction.

Specific questions to be answered by this study are:

1. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with group cohesiveness?
2. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with group productivity?
3. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with group drive?
4. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with opportunity for advancement?
5. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with management?
6. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases,
what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with pay?

7. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with freedom on the job?

8. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's loyalty to the company?

9. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with job security?

10. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of the workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the effect on leader behavior variable initiating structure?

11. As the difference between "real" and "ideal" perceptions of workers concerning the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the effect on the leader behavior variable of consideration?

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Data for this study were obtained by questionnaire (see Appendix B). The questionnaire consisted of four parts as follows:

PART I - The worker describes what he considers ideal behavior of a supervisor.
PART II - The worker describes actual behavior of his supervisor.

PART III - The worker describes performance of his group.

PART IV - The worker describes his own satisfaction with work.

The questionnaire used in this study was developed by the staff of the Bureau of Business Research, College of Administrative Science, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. Its reliability has been tested through many years of use in business research.

The questionnaire was distributed to 180 airmen at Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana.

Pearson's correlation coefficients were computed to find the relationships among the different variables.

Chapter III is devoted to a more detailed discussion of the methodology.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

It has been suggested that individual expectations play an important part in the development of norms and roles. Also, Stogdill (1959) suggests that expectations are member inputs into group activities and play an important part in the development of a theory of organization. Thus, he perceives expectation as an input variable and an aspect of individual behavior which affects group achievement or group output, which includes such factors as pro-
ductivity, cohesion, and drive.¹

Estimates of ideal behavior and actual behavior of supervisory behavior have been obtained and used to measure supervisor performance but a search of the literature failed to reflect significant research designed specifically to determine relationships between worker performance and job satisfaction as it may be related to conformity or non-conformity of expectations of supervisory behavior.

It is expected that this study will add to the knowledge of worker behavior through examination of the various relationships explored in this study. Such knowledge could support some modification in the appraisal content and conduct of supervisory training programs. It is assumed that expectations could be unreasonable and impossible to satisfy. If these kinds of conditions could be predicted, undesirable outcomes could be prevented through the selection, training, and promotion process.

DEFINITION OF VARIABLES

¹R - Discrepancy. Discrepancy refers to the discrepancy factor or difference between the ideal behavior of the supervisor as perceived by the worker and the actual

behavior of the supervisor or leader as perceived by the worker.

R$^2$ - Cohesiveness. Cohesiveness is the capacity of the group to maintain structure and function under stress. It is the ability to keep things together and under control. Cohesiveness is a group output factor.

R$^3$ - Productivity. Productivity is the fertility or abundance of production attained. Productivity is a group output factor.

R$^4$ - Drive. Drive is that motivation which is a strong impulse or urge to attain specified goals. Drive is a group output factor.

R$^5$ - Advancement. Advancement refers to the opportunities which an individual feels exist for him to move upward in the organization and is a factor in job satisfaction.

R$^6$ - Management. Management refers to an individual's loyalty toward and satisfaction with management and is a factor in job satisfaction.

R$^7$ - Pay. Pay refers to an individual's satisfaction with the wages he is receiving for his work and is a factor in job satisfaction.

R$^8$ - Freedom. Freedom refers to the amount of freedom an individual feels he has in his job, freedom from supervision and right to make decisions. This is a factor in job satisfaction.
R⁹ - Company. Company refers to the worker's attitude toward and satisfaction with his company. This is a factor in job satisfaction.

R¹⁰ - Job Security. Job security refers to the satisfaction an individual has for the amount of security he experiences for his job. This is a factor in job satisfaction.

R¹¹ - Consideration. Consideration refers to leader behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leader and members of the group.

R¹² - Structure. Structure refers to initiating structure which is concerned with the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done.

LIMITATIONS

This study is concerned with worker behavior in group activity. Individual behavior in group activity is influenced by many variables, and is thus difficult to predict. Also, it is difficult to isolate those variables influencing behavior. This study does not attempt to predict behavior but merely establish relationships with discrepancies between worker expectation of supervisor
behavior and actual behavior of supervisor.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF DISSERTATION

Chapter II contains the theoretical framework and review of the literature followed by methodology in Chapter III. Chapter IV contains an analysis and discussion of the data followed by Chapter V which includes the Summary and Conclusions.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

CHAPTER PERSPECTIVE

In this chapter, the framework for a structure of organization achievement is discussed. The structure consists of an input-output system designed to present a more adequate theory of organizational behavior. The discussion will begin with a limited background introduction followed by a review of the previous research which has relevance to this investigation. The discussion is concerned primarily with output variables in group activity. The objective is to show the basis for the logic of the approach and the variables selected in this study.

BACKGROUND

Aside from a few early attempts at improving the general welfare of workers similar to the efforts of Robert Owens, there is little evidence that prior to the twentieth century employers were particularly concerned with worker morale or its effects. Frederick Taylor and others did much to direct management's attention toward the relationship between the individual worker and productivity.
Later, the studies by Elton Mayo and his associates turned direct attention to the importance of employee attitudes.

Today the evidence indicates that employers and researchers are greatly concerned with attitudes in the general belief that if morale is high, employees are satisfied and happy about their conditions of employment. It is further generalized that when employee morale is high, they produce more; and when morale is low, both the quantity and quality of production suffer accordingly.

In response to this general belief, it must be pointed out that a clear relationship between employee morale and production is unproved. Brayfield and Crockett\(^2\) conclude that there is little convincing evidence that individuals in any group who have more favorable attitudes toward the company do a better job. This generalization applies to a wide variety of occupational groups including insurance agents, employees paid by the hour, office workers, supervisors, and other employee categories in various business and industrial companies.\(^3\) Studies by other researchers indicate that the relationship that may exist


between morale and productivity is at best a slight one.\(^4\)

Individual behavior in group activity is influenced by many variables and is thus difficult to predict. Continued research and studies tend to enhance the quantity and quality of knowledge pointing toward a more adequate theory of organizational behavior.

Stogdill\(^5\) maintains that the deficiencies of existing theories of group organization are most clearly revealed in their inability to account for the findings on group achievement. He presented a structure of a theory of organization achievement on the basis of an Input-Output system. Output included productivity, cohesiveness, and drive as group factors and morale or job satisfaction as an individual factor. Inputs included performance, interactions, and expectations.

This study is concerned with the input variable of leader behavior expectations and its relationship with group and individual output variables.

**PRODUCTIVITY**

Productivity is characterized by fewer problems


of definition and measurement than morale. Productivity is, for the most part, quantifiable in terms of an input-output ratio for research purposes. Productivity may be defined as the number of units of work accomplished in a given period of time.\textsuperscript{6}

This method of defining productivity is direct and simple. Furthermore, it is very suitable for gathering information and making appraisals of work groups which are producing a tangible, measurable output in a certain period of time. This definition of productivity will serve quite adequately for the discussion that will take place in the following pages.

On jobs on the production line as well as in sales, and on many other types of jobs, the criterion which seems at first, to reflect adequacy of job performance best is productivity. Yet, measuring productivity is harder than it may initially seem.\textsuperscript{7}

A comparison of output between two persons must be equal with the conditions under which these people operate. One salesman's territory may be potentially more fruitful than another's. In addition, his sales may cause, rather


\textsuperscript{7}Arthur H. Brayfield and Walter H. Crockett, op. cit. p. 410.
than result from, his higher morale. Two machines may vary in their output, in their state of repair, and in many other ways. Very often there are external restraints on productivity. Output in a factory may be determined by the speed of the assembly line, by the speed of the machine, by the amount of the materials provided to a person by some feeder line, or by the quality of the material being processed. Total productivity will certainly be affected by the variation in situational factors no matter what the level of personal job performance.

Managers tend to assume that high morale and high productivity go together. When one factor moves, the other moves with it. Recent research has questioned the generality of this claim. Studies have shown that a direct positive relationship does not prevail between morale and productivity. It can be deduced that productivity is not a dependent variable operating as a function of morale.

The classic study relating morale and productivity in a personal environment was conducted by Kornhauser and Sharp in 1930 in Neenah, Wisconsin, in the mill operated by the Kimberly-Clark Corporation. Between 200 and 300 young girls engaged in routine repetitive jobs at machines were studied. Both questionnaires and interviews were employed. Scores were tabulated for groups of items and item responses were analyzed.
The findings on the relationship of morale to productivity is summarized in the statement that "Efficiency ratings of employees showed no relationship to their attitudes." Further, the authors say, "In one group of 20 girls for whom they had comparable output records, three of the four with the most unfavorable attitudes were first, second, and fourth in production and the two most favorable were near the bottom in production."\(^8\)

Mayo, to a certain extent, disagrees with most of the empirical evidence presented by researchers in this area of investigation. He believes that morale is commonly spoken of as an imponderable or intangible by people in the business world. He cites the studies conducted in Philadelphia and at Hawthorne in the test room. In the latter study, individuals were bodily removed from their respective work scenes and placed in a sheltered work place. Instead of the usual supervision, the researchers attempted to gain their cooperation and willing participation in the experiments. Top management showed a definite interest in the workers. Production increased, wastage diminished, absenteeism and labor turnover decreased, and morale was increased significantly. According to Mayo, "Those who refer to such matters as imponderable are themselves ignorant of methods by which they can systematically set

\(^8\)ibid., p. 397.
about the task of improving the cooperative morale and production in a working department, and are irked by any implication that this is a proper duty of the manager."^9

The early work of Likert and Katz has been continued by them at the University of Michigan since the end of World War II. The prototype investigation was undertaken in 1947 in the Prudential Insurance Company. The findings of this study were publicized in some detail in 1950. The most important part of the investigation was dedicated to exploring the relationship between employee morale and employee productivity. One and one-half hour answer interviews covering 53 questions were conducted with 419 non-supervisory clerical workers in 24 various departments. Their responses were coded. The section was designated as high productivity on the basis of production records while the parallel set was representative of low productivity sections. The productivity differences between the pairs were not very great; rarely more than 10 percent. Each of the high-low productivity pairs as composed of two sections handling similar types of people at the same occupation levels and was very similar on a number of

variables.

An interesting feature was the computation of four indices of attitudinal variables. The differentiations were built on a theoretical basis with some empirical confirmation for the relationship among the items used in the work group indices. Four variables were specified: (a) pride in the work group; (b) job status and financial satisfaction; (c) intrinsic job satisfaction; and (d) company involvement. The most independent of the four was pride in the work group. The remaining three intercorrelated around .4, out of a possible 1.00 rating scale.

When these morale indices were related to productivity, only pride in the work group showed a distinct relationship. Productivity groups were also differentiated by three specific attitude items not included in the morale indices.  

Product is defined by Stogdill as the relative change in the goal expectancy and goal achievement values of the organization. Product refers to those outcomes designed to satisfy the expectations of the group as a whole. That is, product measures the values created by the

10 Brayfield and Crockett, op. cit. p. 403
11 Ralph M. Stogdill, Managers, Employees, Organizations (Bureau of Business Research, Monograph #125, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1965). p. 4.
members for the group. However, a portion of these values may be conceived as undergoing redistribution to the members. In creating values for the group, the members also create values for themselves. And while productivity is achieved at a cost to the members, the satisfaction of the individual values of the members represents a cost to the group.

In measuring the productivity of a group, it is necessary to isolate some observable and quantifiable unit of input. But when this has been accomplished, it cannot be assumed that the productive effectiveness of the group has been measured either adequately or completely.

It has been very difficult to isolate and measure all the factors that need to be taken into account in evaluating product. J.P. Troxell provided an analysis of the many complex factors, both internal and external, which affect the productivity of an organization and of an economic system. He points out the fact that an organization creates a great variety of values, both material and non-material. For this reason, the measure of product in terms of units of material product created by the effort of the members can represent at best only a crude approximation of the results of group effort. It was also pointed out that the problem of measuring productivity in governmental, religious, and educational organization, where no
material product is used, is even more difficult.\textsuperscript{12}

Individuals form judgments regarding the productivity of groups and the worthwhileness of groups as productive agents. Members tend to regard these judgments as having validity. Moreover, these facts suggest that productivity can be evaluated within degrees of accuracy that are useful for operating purposes.

In conclusion, it can be stated that both the formal group structure and the role structure are instrumental to productivity. Also, product is facilitated when function and status are clearly defined and when those members in high status positions maintain group structure and goal direction. In addition, a type of leadership in high status positions which enlarges the responsibility and authority of subordinates to a degree that is permitted by the necessity for controlling operations also tends to increase productivity.

COHESIVENESS

In a general sense, the word "group" refers to persons who are bound together by specific relationships which set them apart from others. In these groups there

\textsuperscript{12}Ralph M. Stogdill, \textit{Individual Behavior and Group Achievement}, op. cit., p. 205.
is an attraction of the members to one another. This characteristic is called group cohesiveness. The people in these groups interact with one another and set up different patterns of interaction which influence the behavior of the group. An example of this is group norms which have an impact on individual attitudes on output.

The power of the group can be channeled into lines of productivity. By the closeness of the group it is believed that the workers will be highly motivated to carry out their jobs effectively. Whereas if the workers are indifferent to, or dislike one another, its members will not be highly motivated to carry out their jobs effectively. This means that groups high in cohesiveness can exert greater influence over the behavior of their members than those which are low in cohesiveness. The direction that this influence will take cannot be inferred from the degree of cohesiveness of the group but requires a knowledge of the group norms or standards regarding productivity.

Cohesiveness in the informal work group may have either positive or negative consequences on the level of performance of individual group members, depending on the nature of the norms or standards with respect to performance adopted in the group.¹³ This means that high

cohesive groups that are hostile to the company or the union tend to limit production. These hostilities are usually caused by the inability of management to get along with the workers. This inability could be caused by such things as the workers being unable to cope with exorbitant managerial demands or the worker not receiving enough pay. These hostilities are short-lived because usually a pay raise or a strike and arbitration results which eventually gets rid of the grievances.

There is considerable evidence to show that management does not have to sit idly by, allowing its supportive attitude to provide an environment in which groups of employees will arise spontaneously and set high goals. The development of the whole group-dynamics approach strongly suggests that a sincere and honest management can take an active part in the development of groups and in an attempt to induce these groups to set high goals. Because of the somewhat complex approach used in group dynamics, great difficulty exists in trying to determine just which of the various elements is responsible for how much of the result. In general, the efforts involve an approach to a relatively small group of workers as intelligent and relatively important human beings, presentation of a problem, encouragement of participation, two-way exchange of information, acceptance of the proposal by the group, frequent information concerning achievements,
and continuing permissive but helpful supervision to provide a supportive environment for carrying out the agreed upon activity. When the process can be completed successfully, the result is not only higher production but also less evidence of frustration among the workers as evidenced by such things as aggression, absences, and quits.\(^{14}\)

Most organizations have a tendency to introduce changes in work methods and routines at a faster rate than the individual can adjust to them.\(^{15}\) Without this sense of faith in one another, individual workers may behave in ways that will injure their fellow workers. This voluntary group is the locale within which the person feels good about himself because the others feel that he is important or at least a desirable associate.

The most common target of group power is the manager. Most managers are quick to recognize that although they have the authority to make a wide range of decisions, to make certain decisions would be downright foolhardy. The members of the group can express their displeasure by cutting down their work pace, sabotaging their work, or making their boss look bad as a supervisor.


Rarely do participants in an organization belong to just one group. Employees form friendship groups based on their contacts and common interests and these groups arise out of the life of the organization. Once these groups have been established, however, they develop a life of their own that is almost completely separate from the work process from which it arose.  

Increasing interaction builds favorable sentiments toward fellow group members. The group then becomes something more than a mere collection of people. It develops a customary way of doing things i.e. a set of stable characteristics that are hard to change. It becomes an organization in itself.

The suborganization that is formed has a few major characteristics. One is that it performs a psychological function for the individual providing support and permissiveness. The group sets goals for itself that become important motivators for the individual. In the large organization everyone is supposed to be working toward the same objectives. The individuals are likely to put their own need satisfactions ahead of these goals. The goals take precedence over the total organization goals when the small group objectives tend to conflict with

---

16 Ibid. p. 89.
or take precedence over the organization goals. 17

DRIVE

Group drive is defined as the vigor and freedom of action exhibited by the organization. 18 Freedom to act, freedom to interact, and freedom to reinforce expectations are factors that have been shown to play an important part in the development of group structure, function, and operations. Since drive is an aspect of group output, it is also defined in terms of these areas of freedom. These areas in combination describe the freedom from restraint which the group members exhibit in attacking their task.

This definition does not imply that all drive is good drive. Drive can be either too high or too low for the welfare of the group. The group may suffer when the members fail to accomplish their task with sufficient vigor and enthusiasm. There are times when high drive needs to be tempered by a just regard for group integrity and by a careful consideration of the effective means of goal attainment.

The reinforcement of goal expectations is to enlarge

18Ralph M. Stogdill, Individual Behavior and Group Achievement, op. cit. p. 211.
the area of freedom of a group. Successful outcomes reinforce the expectation of further successes. Success brings prestige and high status to a group so that it is expected to exhibit a high degree of initiative, freedom, and privilege in keeping with its status. Furthermore, controlled freedom from restraint tends to facilitate successful action. Successful groups tend to exhibit high morale.

The drive of a group is a direct outcome of the freedom of action granted to its individual members in the performance of their group-defined roles. However, in order for this freedom to be utilized as group drive, it is necessary for the activities of individual members and of subgroups to be co-ordinated and directed toward the goal of the group. This fact suggests that drive should be related to group cohesiveness. A low cohesive group would be expected to exhibit lower drive than one that is more highly cohesive. Also, since drive is increased by reinforcements of the expectations of success, it is expected that the product of a group should be related to its drive.

It is necessary to distinguish between motivation and drive. Motivation is regarded in Stogdill's theory as a function of drive. Drive is defined as freedom from restraint in action toward a goal. An individual or a group may be highly motivated but be unable to act. Given
freedom to act, the degree of drive may be highly related to the strength of motivation. There is a sense in which drive may be regarded as motivation exhibited in some overt action toward a goal objective. Motivation provides potential for drive.

The definition of drive as freedom from restraint in action toward a goal carries important implications relative to the nature of group motivation. Applications of pressure and persuasion tend to pervert a group rather than to motivate it. The proper motivation of a group consists of setting attainable goal expectations, providing freedom of action, and providing sufficient structure and control for action upon the goal objective.\(^{19}\)

The leader's fundamental responsibility in any form of organization is to get work done through people. The basic objective of all leaders is the effective accomplishment of the duties and the responsibilities necessary for the successful operation of an organization. All facets of work done in an organization are ultimate manifestations of some manner or form of human behavior.

All rational human behavior is caused: we behave as we do because we are responding to forces that have the power to prompt and motivate us to some manner or form of action. There must be some reason why we are

\(^{19}\textit{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 211-214.$
responding to this force. This is simply the force which caused the motivation.\textsuperscript{20}

Although there have been many descriptions of the types or classes of needs that motivate human behavior, there are three general types: physiological, sociological, and psychological needs.

There is much evidence today that employers and managers are greatly concerned with employee morale. They tend to believe that if morale is high employees are satisfied and happy about their jobs, working conditions, pay, and other aspects of the employment situation and are, consequently, producing efficiently and effectively.

Although the term morale is used very loosely, there is general agreement that it refers to a combination of employee attitudes toward employment. Morale is a synthesis of how employees think and feel about their jobs, their working conditions, their superiors, their firm, their fellow worker, their pay, and other problems. If a particular response results in satisfaction of one or more needs, it could be deduced that the individual's attitude with respect to his need, his action, and the result of his action is good. From a management viewpoint

this assumes that in both cases the employee's needs and responses are oriented towards the interest of the organization.

The implication of the relationship between morale and behavior is clear; significant attention must be given to morale as an indicator of need satisfaction, both of the individual employee and of the group as a whole. The leader must, therefore, make every effort possible and use every means at his disposal to determine and be cognizant of employee attitudes.

Morale and motivational factors are generally found to influence production. When the foreman uses the employee-centered idea he usually gets the most out of his workers. The employee-centered supervisor endeavors to build a team, whose members cooperate and work well together. He tries to have people work together who are congenial. He not only trains people to do their present jobs well, but tends to train them for the next higher job. In other words, he is interested in their problems, both on and off the job.

JOB SATISFACTION

Job satisfaction has been defined as "an attitude which results from balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job. These evaluations may rest largely upon
one's own success or failure in the achievement of personal objectives and upon perceived contribution of the job and the company toward these ends." Job Satisfaction, then, is a judgment by the employee of how well his job is generally compatible with his different needs.

The most comprehensive studies of this problem have been conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan. This group has studied such work environments as the offices of an insurance company, railroad section gangs, and an electric utility firm, to name a few. A summary of their findings is as follows:

We find that the twin criteria of productivity and morale determinants in common. Yet the coexistence of high morale and low productivity or more frequently, low morale and high productivity, is sufficiently common so that no consistent relationship between productivity and morale has appeared in any of the research studies. One explanation of the discrepancy has already been suggested, namely, that the supervisor can increase productivity in two fairly independent ways; either through his engineering skill or through his ability to motivate his men. Another major explanation is that productivity can be increased in some instances by company practices involving

---

negative sanctions which affect morale adversely.22

Job satisfaction can simply be stated as the satisfaction received by an employee from his job. Or is it really just that simple? Job satisfaction is influenced both by the extent to which the work a person does is intrinsically interesting to him and by his attitude toward the total work situation, including the company, his supervisor, and fellow workers.23

There are a number of different definitions of morale, however, managers seem to be fairly consistent when defining it. When referring to morale, managers usually mean the attitudes of individuals and groups toward their work environment and toward voluntary cooperation to the full extent of their ability in the best interests of the organization.

Defined in this way, the term includes both individual and group aspects of morale, individual morale being the structure of an employee's attitudes toward employment, whereas group morale is the general tone of employee attitudes in the organization as a whole or in a particular office or department.


Because morale represents the general conditions of human relations, it plays a very important role. It is a collection of employee feelings, attitudes, and sentiments, instead of a single feeling. When one examines morale concretely, one must look at these attitudes in relation to particular and specific company conditions. Thus, there are three principle ways in which morale can be measured. The first way is through face-to-face contact. The second way is through regular interpretation of existing information. The third and final way is through periodic surveys.  

Whatever the problems in measuring and defining morale, it is possible to conclude, deductively speaking, that it plays an important role in the individual's behavior and motivation. The reason for this should be very obvious. If it is true that employee behavior is directed toward greater satisfaction of needs, the result of that behavior must directly influence the attitudes of the individual. In similar terms, if a certain response results in satisfaction of one or more needs, it can be concluded that the result of his attitudes with respect to his needs, his action, and the

result of his action is good. Resulting attitudes should continue to be good as long as this behavior brings about satisfaction. If, however, behavior does not result in satisfaction, frustration and its consequences will be forthcoming and a negative attitude will result.  

The estimates of the number of satisfied workers in the general employed population are fairly close in agreement. A majority of workers, about two-thirds, appear to be generally satisfied with their occupations. Statistics such as these obscure certain important characteristics when giving an over-all picture. Job satisfaction has many points of reference, and very few employees are satisfied with all aspects of their jobs. Differences in degree of satisfaction, especially in specific areas, compensatory adjustments that occur with differences in working conditions, and other related factors may all be obscured by the over-all measurement of job satisfaction. The satisfactions the worker receives from his occupation are not only many and varied, but are also highly sensitive to change.  

Consider specifically, the possible relationship

---

25 I.L. Heckmann Jr. and S.G. Huneryager, Human Relations in Management (Cincinnati: Southwestern Publishing Co. 1960), p. 120.

between job satisfaction and productivity. It does seem likely that low productivity may serve as a form of aggression which reflects worker hostility under conditions of marked dissatisfaction. Yet, the belief that production should increase monotonically with increases in job satisfaction apparently rests on the assumption that the worker will demonstrate his gratitude by increasing his output, or that the increased job satisfaction liberates certain energies in the worker, or that the satisfied employee accepts management's goals, which include high production.

Whatever the case may be, it is a common belief that increased job satisfaction encourages the worker to produce more. If this is true, then it should follow that increased productivity can be attained by raising the worker's job satisfaction. However, this type of correlation is not as simple as it may seem. Many researchers in this area of investigation who have been mistaken. Blinded by their great concern with discovering pertinent and applicable generalizations, they have tended to overlook the personal differences in motivation and perception of the employees in organizations.

The correlation between job satisfaction and productivity is actually one of concomitant variation, rather than a cause-and-effect relationship. It certainly makes sense to assume that people are motivated to achieve specific
environmental goals and that the attainment of these goals results in satisfaction. Productivity is rarely a goal in itself. It is more commonly thought of as a means to goal achievement. Therefore, it might be expected that high job satisfaction and high productivity occur together when productivity is perceived as a road to specific important goals and when these goals are attained. However, under other conditions, job satisfaction and productivity might be unrelated or even negatively correlated.27

Individual job satisfaction depends on many factors; psychological, physical, and economical. The main point to understand is that each man is an individual, a microcosm who must be respected as such in order to be a successful managerial innovator of the future.

27 Brayfield and Crockett, op. cit. p. 415-416.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER PERSPECTIVE

In this chapter, the setting for the study and a description of the method of measuring the variables under study are provided. The composition and selection of the subjects are identified, followed by a discussion of the questionnaire formulation.

SETTING FOR THE STUDY

The setting for the study was Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, which had a population of approximately 3800 enlisted men at the time this study was conducted in 1970. It was considered desirable to select the subjects from one location in order to lessen environmental influences related to geography and different management philosophies. Therefore, all subjects were selected from one Air Force Base which would correspond to a single location of a large business enterprise.

METHOD OF MEASUREMENT AND QUESTIONNAIRE SELECTION

In order to test the relationship between the investigated variables, a questionnaire was devised
incorporating previously developed and tested items from the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire\textsuperscript{28}, Job Satisfaction and Job Expectation Scales\textsuperscript{29}, and Work Group Description Scales\textsuperscript{30}; all developed and tested by the Staff of the Division of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (see Appendix B).

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire provides a technique whereby group members may describe the leader behavior of a designated leader in formal organization. This same questionnaire was used in this study to determine how the individual group member thought the leader ought to behave. The Job Satisfaction and Job Expectations Scales measure present satisfaction in relation to past expectations concerning advancement, management, pay, freedom on the job, company and job security. The work group descriptions scales provide a technique where group members may describe their group behavior relative to productivity, cohesiveness and drive.

\textsuperscript{28} Andrew W. Halpin, "Manual for The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire". Bureau of Business Research, College of Commerce and Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. 1957.

\textsuperscript{29} Ralph M. Stogdill, "Manual for Job Satisfaction and Job Expectations". Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. 1965.

\textsuperscript{30} Halpin, op. cit.
The independent variable in this study is a quantified difference between ideal behavior and actual behavior as perceived by the worker. To obtain this measure the worker was first asked how he believed the ideal leader should behave by indicating the frequency with which he perceives that the ideal leader ought to engage in each type of leader behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never. Next, the worker was asked how his leader actually behaved by indicating the frequency with which he perceives that his leader actually engaged in each type of leader behavior by marking one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never. Thirty items were used to describe leader behavior and Part I of the questionnaire is concerned with ideal leader behavior while Part II is concerned with actual leader behavior.

The 30 items in the ideal leader behavior and the actual leader behavior section are scored as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>A= 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>B= 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>C= 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>D= 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>E= 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exceptions are items 10, 15, and 16 and these are scored in reverse. Each part is scored on a single dimension to arrive at a sub-total and Part II subtracted from Part I

31See Part I and Part II of Appendix B.
equals the difference or discrepancy between ideal supervisory behavior and actual supervisory behavior, which is the independent variable of this study.

The data for variables $R_{11}$ (Consideration), and $R_{12}$ (Initiating Structure) was obtained from Part II of the questionnaire.

The data for variables $R_2$ (Cohesiveness), $R_3$ (Productivity), and $R_4$ (Drive) was obtained from Part III of the questionnaire.

The data for variables $R_5$ (Satisfaction with Advancement), $R_6$ (Satisfaction with Management), $R_7$ (Satisfaction with Pay), $R_8$ (Satisfaction with Freedom), $R_9$ (Satisfaction with Company), and $R_{10}$ (Satisfaction with Job Security), was obtained from Part IV of the questionnaire.\footnote{32 See Appendix C for scoring key for all variables.}

**SELECTION OF SUBJECTS**

Approval to conduct this study at an Air Force Base was granted through the Department of Defense with the provision that all participation would be on a voluntary basis and during off duty hours. This stipulation injected certain limitations relative to random selection and control of subjects.

The Non-Commissioned Officers Association, Grissom
A. F. B. Chapter, which is composed of approximately 200 members representing first line managers at Grissom A.F.B. Indiana, assisted with the selection of subjects and collection of data for this study. 40 first line managers distributed 180 questionnaires to subordinates who volunteered to participate in this study. The number of respondents per supervisor ranged from 2 to 6. A letter of instruction was attached to each questionnaire outlining the purpose of the study and the method in which the data would be processed. (See Appendix A).
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

CHAPTER PERSPECTIVE

In this chapter, tables are presented showing the intercorrelations between the twelve variables (Discrepancy R_1, Cohesion R_2, Product R_3, Drive R_4, Advancement R_5, Management R_6, Pay R_7, Freedom R_8, Company R_9, Job Security R_10, Consideration R_11, Structure R_12). The data are presented in seven tables in order to facilitate the presentation. Significant relationships are discussed in connection with each table. The presentation of data is followed by a chapter summary.

THE DATA

Table 1 shows the intercorrelations among the twelve variables. It will be observed that leader behavior variables (Consideration R_11 and Structure R_12) are statistically significant with all group performance variables (R_2 through R_4).
Table 1

Intercorrelation Between Twelve Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>R7</th>
<th>R8</th>
<th>R9</th>
<th>R10</th>
<th>R11</th>
<th>R12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=129. r=.19 is significant at .05 level. r=.25 is significant at .01 level.
Table 2
Leader Behavior Correlated With Group Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Consideration (Real)</th>
<th>Structure (Real)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>$R_2 = -.32$</td>
<td>$R_{11} = .33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>$R_3 = -.23$</td>
<td>$R_{11} = .37$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>$R_4 = -.26$</td>
<td>$R_{11} = .39$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be observed in Table 2 that consideration (Item 11) and structure (Item 12) are both significantly correlated with group cohesiveness, productivity, and drive. This means that groups with leaders who are high in leader behavior (consideration and structure) are high in the three aspects of group performance. Groups with leaders who are low in leader behavior (consideration and structure) are associated with low group performance.

Discrepancy between real and ideal leader behavior (Item 1) is associated with low group performance. As the difference between real and ideal leader increases, performance factors, being negatively correlated, will decrease.
Table 3 shows the correlations between leader behavior and the job satisfaction of employees. Discrepancy between actual and ideal leader behavior is negatively related to four of the job satisfaction items. But only the correlation of -.26 between discrepancy and satisfaction with advancement (Item 5) is statistically significant.

Leader consideration (Item 11) is significantly (r=.21) related to satisfaction with management (Item 6) and satisfaction with company (r=.20). Initiating structure (Item 12) is significantly related to satisfaction with advancement (r=.35), satisfaction with management (r=.23), freedom of action on the job (r=.40), and satisfaction with company (r=.22).
Table 4 shows the correlations between job satisfaction and group performance variables. Group cohesion (Item 2) is significantly related (r=.19) to satisfaction with management (Item 6), satisfaction with freedom on the job (r=.25), and satisfaction with company (r=.35).

Group productivity is negatively related (r=-.34) with satisfaction with pay and is positively (r=.19) related to satisfaction with company (Item 9). Group drive is negatively related (r=-.22) to satisfaction with pay (Item 7) and positively related (r=.28) with satisfaction with company (Item 9).
Table 5

Correlation Between Job Satisfaction Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Freedom</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₆</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₇</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₈</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₉</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₁₀</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the intercorrelations between job satisfaction variables. It will be observed that satisfaction with advancement (Item 5) is significantly (r=.36) related to satisfaction with freedom on the job (Item 8). Satisfaction with management (Item 6) is significantly related with satisfaction with pay (r=.48), satisfaction with freedom on the job (r=.52), and satisfaction with company (r=.71).

Satisfaction with pay (Item 7) is significantly correlated with satisfaction with company (r=.34). Satisfaction with freedom on the job is significantly correlated with satisfaction with management (r=.52), satisfaction with company (r=.62) and with job security (r=.30). Satisfaction with company is also significantly related to satisfaction with job security (r=.21).
Table 6
Correlation Between Group Performance Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>R₂</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>R₃</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>R₄</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be observed in Table 6 that all group performance variables are significantly correlated with each other. Cohesion (Item 2) is significantly related to productivity (r=0.46) and drive (r=0.50).

Product (Item 3) is significantly related to cohesion (r=0.46) and drive (r=0.81). Drive (Item 4) is significantly related to cohesion (r=0.50) and product (r=0.81). The relationships between group performance variables are positive.
Table 7
Means and Standard Deviation for all Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>16.186</td>
<td>10.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>24.977</td>
<td>2.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>30.481</td>
<td>4.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>30.062</td>
<td>4.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>12.302</td>
<td>3.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>11.729</td>
<td>2.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>6.527</td>
<td>3.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>12.961</td>
<td>2.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>12.116</td>
<td>2.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>13.132</td>
<td>2.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>62.659</td>
<td>7.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>57.791</td>
<td>9.982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 indicates the mean and standard deviation for all variables. Among the group performance variables (cohesion, product, and drive) product and drive were scored higher than cohesion.

Among the job satisfaction variables (advancement, management, pay, freedom, company, and security) satisfaction with security was scored the highest. Satisfaction with pay indicated the lowest satisfaction.

Leader behavior variable consideration was higher than the variable initiating structure.
SUMMARY

Significant relationships exist between the discrepancy variable and all group variables. The relationships are negative indicating that as the difference between expected and actual leader behavior increases, cohesiveness, drive, and productivity tend to decrease. Also, significant negative relationships exist between the discrepancy variable and the leader behavior variables of consideration and structure.

The lack of significant relationships between the discrepancy variable and job satisfaction variables is to be noted. Only the variable of satisfaction with opportunity for advancement is significantly related to the discrepancy factor and it is negatively related. This means that a subordinate's satisfaction with opportunity for advancement declines when the difference between expected leader behavior and actual leader behavior increases.

The group output variables of cohesiveness, drive, and productivity correlate significantly with one another. All relationships are positive indicating that they rise and fall together as they are influenced by leader behavior. Leader behavior variables of consideration and structure correlate significantly with group output variables.

A lack of correlation between group variables and job satisfaction variables is noted. In the case of the
variables of productivity and drive a significant negative correlation with pay exists. This indicates that satisfaction with pay decreases as productivity and /or drive increase. This relationship was expected. However, no other job satisfaction variable correlated with productivity. The variable of drive is significantly correlated with satisfaction with company, thus limiting significant relationships to the variables of pay and company. The group variable cohesiveness is significantly related to job satisfaction variables freedom, company, and management.

Correlations between the job satisfaction variables reveal some interesting information. The variable of satisfaction with opportunity for advancement correlates significantly with only the job satisfaction variable of freedom. The variable of satisfaction with management correlates significantly with variables pay, freedom, and company. The variable of pay correlates only with management and company. The variable of freedom correlates significantly with all job satisfaction variables except pay. The variable of company correlates significantly with all job satisfaction variables except advancement. The variable of job security is significantly correlated with freedom and company only.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study is concerned with the input variable of leader behavior expectation on behalf of workers in group activity and its relationship with group and individual output variables. Also, the relationship between the input variable of leader behavior expectation of workers' and its relationship to job satisfaction was studied. Theoretical concepts of organizational achievement providing the background for this study were introduced by Stogdill.33

METHODOLOGY

The samples for the study were selected from enlisted men assigned to Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana. The population from which the samples were selected was approximately 3800. The samples were selected by non-commissioned officers assisting in this study. 129 samples were accepted which provided the data for correlations.

For testing relationships, a questionnaire was devised incorporating previously developed and tested items

from the Leader Behavior Questionnaire, Job Satisfaction and Job Expectation Scales, and Work Group Description Scales. All items used in the questionnaire were developed by the staff of The Division of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire provided a technique whereby group members may describe the leader behavior of a designated leader in formal organization (actual behavior). This same questionnaire was used in this study to determine how the individual group member thought the leader ought to behave (ideal behavior). The Job Satisfaction and Job Expectations Scales measure present satisfaction in relation to past expectations concerning advancement, management, pay, freedom on the job, company, and job security. The Work Group Description Scales provide a technique where group members may describe their group behavior relative to productivity, cohesiveness, and drive.

The independent variable of this study is a quantified difference between ideal leader behavior and actual leader behavior as perceived by the worker. The output variables, including group output and job satisfaction,

---

34 Halpen, op. cit.
35 Stogdill, "Manual for Job Satisfaction and Job Expectations" op. cit.
36 Halpen, op. cit.
were obtained by combining the scores of the related items to yield a single score for each variable. Inter-correlation between all variables is presented in Table 1, Page 41.

FINDINGS

Significant relationships exist between the discrepancy variable and all group output variables. The relationships are negative indicating that as the difference between expected and actual leader behavior increases, cohesiveness, drive, and productivity tend to decrease. Also, significant negative relationships exist between the discrepancy variable and leader behavior variables of consideration and structure.

A lack of significant relationships between the discrepancy variable and job satisfaction variables was indicated. The variable Satisfaction with Opportunity for Advancement is the only job satisfaction variable that is significantly related to the discrepancy variable. The relationship is negative which means that a subordinate's satisfaction with the variable Opportunity for Advancement declines as the difference between expected leader behavior and actual leader behavior increases.

Certain specific questions were presented in Chapter I for which it was believed the study would provide information. The questions and answers are as follows:
1. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with group cohesiveness?

Answer: The relationship is significant and negative. This means that as the discrepancy variable increases, group cohesiveness decreases.

2. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with group productivity?

Answer: The relationship is significant and negative. This means that as the discrepancy variable increases, group productivity decreases.

3. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with group drive?

Answer: The relationship is significant and negative. This means that as the discrepancy variable increases, group drive decreases.

4. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with opportunity for advancement?

Answer: The relationship is significant and negative. This means that as the discrepancy variable increases, worker's satisfaction with opportunity for advancement
5. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with management?

Answer: The relationship was not significant.

6. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with pay?

Answer: The relationship was not significant.

7. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with freedom on the job?

Answer: The relationship was not significant.

8. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's loyalty to the company?

Answer: The relationship was not significant.

9. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the relationship with the worker's satisfaction with job security?

Answer: The relationship was not significant.

10. As the difference between observed and ideal descrip-
tions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the effect on the leader behavior variable initiating structure?

   Answer: The relationship is significant and negative. This means that as the discrepancy variable increases, the variable of initiating structure decreases.

11. As the difference between observed and ideal descriptions of the supervisor's behavior increases, what is the effect on the leader behavior variable of consideration?

   Answer: The relationship is significant and negative. This means that as the discrepancy variable increases, the variable of consideration decreases.

LIMITATIONS

   This study is concerned with worker behavior in group activity. Many variables influence individual behavior in group activity and this makes it difficult to isolate those variables influencing behavior. This study does not attempt to predict behavior but merely establish relationships with discrepancies between worker expectation of supervisor behavior and actual supervisor behavior. The samples for the study are from military work groups and the descriptions of supervisor behavior are of actual military supervisors.

   No attempt was made to compare findings with those of other groups.
CONCLUSIONS

Stogdill indicates that the three output variables (product, cohesiveness, and drive) are interrelated, but that the correlations among them are seldom very high. His survey of the literature suggested certain general trends as follows:

1. Productivity and Drive tend to be positively related.
2. Productivity and Cohesiveness tend to be negatively related.
3. Drive and Cohesiveness may be either positively or negatively related.

In a later study of 1267 work groups by Stogdill, in which superiors of supervisors rated the work group, correlations between the three variables were in accord with the three hypotheses above.

In this study where the worker was asked to describe his productivity, cohesiveness, and drive, the following results were obtained.

1. Productivity and Drive were positively related (.81).
2. Productivity and Cohesiveness were positively related (.46).

38 Stogdill, Managers, Employees, Organizations, op. cit.
3. Drive and Cohesiveness were positively related (.50). The discrepancy variable was negatively correlated with each of the three group output variables (productivity, cohesiveness, and drive) which was in accord with the author's expectations.

Generally, leader behavior did not correlate significantly with the job satisfaction variable. This was not in accord with expectations.

Additional research is needed to determine the validity of the methodology used in this study and to determine if worker evaluation of his work group output can be utilized in predicting behavior.
To: Grissom AFB Personnel:

The undersigned is conducting a study of worker behavior in group activity as a partial fulfillment for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at the Ohio State University, and would like for you, as a member of the United States Air Force, to participate in the study. The purpose of the study is to examine relationships between aspects of leader behavior and worker performance, morale, and productivity in group activity. The results of the study are to be used for educational and research purposes.

Attached is a set of research forms which I would like for you to fill out. You will note that the survey is divided into four parts with special instructions at the beginning of each section. When you have completed the survey, which will take about 30 minutes, return it to the NCO who gave it to you or according to instructions given when you received the survey.

You are not asked to sign your forms or to identify your supervisor. When your survey has reached me your answers will be punched on IBM cards and averaged with those of other persons at your base. The results of the study will show only general relationships among leader behavior and worker performance, morale, and productivity. No individual will be identified in the results.

Your participation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Roy E. Burkey
Assistant Professor
(M/Sgt. USAF Retired)
APPENDIX B

LEADER BEHAVIOR, GROUP DESCRIPTIONS

AND JOB EXPECTATION

Developed by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe certain aspects of your work environment. The items are divided into four parts.

Part I may be used to describe the behavior of a supervisor, as you think he should act. Part II may be used to describe the actual behavior of your supervisor. Part III may be used to describe the group in which you work. Part IV may be used to compare your job with what you think it should be.

This is not a test of ability. It simply asks you to describe certain aspects of your work environment.

Published by
Bureau of Business Research
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The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210
PART I

IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOR

(What You Expect of Your Leader)

DIRECTIONS:

1. READ each item carefully.

2. THINK about how frequently the leader should engage in the behavior described by the item.

3. DECIDE whether he should always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never act as described by the item.

4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

   A = Always
   B = Often
   C = Occasionally
   D = Seldom
   E = Never

THE IDEAL LEADER SHOULD:

1. Do personal favors for group members ........................................... A B C D E
2. Make his attitude clear to the group ........................................... A B C D E
3. Do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group ................................. A B C D E
4. Try out his new ideas with the group ........................................... A B C D E
5. Be easy to understand ............................................................. A B C D E
6. Rule with an iron hand ............................................................ A B C D E
7. Find time to listen to group members ........................................... A B C D E
8. Criticize poor work ................................................................. A B C D E
2.

A = Always  
B = Often  
C = Occasionally  
D = Seldom  
E = Never

9. Speak in a manner not to be questioned ..................... A B C D E
10. Keep to himself ...................................... A B C D E
11. Look out for the personal welfare of individual group members... A B C D E
12. Assign group members to particular tasks ...................... A B C D E
13. Schedule the work to be done ........................... A B C D E
15. Refuse to explain his actions .............................. A B C D E
16. Act without consulting the group ........................... A B C D E
17. Back up the members in their actions ........................ A B C D E
18. Emphasize the meeting of deadlines .......................... A B C D E
19. Treat all group members as his equal ...................... A B C D E
20. Encourage the use of uniform procedures ..................... A B C D E
21. Be willing to make changes ................................ A B C D E
22. Make sure that his part in the organization is understood  
   by group members ...................................... A B C D E
23. Be friendly and approachable ................................ A B C D E
24. Ask that group members follow standard rules and 
   regulations ............................................ A B C D E
25. Make group members feel at ease when talking to them ......... A B C D E
26. Let group members know what is expected of them ............ A B C D E
27. Put suggestions made by the group into operation ............ A B C D E
28. See to it that group members are working up to capacity .... A B C D E
29. Get group approval in important matters before going ahead ..... A B C D E
30. See to it that the work of the group members is coordinated ... A B C D E
PART II

ACTUAL LEADER BEHAVIOR

DIRECTIONS:

1. READ each item carefully.

2. THINK about how frequently the leader does engage in the behavior described by the item.

3. DECIDE whether he always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never acts, as described by the item.

4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

WHAT MY LEADER ACTUALLY DOES:

1. He does personal favors for group members ....................... A B C D E

2. He makes his attitude clear to the group ....................... A B C D E

3. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group ............................................. A B C D E

4. He tries out his new ideas with the group ....................... A B C D E

5. He is easy to understand .............................................. A B C D E

6. He rules with an iron hand ............................................. A B C D E

7. He finds time to listen to group members ............................ A B C D E

8. He criticizes poor work .............................................. A B C D E

9. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned ............................ A B C D E

10. He keeps to himself .............................................. A B C D E
A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

11. He looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members ........................................... A B C D E
12. He assigns group members to particular tasks ................................................................. A B C D E
13. He schedules the work to be done .................................................................................. A B C D E
14. He maintains definite standards of performance ....................................................... A B C D E
15. He refuses to explain his actions .................................................................................. A B C D E
16. He acts without consulting the group .......................................................................... A B C D E
17. He backs up the members in their actions ................................................................. A B C D E
18. He emphasizes the meeting of deadlines .................................................................. A B C D E
19. He treats all group members as his equal .................................................................... A B C D E
20. He encourages the use of uniform procedures .......................................................... A B C D E
21. He is willing to make changes .................................................................................... A B C D E
22. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by group members ........................................... A B C D E
23. He is friendly and approachable ................................................................................ A B C D E
24. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations ........................................... A B C D E
25. He makes group members feel at ease when talking with them .................................. A B C D E
26. He lets group members know what is expected of them ........................................ A B C D E
27. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation ............................................... A B C D E
28. He sees to it that group members are working up to capacity .................................. A B C D E
29. He gets group approval in important matters before going ahead .................................. A B C D E
30. He sees to it that the work of the group members is coordinated ........................................... A B C D E
PART III

WORK GROUP DESCRIPTIONS

DIRECTIONS:

1. READ each item carefully.
2. DECIDE how well the statement describes your group.
3. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

1. The members of my group regard each other as friends ............ A B C D E
2. My group turns out more work than most groups here............... A B C D E
3. This group tackles any job with enthusiasm ....................... A B C D E
4. The members of the group are very cooperative with each other .... A B C D E
5. The group has an excellent production record ..................... A B C D E
6. The group has quit trying ........................................... A B C D E
7. The group members know that they can depend on each other ...... A B C D E
8. The group turns out as much work as management expects .......... A B C D E
9. The group tries to be on top in everything it does ................ A B C D E
10. The group members stand up for each other ....................... A B C D E
11. The work of the group seems to drag ................................ A B C D E
12. The group works hard on any job it undertakes .................... A B C D E
13. Members of the group work together as a team .................. A B C D E
14. My group gets a job done on time ............................... A B C D E
15. The group shows a lot of pep and enthusiasm .................. A B C D E
16. Some of the members of my group do not like each other ....... A B C D E
17. The group production record is below standard ................ A B C D E
18. The group does not exert itself very hard ...................... A B C D E
19. The group hates to lose old members or take in new ones ....... A B C D E
20. The group produces less than it should .......................... A B C D E
21. The group loafes and takes it easy .............................. A B C D E
PART IV

JOB EXPECTATIONS

DIRECTIONS:

1. READ each item carefully.

2. DECIDE whether it says something about your job that is much better than you expect, better than you expect, about the same as you expect, poorer than you expect, much poorer than you expect.

3. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five symbols to show how well the item meets your expectations. Do this for each item.

MB = Much Better than expected
B = Better than expected
S = Same as expected
P = Poorer than expected
MP = Much poorer than expected

1. My chances of getting ahead in this company ................. MB B S P MP
2. Management's interest in the welfare of employees .............. MB B S P MP
3. The amount of money I am paid .................................. MB B S P MP
4. Freedom to make decisions about my work ........................ MB B S P MP
5. This company as a place to work .................................. MB B S P MP
6. Chances of keeping this job as long as I want it ............... MB B S P MP
7. Satisfaction with my progress here ............................... MB B S P MP
8. Fair treatment of employees by management .................... MB B S P MP
9. Pay here compared to other places ............................... MB B S P MP
10. Freedom to use my own judgment in my work .................. MB B S P MP
11. My pride in working for this company ............................ MB B S P MP
12. Chances of steady work .................. MB B S P MP
13. My chances of going as high as I want to go here .......... MB B S P MP
15. Pay compared to what my work is worth .................. MB B S P MP
16. Ability to plan ahead in my work .................. MB B S P MP
17. Credit given by the company for good work ............... MB B S P MP
18. Chances of staying on this job until retirement ........... MB B S P MP
19. Advancement on the basis of ability .................. MB B S P MP
20. Management's planning for the future .................. MB B S P MP
21. The pay for overtime work .................. MB B S P MP
22. Freedom to express my opinion to my supervisor .......... MB B S P MP
23. This company's reputation in the community ............... MB B S P MP
24. Steadiness of work here compared to most places .......... MB B S P MP
APPENDIX C

SCORING KEY

The data for variables $R_{11}$ (Consideration) and $R_{12}$ (Initiating Structure) was obtained from Part II of the questionnaire. The items in the questionnaire and scoring key relating to consideration and structure are as follows:

Scoring Key for Consideration ($R_{11}$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores for the 15 items in the Consideration and Structure scales are combined to a single score. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 15 to 75.

The data for variables $R_2$ (Cohesiveness), $R_3$ (Productivity), and $R_4$ (Drive) was obtained from Part III of the questionnaire. The items in the questionnaire and scoring key relating to cohesiveness, productivity, and drive are as follows:
### Scoring Key for Cohesiveness ($R_2$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Key for Productivity ($R_3$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scoring Key for Drive ($R_4$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores for the 7 items in the Cohesiveness, Productivity, and Drive scales are combined to a single score in each scale. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 7 to 35.

The data for variables $R_5$ (satisfaction with Advancement), $R_6$ (satisfaction with Management), $R_7$ (satisfaction with Pay), $R_8$ (satisfaction with Freedom), $R_9$ (satisfaction with Company), and $R_{10}$ (satisfaction with Job Security), was obtained from Part IV of the Questionnaire.

The 24 items in the Job Expectations section of the questionnaire (Part IV) are scored as follows:

- **MB** = Much better than expected 5
- **B** = Better than expected 4
- **S** = Same as expected 3
- **P** = Poorer than expected 2
- **MP** = Much poorer than expected 1
The items in the questionnaire and scoring key relating to the satisfaction variables are as follows:

**Scoring Key for Satisfaction with Advancement (R₅)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Key for Satisfaction with Management (R₆)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Key for Satisfaction with Pay (R₇)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>MB</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>MP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores for the four items in the Job Satisfaction scales are combined to a single score in each scale. The possible range of scores on each dimension is 4 to 20.
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