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CHAPTER I

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Most organizations, particularly business firms, are concerned with the continuation of their existence beyond the incumbency of the present executive group. If this desire is to be fulfilled, provision must be made for succession to the executive ranks as retirement, death, and other reasons for termination occur. Drucker stresses the importance of this when he says, "The business enterprise must make provision for its own survival and growth. It must make provision for tomorrow's managers."  

Another comment in this regard is made by Randle:

The most critical limitation on future business growth is the shortage of capable executives. In discussions among business leaders this shows up constantly as an abiding and central concern. It is reflected in the unceasing search for management talent—which today assumes major proportions, at the same time that the hunting ground is narrowed. Management is now aware that its top executive requirements must be largely met from within the company rather than from the market place. And, in turn, this puts a distinct premium on identifying promotable executives—those who, in the long run, must carry the responsibility for directing the business.

Providing for their replacements has been a matter of major concern for top management for some time. A considerable body of

---


literature exists on the subjects of manager selection, development, and replacement. Research has been conducted within many organizations, as well as by persons outside them, to try to find ways of making this succession bring the highest quality managers to the top executive positions. It seems safe to say that no infallible technique has been found to date.

It is not suggested that there are no methods which can be of assistance to organizations in identifying and developing potential executives. Such procedures as biographical data, psychological testing, performance appraisal, and various types of development programs improve the possibilities of selecting better managers for advancement. Many of these procedures, however, often involve considerable expense which may make them beyond the resources of the smaller organizations. There is the additional difficulty for these smaller concerns of unfamiliarity with some of the techniques.

The sources of candidates to fill the top executive positions are primarily two--promotion of managers already in the organization or procurement from outside, usually someone who has had executive experience in some other organization. Many organizations, if not most, profess to follow a policy of promotion from within and probably do so for good reason. It is difficult to attract and to retain competent personnel if there is not some hope of being able to advance within the organization. There appears to be some indication, though, that a considerable number of executive positions are filled from external sources. An executive recruiter recently
It is probable that most small firms are family-owned and that the primary qualification for succession to the executive position is relationship by blood or marriage. The matter of succession and the preservation of the firm as a viable entity may be of concern to the head of the firm as he considers the capabilities of the family members. But he has difficulty attracting an outside executive unless he holds out the possibility of an ownership interest. As a result, the solution of the succession question for the small firm wherein a lack of interest, a lack of ability, or a lack of a family member to take over exists may be the sale of the firm.

At the other end of the scale of businesses, and of other types of organizations such as government agencies, are those which are considered to be big business. Many of these firms take advantage of some or all of the procedures mentioned above. They maintain inventories of prospective executives in the middle management ranks showing the anticipated requirements for replacements of top executives and what personnel are being developed to meet these requirements. They have planned development programs to prepare these managers for promotion to higher levels using both company and outside resources. Often there are specialized staff personnel whose primary responsibility is in the area of management selection and development. In addition, outside consultants may be engaged to

---

make recommendations on candidates within the firm or to recommend candidates from outside. Even the availability of all these resources does not guarantee the selectees will be successful as top executives but it decreases the possibility of failure.

There are a large number of organizations which may be classified as being of medium size. These firms would have more executive positions to be filled than candidates with family or ownership connections or may wish to fill these positions with the best possible candidates irrespective of such connections. They would have a middle management group of such a size as to be able to have more candidates from which to choose than there would be positions to be filled. These organizations would not be likely, because of the costs involved, to use the procedures of the large firms. What methods might be available to firms in this category to assist in the selection process and still be within their capabilities?

The primary, but not the only, consideration in reviewing candidates for promotion in any size organization should be their performance in past assignments. In the small firm it is not likely that any type of formal appraisal is used nor that any records are maintained of individual performance. Since management work does not easily lend itself to objective measures such as units of output of operative workers or units of sales of salesmen, the judgment of performance by the owner of the small firm may be highly subjective. He is in closer contact with his junior managers than is likely to be the case with the executives of larger organizations; however, as the size of the organization increases, there is more likely to be some
form of performance evaluation made from time to time and records maintained of them. Other factors which may be considered in the promotion of managers to higher executive positions may be the level and type of formal education, superiors' impressions of personality characteristics vis-a-vis those felt to be necessary at the higher level, demands of the new position relative to previous positions held, and any indications of leadership ability.

It is to an aspect of this last factor--evidences of leadership ability--that this study addresses itself. Middle managers usually have opportunities to lead in the assignments they receive as they progress in the firm. How well they perform should be reflected in the evaluations mentioned above. The mode of leadership exhibited may not truly reflect a manager's potential either because of the structured environment of the organization or the constraints imposed by superiors (or both). Neither of these restrictions is as likely to be a strong influence at the executive level and persons in these positions may have to establish their own leadership style. How one performed as a leader in a restricted middle management position may not be indicative of his ability to lead as an executive. There is another area, however, in which organization members may exhibit behavior which may have some relevance as to their leadership potential in the organization. This area is participation in off-job, or community, activities. There are many types of activities which depend entirely or to a large extent on the voluntary participation of persons who work for other organizations as their vocation. A number of these participants come from the
management ranks of business firms and some occupy leadership positions, either elective or appointive, in the community activities.

There seems to be some interest on the part of business firms in the outside activities of candidates for employment. A review of application blanks used for the employment of managerial, professional, and technical personnel of fifty firms on file at the National Industrial Conference Board in New York in 1966 disclosed that thirty-five of these asked for such information. In the course of this study, firms taking part were asked to submit samples of application forms they used and twenty-four did so. Fourteen of these forms ask for information on participation in community activities (except for those types of a religious, racial, or ethnic nature). More than half of the firms responding in the study indicate on a data form about the firm that they do request information at the time of employment on community activities and/or extracurricular activities in school. The forms at NICB were all from large firms but the samples received and the questionnaire responses indicate that many smaller firms feel that this information may be of some significance. This study seeks to determine whether there is any relationship between the outside activities of middle managers and their promotability within the firm. If there should be a significant relationship, review of the extent of this activity might be of assistance in the selection of managers for promotion to executive positions.

The purpose of this study is to examine the extent of participation of middle managers in a number of medium-size
manufacturing firms in off-job organizations, then to determine if there is any difference in this participation between those managers considered to be promotable to executive positions in the firm and those who are not so considered. The study examines participation in a number of different types of activity: professional and technical associations, service clubs, fraternal groups, veterans' organizations, community service activities, social clubs, church activities, youth groups, and other miscellaneous types of organizations. Not only participation, per se, but evidences of leadership in these various activities is examined. The hypothesis to be tested is that those who have the promotion potential in the firm are more active in community organizations than those who are considered not to have that potential.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

The literature which pertains to community activity participation by members of business firms is found primarily in three fields: sociology, psychology, and management. Each of these discusses various aspects of such participation but each also tends to have its particular area of interest. The field of sociology has a strong emphasis in its literature about the power structure of the community. Psychology's literature has a number of writings on participation as a predictor of managerial performance in the firm. The management literature tends to be more generalized but there are many references to this type of activity as a method for the development of managers to prepare them for higher positions in the firm. The recent literature of both sociology and management, perhaps reflecting the concerns of the times, also deals with the social responsibilities of business and of its leaders.

A survey of the role of business executives as volunteers makes this observation:

Altruism, of course, plays its role. So does a sense of the seriousness of our current social situation; the responsibility of business for parts of it; and the obligation business and businessmen have to lend their talent to ease, if not cure, our social ills.¹

In the summation chapter of a collection of readings about the cultural impact of business on society, Peters notes:

Business makes its arguments in terms of economic efficiency, but its critics couch their attack in terms of social effectiveness. No matter if, in fact, business has performed exceedingly well in terms of its own values. If the values or standards are invalid, then the level of performance is irrelevant. It is to this problem that the manager must direct his attention. To defend the institution and its component organizations, he must demonstrate the validity and legitimacy of its existence within the context of values of the whole society. The comfortable age when business could be assured that 'those who counted' shared its ideals has disappeared. Business must now demonstrate its worth and viability to a society that no longer accepts it as being innately 'good.'

Because the firm is an inanimate entity, it is the actions of its membership that determine the manner in which it meets its responsibilities and answers its critics. The members of management as makers of policy and initiators of action should assume the role in the society to act for it.

There are also other general aspects of community activity participation which are the subjects of the literature of one or more of these fields. Each of these, with the four mentioned above, will be discussed as a section in this chapter.

**Community Power Structure**

The consideration of the literature on community power structure for this study is with respect to the types of activity in which businessmen are observed to engage and who in the firm does so. The subject matter of the writings is usually concerned with

---

whether there are "dominants" in the power structure and who they may be. Many of the studies have focused on the smaller cities rather than on the major metropolitan areas. The findings of the studies do not have a common pattern. Some of the communities, particularly where there may be one major employer, are found to be strongly influenced by this economic dominant. Most of the communities are found to have a "pluralistic" power structure in which there are a number of groups influencing what takes place there. This is in contrast to the "elitist" concept that is assumed in domination by the economic groups--banks and industrial firms. But from these studies it is possible to determine what role the top executives of business firms and some of their subordinate managers play.

One view of the comparative role of executives and subordinates is expressed by Mills:

Power does not reside in these middle-level organizations; key decisions are not made by their membership. Top men belong to them, but they are only infrequently active in them. As associations, they help put into effect the policy-line worked out by the higher circles of power; they are training grounds in which younger hustlers of the top prove themselves; and sometimes, especially in the smaller cities, they are recruiting grounds for new members of the top.3

In a study in Syracuse, New York, Freeman et al. classifies community leaders as "Institutional Leaders," "The Effectors," and "The Activists." The first are described as the heads of large and actively participating business, industrial, labor,

educational, professional, and governmental bodies. They are further characterized as "... for the most part not active participants in community affairs." The Effectors are seen as employees of the organizations headed by the Institutional Leaders. These people "... carry most of the burden of effecting community change." The Activists are members of voluntary community organizations and clubs but lack the power base of association with the Institutional Leaders' organizations.\(^4\) Dahl observes that in New Haven, Connecticut, the community fund campaign attracts "... young businessmen who are looking for a chance to make a mark as go-getters and to pick up some recognition and prestige."\(^5\)

Another disclosure brought out in community power studies of interest in this consideration of businessmen's participation in community activities is the difference in the degree of participation between executives of local firms and those of "absentee" firms (firms which are subsidiaries or branches of companies headquartered elsewhere). In a study of a community in Michigan, Reichler finds:

> Even where the differences are not strong they are consistent in direction and point to greater commitment to the community on the part of local economic dominants.

\(^4\)Linton C. Freeman et al., "Locating Leaders in Local Communities: A Comparison of Some Alternative Approaches," \textit{American Sociological Review}, XXVIII (October, 1963), 797-98.

The absentee dominants seem more cosmopolitan and least tied to the local community.\(^6\)

Dahl, Haire, and Lazarsfeld observe "The executives of national firms are often too much on the move to settle more than superficially into local politics."\(^7\) Clelland and Form, in a study of two other Michigan cities, one a satellite of probably Detroit and the other apparently Lansing (the names are disguised), state:

A study of the history of these two cities shows a pattern of 'withdrawal' by the economic dominants in each from politics (especially) and other voluntary civic organizations. This pattern coincides rather markedly with the advent of absentee ownership of major industrial plants and a widening of the markets of local industry beyond the community.\(^8\)

**Social Responsibility**

In these days of pollution problems, consumerism, mergers and acquisitions, and high unemployment with inflation, there is considerable concern among businessmen about the "image" of business in the society. This concern is not new but it has probably been intensified by these developments. For most of the history of the United States, high-ranking businessmen took an active part in their communities but the motivation was primarily from a sense of *noblesse oblige*. However, since World War II, the basis for

---


community activity of businessmen seems to be more altruistic. A statement in 1946 illustrates this changed point of view:

Because of his position the executive is often expected to be a leader in civic and community activities. He must interest himself in social institutions and community activities, such as schools, churches, recreation centers, boys' and girls' organizations, charities and civic clubs. Failure of business executives to assume responsibilities as community leaders has often resulted in the development of industrial centers which leave much to be desired socially and physically.9

Donald K. David, then Dean of the Harvard Business School, in a speech before the Economic Club of Detroit a few years later, admonished business leaders to participate constructively in the affairs of their communities and the nation. He went on to say:

... I believe I see important similarities between the way in which a business executive makes his contribution to his company and the way in which responsible business leadership may make a contribution to our society.

If I am right in viewing the problems which face our society as requiring the calculation of the risks involved, the formulation of a program to be carried out, and the effective administration of that program, then I cannot see why the business leader should feel himself on unfamiliar ground when he participates in the affairs of his community and nation.10

It should be noted, however, that there are some who have reservations about the participation of business leaders in community affairs:


Viewed by the participant in educational, religious, or similar organizations, there is no effective guarantee that the leadership of businessmen will be disinterested. In other words, the very fact that such officials represent an organization that is not only powerful but organized around very specialized and explicit goals justifies considerable doubt concerning the treatment of any interests that might conflict with those of the business organization.11

This is not typical of the feeling of many businessmen as a survey in 1950 indicated that 40 per cent of the chief executives in a sample of large companies take part in community affairs such as local government, fund drives, and civic groups.12 Another survey in 1964 shows 86 per cent of those responding taking "a responsible role in local public service activities on a regular basis."13 The overwhelming reason given by these participants (97 per cent) is that it is an obligation of good citizenship. In both cases the respondents say that other members of the firm are encouraged to take part in similar activities.

In a speech at Westminster College in 1965, Wilson discussed individual social responsibility of businessmen as being different from that of the corporation as an entity saying:

The progress of community organizations depends largely on the voluntary contribution of time and energy by members of corporations acting as private individuals. Participation in church activities, fund drives, elections, and service on school


boards are activities that individuals must engage in as individuals. Corporations can only foster an atmosphere where participation of this sort is nurtured. Corporate responsibility must manifest itself in other ways.14

Another manager says that every businessman has five "entities" which he must serve: the customer, the owners, the employees, and suppliers, and a

... factor important to the business, which you must satisfy largely through your personal relationship efforts, is the community. More and more frequently, managers are called upon to provide leadership in such things as the Chamber of Commerce, Red Cross, United Fund, YMCA, Boy Scouts, Salvation Army, and other types of worthwhile public services.15

That business could do more in this respect is argued in a recent statement by an organization of prominent citizens:

Business itself could promote greater involvement in various ways. Top management, for example, could provide stronger leadership within many corporations to develop the policies and climate that would stimulate employees, especially young managers, to apply their interests and skills to relevant social as well as conventional business matters. The additional duty could be more widely and explicitly recognized as a normal, rather than extracurricular, part of managerial responsibilities, and as an essential ingredient for managers aiming to equip themselves for broader executive responsibility. Managers at all levels could be encouraged and given adequate incentives to seek out relevant social market opportunities for the corporation.16


Determinants of Degree and Type of Participation

Some writers look at the participation of members of business organizations in community activities in an effort to identify causal factors which might account for differing patterns of participation. These writings are applicable to this study as they may indicate other variables with respect to participation besides a manager's promotion potential in the firm. Since only a limited amount of biographical information was requested from respondents in the study, those items which were asked are the ones which were looked for in the literature to see if they had been found to be influential. Most of the research reviewed was conducted in specific localities and was not necessarily on members of business firms as such.

One of the relationships most frequently found to be significant is that between the level of formal education attained and the extent of participation in community activities. This is usually found to be a direct relationship—the higher the level of education, the more organizational memberships. Douglah finds this to be the case in a study in Columbia County, Wisconsin; similar results are found in a study in Bennington, Vermont, by Scott; a study by Thelin which was one of several resulting from research done in four


North Carolina cities (Burlington, Charlotte, High Point, and Winston-Salem) has a similar finding; Bell and Force find the same in two high-income areas in San Francisco compared to two low-income; and a study in Lawrence, Kansas, by Rothrock discloses a similar relationship.

Two other factors noted in the above studies which are associated with higher participation are occupation and income (socio-economic status). Bell and Force find higher participation among professionals, managers, proprietors, and officials while Rothrock finds that those with higher occupational level participate more. The Bell and Force study and the Rothrock study, as well as one carried out in four Iowa cities by Erbe, indicate a higher rate of participation among those with higher income. The


22Bell and Force, loc. cit.

23Rothrock, loc. cit.

24Bell and Force, loc. cit.

25Rothrock, loc. cit.

Scott\textsuperscript{27} and Bell and Force\textsuperscript{28} studies also indicate that there is some evidence that participation is higher among those over forty years of age up to fifty-five or sixty than those from twenty-one to forty. This relationship, however, does not seem to be as strong as in the other three studies.

Two studies are cited which indicate there is a difference in the type of community activity which may be engaged in by first-line supervisory management and top executives, and between high and low occupational status groups. The first is a comparison of the activities of fifty community leaders in business, industry, education, and government and fifty industrial supervisors in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. It is found that:

Differential patterns of social and civic participation are prevalent. Executives are typically active in high-level civic, 'social,' and professional organizations, whereas supervisors tend to belong to few organized groups, those being mainly middle-level 'social' clubs and fraternal orders.\textsuperscript{29}

The second study by Hausknecht indicates that those from the higher status occupational groups have higher rates of membership in civic and social activities and less in church organizations than those of lower status. The lower status occupational groups have higher participation in social and recreational organizations and

\textsuperscript{27}Scott, \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{28}Bell and Force, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 33.
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veterans' associations. Another study based upon the research in
the North Carolina cities finds that:

Participation in voluntary associations by all
the executives was greater in job- and community-
oriented associations than in religion-, social-, and society-oriented associations. Religion-
oriented participation exceeded that of societal and social orientation, the latter being the area
of least participation. 31

Method of Manager Development

Many writers on the subject of management development have
expressed the view that one of the means by which junior managers
may gain experience to equip themselves for higher level positions
in the organization is by taking an active role, and particularly
a leadership role, in activities outside of the firm. Various firms have also expressed this opinion in descriptions of their
development programs. A pioneer in the field of management thought
in the United States, Henry C. Metcalf, said almost forty-five
years ago:

There should be opportunities for the training of
managers through talks, suggested readings (including
journals on management), through wisely led discussion
groups and conferences through managers' associations,
foremen's associations, and the like. 32

30 Murray Hausknecht, The Joiners: A Sociological Description
of Voluntary Association Membership in the United States (New York:

31 William E. Heck, "Executive Career Types and Their
Community Participation" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of

32 Henry C. Metcalf, Business Management as a Profession
The period since World War II has seen an increased interest in management development programs and much of the literature on the subject of this section has appeared since. Bass suggests that training can be given outside the company in various formal organized programs of trade and professional associations and educational institutions but that in addition:

Individual development may take the form of participation in a variety of activities outside the plant, many affording an opportunity to lead, as in business, trade, and professional associations; civic projects; or planned visits to other plants.33 Mahoney also suggests the use of formal programs and community activities but cautions that they should be suggested to the individual from an analysis of his development needs just as the development experiences within the firm should be.34 Cady says that outside activities are a way a man can show he enjoys executive work by accepting such assignments in church, hospital, and young people's organizations.35

Business firms are not the only organizations to recognize the benefit of community activities for manager development. A survey of managers in government has this observation:

Again and again respondents stressed the usefulness of experience in organizations such as school boards, hospital boards, the community chest, the chamber of


commerce, technical societies, trade associations, and other kinds of enterprises, particularly at the local level.36

Other societies also feel this experience is of value to the manager as evidenced by the following from an Australian business publication speaking about the privilege of community service:

Business recognizes the value of this privilege. It is a tradition which gives an executive both the outlet and the stimulation of applying his talents in a way which develops them still further. Progress associations, school parent associations, Legacy, social and sporting clubs, lay office in his church, even participation in local government, are all activities which are seen as adding to his value as a man and an executive.37

A survey taken of 200 members of the Personnel Policies Forum indicates that the following techniques are the most popular for management training: job rotation (39 per cent of firms), lectures (34 per cent), organizational charts (25 per cent), participation in community activities (24 per cent), and other types such as role playing and outside education each less than 20 per cent.38 There are other examples of specific firms' views of community activities. Zerfoss, in describing American Enka's program, says the firm feels that professional activities provide the manager the "... opportunity to maintain his skills, build his


ego, and gives him a sense of competence from 'being in the know' on the frontier elements of his profession" and that "... 'community' jobs provide 'for free' excellent training that can readily be translated into improvement of job skills." Part of management education at General Electric is:

Sensible participation in affairs of such outside organizations as professional societies, community and civic groups, and similar organizations which can contribute significantly to self-development of an individual.40

The Armco Steel Corporation's "Plan of Manager Development" includes programs and outside courses, the latter listing:

- Membership in professional society in the manager's field of responsibility or training,
- Participation in industry technical committees,
- Participation in, and when possible leadership assignments in civic, political, and government activities or functions.41

A development program which includes joining professional technical societies, boards of trade, and chambers of commerce, and work on civic projects such as Community Chest and Red Cross is used by Canadian Marconi Company.42

---


Necessity For Promotion

Aside from community activity participation as a development method, some view such activity as a requirement for promotion in the management ranks. This is not always considered to be so because of the developmental aspects but rather that it is "what is expected if one wishes to get ahead." Packard refers to participation as a means for attaining "visibility" with "joining the boss' country club as a crass example."43 In another situation of a particular firm studied by Dalton, it appears that two of the four criteria for advancement in management are being a Mason and membership in the local Yacht Club (the other two are ethnic background and political party).44 Caplow makes this observation about some of the factors which appear to enter into promotion decisions:

Other secondary qualities which typically figure in hierarchic promotion are appearance, skills of sociability (including sexual attractiveness), religious and athletic affiliations, participation in formal and informal associations, miscellaneous talents for oratory, poker, or golf, and judiciously conspicuous consumption.45

Warner and Abegglen observe that:

Generally, but not always, mobile men and women enter and use philanthropic and civic organizations 'to know and be known by' the right people. Often they are instruments of social mobility and means


by which people of talent, energy, and drive can advance themselves.46

Another study contains this comment:

The junior executive may also further his career progress by outstanding performance in community organizations, thereby calling the attention of his superiors who control promotion to his leadership attributes while he also broadens his contacts and experiences and, in large organizations, emerges with the mark of a 'comer' from the mass of 'anonymous' bright young men.47

A survey of more than 100 young executives as to various aspects of their lives and personalities has a comment that the firm "is apt to assess the man's position and conduct in the community as part of his general job performance." Going to church and joining the P.T.A. are cited as examples.48 Powell is another who comments on outside activities as a promotion factor:

In the community, the executive can strengthen his opportunities for advancement by being a moderately conservative Republican, and participating in Chamber of Commerce and American Legion activities. If he directs some of his energies to nonpartisan civic, charitable, and professional activities, such as school board matters, cancer drives, and organizations of this nature, it helps both the executive and his firm. However, he must avoid letting these community activities take too much of his time so that others in the firm will not begin to suspect


that the company is no longer his greatest devotion in life. 49

Another Outlet

The literature concerning the participation of members of business firms in activities outside also discusses this type of activity as a way in which an individual may find outlets for his ambitions or relief of his frustrations. Jennings cites an example of a manager who, when passed over for selection to the top position in his firm, turned to community and national organization activities where he found satisfactions and gathered favorable publicity for his firm. 50 Levinson draws an analogy between professional or trade association membership by the organization man as a way in which he seeks recognition and the adolescent seeking to become a "wheel" in his peer group by being a star athlete or class officer. He goes on to say, "His work organization may welcome his participation for less complimentary reasons: it may be a way of getting rid of him while, at the same time, deriving some incidental benefit." 51 A study concerning "nonpromotable" middle managers makes the following statement:

Management personnel should pay particular attention to this finding. It may be that the 'pure

49 Reed M. Powell, "Elements of Executive Promotion," California Management Review, VI (Winter, 1963), 86.


nonpromotables' are men who understand fully well
where they stand in the organization. These men
may have made the transference of their aspirations
from company orientation to out-company orientation.
One nonpromotable in the case company showed a
definite positive change in his speech and activity
when he related his experiences and problems as a
member of the Board of Education.52

A case is described of a purchasing agent whose drive for power
led to hostility with his boss. He found an outlet for this drive
in a local political organization after being counseled which
enabled him to reduce the on-the-job conflict to a manageable
level.53 Shartle observes:

Sometimes events outside the organization are of
such interest that only minor feed-back satisfactions
seem to be related to executive performance. Perhaps
the administrator feels that he has reached his highest
level of attainment in the organization or that he has
not been fairly treated and his satisfactions of
achievement come from other activities. These may be
family, social, political, or outside business.54

Argyris says that individuals with a strong sense of self-
actualization and for whom the opportunities for such in the firm
are maximized seek "outside creative interpersonal activities, for
example, school boards, church committees, service organizations,
and so forth."55

52 John Douglas, "The Present State of Management Training
and Development Activities for the Nonpromotable Middle Managers in
Major American Companies--A Study of an Undeveloped Managerial
Resource" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1960),
p. 171.

53 Richard J. Obrochta, "How to Succeed in Business,"
Administrative Management, XXIII (September, 1962), 16.

54 Carroll L. Shartle, Executive Performance and Leadership

55 Chris Argyris, "The Individual and Organization: An
Empirical Test," Administrative Science Quarterly, IV (September,
1959), 158.
Predicting Managerial Success

A considerable body of the literature over the years has been concerned with what characteristics may be identified with those who are successful leaders and, if there are such, whether they can be identified in others to determine their leadership potential. The pyramidal structure of organizations does not permit every person who enters the organization at the bottom to eventually become its head. As a matter of fact, the inputs today for future leadership often come from college-graduate trainees rather than from those starting at the bottom. It may not be desirable that all the trainees entering be potential chief executives as this might result in too many disappointed, frustrated managers who do not get selected as well as inordinately high managerial turnover. Despite this possibility, many organizations would like to find ways to improve their selection of candidates for initial employment, and to improve promotion selection for higher management and executive positions. Much research has been devoted to this problem over the years, within business organizations and in other settings, but as yet there is no definitive answer. It is hoped that progress has been made although failures of those who were thought to have the potential for leadership still occur. So the search goes on.

It is not the intention in discussing the literature to consider that which pertains to characteristics other than the subject of the study. A review of the literature was made to see if there were references to off-job activities of managers as being
predictive of their on-job performance. Reference is made here to some which were found. Some of the writings refer to the relationship of extracurricular activities in school and college to management potential. Since this is not the concern of this study, they are not discussed here.

A comprehensive review of the literature pertaining to leadership factors by Stogdill in 1948 classified the factors under five general headings: "capacity, achievement, responsibility, participation, and status." The participation factor was described as "activity, sociability, cooperation, adaptability, humor." Two of the elements of this factor—activity and sociability—might be considered to be related to engaging in off-job pursuits. Freeman and Taylor list nine application blank items which have been developed by the Life Insurance Agency Management Association and incorporated into a form used to screen over 500,000 applicants. These items have been found to have a validity coefficient of .40 with management success in the life insurance field. One of the items on the blank is "Organizations (church, business, political, fraternal, and military) of which an active member in good standing." Another is "Offices (if any) held in above organizations in last five years." An article on ways to identify managers says ". . . we can look for evidence in the


applicant's participation in school groups (captain, president) and in adult groups (civic, fraternal, union, professional)."\(^{58}\)

McQuaig, on picking men, lists ten areas in which inquiry should be made, one of which is social life, saying, "The social area discloses important information about a man's ability to get along in groups and to take responsibility, and his capacity for leadership and teamwork."\(^{59}\) Research by McClaine on promoted and non-promoted executives finds that:

> A significantly larger number of promoted executives was found to hold membership in local school boards or in other civic organizations. This indicates that promoted executives are not only successful in achieving personal objectives but are active in local community activities.\(^{60}\)

A description of methods used by the Detroit Edison Company in manager selection says:

> Pertinent experience both within and outside the company was considered . . . . Also several of the candidates were active in church, social, and civic activities. These activities indicated the employees' breadth of interests and were proof of some leadership experience.\(^{61}\)


The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and its Humble Oil and Refining Company affiliate have been engaged for a number of years in a research project called the Early Identification of Management Potential (EIMP). In the course of the study, the researchers have looked at certain biographical information of managers who have been with the company for a number of years. They developed criteria of managerial success—position level, managerial effectiveness and salary—which were combined into an overall success criterion. Correlations were made between this criterion and biographical data, some of which concern outside activities. The most significant relationships are found to exist for professional societies, community social organizations, college alumni clubs, and management associations. These relationships are not significant for all the kinds of managers (of which there were five classifications), however. Also, these correlations were for membership, only; when holding office was examined, only professional societies had a significant relationship (all of these were at the .01 level of significance).

Summary

This review of some of the literature does indicate that managers do participate in organizations outside of the firm, both as members and as leaders. This participation may occur for one or a combination of reasons. There appears to be a strong sense of

62 Personal communications from C. P. Sparks, Senior Personnel Research Associate, Humble Oil and Refining Company, Houston, Texas (December, 1967, and August, 1971).
concern among businessmen today about the "image" of business in general and their own firms in particular in the society. Much of the activity engaged in by top executives, and some of their subordinates perhaps at the direction of their superiors, is motivated by the desire to be a good citizen both as an individual and as a representative of the firm. The leaders of business often assume important leadership posts in the community in the course of this activity but it does not appear that they "dominate" in the sense that such economic leaders might have in the past or that some "viewers with alarm" might feel they do today. There do appear to be differing patterns of participation for different levels of management and for different reasons by managers. Some may take part because they want to, some because they are directed to as a part of a planned program for their personal development or as representatives of the firm in its role in the community, some because they perceive it as a way to gain approval of superiors and thereby enhance their own careers, some as a means of gaining personal satisfactions they do not find in the work situation, and some to gain status.

The literature seems to indicate that the managers with higher potential for advancement, or those more likely to be considered "successful" are the more active in various organizations outside of the firm.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE FOR THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship of the participation of middle management personnel in medium-size firms to their promotability to executive positions. It is hypothesized that the promotable managers have a greater degree of community activity participation than those who are not promotable. In order to test this hypothesis, it was necessary to obtain information about the outside activity of middle managers and to have these managers who furnished the information designated as being promotable or not promotable.

Because it was felt desirable to get responses from many sections of the country and it was hoped that a substantial number of managers' activities might be examined, it was decided to use a mail questionnaire to gather this information. Limitations of time and money made the interview method of data-gathering impossible if the above two objectives were to be accomplished. It is recognized that this method of gathering data has the limitations of the percentage of returns, the possible bias of those who do respond compared to those who do not, and an inability to follow-up personally any of the questionnaires which might have ambiguities in order to clarify them.
The criterion used in the study is the opinion of the chief executive of the firm as to the promotability or non-promotability of the managers selected to complete the questionnaires. A medium-size firm, such as the ones surveyed in this study, normally has a middle management group of small enough size that the head of the firm is well-acquainted with the capabilities of all of them. He is also the one who typically makes the decisions on all promotions although others may make recommendations to him. Researches which have been concerned with predictors of managerial "success" have used other criterion against which to compare the predictors. In many instances there have been questions about the appropriateness of the criterion, especially when the managers studied are in different settings. The EIMP study of Jersey Standard referred to in the survey of literature uses a combination criterion made up of position level, salary, and superiors' evaluations of performance. The salary figure has certain adjustments made to it, one of which was for age. This study is for one company, however, even though it has a number of divisions which are virtually different companies.¹

¹Personal communications from C. P. Sparks, Senior Personnel Research Associate, Humble Oil and Refining Company, Houston, Texas (December, 1967, and August, 1971).
satisfaction with career progress, and membership in general management. Another study using some of the same data has pay, adjusted for years out of school, as the criterion of success.

Both studies mention possible contaminations in these criteria and the difficulty of applying them across firms. A major study based on men who served in the Army Air Corps in World War II also has multiple criteria: monthly earned income, number supervised, self-rated success, self-rated satisfaction with job, vertical mobility, and lateral mobility. The authors reporting the study comment on the first of these criteria:

Monthly income is the index that seems most objective and for many occupations seems the most relevant indicator of success. Income ceases to have much meaning if we try to make comparisons between occupations. On what grounds shall we say that the college professor making $600 a month is less successful than the contractor making $800? But within a single occupation, at least for many occupations, the man making more money is the more successful man. However, we must recognize that the relationship is an imperfect one. There are variations of type and location of job even within a single occupation that attenuate the relationship, that is in industry versus in civil service, in a big city versus in a small town. Inaccuracies of reporting income attenuate it still more. The impact of irrelevant factors, such as family ownership of the business, makes income even less trustworthy as a measure of true achievement.

---


3Frank J. Williams, Jr., "Predicting Success in Management" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1959), p. 79.

Because of the differences between firms, parts of the country, positions and functions of the respondents, and other possible contaminations, none of the criterion used in these other studies was felt to be desirable. The salary level of the respondent was asked on the questionnaire but this was not used as a measure of his "success" in his firm.

Selection of Sample

The basic criterion as to the firms to be considered for the study was that they be of medium-size based upon the number of total employees. The size of firm was decided to be any which had between 500 and 1,000 employees as it would be most likely that there would be a middle management group (managers above the line foreman level but below the executive level reporting to the chief executive) large enough to permit the selection of four managers fitting certain specifications.

Several other criteria were also set up which restricted the population from which the sample was selected. One of these was the size of the community in which the firm was located. It was felt, and two studies were found in the literature to this effect, that commuting time would have an effect upon the degree and/or kind of community activity participation. This would seem to be a factor in large metropolitan areas where considerable time may be spent in getting to and from the job. One study made in Southern California finds that participation is lower for commuters than non-commuters and drops as the distance of commuting
increases. The other study, in Pennsylvania, indicates that non-commuters participate more in intra-community activities than do commuters while commuters take a more active role in extra-community activities than do non-commuters. In order to minimize the commuting influence, it was decided not to include any firms located in metropolitan areas with 1,000,000 or more population. This excluded firms located in or near New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, and Houston. Another constraint was to try to select only firms which were independent, not divisions of larger corporations. There is reason to believe that the transfer of managers from one division to another as they rise in the company hierarchy in large, multi-plant corporations lessens the interest they may have in communities where they may be for relatively short periods of time. Straus alludes to this when discussing the job rotation of the large firms, "Like their children, parents learn not to develop close ties to friends or relatives, to the community, or to a single portion of the company." He goes on to point out the paradox, though, where, "Ironically, some of those companies which practice rotation most assiduously, also have implicit requirements for


promotion that a man should be 'active in the community.' Only firms that are manufacturers were selected, not locally-oriented business organizations such as banks and retail establishments. As one article expresses it, "Significantly, the businessmen who plunge into civic work with gusto usually are the bankers and merchants and others for whom it is virtually a part of their job." Manufacturing firms usually sell their output in wider markets than the community in which they are located so their community participation is based on reasons other than building business for the firm. The community responsibility "image" would seem to be more of a motivating factor.

A list of firms meeting the above criteria was compiled on cards from Standard and Poor's 1968 Register of Corporations, Directors, and Executives. Each card showed the company name and address, the name of the president (or chairman of the board if he was shown as the chief executive officer), and the number of employees. When the listing was completed, there were approximately 1,000 cards. The funds available to make the study did not permit making a mailing to this many firms so 250 were selected. The list was in alphabetical order as it had been prepared from the Register so every fourth card was pulled for the mailing list. No claim is made that this is a "representative" sample of American manufacturing firms employing from 500 to 1,000 persons located outside of major metropolitan areas. It did, however, result in a list of firms

8Ibid., p. 16.

spread rather widely over the country and located in communities ranging from small towns to cities approaching 1,000,000 in population. Because the information in the directory is difficult to keep up to date, it did turn out when the questionnaires were returned that several firms had become subsidiaries of other companies and others had over 1,000 employees.

**Questionnaires**

The method of gathering the data for the study was that of mail questionnaires sent to the 250 selected firms in care of the president of the firm. One of the questionnaires was to be completed by him giving certain information about the firm. Four other questionnaires (which were identical except for different type used in the title) were to be distributed by him to four middle managers, two he considered to be potentially promotable to executive positions and two he considered to be nonpromotable. All the questionnaires were accompanied by business reply envelopes so there would be no cost to the respondent in sending them back.

Each company president received a letter addressed to him by name (Appendix A) asking for the participation of his firm in the study. Attached to this letter was a one-page explanation of the procedure for the study (Appendix B). In this explanation it was requested that managers of certain characteristics be selected if possible. This was to try to reduce some of the other variables which might affect outside activity participation or promotability. For example, it has been seen from the literature that age can be a factor in community activity participation and it may also be a
factor in promotion. Hence, it was desired that the managers be in a limited age range. Years of service requirement was included so that a manager would not be considered to be nonpromotable simply because he had not been employed long enough for his performance to be known. The education requirement was to try to equalize the level of education for the managers as the literature also showed that those with higher educational attainment tend to be more active in community organizations. The request that relatives not be included was to minimize the nepotism factor in promotion. The position requirement was to try to avoid the possibility that all the promotables would be persons who were already executives and the nonpromotables all be foremen. The literature also indicated some differences in the kinds of community activities of supervisors and of managers. These two documents were put in a window envelope affixed to the outside of a larger 9 x 12 envelope which contained the five questionnaires as the letter was first-class mail (to save expenses, it was not desired to pay the first-class rate on the printed questionnaires).

The questionnaire for the president to answer (Appendix C) was placed in the larger envelope with a reply envelope for its return clipped to it. This form asked for information about the firm and some of its policies with respect to outside activity participation. It also inquired about possible programs of manager evaluation and development. The company name was written in the upper left-hand corner in order that it could be joined with the manager questionnaires from that company when they were received.
This helped in following up as the questionnaires were returned when one or two did not come in and a second letter was sent with additional forms calling attention to the non-receipt and saying the enclosed forms could be used in the event the originals had been misplaced.

In order to save the president's time in the routing of the questionnaires to the managers he selected, a half-sheet dittoed memo was clipped to each form (Appendix D) along with the reply envelope. He could fill in the manager's name and his own at the top before sending it on. It was hoped that receiving this request from the president would stimulate a greater number of responses. At least some of them used this, for several questionnaires were received with the memo still attached despite the admonition in its text to remove it before mailing back the questionnaire.

The manager questionnaire (Appendix E) was designed to give certain information about the individual on the first page, some of which might be useful in the analysis of the data. The second and third pages, which are the heart of the questionnaire, inquired about the kinds of activities outside the firm in which he engaged and to what extent he participated (presently and in the past). The principal activities being examined were those on the second page: professional and technical associations, service clubs, fraternal groups, veterans organizations, community service organizations, social clubs, and religious activities. Those on the third page were types of activities in which there might be
less participation as well as some in-company after-hours activities. At the bottom of the page respondents were asked to indicate which activities they participated in for personal satisfaction and which because of their job. The last page of the form was optional and tried to explore the feelings of the respondents about the connection between outside activities and the ability to be promoted in the firm.

Before this questionnaire was printed up to use in the study, a tentative one was prepared and was tested on managers in seven firms in different parts of the country. These firms were headed by personal friends of the researcher and they were contacted in person or by mail to ask their help in a trial of the instrument. In addition to completing the questionnaire, each of the managers taking part in the test completed a "comments" sheet attached to his questionnaire. This sheet asked for such information as the length of time required to complete the form, whether the instructions were clear and understandable, if any of the questions seemed impertinent or were ones he would be reluctant to answer, whether he felt respondents would be likely to answer the form honestly, whether the information on the routing memo with the questionnaire was assuring enough to him that the responses would be anonymous, and if there were any important categories of activities which were overlooked. A similar testing of the president's questionnaire was made in these firms and he was also asked to comment on the manager questionnaire. As a result of this testing, some changes were made to improve the form.
In any kind of an empirical study, it is recognized that there may be shortcomings in the method of data-gathering. In this study a major weakness was that the routing of the questionnaires to the managers was done by the president. The only difference in the questionnaire form for the promotable managers and the non-promotable was that the first had the heading of the form printed "MANAGER SURVEY" and the second was printed 'Manager Survey.' Despite the instructions in the sheet sent with the letter to the president, there exists the possibility that he may have inadvertently reversed these in the routing. Since the questionnaires were anonymous and had nothing on them except the company name written at the top left-hand corner of the first page, there was no way that a check could be made to tell whether the proper routing had been made. Data-gathering by means of personal interview with each manager after having discussed each with the president would give more confidence as to which of the respondents were the promotable and which non-promotable. Surveys by questionnaires, and also interview-type, run the risk that the responses received may not be accurate. There may be some situations where a check can be made of records or interviews with others to determine the accuracy of the responses. In this study such was not possible and so reliance has to be placed upon the statements the respondent made as to the types of participation and their extent.

A further question hangs over the study with respect to the differences there may be between those firms who did respond and those who did not. Limitations of money at the time of the receipt
of returns precluded a follow-up (except for that noted above to try to get the one or two laggard questionnaires) of the non-responding firms. There were about 180 of these. A later attempt to obtain information from two-thirds of these was made, the results of which are given in the next chapter. If it had been possible to visit personally a number of the presidents of these firms, it might be possible to determine whether a bias was introduced into the study.

Data Analysis

The questionnaires from the company presidents and the responding managers were returned individually in the reply envelopes supplied with each questionnaire. As they were received, the questionnaires from each firm were kept together. After the passage of a sufficient period of time from the original mailing and the follow-up letters to try to get the one or two additional questionnaires from firms where three or four had already been received, they were arranged in alphabetical order by company name and consecutive numbers assigned to each company from one to forty-nine. In addition each manager questionnaire was assigned a number, 0 and 2 for the promotable and 1 and 3 for the non-promotable. No set procedure was followed in the assigning of these last numbers; the first promotable questionnaire in the company group was assigned 0 and the other 2 and the same was done with the 1 and 3 for the nonpromotable.

The original intent had been to use only the responses in the study where all five questionnaires were returned. However,
the returns were disappointingly small so it was decided to use all where the company form and at least one of each of the manager forms was returned. Forty-five firms returned all of the forms, three had all but one, and one had one each of the manager forms. This gave a group of forty-nine each in the 0, promotable, and 1, non-promotable; and forty-four in 2, promotable, and forty-three in 3, nonpromotable, for a total of ninety-three promotable and ninety-two nonpromotable.

The data contained in the manager questionnaires were then coded in order that it could be put into punched cards. The company number and the questionnaire number (0, 2, 1, or 3) were put in each card. Such items as age, years with firm, years in present position, amount of education, and salary were coded into classes. Type of position was classified as either line or staff. College degree, extracurricular activities, and number of persons supervised were not used. The activities listed on the second page plus youth activities from the third page were punched in the eight different categories. No differentiation was made as to whether the activity was "past" or "present." The types of activity were assigned point values as an indication of the degree of involvement in the activity. A value of 1 was given for "attend occasionally," 2 for "attend regularly," 3 for "serve on committees," and 4 for "hold office." It was felt that this would reflect a greater degree of participation for "leadership" than for just "joinership." It is a moot question as to whether the contribution to society, amount of developmental training, effort expended, and any other aspects
of participation would be equal for a man who attends occasionally four organizations as one who belongs to and holds office in only one. The point value system used in the study would so indicate but it is not to be assumed that this is a valid equality. But it was felt that even the "joiner" should get some credit for community activity as compared to one who did nothing and any assignment of values to other degrees of participation runs up against the "quantity versus quality" problem. An avid "joiner" may "outweigh" a selective "leader" under the method used. However, a review of the types of participation found in this study did not reveal many instances where this occurred. There were those who had a number of organization affiliations, some of which they attended only occasionally, but they usually took some more active part in some so could not be considered "joiners" only. The other types of activities on the third page were coded only to show whether the manager took part in this activity and were not given point values. The last page was optional and was not put into the cards. Its purpose was to gain an impression as to the feeling of the respondents about the relation of community activity participation to promotion within the firm.

Statistical analysis using a computer was employed to examine the degree of participation by the respondents in the eight activities mentioned above as well as a "total" amount of activity determined by combining the points from these eight. For the purpose of this analysis, the cards were divided into four groups by the questionnaire numbers so there were two groups of
promotables and two groups of nonpromotables, and were also divided into two groups made up of all the promotables in one and all the nonpromotables in another for some of the analysis.

The first statistical test which was applied was an analysis of variance of means of the four groups to determine if there was any significant difference between the groups at the .05 level. A second test was made on the two groups, also an analysis of variance, for a difference between them which might not have developed in the four-group analysis. The F-ratio for significance in the first test was 2.66 (degrees of freedom were 3 in the numerator and 183 in the denominator) and 3.9 in the second (d.f. 1 and 185). For those activity groups which did show a significant difference at the .05 level, t tests were made to see if these differences would still be significant. The same level of significance was used and both four-group and two-group comparisons were made. In the first, each group was compared to every other group—six comparisons for each activity analyzed—and in the second there was only the one comparison between promotable and nonpromotable. The value required for significance at the .05 level was 1.66 (d.f. from 87 to 96) for the four-group analysis and 1.65 for the two-group (d.f. 185).

In addition to the statistical analyses, other types of activity shown on the third page of the questionnaire were compared for the two groups using percentages or number of persons taking part due to the small amount of participation in them. Other characteristics of the managers not having to do with their outside
activities, such as level of education attained, age, salary, and line or staff were also examined for differences between promotable and nonpromotable.

It had been seen in the literature that educational level attained and age have some influence on the outside activities of managers. Since this information was obtained from the questionnaires, it was decided to see if there was a differential activity pattern from one or the other of these factors in this manager group. Analysis of variance and t tests were run for each on the eight activity groups dividing the cards on education into those with bachelor's degrees or above in one group and those with less than a bachelor's degree into the other, and the cards on age into those less than forty-five years of age and those forty-five and older.

Certain items from the president's questionnaire concerning characteristics of the firm were coded and included on the managers' cards. It had been thought that some of these items—particularly whether the company had a policy of encouraging or discouraging participation in outside activities—might be worth exploring as to the influence they might have on the amount of participation. However, these items were not used in the analysis as there was not enough difference in the responses to make different groups. No firm, for instance, said (or would admit) that it discouraged community activity participation. Most said their policy encouraged it while the others said they had no policy regarding it. The information from the company questionnaire was used primarily to learn about the firm's selection and development methods.
Summary

Data for this study were obtained by sending two questionnaire forms to 250 manufacturing firms throughout the country. One form was to be completed by the company president giving some information about the firm's policies with respect to middle managers' outside activities and about their selection and development. The other, of which there were four copies, was to be distributed to four middle managers, two promotable and two nonpromotable, for their completion and return. It asked for some information about the manager's background but was primarily concerned with the type and degree of his participation in activities outside the firm. After the forms were returned, they were coded and scored for the amount of activity and the information put into punched cards. Analysis of variance of means statistical tests were made on eight different categories of community activity to determine whether there were significant differences between promotable managers and nonpromotable as to their participation. For those where such were found, a t test was made to confirm the existence of the differences. Analyses of variance were also run to see if there were differences in participation based upon age and level of education. Company questionnaires were not given statistical analysis but were reviewed to gain information about policies with regard to outside activities and about selection and development programs for managers.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Company questionnaires and at least one promotable and one nonpromotable managers’ questionnaires were received from forty-nine firms. This group made up the study sample consisting of the forty-nine company characteristics questionnaires and 187 manager questionnaires, ninety-four from promotable managers and ninety-three from nonpromotable.

In addition to the above returns partial returns of questionnaires were received from seven firms. These had company questionnaire only, company questionnaire with one manager questionnaire or two of the same category, or one or two manager questionnaires without a company one. One firm sent back the cover letter with the notation that the firm is no longer in business. Eleven other firms responded (sometimes returning the material) that for one reason or another they could not take part in the study. Several stated, in effect, that it was not appropriate to their manager group. Others said they did not have time to answer questionnaires; they received too many. This may become more and more of a problem for researchers who hope to make empirical studies in organizations if the executives of the organizations feel it is too much trouble to supply the information requested. Businessmen have been heard
to complain about the lack of relevant research but if the attitude expressed by these firms becomes more prevalent, it bodes ill for being able to gather data for research that will be seen by business to be relevant. The most interesting comment received from a non-responding firm was "I hesitate to request our people to complete your questionnaire because I feel there is a remote possibility that this may be a disguised method for use by someone who wants to recruit promotable people." No word was received from the other 182 firms to whom the packets of letters and questionnaires had been sent. The later follow-up on two-thirds of these non-respondents was made by letter enclosing a postcard on which the president was asked to give the reason(s) why the firm did not feel it could take part. Of those who returned the card, most indicated that they get so many requests of this type that they cannot afford to take the time to furnish the information. This further substantiates the above observation.

Data From Company Questionnaires

One of the purposes of this questionnaire was to determine whether the firms selected meet the criteria which had been used to select the list: company size, number of middle managers, and size of community. There are nine firms which have over 1,000 employees, one of which is in excess of 1,500. The other forty are from 250 to 1,000 with the greatest number being from 500 to 750. All of the firms have six or more middle managers and eleven have over thirty-five. Only one firm is located in an area where the population is over 1,000,000 and one-third are in communities
of less than 25,000. Only eight firms are in cities of 500,000 or more population or have some responding managers in cities of this classification.

In response to the question as to whether the firm has a policy of encouraging, discouraging, or no policy regarding outside activities by its personnel, 65 per cent say that such participation is encouraged while the rest have no policy. However, of the thirty-two firms which say they have such a policy, only five have it in writing and published. In 60 per cent of these firms, the policy applies to all employees and in the other 40 per cent it applies to managers alone. Over 90 per cent of the firms, including some who have no policy on participation, allow time off for participation in some types of activities, usually for professional and technical meetings or for civic work such as fund drives. Eighty per cent of the presidents do not think that their managers feel there are particular types of activities in which it would be advisable to engage in order to get ahead in the firm. But 90 per cent of them feel that such activities are of value in the development of managers. Some of the representative comments as to the value are:

"A measure of their motivation and desire for self-realization--when not directly supervised."

"Exposure to what other companies are doing."

"Developing broader perspectives, additional leadership skills."

"Promotes personal growth, maturity."
"Broad association with general social and economic problems."

"Meet other people in community, good public relations."

"Develops a more active and interesting mind--gives a feeling of can do."

"Maintain and improve current job knowledge, experience in dealing with people."

Sixty per cent of the firms also ask applicants about what organizations they have taken part in on the application forms used for employment (almost as many also ask about extracurricular activities in school). Only 30 per cent keep any record of such activity after the individual joins the firm, however. This raises the question of why, if so many feel this type of experience has value, more do not try to keep track of what their people may be doing in this area?

With respect to the formal appraisal of the performance of managers, 65 per cent indicate they have such programs, most on an annual basis with a few semi-annually. Conferences concerning the evaluation are held with the person evaluated in almost all firms using a program. This would indicate that in the majority of medium-size firms, information is available in the records of middle managers to assist in making promotion decisions insofar as their on-the-job performance is concerned.

The last subject raised in the questionnaire concerns management development programs in firms of this classification. A majority (60 per cent) of the firms indicate they have "formal" management training programs. There may have been some ambiguity
as to what "formal" meant. It is doubtful that firms averaging twenty-five middle managers have formal management development programs similar to those of the large corporations. But the responses indicate that various training methods employed in those programs are used by the responding firms in their own. The types most commonly mentioned are coaching (which might not be considered by some to be a method of "formal" training), occasional group meetings, and outside courses by universities and professional associations. Individual correspondence courses are used by a number of firms.

When asked about the principal source of executives for the company, 40 per cent indicate promotion from within, 14 per cent say they are obtained from the outside, and 46 per cent use a combination of the two, neither one predominating. This would indicate that many of the firms in this size category have problems in developing and/or identifying executive talent in their lower management ranks.

**Data From Manager Questionnaires**

**Personal Profile**

The information supplied by the managers on the first page of the questionnaire was examined to see how closely it met the desired specifications which had been listed in the survey procedure sheet (Appendix B) sent with the president's letter. The results of the examination are disappointing. The average age of the respondents is forty-two and the ages range from twenty-four to seventy (the latter is classified as a "promotable" manager)
instead of the desired thirty to forty-five. Eight of the managers are under thirty and fifty-one over forty-five—almost one-third of the respondents are outside of the desired age group. On years of service with the firm, forty-two have less than five years of service where the desired minimum was five years. Interestingly, twenty-six of these are in the promotable classification so the reason for specifying the five-year minimum, that the managers with less than five years of service might be more likely to be considered nonpromotable due to lack of knowledge of their performance compared to those with longer service, may not be valid. Another desired attribute was that all selectees have some college, preferably be college graduates. However, thirty have not attended college (about 15 per cent of the total) and another forty-four are not graduates so 40 per cent do not meet the hoped-for level of education. There is no way to learn from the questionnaires whether the other two criteria are met, those of being a middle manager (or on an equivalent level in a staff position) and not being a relative. If there had been a larger number of returns than the slightly less than 20 per cent, it might have been advisable to eliminate those which did not meet the specifications. The decision was made to retain all of the returned questionnaires and it is hoped that any contamination which may be caused by those which do not meet the standards will be less damaging to the study than having only a small sample with which to work.

A summary of the personal profile responses is given in Table 1 to compare the characteristics of the promotable and the nonpromotable managers.
### TABLE 1
MANAGERS' PERSONAL PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Promotable</th>
<th>Nonpromotable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (mean)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years with the firm (mean)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in present position (mean)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate study</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College extracurricular activities by those who attended college</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary (mean)</td>
<td>$15,700</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This summary indicates that there are notable differences between the promotable and nonpromotable managers in every category. It would appear that the promotable manager is younger, has less years of service, has less years in his present position, is more likely to be a college graduate, has participated to a greater extent in college extracurricular activities, is more likely to be a line manager, and has a higher salary than his nonpromotable counterpart, on the average.
**Outside Community Activities**

The data from the second page of the questionnaire (Appendix E) plus Youth Activities from the third page which had been coded and punched into cards were run on an Analysis of Variance of Means program on an IBM 1130 computer. The results of this are shown in Table 2. The test was made in two different runs; one a four-group comparison of the two promotable and the two nonpromotable groups, the other a two-group comparison of all promotables against nonpromotables. Five of the types of activities show no significant difference in the participation between any of the groups. No further test was run on these five classifications. Three other activities, however, show, on one or both runs, differences which are significant at the .05 level. A total of scores from all eight activities is considered, for purposes of the statistical comparison, as a ninth group and included in the analysis of variance test. This group shows a significant difference between the promotables' participation and that of the nonpromotables at the .05 level on one run and .01 on the other. A t test was run on these four groups to further examine the apparent differences. In this test, each of the four groups was compared with each of the other three and a two-group comparison was again made. The results of this test are shown in Table 3. The theory behind the four-group cross comparisons is that there should be no difference when Prom-0 is compared with Prom-2 or when NProm-1 is compared with NProm-3 but there should be a significant difference between each Prom when compared with a NProm and in the comparison of the combined Proms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Promotable Mean</th>
<th>Promotable S.D.</th>
<th>Nonpromotable Mean</th>
<th>Nonpromotable S.D.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>2.490</td>
<td>2.493</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>3/183</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>1.956</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>2.477</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>2.234</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>2.579</td>
<td>1/185</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>3/183</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1/185</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>3/183</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>1/185</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>3/183</td>
<td>1.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>1.259</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>1/185</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>3/183</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>1/185</td>
<td>1.446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Promotable</th>
<th>Nonpromotable</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>3.347</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>2.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>2.523</td>
<td>2.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>3.309</td>
<td>3.107</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>2.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>6.510</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td>4.490</td>
<td>4.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>4.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>5.723</td>
<td>4.829</td>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>4.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0, NProm-1</td>
<td>2.194</td>
<td>1.127</td>
<td>1.656</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2, NProm-3</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (F value for significance--four group = 2.66, two group = 3.9)
**Significant at the .01 level (F value for significance--four group = 3.90, two group = 6.7)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Group</th>
<th>Second Group</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs Prom-2</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td>3.266</td>
<td>3.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>2.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>2.869</td>
<td>2.522</td>
<td>2.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>3.266</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>2.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>3.266</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>2.522</td>
<td>2.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NProm-1 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>2.183</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>2.522</td>
<td>2.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group Prom vs NProm</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>3.107</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>2.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs Prom-2</td>
<td>6.510</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>3.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>6.510</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td>4.489</td>
<td>4.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>6.510</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>4.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>4.489</td>
<td>4.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>4.866</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>4.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NProm-1 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>4.489</td>
<td>4.378</td>
<td>3.659</td>
<td>4.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group Prom vs NProm</td>
<td>5.723</td>
<td>4.829</td>
<td>4.096</td>
<td>4.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs Prom-2</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>1.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>1.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>1.467</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NProm-1 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>1.081</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group Prom vs NProm</td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>1.803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
COMMUNITY ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION

$t$ Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Group</th>
<th>Second Group</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>First Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs Prom-2</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-0 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-1</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prom-2 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NProm-1 vs NProm-3</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two group Prom vs NProm</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>1.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (t value for significance—four groups = 1.66, two groups = 1.65)

**Significant at the .01 level (t value for significance—four groups = 2.37, two groups = 2.35)
with the NProms. This theory does not hold up in all of the comparisons.

The Community Service comparison, which shows a significant difference in the analysis of variance for the two-group but not for the four-group comparison, shows a significant difference at the .05 level in the two-group $t$ test. In the between-group comparisons, the Prom-0 versus the Prom-2 and the NProm-1 versus the NProm-3 do not show significance. The Prom-0 and Prom-2 comparisons with NProm-1 are both significant at the .05 level. The comparisons of these two groups with NProm-3, however, are not. The participation in this activity by the managers who by chance fell in the NProm-3 group is enough higher than those in NProm-1, although not significantly so, to keep it from being significantly different from the two promotable groups. The two nonpromotables combined, though, are significantly less than the two promotables combined. On balance, then, the activity does seem to be one in which the promotable managers take a more active part than do the non-promotable.

Participation in Religious Activities, which shows significance on both analyses of variance, also does not show the expected pattern in the four-group $t$ test. The managers who fell into the Prom-0 group have a much higher degree of participation than do any of the other three groups so that there is a significant difference at the .05 level with the other group of promotables, Prom-2. This latter group does not have a significantly higher amount than the two nonpromotable groups. The degree of activity
of the Prom-0 is so high, however, that when combined with Prom-2 and compared with the combined nonpromotables, there is a significant difference at the .01 level. It should be noted that the activity of all groups in this classification is considerably higher than in any of the other types of outside activities. Despite the lack of significant difference in the Prom-2, it would seem reasonable to include this activity as one in which promotables are more active.

The third of the activities showing significant difference on the analysis of variance is that of Youth Activities. It is similar to Community Service in that the four-group comparison does not show such a difference while the two-group does. When the four-group t test is examined, it is found that the Prom-2 group is significantly different at the .05 level from the two nonpromotable groups but the Prom-0 is not. There is no significant difference between the promotable groups when compared with each other and between the nonpromotables in a similar comparison. In this activity it appears that by chance the Prom-2 group has more managers who are active in this type of activity than the other group of promotable managers although not to the extent that the Prom-1's exceed the Prom-2's in Religious Activities. The two-group t test shows a significant difference at the .05 level just as the analysis of variance does. This activity is also considered to be one in which the promotables show a more active involvement.
Total Activities, which shows a significant difference for the four-group analysis of variance at the .05 level and at the .01 level for the two-group, is somewhat similar to the pattern of the Religious Activities in the t test. There is no significant difference between the two promotable groups in a comparison with each other and between the two nonpromotable. There is a significant difference when the Prom-0 group is compared with the two non-promotable at the .01 level. The Prom-2 group does not have this difference when compared to the same two groups. But the two-group comparison shows significance again at the .01 level as does the analysis of variance. This might indicate, had there not been separate tests run on the various types of activities, that there is a significant difference between the two types of managers in the extent to which they take part in community activities. But the analysis of the individual kinds of activities does not so indicate.

It would seem that the extent of activity in a few kinds, particularly Religious Activities, influences the Total Activities analysis so heavily that there is an appearance of a relationship which does not, in fact, exist. It would seem more cautious to reject the hypothesis with respect to all types of activities and selectively accept it for some types, at least for the companies studied.

About 30 per cent of the responding managers are older than the desired age group of thirty to forty-five which was requested in the procedure for the study. Because of this, it was decided to divide the cards on the basis of age groups—those under forty-five and those forty-five and older—and run two sets of analyses of
variance and t tests on each of these groups in comparing the promotable and nonpromotable managers' participation. Table 4 shows the results of these comparisons. The first five categories of activities still do not show any significant differences which is the same as the findings shown in Tables 2 and 3. The other three categories and the one for the total of all activities do show significance but only in one or the other group, not in both in any instance. There is a significant difference at the .01 level (except for the F-value on Community Service which is at the .05 level) for the older-manager group in the extent of activity in Community Service, Religious Activities, and Total Activities with the promotable being more active than the nonpromotable. The only activity in which there is a significant difference in the younger-manager group is in Youth Activities in which there is a significant difference at the .05 level in the analysis of variance and at the .01 level in the t test. The promotables here are also more active than the nonpromotables.

In addition to the comparison of promotable and nonpromotable managers on their "participation" in outside activities, an analysis was made of their "leadership" in these same activities. This analysis includes only those who serve on committees or who hold office in the organizations. The analysis of variance of the first five classes of organizations shows the same results as the analysis of variance on "participation"--no significant difference between promotable and nonpromotable managers in either the four-group or the two-group comparison. Community Service also joins
## TABLE 4

**PARTICIPATION COMPARISONS BY AGE GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Under 45</th>
<th>45 and Over</th>
<th>45 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotable</td>
<td>Nonpromotable</td>
<td>Promotable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional and Technical</strong></td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>2.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>2.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 0.181</td>
<td>t -0.425</td>
<td>F 1.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Clubs</strong></td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 0.415</td>
<td>t -0.644</td>
<td>F 0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fraternal Groups</strong></td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>1.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 0.684</td>
<td>t 0.827</td>
<td>F 0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans Organizations</strong></td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>1.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 0.981</td>
<td>t 0.990</td>
<td>F 2.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Clubs</strong></td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>1.757</td>
<td>1.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 0.051</td>
<td>t 0.226</td>
<td>F 0.330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Under 45 (DF: F-ratio 1/132, t test 132)</th>
<th>45 and Over (DF: F-ratio 1/51, t test 51)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotable</td>
<td>Nonpromotable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Activities</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Activities</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.882*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>2.425**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Activities</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at the .05 level
**significant at the .01 level

F value for significance:
1/132 DF 3.92
1/51 DF 4.03

F value for significance:
1/132 DF 6.83
1/51 DF 1.68

t value for significance:
132 DF 1.65
51 DF 1.68

t value for significance:
132 DF 2.35
51 DF 2.40
this group of activities with neither the four-group or the two-group comparison having a significant difference. Religious Activities leadership has the same pattern as in the analysis of participation—F-ratio on both four-group and two-group significant at the .05 level, and t test showing significant differences between Prom-0 and all the other three groups (at .05 level with Prom-2 and NProm-1 and .01 level with NProm-3) in the four-group and at the .05 level in the two-group. Youth Activities has only significant differences at the .05 level in the two-group analysis of variance and two-group t test, there are no significant differences in either of the four-group comparisons. Total Activities shows significant differences in the analysis of variance on the two-group and the four-group but at the .05 level. The t test shows the same level of significance (.01) between Prom-0 and the two nonpromotable groups but also shows a difference between it and Prom-2 at the .05 level. The two-group comparison is also the same as in the participation analysis—significant at the .01 level. It seems, again, that Religious Activities has been the primary influence on the total and, in looking at leadership in community activities, it is the only type where there is a difference between the promotables and the nonpromotables.

Two other analyses made are by "age" and "education" rather than promotable and nonpromotable. In the first, the cards were divided into those under forty-five and those forty-five and over and in the second, those with a bachelor's degree or more and those with less than this degree. Both an analysis of variance and a t
test were made on these two classifications to examine whether they might be factors in different types of activity. Tables 5 and 6 show the data.

The comparison of participation by age groups does not show any significant differences in the analysis of variance but three types of activities are significantly different in the $t$ test at the .05 level. The first two of these would seem to be plausible--Community Service and Social Clubs. The younger managers are likely to be more active in the Junior Chamber of Commerce and as solicitors in fund drives than are the older ones to be members of the Chamber of Commerce and to do the "leg" work in fund drives. The older managers, on the other hand, are more likely to have the money and the time to join and use the clubs as their children are on their own and their mortgages are paid off. The third, however, does not seem as plausible. It would seem logical that the younger managers with children still dependent upon them would be more active in Youth Activities than would the older age group. This difference would seem to be attributable to chance rather than being a real one.

There are also some significant differences in the comparison made by education. All but one show significance only on the $t$ test and at the .05 level. Veterans Organizations shows a significant difference at the .01 level on both the analysis of variance and the $t$ test. The literature indicates that those with a higher level of education are more likely to be active in community affairs and the $t$ value for Total Activity, while it is close to, but not at,
### TABLE 5

COMMUNITY ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION BY AGE

Analysis of Variance of Means and t Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Under 45</th>
<th>45 and Older</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Technical</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>2.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Clubs</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Groups</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>1.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Organizations</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>3.060</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>2.245</td>
<td>2.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Clubs</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>1.775</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>2.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Activities</td>
<td>5.030</td>
<td>4.689</td>
<td>4.623</td>
<td>4.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Activities</td>
<td>1.284</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>1.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Activities</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>1.899</td>
<td>1.222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (F value for significance 3.9, t value for significance 1.65)
### TABLE 6

**COMMUNITY ACTIVITY PARTICIPATION BY EDUCATION**

Analysis of Variance of Means and $t$ Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Less than Bachelor's</th>
<th>Bachelor's or More</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Technical</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>2.226</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>2.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Clubs</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>1.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal Groups</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Organizations</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>2.480</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>2.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Clubs</td>
<td>1.520</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Activities</td>
<td>4.133</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>5.438</td>
<td>4.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Activities</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>1.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Activities</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>1.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level  
**Significant at the .01 level  
F value for significance 3.9  
$F$ value for significance 6.7  
$t$ value for significance 1.65  
$t$ value for significance 2.35
the .05 level of significance, tends to confirm this in the sample of managers. However, two of the activities which show significant differences, Fraternal Groups and Veterans Organizations, show the greater participation by the managers with a lower level of education. Some of the literature cited earlier indicates that participation in these types of activities is greater among those of lower occupational rank and lower socio-economic status. It is possible that the managers with a lower level of education fit these classifications in fact or in self-perceptions since the non-promotable manager group is found to have a greater percentage of managers with less than a college degree and a lower average income. The higher participation in Religious Activities by the more educated is contrary to previous findings in the literature which found that there is less participation by those with the higher status. It is possible, though, that in small and medium-size cities where many of these managers are located that there is a greater amount of church-related activity because of a feeling by higher status persons that it is "expected" of them. It has already been shown that the promotable managers, in particular the Prom-0, have high participation in this area. The greater participation in Professional and Technical seems quite plausible for those who have a college degree or higher. Graduate engineers, accountants, and the like have a stronger feeling of professionalism.
Other Activities

The other activities on the third page of the manager questionnaire (Appendix E) except for Youth Activities (the first item on the page was used to score the fund drives category under Community Service) were not scored nor subjected to statistical analysis. In most cases the participation is small so that there are not enough managers in either group taking part to draw any meaningful conclusions about greater participation on the part of the promotable over the nonpromotable. The responses are summarized in Table 7.

TABLE 7

OTHER ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Promotable Total=94</th>
<th>Nonpromotable Total=93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College alumni (of those who attended college)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company recreation</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military reserve Officer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlisted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA officer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare board</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside firm board</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that, except for political and military reserve activities, the participation of promotable managers is greater than for nonpromotable in these other activities.
At the bottom of the third page, two questions were asked of the respondents as to the reasons they take part in outside activities—which for personal satisfaction and which for vocational reasons. Most of the managers list one or more types under each question but there is no discernible difference in the types listed between the promotable group and the nonpromotable. In the first question responses, Religious Activities, Social Clubs, and Youth Activities receive the most. Professional and Technical are by far the highest for the second question with Community Service second.

Relation of Outside Activity Participation to Promotion

The last page of the questionnaire was not required to be answered by the managers. It is an attempt to see whether they feel that there was any connection between participating in outside activities and getting ahead in their firm. Fourteen managers in each category answer "yes" to the question and nineteen promotable and seventeen nonpromotable say "possibly." In only two firms do all the managers responding to the question answer that there is, or possibly is, a connection. In one of these two firms the president also indicates on the company questionnaire that he thinks the managers feel there are certain types of activities which are helpful in getting ahead but the president of the other does not. Of the other eight firms where the president indicates some feeling that managers perceive this relationship, it is not borne out by their responses. It had been thought that perhaps
the promotable managers might be more sensitive to this and would indicate "yes" or "possibly." However, of the ten responding in these firms, four indicate "yes," one "possibly," and five "no." Nonpromotable managers in these same firms responding to the question are eleven in number: three "yes," four "possibly," and four "no." Many presidents who do not feel managers feel there is a relationship have managers who feel otherwise since there are twenty-seven firms in which one or more answer "yes" or "possibly"--a difference in the view from the summit and from part of the way up the hill.

In checking the possible responses given as the reason for their feelings, the largest number (forty-eight) check "Every responsible manager must be a good citizen in his community." The next two are "These activities are good training for greater responsibility" (forty-six) and "Taking part in these activities promotes company interests" (forty-four). Only three check the response "It appears that only those who do these things get promoted." Some of the free responses given are:

"Our company rewards producers but is not blind to other activities."

"Broadens the individual, gives the company a better image, but most important helps our fellow man."

"Management's encouragement to participate."

"Need for knowledge to keep pace with our fast moving society."
Summary

The returns from the mailing made to 250 firms for the survey amount to about 20 per cent which could be used in the study. The firms almost all fit the specifications as to size, location, and independence but a number of the managers who returned the questionnaires do not fit the hoped-for age, years of service, or educational level parameters. However, all were retained in the study due to the number of returns.

The company questionnaires indicate that the great majority encourage participation in outside activities, feeling it is of benefit to the individual and to the firm. A majority inquire about such activity at the time of employment but few maintain an up-to-date record in the individual's file. About two-thirds of the firms have performance appraisal programs and slightly less have formal management development programs.

The information about the type and degree of participation of managers in major types of community activity was coded and scored for statistical analysis. All types were compared by analysis of variance of means for both four groups, two promotable groups and two nonpromotable groups, and two groups, promotable and non-promotable. Those comparisons which showed a significant difference on one or both at the .05 level were then given t tests. These tests compared each of the four groups with the other three and the promotable group with the nonpromotable group. The results of the analysis of variance and t test indicate significant differences in participation in three types of activity--Community Service,
Religious Activities, and Youth Activities--between the promotable and the nonpromotable managers. A similar analysis to the one on participation was made on leadership in community activities but this only shows significant difference in Religious Activities. An examination, but not tests for significance, was made of other types of activity in which a fewer number of managers participate. In most of these, the promotable group is more active. The hypothesis of the study is neither confirmed nor refuted in its entirety for this sample of managers. There are some activities in which the promotable managers have a significantly higher amount of participation but not in all.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study is to determine if there might be a relationship between the participation of middle managers in various types of activities off the job and the perception of the firm's president as to their promotability to executive positions. The hypothesis being tested is that managers judged to have the potential for promotion are more active in community activities than those who are not considered to be promotable. Medium-size manufacturing firms not located in major metropolitan areas were selected to be surveyed. The reason for selecting firms of this size was twofold: they are not so large that the chief executive would be unacquainted with the middle managers and therefore be unable to make the promotable-nonpromotable distinction, and firms of this size may perceive the results of the study as useful since their techniques for manager selection may not be as sophisticated as those of the large firms. Manufacturing firms were chosen since community activity is not as likely to be a requirement of the middle managers' jobs as it is in local retailing and financial firms. Major metropolitan areas were avoided because of the effect commuting time has on the ability of persons to participate.

The method used to gather the data for the study was a questionnaire sent to the company president to be given to the
manager for completion and to return by mail to the researcher. Each president was furnished four of the instruments, two to be given to promotable managers and two to nonpromotable. In addition, another, and shorter questionnaire was to be completed by the president concerning the firm's policies with respect to outside activities of its members and about its programs, if any, for manager evaluation and development.

The responses on the manager questionnaires having to do with eight major categories of outside activities and a total for all these activities were scored and key-punched for analysis. The methods of statistical comparison used were analysis of variance of means on all of the categories and t-test on those that showed some significant difference at the .05 level on the analysis of variance. These comparisons were made on an IBM 1130 computer.

In addition to the statistical analysis, other comparisons were made between promotable and nonpromotable managers on certain personal characteristics and on some lesser outside activities by means of averages and percentages. An opportunity was provided on the form for those managers who wished to do so to comment on their feelings about the possible influence of participation in outside activities on getting ahead in the firm.

**Principal Findings**

Almost all the responses to the company questionnaire indicate that there is a strong feeling of the value of participation in outside activities by managers and that most of the firms encourage it. The reasons expressed tend to confirm some of the findings in the
literature concerning such participation: enhancement of the image of the firm, fulfillment of individual and corporate social responsibility, a means for gaining experience in leadership, and a broadening of one's awareness. Few (18 per cent) of the replies indicate that the presidents think their managers feel that such activity is necessary for promotion. Thirty-five per cent of the responding managers, however, on their questionnaires indicate that this is, or possibly is, true.

About two-thirds of the firms inquire about the types of activities in which the applicant has taken part in the community on the application for employment so it may be a consideration in initial hiring. But only 30 per cent update their personnel records with this information so there may be a question as to what influence it has on later personnel actions.

About the same number of firms (two-thirds) have periodic performance evaluation of managers and almost all of these include conferences with the manager by the evaluator as part of the procedure. Unfortunately, the questionnaire did not ask whether any consideration of outside activities was a part of this evaluation.

A slightly smaller number, but still more than half, of the firms indicate that they have "formal" management development programs. The descriptions of the types of development methods used indicate they are more individual than formal in the sense of those of larger companies. Such methods as coaching, occasional meetings, correspondence courses, and university and association courses are the most frequently mentioned.
Personal characteristics of the managers indicate differences between promotable and nonpromotable managers although these were not subjected to tests of significance. Promotable managers, on the average, are younger, have been with the firm and in their present position a lesser number of years (McClaine also found this in his study of promotable and nonpromotable managers\(^1\)), have higher annual salaries, have more education, take a more active part in college extracurricular activities, and are more likely to be in line, rather than staff, positions.

The statistical analyses of the various types of community activity of the basis of participation show no significant differences between the two classifications of managers in five of the activities: Professional and Technical Associations, Service Clubs, Fraternal Groups, Veterans Organizations, and Social Clubs. There is enough evidence from the two types of statistical tests to indicate that participation in Community Service organizations, Religious Activities, and Youth Activities are significantly higher for promotable managers than for nonpromotable. The total of all activities also shows a difference at the .05 level on one test and the .01 level on three others. This is rejected as differentiating between the two classes of managers, however, since five of the types of activity included in it do not show significant differences. The total is probably strongly influenced by the Religious Activities category.

A similar analysis was made of these activities on the basis of leadership (includes only those who have served on committees or held office). Of the eight activities, only Religious Activities shows significant differences on enough of the comparisons to be considered discriminating.

Analyses were also made of participation to see if there are differences in activities which could be attributed to age or education instead of promotability. Not all activities showed differences which are significant but there are some, not all of which are the same as those in the promotability study. The age analysis shows significantly higher participation on the part of the under forty-five managers in Community Service but the forty-five and older group is higher in its participation in Social Clubs and Youth Activities. The first two findings seem plausible and therefore acceptable but the third does not and is considered to be attributable to chance. The education analysis shows significantly higher participation by those with a college degree on the bachelor's level or more in Professional and Technical associations and in Religious Activities. The first seems logical but the second is in contradiction to some of the findings in the literature, if one assumes that the promotable group with its higher level of education also means higher socio-economic status. The findings of Hausknecht² and Heck³ both


indicate that there is less participation in church-related activities among the higher status groups. The managers with less than a college degree have significantly more participation in fraternal groups and veterans organizations. This is also confirmed by Coates and Pellegrin\(^4\) and by Hausknecht.\(^5\)

Other activities which were compared but not subjected to statistical analysis are college alumni activities, company recreation programs, PTA officerships, membership on boards of social welfare organizations or of other business firms, military reserve active membership, and political activities. Except for company recreation programs, less than half of the managers in either group take part in any of these. Of those who do, the non-promotable managers are more active in the last two types and the promotable in the others.

Most of the managers indicate they take part in such activities as church-related groups, social clubs, and youth activities for their own personal satisfaction; and they engage in professional and technical activities and community service for vocational reasons. Less than half of the managers answer in the affirmative or possibly to the part of the form which asks if they feel there is any relationship between getting ahead in the organization and participation in outside activities. The reasons


\(^5\)Hausknecht, \textit{loc. cit.}\n
they give for these feelings are related primarily to the training benefit, the promotion of the firm's interests, and being a good citizen in the community. Only a handful perceive it as a way to get to know those who make promotion decisions on a social basis outside the firm or that only those who take part in these activities seem to get promoted.

Conclusions

The conclusions reached in this study, because of the high percentage of nonrespondents and the possible bias which may have been introduced, can only be made with respect to the firms taking part in it. The nonresponding firms may have different characteristics which would affect the participation pattern of their managers. The returned cards from the follow-up mailing (less than half of the 115 firms contacted returned cards) do not indicate any predominant reasons other than they did not wish to take the time to complete the questionnaires. But there are too many from whom there was no response to assume that this is true of all. Any extrapolation to the larger group to whom the mailing was made, or to the 1,000 firms found to be in this type, size, and location category, can only be conjecture. Only if other studies could be made, preferably with personal follow-ups on nonrespondents, in some of the other 750 not contacted might more generally applicable conclusions be drawn.

For this group of firms, the following conclusions might be made:

1. There is a considerable amount of community activity participation on the part of middle managers. Only three are found
who have only one outside activity (for two it is regular church attendance and the third is a military reserve officer). For most it is not simply "joinership"--they take an active part by regular attendance, service on committees, or holding office.

2. There is a significant difference in the amount of participation between promotable managers and those considered nonpromotable in only a few types of activities--Community Service, Religious Activities, and Youth Activities--and if one considers leadership, there is only one type--Religious Activities. Therefore, any use of outside activity participation as a predictor should be cautious and selective and only in support of other techniques.

3. The strong showing of significance in Religious Activities, both participation and leadership, would seem to indicate the values and principles inculcated by religion help managers to excel and prepare themselves for greater responsibilities. However, the provisions of the laws regarding discrimination on the basis of creed or religion may inhibit firms gaining much information of the extent of such activity, particularly from applicants for management jobs.

4. Age and education do appear to have an influence on the type and degree of outside activity participation.

The hypothesis which the study sought to confirm cannot be substantiated in its entirety or completely rejected. It is suggested that other studies might be made in larger firms, in firms in larger cities, and in a larger sample of firms before
decisions on complete acceptance or rejection, or selective acceptance, can be made.

Despite the fact that there is a lack of conclusive evidence of the relation of promotability and community activity, this does not mean that such activity should not be encouraged by superiors for other reasons. Certainly the current emphasis upon corporate good citizenship indicates community service might be considered a part of job content. In locally-oriented firms such as retail establishments and financial institutions, it probably is part of the job responsibility of managers. The need for managers of manufacturing firms to take an active part can be argued but some role in the community is possibly necessary to carry out the firm's social responsibility. The community often looks to the head of the firm to fulfill the role but demands upon his time usually require that he enlist the services of some of his subordinates.

**Recommendations**

In the preceding section it was suggested that additional studies be made in larger samples to see if a clearer indication of possible relationships might be obtained.

Another area for research might be to explore the perception of business executives of the firm's social responsibility and their role in it. Does participation in activities of the community have any relationship to the firm's social responsibility or is this an individual matter for the firm's members apart from their affiliation
with it? Perhaps some of the nonresponse to this study was due to a perception of the president more in line with the latter and this is why he did not choose to have his managers take part. One company president interprets community activity participation as "moonlighting" and goes on to say "... it is a conflict of interest and would adversely affect promotability," when replying to the follow-up on nonresponse. A study in this area might reveal the extent of this type of attitude and raise the question as to whether, if it is very widespread, junior managers may be jeopardizing their chances to advance, rather than enhancing them, by their outside activities.

Another recommendation is that researchers try to build better bridges with practitioners of management to be able to conduct empirical studies in business environments. The replies of non-respondents in this study, while they did not come from a majority of those who did not take part, may be representative. The two recurring themes of the replies were that they were bombarded with questionnaires of all types from government, institutional surveys, market research, and individuals so that if they took the time to respond to all they would have time for nothing else; and that the subject of the study had no relevance to their managers so they saw no benefit in responding. It would seem, then, if research is to be conducted by surveys, a selling job to show how the firm's self-interest can be served will have to be done to enlist its cooperation.
Dear Sir:

Do the activities of managers outside the firm have any bearing on their promotability within it? I am making a study of such a relationship for my doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University.

To gather data from the widest possible sampling, questionnaires are being sent to presidents of selected firms throughout the country. The president then selects four middle managers to complete and return the questionnaires directly to Ohio State University. Because of the nature of the sampling method, it is important to the study to have replies from each company selected. With this in mind, the questionnaires have been designed to take only fifteen minutes to complete. A copy of the findings will be sent to the president of each firm taking part in the study.

The procedure for the survey is outlined on the next page. The questionnaire material is in the large envelope accompanying this letter. Your assistance and that of the managers selected will be sincerely appreciated.

Yours very truly,

Emory H. Richards
Researcher

Approved:

C. B. Hicks
Adviser

Enclosure
APPENDIX B
PROCEDURE FOR MANAGER SURVEY

1. Four manager and one company characteristics questionnaires are in the large envelope accompanying this letter. Each has its own business reply envelope for return directly to Ohio State by the respondent.

2. Four middle managers are to be selected by the president to receive and fill out the questionnaires (takes about 15 minutes to complete). A routing slip is attached to each manager questionnaire for the president's use in forwarding them if he so desires. Two of the managers are to be selected from those middle managers the president feels show the potential for promotion to executive level (the level which reports directly to him) at some future time. The other two are to be from those who, although probably satisfactory in the performance of their present jobs, are not felt to have this potential for promotion to executives.

3. To minimize other variables which may affect promotability, it is requested that the four managers selected meet as many as possible of the following characteristics:
   Male - 30 to 45 years of age,
   Employed by the firm at least five years,
   Have some college training, college graduates preferred,
   Not be related to ownership by blood or marriage, and
   Be on a level above that of foreman but below the executive level reporting to the president (or be in a staff position of equivalent rank).

4. The questionnaires are identical in content and do not give any indication of the "promotability" aspect of the study. The only difference in the forms to be given to the two types of managers is in the way the title of the form is printed. The two questionnaires which are titled "MANAGER SURVEY" in upper case letters are to be given to the two promotable managers. The ones titled "Manager Survey" in capitals and lower case letters are for the nonpromotable. Only the president and the researcher will be aware of this difference. It is important to the survey that care be used in routing the questionnaires properly as this will be the only way to identify the two types of managers to see if there is a difference in their activity patterns.

5. The questionnaires are to be anonymous but each will have the firm name on it in order that data from the company characteristics questionnaire may be matched with those from the firm's managers.

6. A company characteristics questionnaire for completion by the president or his representative (takes about ten minutes) is also furnished. This is used to try to determine whether the type of firm or firm policies may be a significant variable.

7. Upon completion of the study, a summary of findings will be furnished to the president. Four copies of an additional summary which does not refer to the promotability aspect will also be sent for distribution to the participating managers if desired.
APPENDIX C

COMPANY QUESTIONNAIRE
COMPANY CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONNAIRE

Most of the responses to this questionnaire can be made by checking the appropriate blank in front of the answer for the question. Other types of responses will be indicated in the question.

1. What is the total employment of the firm? (use average if employment is seasonal)
   - under 250
   - 500 to 749
   - 1,000 to 1,249
   - 1,500 or more
   - 250 to 499
   - 750 to 999
   - 1,250 to 1,499

2. What is the size of the middle manager group, including staff of the same relative rank, from which the sample of four managers was drawn? (above foreman level but below executive level reporting to president)
   - 5 or less
   - 11 to 15
   - 21 to 25
   - 31 to 35
   - 6 to 10
   - 16 to 20
   - 26 to 30
   - over 35

3. What is the company policy toward outside activities by its personnel?
   - encouraged
   - discouraged
   - there is no policy on this matter

4. If there is a policy, is it
   - written and published for all informal and word-of-mouth?

5. Does the policy apply to
   - all persons
   - managers only
   - line employees only

6. If outside activities are encouraged, is time-off ever allowed for any?
   - no
   - yes (if “yes”, what types)

7. Do you think there is any feeling among the managers in the firm that there are certain types of activities in which it is advisable to take part if one hopes to get ahead in the firm?
   - yes
   - no (if “yes”, what types)

8. Do you feel that outside activities are of any value in the development of managers?
   - yes
   - no (if “yes”, what types
   - what value)

9. Does the application form used for the employment of supervisory and staff personnel (including trainees) ask for information concerning:
   - community activities and organization memberships
   - school or college extra-curricular activities

(It would be greatly appreciated if you would send a copy of the application blank used in hiring management personnel with this completed form)

(over)
10. Is personnel record data for this type of employee updated from time to time as to the types of outside activities in which he is engaged and what positions he may be serving in them?
   yes    no

11. Does the firm have a formal performance evaluation program for its employees?
    yes, for all employees         managers only         line employees only         no.

12. If managers are evaluated, how often is it done?
    yes    no

13. Is the evaluation discussed with the subordinate by the evaluator?
    yes    no

14. Is there a planned training program for managerial personnel?
    yes    no (if “yes”, which of the following are a part of it?)
    individual coaching of the manager by his immediate superior
    individual types of training based upon development needs of the manager as perceived by himself and/or his superiors
    occasional training meetings for all levels of managers
    occasional training meetings for selected managers or levels of managers
    regular training sessions for all levels of managers
    regular training sessions for selected managers or levels of managers
    local college and university courses
    local professional association programs
    out-of-town university or professional association programs
    individual correspondence course study
    other (please specify)

15. What has been the principal source of executives for the firm in the post World War II period?
    promotion from within         hired from other, outside sources
    transfers from affiliates      combination of these, none predominant

16. Is this firm a subsidiary of a larger company?    yes    no

17. Size of the community where the firm is located (or where the selected managers are located if other than the headquarters address—please use an O in the blank to indicate location of promotables and an X to locate nonpromotables if they are at different size communities)

   under 25,000          50,000 to 100,000          500,000 to 1,000,000
   25,000 to 50,000      100,000 to 500,000          over 1,000,000

Your time and the information you have contributed to the study by completing this questionnaire are greatly appreciated.
APPENDIX D

Memorandum

To:

From:

Our company has agreed to participate in a survey of some off-job activities of middle-management personnel being conducted by The Ohio State University in a sampling of firms throughout the United States.

I have been asked to distribute the attached questionnaire to selected managers in the company for their completion and direct return in the envelope which is also attached. The questionnaire is to be submitted anonymously, the University will not be told to whom I have sent it for completion (so be sure to take off this memo before mailing your completed form). The company name is on the questionnaire so your return may be matched with one concerning the company which I am submitting.

Please fill it out according to the instructions contained in it being as factual as you can and mail it to Ohio State promptly. Thank you for your assistance in our firm's participation in this study.
APPENDIX E

MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE
MANAGER SURVEY
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
P. O. Box 3092, University Station
Columbus, Ohio 43210

This questionnaire is to be completed without identification, except for the company name on it, and returned directly to Ohio State University in the attached envelope. The form asks for certain information about you; about your position in the company and what you do there; and, most of all, about what things you do away from the job in your community. The information about you and your job is not to try to identify you but rather to see if persons with certain backgrounds, personal or job, tend to do things away from the job which those with different backgrounds do not.

Much of the information called for requires only entering a letter, a check mark, a number, or a word or two. We are aware that your time is limited and valuable so we do not wish to take very much of it. Completing the form should not take more than 15 minutes. We would appreciate your cooperation in completing and returning this within a week so we may have a large enough sample to draw some meaningful conclusions. Thank you for your help.

PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Age at nearest birthdate
2. Number of years with this firm
3. Number of years in your present position
4. Number of years of education completed (circle one):
   Elementary and high school 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
   College and graduate school 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. If a college graduate, what is the highest degree you earned?
6. If you attended college, did you take part in any of the following?
   intercollegiate athletics  drama, debate, glee club  fraternity
   intramural athletics  campus religious group  publications
   team captain  fraternity officer  class officer
7. Type of position now held:
   line — production  marketing  finance  other (  )
   staff — personnel  engineering  R & D  purchasing
   assistant—to a line manager  other (  )
8. If a line manager, how many people do you supervise?
   directly  indirectly through subordinates
9. What is your present annual salary (nearest $1,000)

OUTSIDE COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

For the types of activities on the page immediately following, please mark the box to show the extent of your association with each type and write in the name of the organization. Put a "P" in the box if that describes your present situation in the activity, and put an "X" in the box to show what it has been in the past (if you were once associated with an organization while employed by your present firm but currently do not belong to it).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>Attend Occasionally</th>
<th>Attend Regularly</th>
<th>Serve on Committees</th>
<th>Hold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Professional and technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting or financial such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General management such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAM, AMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized management such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPA, NOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional such as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Service clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fraternal groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights of Columbus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights of Pythias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Veterans organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic or Jewish War Veterans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Community service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Chest (United Appeal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Charity Drives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA or YMHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Social clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City luncheon club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting and fishing club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yacht club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay leadership (vestry, deacon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church business board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following can best be answered by a "P" or "X" in the space before the phrase which may describe your participation in the activity.

17. Community fund campaigns such as United Appeal, Red Cross, Cancer Society:  
   solicitor  team captain  campaign chairman  board of directors

18. Youth activities such as Boy Scouts, Junior Achievement, Boy's Club:  
   group leader or advisor  fund raiser  board of directors

19. College alumni activities:  
   member of local alumni club  officer of national alumni association
   officer in local club  college trustee
   contributor to alumni fund  solicitor for alumni fund drives

20. Political activities:  
   hold political office  local  state  national
   unsuccessful candidate for office
   regular contributor to political fund drives  fund raiser
   precinct worker  campaign worker for another's campaign

21. Military reserve activities:  
   member of a drilling unit  officer  enlisted

22. Miscellaneous activities:  
   officer in PTA or other school-affiliated organization
   board member of hospital, private school, or other institution
   director of a firm not affiliated with your present employer

23. Participation in after-hours company activities:  
   intracompany sports such as golf or bowling league
   intercompany sports such as softball or basketball
   credit union officer or director
   employee welfare or recreation association officer or director
   special interest groups such as photography, chess, great books discussions, Toastmasters

24. Is there any other activity not listed in the above groups in which you take part outside of the job?

25. Considering all types of organizations of which you are a member, which did you join solely for personal satisfaction?

   Which did you join for vocational reasons?

26. Do you have any other comments which might be of interest to a study of the outside activities of management personnel?
This page of the questionnaire is optional and you need not answer the question if you would prefer not. They are not essential to the study but would be of general interest in it.

Do you have a feeling, or do you think there is a general feeling in the firm, that there are certain types of outside activities (among those listed in the questionnaire or others) which one should participate in if he expects to progress to the higher levels of management in the firm?

[ ] yes  [ ] no  [ ] possibly

If you have checked "yes" or "possibly", what types of activities would you say these are?

What do you think are the reasons for these feelings?

[ ] These activities are good training for greater responsibility
[ ] It appears that only those who do these things get promoted
[ ] Taking part in these activities promotes company interests
[ ] Top management indicates they want the managers to participate
[ ] Every responsible manager must be a good citizen in his community
[ ] Provides opportunities to get to know those who decide on promotions in a social and non-work environment
[ ] Other (list, please)

Your help and time in supplying information for the study are greatly appreciated.
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