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CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Concern with problems of leadership and principles of scientific management in industry had their formal beginning in the writings of Taylor and Fayol (Beer, 1966). Taylor (1911), in his analysis of management principles, considered formal authority and control as the most important facets of the management process. Underlying Taylor's approach was the assumption that employees are primarily motivated by monetary incentives and will be productive and accept the authority of management in return for such renumeration.

In addition to problems of authority and control, early researchers focused upon isolating the physical, intellectual, and personality traits that distinguished leaders from followers. Writers of this period viewed leaders as being characterized by outstanding and sometimes, almost superhuman personal qualities not possessed by the average person who, because of their absence, was destined to remain among the followers (Peirce, 1970).

Research designed to identify traits associated with leaders
in general proved to be statistically nonsignificant. As summarized by Shaw (1971), the relationship between specific personality traits and leadership tends to be positive but weak. Spotts (1964) further concluded that: "General dissatisfaction with the failure to isolate leadership traits led some investigators to focus their research efforts more upon the situation in which leadership occurs" (p. 257).

An example of this approach was the famous Hawthorne study (1933) which resulted in the realization that employees are motivated by social and psychological forces as well as economic ones (Mayo, 1933; Dickson, 1939; Homans, 1940). The proposition that productivity can be affected by workers' perception that management is interested in them, and that productivity can also be restricted by social pressures to conform to group-determined standards, was accepted by social scientists in industry (Beer, 1966).

Between the late 1920's and the early 1950's, a proliferation of research was conducted concerning the psychological and sociological forces operant in the industrial organization. Studies were performed in an attempt to identify relationships between the attitude of workers and various dependent variables such as absenteeism, turnover, and productivity (Carter, 1951; Bales, 1965; Cattell, 1951). The many studies conducted during this period failed to
identify the existence of such a relationship. It was concluded that satisfaction and morale are not necessarily related to production (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1960; Kahn, 1960, Prybel, 1973).

In addition to studies focusing on behaviors of workers, other researchers concentrated their theories on the study of worker attitudes, production, and leadership within the framework of the organization and the climate provided by leadership style (Peirce, 1970).

Fiedler's (1967) contingency model is representative of this approach. According to Fiedler, the type of leadership which will be most effective in a situation is dependent upon major dimensions of: (1) leader-member relations, (2) task structure, and (3) leader position power. The behavior of leaders is influenced by their attitude toward employees and the favorableness of the situation within which they operate. Bass (1960) reported that cross-cultural studies by anthropologists support the importance of situational leadership factors. Shaw (1971) similarly concluded that Fiedler's contingency model is a promising start toward the integration of leadership styles and situational factors as determinants of group effectiveness. Effects of the relationship between supervisor and employee became the situational factor of concern to many investigators (Cummins, 1971; Dawson, 1972; Fiedler, 1955; Fleishman,
Examination of selected literature concerning the relationship between supervisor and employee reveals that most theories were developed on the basis that there is one style of supervision which is believed to produce favorable outcomes, e.g., worker satisfaction or increased productivity, and a second which has less favorable outcomes. Although these styles are given different names and are conceptualized somewhat differently, depending on the study, most of them may be reduced to either "good guy" or "bad guy" management comparisons (Fleishman, 1971; Feidler, 1967; Likert, 1961; Schlacter, Festinger, Willerman, & Hyman, 1961; Argyris, 1958; House, Hunt, & Liebscher, 1973; Korman, 1966; Kerr, 1974). Almost lost in the proliferation of studies were the observations of Tannerbaum and Schmidt (1958) which concluded that such dichotomizing of supervisory style is inadequate as the approach does not consider the many forces operating within the personality of managers and their employees. Tannerbaum (1966) later summarized that supervisory style is both a cause and effect of worker performance. Knech, Crutchfield, and Ballachy (1962) observed in their discussions of leadership, "like all forms of interaction, leadership works two ways: The leader influences the follower and the follower, in turn, influences the leader" (p. 423).

Related to this view is Argyris' (1958) observation that job
enlargement, employee-centered supervision, and a reduction of control will allow workers fuller personal development and self-actualization.

Thus, the theory and research have only begun to isolate the variables which are essential to productive workers. While these relationships and variables are being studied, the lack of opportunity for self-actualization or fulfillment through job efforts has its toll on the worker (Porter, 1959, 1961, 1962, 1963; Levoy, 1972; Finley & Pritchett, 1973). In discussing the plight of the "alienated" workers, Newsweek states: "... the 'alienated' worker, afflicted with the blue collar blues, the white collar woes, and the just plain on-the-job blahs. They are bored, rebellious, frustrated; sometimes they're drunk on the job or spaced out on drugs" (1973, p. 79).

Other researchers have similarly concluded that employee discontent is not limited to nonsupervisory personnel. Seashore and Barnowe (1972) surveyed the attitudes of 1,553 persons considered to be representatives of the national work force. They observed in their discussion of worker discontent:

1) the syndrome is far more widespread than we and others had suspected--so much so, in fact, that "blue collar' is a misnomer;

2) the source of the disease lies not in inherent characteristics of the worker--sex, age, income, or the color of the collar--but most probably on
the job and the job setting and in the limitations that the job and the setting put on the worker's self-actualization (p. 827).

Finley and Pritchett (1973) suggest the need for additional research conducted in a variety of organizational settings to augment our knowledge of variables affecting worker need satisfaction. Of particular relevance to the present study is Beer's (1966) suggestion that there is a need for researchers to investigate the relationships between styles of supervision and worker satisfaction.

Thus, there is a need for additional research designed to augment our knowledge of variables associated with worker discontent. A study that measures the relationship between styles of supervision and employee need satisfaction appears to be justified.

Significance of the Present Study

The review of selected literature failed to identify any studies measuring the relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction of employees in the retail industry. Following Finley and Pritchett's (1973) suggestion, the present study is designed to investigate the relationship between styles of supervision and employee need satisfaction. Unique to this study is the measurement of the relationship of need satisfaction between two levels of supervisory personnel. The study measures the effect of line managers' perception of their need satisfaction and
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supervisory style to department managers' (supervised by line managers) perceptions of their need satisfaction and line managers' supervisory style. The relationship between line managers' supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction is the focus of the study because it is assumed that line managers' supervisory style is the significant variable associated with department managers' need satisfaction. The assumption was based on Hill and Hunt's (1972) conclusion that first level managerial behavior is more important to employee need satisfaction than second level managerial behavior.

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of the study are: (a) to identify line managers' and department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style, (b) to identify line managers' and department managers' perceptions of need satisfaction, and (c) to assess the relationship between measures of supervisory styles and measures of need satisfaction.

The independent variables are measures of department and line managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style. These variables are not manipulated; however, differences in perceptions of line managers' supervisory style are expected to correlate with department managers' perception of need
satisfaction, and line managers' perception of need satisfaction.

Questions basic to the investigation include: (a) What is the relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction? (b) What is the relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and line managers' need satisfaction? (c) What is the relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and line managers' need satisfaction? (d) What is the relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction? (e) What is the relationship between line managers' perception of supervisory style and department managers' perception of supervisory style? and (f) What is the relationship between line managers' perception of need satisfaction and department managers' perception of need satisfaction?

Hypotheses

The present study, formulated to explore and clarify some of the issues noted in the literature, resulted in the identification of four major hypotheses. They are:

Hypothesis 1. --It is assumed that the needs of department managers are better satisfied through a considerate style of supervision by line managers. A considerate style of supervision
for purposes of the present study, is defined as line managers' supervisory behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between line and department managers. The assumption is explored by comparing department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style with department managers' self-report of need satisfaction. The first hypothesis is:

Department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style as being considerate will be positively related to department managers' need satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2.** - It is assumed that line managers whose needs are satisfied will have a greater tendency to use considerate supervisory style than line managers whose needs are not satisfied. The assumption is explored by comparing department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style with line managers' self-report of need satisfaction. The second hypothesis is:

Department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style as being considerate will be positively related to line managers' self-report of need satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3.** - It is assumed that there is positive correlation between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style. The assumption will be explored by comparing line
managers' perceptions of their supervisory style with department
managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style. The
third hypothesis is:

There is a positive and significant relationship
between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department managers' perception
of line managers' supervisory style.

**Hypothesis 4.**--It is assumed that there is a reciprocal
relationship between line managers' and department managers' need satisfaction. The assumption will be tested by comparing
line managers' perception of need satisfaction with department
managers' perception of need satisfaction. The fourth hypothesis
is:

There is a positive and significant relationship
between line managers' perception of need satisfaction and department managers' perception of
need satisfaction.

The aforementioned four empirical hypotheses will be
tested in appropriate null forms.

**Definition of Terms**

The setting for the study is a collection of seven retail
units. The retail units are seven discount department stores
located throughout southwestern Michigan. Each of these stores
is owned and operated by the same family. All seven retail units
are organized through a similar managerial hierarchy. They are divided into three main areas which are composed of several individual departments. The three areas are: (1) foods, (2) softlines, and (3) hardlines.

**Line manager**

Line managers are responsible for the performance of an area within each retail unit. Line managers supervise the work department managers through staff meetings, written instructions, and daily contacts. The line managers are identified by title as follows: (1) foods, (2) softlines, and (3) hardlines.

**Department manager**

Department managers are first level supervisors responsible for the total operation of individual departments within each division of the seven retail units. Individual department managers within each area report to the same line manager. An average number of department managers reporting to line managers is eight.

**Department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style**

Department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style is defined as department managers' response to the consideration and structure subscales of the Leadership Behavior
Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). The questionnaire has been used in a number of studies concerning employees' perceptions of their managers' supervisory style (Fleishman, 1973). "Consideration" for purposes of the study is defined as line managers' supervisory behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between line and department managers. "Structure" is defined as line managers' supervisory behavior of delineating the relationship between themselves and department managers, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done.

Line managers' perception of their supervisory style

Line managers' perception of their supervisory style is defined as line managers' responses to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). This questionnaire has also been used in a number of studies concerning managers' perceptions of their supervisory style (Fleishman, 1973).

Level of need satisfaction

Line and department managers' level of need satisfaction is defined on the basis of their responses to Porter's Questionnaire (PQ) which is based on Maslow's need theory of personality development and his development of a hierarchy of needs (1954). This
questionnaire has been used by a number of researchers studying need satisfaction (Beer, 1966; Hunt, 1971; Porter, 1960). Needs for purposes of the study are defined as follows.

**Security needs**

The desire for a predictable, structure, and reliable environment. The desire for "fairness" and a familiar non-threatening environment.

**Social needs**

The desire for belonging. The desire for association, for acceptance by one's fellows, for giving and receiving friendship and love.

**Esteem needs**

The desire for reputation or prestige, respect, or esteem from other people, status, dominance, recognition, attention, importance, or appreciation. A desire for esteem from others.

**Autonomy needs**

The desire for independence and freedom. The desire for achievement, competence, mastery, adequacy, and confidence.

**Need for self-actualization**

The desire to realize one's own potential. The desire for growth and self-development, and the desire to become everything that one is capable of becoming.
Supervision

Supervision was used interchangeably in the study with supervisory style. Supervision may be considered those oral, written, and nonverbal behaviors which contribute to the success, failure, morale, satisfaction, and tenure of the organizational unit over which the supervisor has jurisdiction. For, as Guion (1965) points out: "the supervisor's own behavior contributes to the achievement of organizational goals only by its influences on the perceptions, attitudes, and motives of other people in the organization and on their subsequent behavior" (p. 446).

Review of Selected Literature

The main conceptual hypothesis of this study is that the supervisory style of line managers is in part a reciprocal phenomenon. It results not only from the needs, personal qualities, and background of the line managers but also from the forces imposed upon them by persons and the environment they supervise. The review will be concentrated into three main areas: (a) literature concerning the interactional character of leadership, (b) studies associated with Fleishman and The Ohio State School of Leadership, and (c) literature concerning the relationship between styles of leadership and measures of employee satisfaction and productivity.
Literature concerning the interactional character of leadership

Among organizational theorists, there is a growing belief that the follower may influence the leader. It is recognized that the behavior of the leader and that of the follower may be reciprocal (Katz & Han, 1966; Blau & Scott, 1962; Gouldner, 1954). Sanford, in his introduction to a study concerning the personality needs of followers stated:

There is some justification for regarding the follower as the most crucial factor in any leadership event and for arguing that research directed at the follower will eventually yield a handsome pay-off. Not only is it the follower who accepts or rejects leadership, but it is the follower who perceives both the leader and the situation and who reacts in terms of what he perceives. And what he perceives may be, to an important degree, a function of his motivations, frames of reference, and readinesses (1950, p. 4).

Styles of supervision as an independent variable and employee need for participation and independence as dependent variables were studied by Vroom (1960). His findings indicated that individuals rated high in a need for independence were significantly more motivated and better satisfied under participative supervision than were individuals rated low in independence. Individuals rated high in authoritarianism tended to be less satisfied and less motivated under participation than individuals low in authoritarianism. Additional evidence that leadership behavior is a reciprocal phenomenon was offered by Gibb (1954). Gibb
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concluded that effective leadership of employees with certain need patterns will differ from effective leadership of people who have different needs and personality patterns.

Studies which seek to evaluate the effect of various leadership styles can usually be interpreted in the reverse causal direction (Lowin, 1968). To evaluate this alternative interpretation, Lowin conducted an experiment in which employee performance was manipulated and supervisory style observed in a realistic setting. Evidence was obtained that employee performance shapes the following leadership styles: closeness of supervision, initiating structure, and consideration for structure. In addition, Graham (1973) noted that supervisors of salesmen were rated as being more considerate under conditions of high group performance.

Tannenbaum (1958) reported that employees' responses to the behavior of their supervisor was influenced by their personality predispositions. Employees whose predispositions reflected a desire to participate in decisions affecting them responded favorably to an increase in participation. Those who were oriented toward dependence reacted less favorably to the increase in participation.

Foa (1957) similarly concluded that worker expectations affect satisfaction with different supervisory styles. Autocratic supervision was negatively related and participative leadership was positively related to satisfaction with the supervisor. However,
leaders who conformed to the expectations of their employees were more likely to have satisfied workers than either autocratic or democratic leaders, even when employees expected and received autocratic leadership.

The interactive nature of the supervisor-employee relationship was also demonstrated in a study by Allen (1973). Allen concluded that as employee's performance improved, managers were more free and relaxed in their supervisory style. A rigid and controlling supervisory style was associated with inadequate employee performance.

Although there is increasing awareness of the interactional character of leadership, there are few studies designed to identify the reciprocal characteristics of the supervisor-employee relationship. The literature relevant to supervisory behavior reveals few studies that treat characteristics of the employee group as independent variables. In general, employees are considered to be "givens" (Peirce, 1970).

Using the theoretical position taken by Sanford (1950), Gibb (1954), Tannenbaum (1958), Vroom (1960), and Lowin (1968), and the research trends identified by Peirce (1970), the purpose of the present study is to investigate the relationship between line and department managers' perceptions of supervisory style and need satisfaction.
One of the most comprehensive and lengthy studies on leadership behavior has been developed and conducted at Ohio State University. In 1950, Hemphill obtained ratings of leader behavior on over 1,000 items. The instrument has been revised and refined over the years. Through a process of factor analysis, two major dimensions of leadership behavior emerged: (a) consideration and (b) initiating structure. These two dimensions were defined as follows by Halpin (1959):

CONSIDERATION refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group.

INITIATING STRUCTURE refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done (p.2).

The research has shown that the effective leader will score high on both dimensions (Fleishman, et al., 1955; Halpin, 1954; Ramseyer, et al., 1955). Fleishman, et al. (1955) summarized the research when they wrote:

The behavior of a leader reflects (1) his regard for others and (2) his efforts to promote action. Consideration of others without regard to getting on with the task at hand produces excellent social relations but does not necessarily prove to be productive. On the
other hand, driving directly toward the accomplishment of a goal without due consideration of others may create conditions which can put the administrator out of his job (p.5).

Other researchers have conducted studies designed to measure the relationship between consideration and structure with a variety of dependent variables.

The supervisory style of industrial supervisors and the dependent variable of risk-taking behavior of head nurses was studied by Rim (1965). He concluded that head nurses who were rated high in both consideration and structure tended to take more initial risks than their colleagues. The relationship among consideration, structure, and empathy was examined by Fleishman and Salter (1963). Empathy was defined as a supervisor's ability to predict responses of his employees to a personality questionnaire. A significant correlation between the consideration score of supervisors and the congruence of their predictions to employees was noted.

Fleishman and Harris (1962) found that turnover and grievances occur most frequently among employee groups whose supervisors are low in consideration. In a study designed to establish the relation of leadership patterns to organizational stress and effectiveness in hospitals, Oaklander and Fleishman (1964) concluded that higher consideration by department heads was related to lower
departmental stress.

A study was conducted by Beatty (1972) to examine the relationship of supervisory style with the dependent variable of earnings and job performance of hardcore unemployed. After two years on the job, the employee's perception of their supervisor's behavior as being considerate was predictive of their weekly earnings and job performance. Structure without consideration was negatively related to earnings and job performance.

The relationship of consideration and structure to group effectiveness has also been studied by a number of researchers. Halpin (1954) indicated that bomber crews rated highest in efficiency were led by commanders rated higher on both dimensions of consideration and structure. Hemphill (1955) noted that university departments with the best reputation had administrators who were described as using consideration and structure in their administrative style.

A study by Fleishman and Simmons (1970) of a cross-section of foremen in Israel indicated that supervisors rated most effective had supervisory patterns high in both consideration and structure. Misumi and Tosaki (1965) also found productivity and morale highest among supervisors emphasizing both consideration and structure.

In the Halpin (1954), Hemphill (1955), Fleishman & Simmons
(1970), and Misumi & Tosaki (1965) studies, supervisors low on both dimensions of consideration and structure scored lowest on the criterion measures.

The moderating effect of consideration was replicated in a study by Cummins (1971). Cummins observed that the quality of work performed by industrial work groups was related to structure, but only where the supervisor was also high in consideration.

Gruenfeld & Kassum (1973) similarly concluded that female nursing supervisors who combined high levels of consideration are more likely than supervisors who fail to do so to develop high levels of satisfaction among their employees and better patient care.

Literature concerning the relationship between styles of leadership and measures of employee satisfaction and productivity

There is an extensive body of research designed to measure the relationship of styles of supervision, employee satisfaction, and productivity.

The pioneering study of supervisory styles was conducted by Lewin and his associate (Shaw, 1971). Lewin (1939) conducted an experiment in which four comparable groups of ten-year old boys were observed as they experienced autocratic, democratic, and laissez faire adult leadership. The results indicated different patterns of group interaction as a function of supervisory
style. Hostility and aggression were greater in the autocratic groups. There were no significant differences in the number of products produced, but the products of the democratic groups were judged to be qualitatively superior to the other two groups.

Comrey, Pfifner, and Beem (1952) found that job satisfaction and personal competence of supervisors were not related to organizational effectiveness in the United States Forest Service. Effectiveness was associated with supervision which was sympathetic, democratic, and kept employees informed. In a replication of the above study, Bass (1958) noted that supervisors who scored high on the consideration dimension of The Ohio State Leadership Opinion Questionnaire were subsequently rated higher in effectiveness than those who were low in consideration.

In a study involving 742 clerical workers, Morse (1953) observed that leaders who supervise closely do not allow an opportunity for developing skills and aspiration among employees. Furthermore, productivity was higher under supervisors who delegate, allow freedom of actions, exert no pressure for production, and treat employees in an understanding way.

The relationship between level of decision-making in a company and employee satisfaction and productivity was tested by Morse and Reimer (1956). Four groups were matched with respect to satisfaction and productivity. Two of the four groups were
assigned to an autonomy condition in which they were given greater control over all aspects of the work situation except their salary. The other two groups were assigned to a hierarchically controlled situation in which greater control was given to the supervisor. Satisfaction increased in the autonomy groups but decreased in the hierarchically controlled groups. Productivity increased in both groups, but the increase was greater in the hierarchically controlled groups.

Schachter, Festinger, Willerman, and Hyman (1961) found that irritating and threatening treatment by leaders affected productivity negatively on small assembly work. A similar relationship between punitive and non-punitive supervision and the dependent variable of production and satisfaction was observed by De Charms and Bridgeman (1961). Argyle, Gardner, and Cioffi (1958) concluded that threatening and punitive supervision resulted in increased employee absenteeism and turnover.

Fiedler's contingency model of leadership effectiveness and his Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) Questionnaire was utilized by Jones (1972) to study the relationships between supervisors and employees of a national service-oriented corporation. Results indicate that: (a) high LPC leaders were more human relations oriented than low LPC leaders, (b) job satisfaction was higher under high LPC leaders, and (c) performance ratings varied
according to the level of similarity of LPC orientation of the leader and follower. Additional data suggest that the follower LPC scores may be a significant variable affecting the quality of leader-follower relations.

Jugoslav (1971) investigated differences in job satisfaction and group cohesiveness of blue collar and white collar employees under participative and authoritative supervision styles for blacks and whites. Both groups had higher job satisfaction with work, supervision, co-workers, pay, and promotion under participative than under authoritative supervisory style. Group cohesiveness was positively related to a participative style of supervision for both groups.

Oaklander and Fleishman (1964) determined that a considerate supervisory style reduces intra-unit stress and serves to harmonize relationships within the group. The exercise of initiating structure by the supervisor served to prevent tension and conflict arising between groups and, in the case of larger organizations, within groups as well. Oaklander and Fleishman further concluded that initiating structure cannot be interpreted solely as a means of encouraging production. It is also a means of reducing intra-group stress and protecting workers from outside interference, political influences, and arbitrary rule by higher authority.

Of particular interest to the present research is a study
conducted by Beer (1966). Beer tested the relationship between four leadership styles (initiating structure, consideration, freedom of action, and production emphasis) and the dependent variables of (1) motivation, (2) perceived opportunity for satisfaction of needs based on Maslow's need hierarchy (security, social esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization), and (3) actual satisfaction of needs based on Maslow's need hierarchy. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was used to measure employees' perception of their supervisor's leadership style. Porter's Questionnaire was used to measure employee's perception of need satisfaction. The subjects in the study were female clerical workers. Beer concluded that higher order need satisfaction (esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization) was positively related to supervisory styles of consideration and freedom of action while satisfaction of security needs was positively related to initiating structure.

The interactive effects of perceived leadership styles were also included in the study by Beer. Workers who perceived a high level of consideration in their supervisor seemed to be more positively motivated by initiating structure than individuals who perceive a low level of consideration. That is, a combination of consideration and initiating structure resulted in a higher positive relationship between structure and initiative than the relationship
between structure and initiative without consideration.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and Porter's Questionnaire were used in a similar study by Hill and Hunt (1971). They tested the relationship of employee's perception of their immediate and second level supervisor's leadership style to employee need satisfaction. Satisfaction of esteem needs was significantly related to the leadership behavior of second level manager's perceived leadership behavior. Security, social, and autonomy needs were associated with the supervisory behavior of first level managers. Hill and Hunt concluded that first level managerial behavior is more important to employee dissatisfaction than second level managerial behavior.

Other researchers have found employee-centered, considerate, or participative supervision does not always lead to higher production and satisfaction. Parker (1963) reported that consideration and initiating structure, as measured by the Ohio State Leadership Scales, were not related to performance.

Dunteman and Bass (1963) concluded that "Task Oriented" supervisors (conceptually similar to initiating structure) are rated as more effective supervisors than those who are "Interaction Oriented" (conceptually similar to consideration). In addition, close supervision and pressure for efficiency was reported by Patchen (1962) to increase group performance when supervisors
"go to bat" for their workers, and when supervisors are the source of rewards. Patchen concluded that close supervision may be perceived by employees as a demonstration of the supervisor's interest in their welfare. His findings suggest that the various measures of participative or employee-centered supervision may not always be comparable. Such supervision may be perceived differently when it is accompanied by other interacting factors.

Summary

A variety of sources were examined to produce a summary of studies concerned with the relationship between styles of leadership and employee need satisfaction.

The central theme of the literature was that explanations of leadership ranged from factors of observable behavior to sophisticated analysis of complex relationships. Early researchers tended to delineate specific traits of leaders which would distinguish them from others. Later, the situational character of leadership became the focus of attention when studies failed to support the trait and factor approach.

The situational approach was based on the concept that effective leadership is contingent on situational factors such as (1) leader-member relations, (2) task structure, and (3) leader position power.
Many studies were conducted concerning the relationship between styles of supervision, employee satisfaction, and productivity. Again, a lack of clear results caused investigators to study the interactive characters of leadership. The approach was based on the assumption that employees' responses to the behavior of their supervisor was influenced by their personality predispositions.

In tracing the past development of leadership studies, it was found that little attention had been given to the reciprocal character of leadership. There were no studies based on this approach to leadership conducted in the retail industry. A study designed to measure the relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction at this time is justified.
CHAPTER II

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter is concerned with the setting for the study, sample, measuring instruments, and statistical procedures employed in this investigation.

Setting the Study

The setting for the study was seven retail discount department stores. Four stores are located in Grand Rapids, Michigan and three are located in Lansing, Michigan. Each of these stores is owned and operated by the same family. The stores were selected because of their similarity with regard to size, time in operation, managerial hierarchy, and overall performance. In addition, each store has three line managers who have several department managers reporting to them.

Population and sample

The subjects of this study consist of line managers and department managers employed in the seven stores. Line managers have an average of eight department managers reporting directly to them.
The sample consisted of 188 department managers and 21 line managers (n = 209). There were 182 males and 27 females ranging in age from 21 to 65 (M age = 32.1). They ranged in educational achievement from grade eleven to a master's degree (M education = 12.6). There were eight minority individuals included in the sample. Table 2.1 provides a comparison between line managers and department managers on selected characteristics.

**TABLE 2.1.--Comparison of line managers and department managers on selected characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \bar{X} ) Values</th>
<th>Department Managers</th>
<th>Line Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>31.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniority (Months)</td>
<td>76.41</td>
<td>77.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Years)</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the sample was taken from one company, the results of the study may be generalized to other retail units within the company that have a similar managerial hierarchy. In addition, it is assumed that the results of the study may be generalized to retail units not associated with the seven stores included in the present study if they have a similar managerial hierarchy.
Measuring Instruments

All management personnel included in the study were given Porter's Questionnaire. Department managers were given the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Line managers were given the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Copies of Porter's Questionnaire, Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, and Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire are in Appendices A, B, and C respectively.

Porter's Questionnaire

The dependent variable utilized in this investigation was Porter's Questionnaire (PQ) as modified by Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1966).

The development of the questionnaire has been described by Porter (1962) and Beer (1966). A large list of items was compiled from various studies of worker needs and attitudes including Porter (1962) and Herzberg et al. (1957, 1959). In modified form, these items served as a pool from which the final set of items was drawn. Seven graduate students in psychology were employed as judges and were asked to group the items into five categories representing a modified Maslow need hierarchy. Maslow described a sixth physiological need level; however, it was felt that this need
level is not of any great importance to a theory of industrial
motivation. For this reason, the category was dropped.

The judges were presented with the following definitions
of the need categories (Maslow, 1954).

**Security Needs.** --The desire for a predictable, structured,
and reliable environment. The desire for "fairness" and a
familiar non-threatening environment.

**Social Needs.** --The desire for belonging. The desire for
association, for acceptance by one's fellows, for giving and
receiving friendship and love.

**Esteem Needs.** --The desire for reputation or prestige,
respect or esteem from other people, status, dominance, recog-
nition, attention, importance, or appreciation. A desire for
esteem from others.

**Autonomy Needs.** --The desire for independence and freedom.
The desire for achievement, competence, mastery, adequacy, and
confidence. The desire for self-respect and self-esteem based on
one's own opinion of oneself as reflected in the specific factors
just listed.

**Need for Self-Actualization.** --The desire to realize one's
own potential. The desire for growth and self-development, and
the desire to become everything that one is capable of becoming.

Whenever judges were unable to place an item in one of the given categories, they were permitted to leave it unclassified. Despite the fact that the items reflected the work situation only, few judges had difficulty classifying the items into the general categories defined above. Seventy items, out of the original 100 or more, were retained. The condition for accepting an item was that at least six out of seven judges agreed on its classification.

The reliability of the PQ was computed by Kuder Richardson Formula Eight. As reported by Beer (1966), Table 2.2 presents the intercorrelations and reliabilities of the subscales based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Beer concluded that the subscales of the PQ are fairly independent.

There were no studies identified in the literature review that were concerned with the validity of the PQ. However, Beer (1966) has indicated that the PQ is a valid instrument for measuring perceptions of need satisfaction. In addition, the PQ has been utilized by a number of researchers to measure need satisfaction (Beer, 1966; Hill & Hunt, 1971; Porter, 1961; 1962; 1963).

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) has been used in a number of studies to measure manager's perception of their
TABLE 2.2---Intercorrelations and reliabilities of the subscales of
Porter's Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-Actualization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

supervisory style. The questionnaire was developed by researchers
at Ohio State University.

The LOQ provides scores on two dimensions of leadership---
Consideration (C) and Structure (S). These two dimensions are
defined as follows:

Consideration (C).---reflects the extent to which an
individual is likely to have job relationships with
his employees characterized by mutual trust, respect
for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a
certain worth between himself and them. A high score
is indicative of a climate of good rapport and two-way
communication. A low score indicates the individual
is likely to be more impersonal in his relations with
broup members.

Structure (S).---reflects the extent to which an
individual is likely to define and structure his own
role and those of his employees toward goal attain-
ment. A high score on this dimension characterizes
individuals who play a very active role in directing
group activities through planning, communicating
information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new ideas, and so forth. A low score characterizes individuals who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in these ways (Fleishman, 1969).

The test manual emphasized that these dimensions are independent of one another. This means a line manager can be high on both dimensions, low on both, or high on one dimension and low on the other. The questionnaire was developed by researchers at Ohio State University. The questionnaire contains a total of 40 items, 20 of which are scored for Consideration and 20 of which are scored for Structure. The maximum score for each scale is 80.

The established reliability for the LOQ was obtained by the split half method (correlations for odd- and even-numbered items within each scale, corrected for full length of each scale). These together with test-retest reliabilities for two samples are shown in Table 2.3.

The LOQ was developed to maximize construct validity. The test manual emphasized that empirical validity studies, relating these dimensions to independent criteria of effectiveness be carried out in particular organizations. Normative data on the LOQ have been obtained and supported by other researchers. Parker (1963), Fleishman & Ko (1962), and Fitzinger (1965) are but a few who have been obtained and supported by other researchers. Parker (1963)
Fleishman & Ko (1962), and Fitzinger (1965) are but a few who have used the LOQ in a variety of settings. The results of each of these studies have been consistent and have supported the importance of these two dimensions of leadership style. The studies cited below are in the "Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire" by Fleishman (1969).

**TABLE 2.3.—Reliability estimates of the LOQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>First-line supervisors</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>ROTC cadets</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Manufacturing employees</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Executives</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>First-line supervisors</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Air Forces NCOs</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Foremen in a pharmaceutical company</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Supervisor applicants in Swedish company</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Test-retest reliabilities. There was a three-month interval between test periods for the sample of 31 first-line supervisors and a one-month interval for the sample of 24 Air Force NCOs.

Bass (1958) conducted a study in a large food-products corporation. The study was done in an effort to predict the success of supervisors. The LOQ was administered to 42 sales supervisors. Three years later, the same group of men was rated by top management in overall effectiveness. A salesman was rated high if "... since he has taken over the job, his employees are
showing signs of doing a better job, getting more done, staying on the job, exhibiting more satisfaction, and selling more" (p. 26).
The correlation between these ratings and Consideration was .32, which was statistically significant at the .05 level. Five years later, performance ratings were obtained again. The criterion this time was the composite of ratings by five supervisors in the organization. For 26 sales supervisors still on the job, the Consideration scale had a validity of .37. It was found that the Consideration scale was more predictive of a salesman's ability over a period of time than such measures as personality, sales knowledge, and intelligence.

The LOQ was used in a study by Parker (1963) conducted at a large wholesale pharmaceutical company that operates 80 geographically decentralized warehouses. Each warehouse was supervised by a foreman whose work group (averaging 25 employees) fills and packs orders from the stock shelves in the warehouse. Although the operation was decentralized, standardized work methods had been installed on a company-wide basis.

The LOQ was administered to each warehouse foreman, and the Consideration and Structure scores were found to be correlated significantly with a number of group-effectiveness criteria. Consideration was positively related to "favorable attitudes toward supervision" ($r = .51$), to "group feelings of goal
achievement" (r = .24), and to the recognition that workers felt they received for good performance (r = .45). Structure was significantly related to favorable attitudes toward supervision (r = .22) and to pricing errors (r = .23).

Productivity (number of items processed per man-hour of production) and filling errors (number of order-filling errors per 1,000 man-hours of production) did not correlate significantly with either scale.

Parker concluded that "workers have favorable attitudes toward supervisors who are considerate yet provide a certain degree of structuring behavior" (p. 148).

**Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire**

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII (LBDQ) has been used in a number of studies concerning employees' perception of their managers' supervisory style (Fleishman, 1973). The LBDQ was developed by researchers of The Ohio State University.

The questionnaire provides scores on 12 subscales. However, the present study utilized only the consideration and structure subscales of the LBDQ. These two dimensions are defined as follows:

1. **Initiation of Structure** -- clearly defines own role and
lets followers know what is expected.

2. Consideration—regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers.

The manual for the LBDQ indicates that the questionnaire was designed for use as a research device. It is not recommended for use in selection, assignment, or assessment purposes; and there are no norms for the LBDQ. The reliability of the subscales was determined by a modified Kuder-Richardson formula. Each item was correlated with the remainder of the items in its subscale rather than with the subscale score including the item. This procedure results in a conservative estimate of subscale reliability. The reliabilities reported for consideration ranged between .76 and .87. The reliabilities reported for structure ranged between .70 and .80.

Procedures to Collect Data

The approval and support of the company president along with his key executives were obtained during the initial planning of the study. Company top management agreed that meetings could be held at each store during working hours for the purpose of collecting the required data.

All stores hold weekly meetings attended by all management
personnel to discuss the operations of the store. Time was scheduled at the beginning of each of these weekly meetings for the purpose of collecting the data. Because these were regularly scheduled meetings, there were only a few management personnel not in attendance. Of the 10 absent, all were tested through individual sessions.

At these meetings, the purpose of the study, management support and the confidentiality of all responses were discussed by the researcher. Special emphasis was devoted to a discussion of the confidentiality of each person's response.

The responses of department managers and line managers to the measuring instruments were coded on mark sense sheets for statistical analysis of the following variables: age, race, marital status, seniority, line managers' perceptions of their supervisory style, line managers' perceptions of their need satisfaction, department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style, and department managers' perceptions of their need satisfaction. There were 188 department managers included in the sample. All department managers responded to the LBDQ and the PQ as directed. The 21 line managers also responded to the LOQ and PQ as directed.
The present study was based on a correlational research design. The design was formulated to measure the relationship between line managers' supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction. Therefore, managers were assigned to groups for comparison as follows: (1) The responses of department managers who report to the line manager responsible for the food division in one store were combined with the responses of department managers reporting to food's line managers in the other six stores. (2) The responses of department managers who report to the line manager responsible for the hardlines division in one store were combined with the responses of department managers reporting to hardlines line managers in the other six stores. (3) The responses of department managers who report to the line manager responsible for the softlines division in one store were combined with the responses of department managers reporting to softlines line managers in the other six stores. Table 2.4 describes the number of department managers reporting to line managers by area in each of the seven stores.

The group average approach was based upon the assumption that "the behavior of the leader is in fact reasonably constant for all staff members" (Seeman, 1957, p. 243). In addition, Haplin
(1954) reported that in several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders was checked by "between group vs within group" analysis of variance, the "F" ratios were found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader and descriptions of different leaders differ significantly. It is further assumed that averaging these perceptions will minimize measurement error (Graen, Dansereau, & Minami, 1972).

**TABLE 2.4.** - Number of department managers by area in each of the seven stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Number</th>
<th>Foods Line Area</th>
<th>Softlines Line Area</th>
<th>Hardlines Line Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses of department managers and line managers to Porter's Questionnaire were correlated with department managers'
and line managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style to measure the strength of the relationship among these variables. The statistical procedure utilized was the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. A two-tailed $t$-test analysis was also used to measure any mean differences in scores on Porter's Questionnaire between line managers and department managers.

Positive correlations indicate that an increase in scores of consideration and structure are associated with an increase in need dissatisfaction. Negative correlations indicate an increase in scores of consideration and structure are associated with a decrease in need dissatisfaction.

The .05 level of significance was selected a priori as the criterion level for all statistical tests because this level has generally been accepted in parallel studies.

Methods of Analyzing the Data

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was analyzed according to the procedures described in the test manual. The questionnaire provides scores on two dimensions of leadership--Consideration (C) and Structure (S). There are 20 items for each scale. Alternatives to each item are scores 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. The maximum possible score is 80 for each scale with scores
generally ranging from 30 to 70 (Fleishman, 1969).

The test manual emphasizes that these dimensions are independent of one another. The various validity studies conducted indicate that "the High Structure - Low Consideration supervisor is more likely to show more turnover, grievances, and stress among his subordinates" (Fleishman, 1969, p. 4). The most undesirable situation is when the supervisor is low in both consideration and structure. The manual also indicates that managers high in consideration can be higher in structure without adverse effects.

The scores for line managers on the LOQ were correlated with line managers' and department managers' perceptions of their need satisfaction to measure the strength of the relationship among these variables.

Analysis of the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire

The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form XII provides scores on subordinate perceptions of their supervisors' style of leadership on 12 dimensions of leadership. The questionnaire includes 20 items to measure leadership styles of consideration and structure. Alternatives to each item are scores 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. The maximum score for each scale is 50 and Form XII represents the fourth revision of the questionnaire. Interpretation of scores from the LBDQ follow the same format as indicated for
LOQ (Fleishman, 1973).

The scores for department managers on the LBDQ were correlated with department managers' perceptions of their need satisfaction to measure the strength of the relationship among these variables. The statistical procedure utilized was the Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

Analysis of Porter's Questionnaire

Data relevant to the present study were based on managers' completion of 15 items of the following form:

The feeling of security in my position:

a) How much is there now?

(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

b) How much should there be?

(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

Managers were asked to respond by circling a number, from one to seven, which best indicated their feelings concerning each of the 15 items. Following Beer (1966) and Hill and Hunt (1971), the scale scores from "is now" were subtracted from "should be" to give the need-dissatisfaction for a given need area. Small difference scores mean little dissatisfaction and large discrepancies indicate considerable dissatisfaction.
Summary

Chapter II is a discussion of the methods and procedures followed in conducting the study. The chapter consists of a definition of the population, a description of the instruments used, the procedures used to collect the data, and a review of methods used for analyzing the data.
CHAPTER III
REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

- Analysis of the Data

Tables are used as matrixes to illustrate the relationship between responses of line managers and department managers in the following areas: (1) The relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and line managers' perception of their supervisory style; (2) The relationship between line managers' perception of need satisfaction and department managers' perception of need satisfaction; (3) The relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction; and (4) The relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and line managers' need satisfaction.

The relationship between department managers' and line managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style

The study's third hypothesis stated that there was a positive relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style. The results of the analysis between perceptions 47
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of supervisory style are shown in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1. --A comparison of the relationship between line managers' and department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Supervisory Style</th>
<th>r Values</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardlines</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.31680</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>-.36380</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softline</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.51420</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.21430</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foods</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>-.48190</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.08240</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.15838</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.06127</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be observed in Table 3.1 that the data did not support the hypothesis which predicted a positive relationship between line managers' and department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style. Table 3.1 provides an analysis of the data by the three areas identified in the present study (foods, hardlines, and softlines). The results of the analysis indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship in any of the three areas described. Therefore, the hypothesis which predicted a positive relationship between line managers' and department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style was not supported by the data at the .05 level of significance.
The relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction

The first hypothesis of the present study stated that there was a positive relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style as being considerate and department managers' need satisfaction. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation examined the strength of the relationship between the independent variable (department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style) and the dependent variable (department managers' need satisfaction.)

The results of the analysis of department managers' need satisfaction and line managers' supervisory style are shown in Tables 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5. Negative correlations indicate that high scores on the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire are associated with less need dissatisfaction for department managers. Positive correlation indicates that an increase in scores of consideration and structure are associated with an increase in need dissatisfaction for department managers.

It may be observed in Table 3.5 that the data did not support the hypothesis which predicted a positive relationship between consideration and need satisfaction. There is a significant relationship between consideration and satisfaction with amount of participation in setting of procedures ($r = .69807$) at the .05 level.
of significance. Therefore, an increase in scores on consideration was associated with an increase in need dissatisfaction in this need area.

The data were also analyzed by area (foods, softlines, and hardlines) to test the first hypothesis. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4. The data did not support the hypothesis in any of the three areas. It may be observed that 10 of the 45 correlation coefficients reported are positive and statistically significant at the .05 level. Three of the 45 correlation coefficients reported for structure are negative and statistically significant at the .05 level. Thus, an increase in scores on the supervisory style of structure was associated with a decrease in need dissatisfaction in these four need areas.

The data were analyzed to determine if there was any relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction. The consideration and structure dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire were utilized to measure line managers' perception of their supervisory style.

It was discovered that there was only one significant relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and need satisfaction of department managers (Self-esteem r = .71530). Data failing to show any statistical significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.08027</td>
<td>-.20327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.22536</td>
<td>-.48223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.09364</td>
<td>-.11283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.36649</td>
<td>-.67834*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.35652</td>
<td>-.41293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.09393</td>
<td>-.26783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.73324</td>
<td>-.83441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.35043</td>
<td>-.36566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.34053</td>
<td>-.35686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54333</td>
<td>.36272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.43621</td>
<td>-.37944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.30437</td>
<td>.04675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.82756*</td>
<td>-.72477*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.44947</td>
<td>-.42274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.73364*</td>
<td>-.60274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.
TABLE 3.3.--Relationship between the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of softlines department managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>r Value Consideration</th>
<th>r Value Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.66031**</td>
<td>-.58042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.45151</td>
<td>-.66152**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.50500</td>
<td>.69074*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.34559</td>
<td>-.04083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.18022</td>
<td>-.73060*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.94520*</td>
<td>-.02868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.47128</td>
<td>-.53737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.79918*</td>
<td>.29565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.52982</td>
<td>-.20117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.61868**</td>
<td>.04771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.41473</td>
<td>-.28214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.11971</td>
<td>.25331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.69278*</td>
<td>-.10031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.21645</td>
<td>.21175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.15851</td>
<td>.59279**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05
** P < .10
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TABLE 3.4.-Relationship between the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of hardlines department managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>L Value Consideration</th>
<th>L Value Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.55620</td>
<td>.25485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.76409*</td>
<td>-.17077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.45456</td>
<td>.40965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.68355*</td>
<td>-.30803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.77605*</td>
<td>-.05088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.21389</td>
<td>.20787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.62143**</td>
<td>.17996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.49444</td>
<td>.08965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.38571</td>
<td>.26180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.87487*</td>
<td>.03040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54062</td>
<td>.50220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.73588*</td>
<td>-.30825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.29524</td>
<td>.31666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54351</td>
<td>.45489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*<p> .05
**<p> .10
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TABLE 3.5.--Relationship between the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of all department managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>£  Value Consideration</th>
<th>£  Value Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.28288</td>
<td>-.15883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.35274</td>
<td>-.34869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.01111</td>
<td>.35897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.38976</td>
<td>-.20621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.36913</td>
<td>-.26339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.34231</td>
<td>.00504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.46304</td>
<td>-.22264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.48433</td>
<td>-.13394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.08269</td>
<td>-.93482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.31447</td>
<td>.13246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.22222</td>
<td>-.12534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting procedures</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.22047</td>
<td>.36992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.69807*</td>
<td>-.26266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.31390</td>
<td>.12860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.46475</td>
<td>.29452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*£ < .05

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
relationship may be studied in Table 3.6.

In summary, the data did not support the existence of a positive relationship between line managers' supervisory style of consideration and department managers' need satisfaction. The correlation coefficient values reported indicate an inverse relationship between consideration and department managers' need satisfaction.

The relationship between department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style and line managers' need satisfaction

The second hypothesis of the present study stated that there was a positive relationship between department managers' perception of line managers supervisory style of consideration and line managers' need satisfaction. Negative correlations indicate an increase in scores of consideration are associated with a decrease in need dissatisfaction for line managers. Positive correlations indicate an increase in scores of consideration are associated with an increase in need dissatisfaction. The consideration and structure dimensions of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire were used to measure department managers' supervisory style.

The results of the analysis of department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and line managers'
TABLE 3.6.--Relationship between the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of all department managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value Consideration</th>
<th>F Value Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.71530*</td>
<td>-.22846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.41016</td>
<td>.01605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.31847</td>
<td>.02529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.33548</td>
<td>.13376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.20160</td>
<td>-.16177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.01166</td>
<td>-.07863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.07263</td>
<td>.13270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.12541</td>
<td>-.01274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.02603</td>
<td>-.11428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.05893</td>
<td>-.17108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.00688</td>
<td>.11354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.48680</td>
<td>-.01765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.01841</td>
<td>-.32441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.06013</td>
<td>.19946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.15616</td>
<td>.222590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05
need satisfaction are shown in Tables 3.7, 3.8, 3.9 and 3.10. It may be noted in Table 3.10 that the data did not support the hypothesis which predicted a positive relationship between line managers' supervisory style and need satisfaction.

An analysis of the relationship by the three areas identified in the present study is presented in Tables 3.7, 3.8, and 3.9. It may be observed that three correlation coefficients are positive and statistically significant at the .05 level for consideration. Thus, an increase in scores of consideration was associated with an increase in need dissatisfaction for line managers. It may also be observed that none of the correlation coefficients recorded for consideration are in an inverse direction. Therefore, the data did not prove the hypothesis which predicted a positive relationship between department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style of consideration and line managers' need satisfaction.

The data were analyzed to determine if there was any relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and need satisfaction. The results are illustrated in Table 3.11.

There generally was not a statistically significant relationship between line managers' perceptions of their supervisory style and need satisfaction as noted in Table 3.11. The exception
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TABLE 3.7.--Relationship between the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of food line managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>r Values Consideration</th>
<th>r Values Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.84744*</td>
<td>-.63657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.26458</td>
<td>-.15504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.60751**</td>
<td>-.82223*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.39466</td>
<td>-.25170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.10901</td>
<td>.44942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.29422</td>
<td>-.03184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.58333**</td>
<td>-.25991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.20843</td>
<td>-.35185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.06593</td>
<td>-.06551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.33700</td>
<td>-.60473**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.25833</td>
<td>.11939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.38302</td>
<td>-.45539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54234</td>
<td>-.19524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.04015</td>
<td>-.28520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.77316*</td>
<td>-.58610**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .10
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TABLE 3.8.--Relationship between the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of softlines line managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( r ) Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.25691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.36463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.11094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.48025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.27459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.35543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.17822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.44935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.14701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.24495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.32649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.33107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.26954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^* p < .05 \)
TABLE 3.9.--Relationship between the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of hardlines line managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>r Value Consideration</th>
<th>r Value Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.32318</td>
<td>.18988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.70813*</td>
<td>-.14421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.28889</td>
<td>.67087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.04183</td>
<td>.02012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.23925</td>
<td>-.10365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.48351</td>
<td>.24917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.19259</td>
<td>.13580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.27488</td>
<td>.69573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.24272</td>
<td>.22561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.21819</td>
<td>.49896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.33737</td>
<td>.48884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.31346</td>
<td>.39961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.47901</td>
<td>.10603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.15220</td>
<td>.86932*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.39270</td>
<td>.16674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
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TABLE 3.10.--Relationship between the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire dimension of Consideration and Structure to need satisfaction of all line managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( r ) Value Consideration</th>
<th>( r ) Value Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.25563</td>
<td>-.09076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.31584</td>
<td>-.04841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.11313</td>
<td>.23752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.24191</td>
<td>.10443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.23100</td>
<td>.07618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.22889</td>
<td>.09559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.17851</td>
<td>.12251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.04873</td>
<td>.19884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.07944</td>
<td>.18106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.30523</td>
<td>.04387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.03783</td>
<td>.28558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.18568</td>
<td>.04617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.10221</td>
<td>.21128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.13086</td>
<td>.07177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.40812</td>
<td>-.01420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3.11. --Relationship between the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire dimensions of Consideration and Structure to line managers' need satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Value Consideration</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Value Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.02313</td>
<td>0.12360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.11794</td>
<td>0.12555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.42296*</td>
<td>0.28295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.11793</td>
<td>0.12986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.24251</td>
<td>0.00343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.09081</td>
<td>0.04617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.12614</td>
<td>0.04617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.02699</td>
<td>0.05120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.10281</td>
<td>-0.12417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.15329</td>
<td>-0.08487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.04433</td>
<td>-0.03636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.09864</td>
<td>-0.23975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.07817</td>
<td>0.18274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.00731</td>
<td>-0.04496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.11140</td>
<td>0.10543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( \chi < 0.05 \)
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was the relationship between consideration and opportunity for personal growth ($r = .42296$) which was significant at the .05 level.

In summary, it may be concluded that there was not a positive relationship between line managers' supervisory style and line managers' need satisfaction.

The relationship between department managers' perception of need satisfaction and line managers' perception of need satisfaction

The fourth hypothesis of the present study stated that there was a positive relationship between line managers' perception of need satisfaction and department managers' perception of need satisfaction. Both line and department managers were given Porter's Questionnaire to measure their perception of need satisfaction. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to measure the strength of the relationship between line and department managers' perceptions of their need satisfaction.

The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.12 and Table 3.13. As reported in Table 3.12, the data did not support the fourth hypothesis of the present study. Only one of the correlation coefficients computed was significant at the .05 level (amount of pressure, $r = .50185$).

Table 3.13 provides a comparison of need satisfaction between line and department managers by area (food, hardlines,
TABLE 3.12.--Relationship between line managers' perception of need satisfaction and department managers' perception of need satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( Z ) Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.19887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.18576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.14672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.01380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.33002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.11856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.10884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.01255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.23176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.03996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.00702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.11354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.01261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.05232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Amount of Pressure              | 21 | 20 | .50186*       

*\( p < .05 \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Softlines Area</th>
<th>Hardlines Area</th>
<th>Food Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.74289*</td>
<td>0.23471</td>
<td>-0.27411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.01790</td>
<td>0.89639*</td>
<td>0.02776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00557</td>
<td>0.75944*</td>
<td>0.50353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.54705</td>
<td>-0.20900</td>
<td>-0.54903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.10795</td>
<td>0.26017</td>
<td>0.38996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.04969</td>
<td>0.10381</td>
<td>0.05986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.60068**</td>
<td>-0.6208*</td>
<td>-0.14291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02501</td>
<td>0.24006</td>
<td>0.11630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.20054</td>
<td>0.42851</td>
<td>-0.41719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02825</td>
<td>-0.28886</td>
<td>-0.44105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.13196</td>
<td>-0.13992</td>
<td>0.25651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.32111</td>
<td>-0.25458</td>
<td>0.62923**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00205</td>
<td>0.48305</td>
<td>-0.16104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.58600**</td>
<td>0.35856</td>
<td>0.57000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
**P < .10
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soft lines). There were only four of 45 correlation coefficients computed that were statistically significant at the .05 level. In summary, the data did not support a positive relationship between line and department managers' perceptions of need satisfaction.

The data were analyzed to determine which of the 15 need areas measured resulted in greatest need dissatisfaction. The responses of department managers and line managers were averaged in each of the 15 need areas. A two-tailed $t$-test of mean scores was utilized to determine if there was any significant difference in amount of need dissatisfaction between line and department managers. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.14. The results indicate that there was a statistically significant difference at the .05 level for 8 of the 15 need areas. Department managers perceived greater dissatisfaction in 8 of the 15 need areas included in the present study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th>t values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Managers</td>
<td>Line Managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.026 p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>.8093</td>
<td>.004 p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>.034 p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Inside Company</td>
<td>1.964</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>.035 p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thought</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>.078 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>.080 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-fulfillment</td>
<td>1.827</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>.125 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige-Outside Company</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>.9524</td>
<td>.385 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile Accomplishment</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>.412 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Others</td>
<td>1.232</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.405 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Goals</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>.9048</td>
<td>.032 p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Setting Procedures</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.050 p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Informed</td>
<td>2.202</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td>.038 p*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Friendships</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.635 p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pressure</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.001 p*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to measure the relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction for a sample of management employees in the retail industry. To accomplish this, four steps were taken. First, leadership behavior studies and research concerned with employee need satisfaction were outlined. Second, a sample of managers employed in the retail industry was selected. Third, data were collected that described styles of supervision and need satisfaction of managers included in the study. Fourth, comparisons were made to determine any differences in perceptions of supervisory style and need satisfaction.

Books and articles were examined in an attempt to produce a summary of studies concerned with the relationship between styles of supervision and employee need satisfaction. These studies indicated that explorations of leadership have emerged from explanations of observable behavior to sophisticated analysis of complex relationships. For example, early researchers tried to delineate specific traits of leaders which would distinguish them from others. The situational approach became the focus of attention when studies failed to support the trait approach.
A situational assessment brought researchers back to the study of the leader. Many studies were conducted concerning the relationship among styles of supervision, employee satisfaction, and productivity. Inconsistent results of studies in this area caused investigators to study the interactive character of leadership.

In tracing the past development of leadership studies, it was found that little attention had been given to the reciprocal character of leadership. However, recent concerns with worker discontent has resulted in studies designed to identify situational factors associated with employee dissatisfaction. An example of this approach is studies designed to measure the effect of styles of supervision on employee need satisfaction. There were no studies conducted in the retail industry involving managerial personnel.

The second step involved the selection of managers to be included in the study. The managers were drawn from a group of seven retail discount stores. There was a total of 188 department managers and 21 line managers included in the study.

The third step in developing this study was to gather data on supervisory style and need satisfaction of line and department managers. Two questionnaires were used to measure perceptions
of supervisory style: The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and The Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. Porter's Questionnaire was used to measure perceptions of need dissatisfaction.

The fourth step involved an analysis of the data. A Pearson Product Moment Correlation measured the strength of the relationship between perceptions of supervisory styles and need dissatisfaction. A two-tailed t-test analysis was used to measure any mean differences in scores on Porter's Questionnaire.

There were seven research questions basic to the present investigation. Discussion of the comparative findings has been organized around these questions.

1. What is the relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction?

The first hypothesis of the present study predicted a positive relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style as being considerate and department managers' need satisfaction. The results of the analysis did not support this prediction. An analysis of the relationship by the three areas included in the present study produced 45 correlation coefficients. The correlation coefficient reported indicated a
negative relationship between consideration and need satisfaction.

An analysis of the relationship between the supervisory style of structure and need satisfaction produced dissimilar results. Twenty-seven of the 45 correlation coefficients recorded by area indicated a positive relationship between structure and need satisfaction. Therefore, for this sample, it may be inferred that the supervisory style of structure was the critical independent variable associated with employee need satisfaction. Department managers appeared to be more satisfied with a supervisory style by line managers that provided direction and structure.

These findings do not correspond with the conclusions reached by Fleishman (1973), Beer (1966), and Hill and Hunt (1971). These investigators concluded that consideration was positively related to employee need satisfaction. Structure was associated with employee dissatisfaction. However, other researchers found results similar to the present study. Patchen (1962) concluded that the supervisory style of structure may serve to reduce tension and conflict occurring within the group. Structure may be perceived by employees as a demonstration of the supervisor's interest in their welfare.

Two observations are noted from the data. The company from which the sample was selected has a reputation for being an
efficiently managed operation that emphasizes performance from its managerial personnel. Department managers from this company may have expected direction and structure from their line managers to assist them in their efforts to be successful. In addition, many department managers experienced their first position in management with the company. Since these managers lack management experience with other companies and are generally eager to be successful, they may seek more structure and direction from line managers. Whether or not an emphasis on performance and structure affect managers' response to supervisory styles of structure and consideration could be explored by future research.

2. Are there any differences in amount of need dissatisfaction between line and department managers?

Department managers were significantly more dissatisfied than line managers in 8 of the 15 need areas. The data from the present study like Porter (1961) noted no statistically significant difference in amount of dissatisfaction with security and social needs between line and department managers. However, the mean scores computed are greater for department managers in all 15 need areas. Thus, in agreement with Porter, department managers perceived their positions as providing less satisfaction than higher level line managers.
Two observations are noted from the data. As previously stated, department managers may desire more structure from line managers than they are presently receiving. In addition, the company has a practice of filling higher level management positions by promoting someone within its management group. The advancement opportunities for department managers are generally related to advancement to a line manager position. There are on the average eight department managers for each line manager position. The next advancement opportunity for line managers is the position of store manager. The ratio of line managers to store managers is three to one. Therefore, it may be inferred that line managers' opportunities for advancement are better than the average department manager. Thus, department managers are in a more competitive environment for promotions and may experience greater need dissatisfaction.

3. What is the relationship between line managers' perception of need satisfaction and department managers' perception of need satisfaction?

The fourth hypothesis of the present study predicted a positive relationship between line managers' and department managers' perceptions of need satisfaction. This hypothesis is supported in only one of the 15 need areas compared. The
exception was the amount of pressure ($r = .50186$) which was significant at the .05 level. About one-half of the remaining correlation coefficients were positive and an equal number were negative. None of the correlation coefficients reported approached the .05 level of significance. However, there was one factor that was consistent in the data. Department managers perceived greater dissatisfaction on all 15 need areas measured.

4. What is the relationship between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and line managers' need satisfaction?

The second hypothesis of the present study predicted a positive relationship between line managers' supervisory style of consideration and line managers' need satisfaction. It was assumed that line managers whose needs are satisfied are more prone to supervise in a considerate manner. The results of the analysis did not support this prediction. All of the correlation coefficients reported indicated a negative relationship between consideration and line managers' need satisfaction. These findings indicated that department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style of consideration was associated with an increase in line managers' dissatisfaction; however, only three of the 45 correlation coefficients reported were significant at the .05 level.

There was no consistent pattern between department
Managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style of structure and line managers' perception of their need satisfaction. About half of the correlation coefficients recorded are negative and about an equal number are positive.

5. What is the relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and line managers' need satisfaction?

There was no consistent pattern between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and need satisfaction in 29 of the 30 correlation coefficients reported in the present study. The exception was the relationship between consideration and opportunity for personal growth ($r = .42296$) which was significant at the .05 level. Therefore, an increase in consideration was associated with an increased dissatisfaction with opportunities for personal growth. This corresponds to the relationship noted between department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style and line managers' need dissatisfaction.

6. What is the relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department managers' need satisfaction?

A significant relationship was not found between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department
managers' need satisfaction. About half of the correlation coefficients reported are negative and about an equal number are positive. However, none approached the .05 level of significance.

These findings are inconsistent with various studies cited by Fleishman that utilized the LOQ to measure managers' perception of their supervisory behavior. Fleishman (1969) pointed out that "... productivity and morale were higher in groups with supervisors emphasizing both consideration and structure."

7. What is the relationship between line managers' perception of their supervisory style and department managers' perception of line managers' supervisory style?

The third hypothesis of the present study predicted a positive relationship between line and department managers' perceptions of line managers' supervisory style. The data did not support this hypothesis. The lack of congruency in perceptions of line managers' supervisory style is significant. Burns (1954) reports, for example, managers spent 80 percent of their time at work talking to others. Perhaps other studies could be designed to measure the relationship between perceptions of supervisory style for two levels of management employees.

Concluding Remarks

The focus of the dissertation was to gather and analyze
data about the relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction for two levels of managerial personnel. There was not a statistically significant relationship between line and department managers' perception of need satisfaction and line managers' supervisory style. It was observed that department managers perceived a higher level of need dissatisfaction than line managers. However, line managers' supervisory style of structure appeared to be associated with a decrease in department managers' need dissatisfaction.

After an assessment of the data, several directions for future studies in the area of need satisfaction of managerial personnel seemed warranted. The data for the formulation of the dissertation were based on limited information about the relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction of managerial employees. In addition, most researchers concluded that there was a positive relationship between a supervisory style of consideration and employee need satisfaction and a negative correlation between a supervisory style of structure and employee need satisfaction. However, data from the present study indicated a positive relationship between structure and need satisfaction with a negative relationship between consideration and need satisfaction. Thus, the relationship between need satisfaction and supervisory styles of consideration and structure
should be subject to future research.

Suggestions for Further Study

Probable refinements in the findings of the present study will occur as data from other studies and samples become available. In order to facilitate such new data, several suggestions for further study are recommended. Among these are:

1. The moderating effect of department managers' expectations and their satisfaction with different styles of supervision could be explored by future research. Other researchers have noted that employee expectations have a significant impact on their perceptions and reactions to different styles of supervision. Therefore, future research is needed to measure the relationship between department managers' expectations and their satisfaction with various styles of leadership.

2. The present study did not include an assessment of department managers' job performance as a dependent variable. A matched sample of managers could be studied to determine any effects of job performance on the relationship between styles of supervision and department managers' need satisfaction.

3. Because a significant relationship was not found between line and department managers' perceptions of need
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satisfaction and line managers' supervisory style, a comparable study could be pursued with a matched sample of managers to confirm the findings of the present study. Future studies could measure the relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction of managers in retail units that have similar staff arrangements.
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APPENDIX A.--Porter's Questionnaire

Need Satisfaction

Following are several characteristics connected with your management position. For each such characteristic you are asked to give two ratings, each on a seven point scale:

a. How much of the characteristic is there now connected with your position?

b. How much of the characteristic do you think should be connected with your position?

Please check each scale below each characteristic.

1. The feeling of self-esteem or self-respect a person gets from being in my position:

   a. How much is there now?
      (min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   b. How much should there be?
      (min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. The authority connected with my position:

   a. How much is there now?
      (min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7

   b. How much should there be?
      (min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7

3. The opportunity for personal growth and development in my position?

   a. How much is there now?
      (min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7
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b. How much should there be?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

4. The prestige of my position inside the company. (That is, regard received from others in the company):

a. How much is there now?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

b. How much should there be?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

5. The opportunity for independent thought and action in my position:

a. How much is there now?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

b. How much should there be?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

6. The feeling of security in my position:

a. How much is there now?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

b. How much should there be?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]

7. The feeling of self-fulfillment a person gets from being in my position. (That is, the feeling of being able to use one's own unique capabilities, realizing one's potentialities.):

a. How much is there now?  
\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
\end{array} \]
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b. How much should there be?
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. The prestige of my position outside the company. (That is, the regard received from others not in the company.):

a. How much is there now?
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment in my position:

a. How much is there now?
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

b. How much should there be?
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. The opportunity, in my position, to give help to other people:

a. How much is there now?
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

b. How much should there be:
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. The opportunity in my position, for participating in the setting of goals:

a. How much is there now?
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

b. How much should there be?
(min) __ __ __ __ __ __ __ (max)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
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12. The opportunity, in my position, for participation in the determination of methods and procedures:

a. How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

b. How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

13. The feeling of being informed in my position:

a. How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

b. How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

14. The opportunity to develop close friendships in my position:

a. How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

b. How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

15. The feeling of pressure in my position:

a. How much is there now?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)

b. How much should there be?
(min) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (max)
APPENDIX B.--Leadership opinion questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS

For each item, choose the alternative which most nearly expresses your opinion on how frequently you should do what is described by that item. Always indicate what you, as a supervisor, or manager, sincerely believe to be the desirable way to act. Please remember--there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Different supervisors have different experiences and we are interested only in your opinions.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the box before the alternative that best expresses your feeling about the item. Mark only one alternative for each item. If you wish to change your answer, draw a circle around your first "X" and mark a new "X" in the appropriate box.

1. Put the welfare of your unit above the welfare of any person in it.  
   __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

2. Give in to your subordinates in discussions with them.  
   __Often  __Fairly Often  __Occasionally  __Once in a while  
   __Very Seldom

3. Encourage after-duty work by persons of your unit.  
   __A great deal  __Fairly often  __To some degree  __Once in a while  
   __Very seldom

4. Try out your own new ideas in the unit.  
   __Often  __Fairly often  __Occasionally  __Once in a while  
   __Very seldom

5. Back up what persons under you do.  
   __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

6. Criticize poor work.  
   __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

7. Ask for more than the persons under you can accomplish.  
   __Often  __Fairly often  __Occasionally  __Once in a while  
   __Very seldom

8. Refuse to compromise a point.
9. Insist that persons under you follow to the letter those standard routines handed down to you.
   __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

10. Help persons under you with their personal problems.
    __Often  __Fairly often  __Occasionally  __Once in a while  
    __Very seldom

11. Be slow to adopt new ideas.
    __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

12. Get the approval of persons under you on important matters before going ahead.
    __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

13. Resist changes in ways of doing things.
    __A great deal  __Fairly much  __To some degree  __Comparatively little  
    __Not at all

    __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

15. Speak in a manner not to be questioned.
    __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

16. Stress importance of being ahead of other units.
    __A great deal  __Fairly much  __To some degree  
    __Comparatively little  __Not at all

17. Criticize a specific act rather than a particular member of your unit.
    __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

18. Let the persons under you do their work the way they think is best.
    __Always  __Often  __Occasionally  __Seldom  __Never

19. Do personal favors for persons under you.
    __Often  __Fairly often  __Occasionally  __Once in a while  
    __Very seldom
20. Emphasize meeting of deadlines.
   __A great deal __Fairly much __To some degree
   __Comparatively little __Not at all

21. Insist that you be informed on decisions made by persons
   under you.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

22. Offer new approaches to problems.
   __Often __Fairly often __Occasionally __Once in a while
   __Very seldom

23. Treat all persons under you as your equals.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

24. Be willing to make changes.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

25. Talk about how much should be done.
   __A great deal __Fairly much __To some degree
   __Comparatively little __Not at all

26. Wait for persons in your unit to push new ideas.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

27. Rule with an iron hand.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

28. Reject suggestions for changes.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

29. Change the duties of persons under you without first talking it
   over with them.
   __Often __Fairly often __Occasionally __Once in a while
   __Very seldom

30. Decide in detail what shall be done and how it shall be done by
   the persons under you.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

31. See to it that persons under you are working up to capacity.
   __Always __Often __Occasionally __Seldom __Never

32. Stand up for persons under you, even though it make you
unpopular with others.

33. Put suggestions made by persons in the unit into operation.

34. Refuse to explain your actions.

35. Ask for sacrifices from persons under you for the good of your entire unit.

36. Act without consulting persons under you.

37. "Needle" persons under you for greater effort.

38. Insist that everything be done your way.

39. Encourage slow-working persons in your unit to work harder.

40. Meet with the persons in your unit at certain regularly scheduled times.
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APPENDIX C.--Leadership behavior description questionnaire

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to described, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

The term, "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.
b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether he (A) Always, (B) Often, (C) Occasionally, (D) Seldom or (E) Never acts as described by the item.
d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

e. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: He often acts as described..................A B C D E
Example: He never acts as described..................A B C D E
Example: He occasionally acts as described...........A B C D E
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1. He acts as the spokesman of the group.
2. He waits patiently for the results of a decision.
3. He makes pep talks to stimulate the group.
4. He lets group members know what is expected of them.
5. He allows the members complete freedom in their work.
6. He is hesitant about taking initiative in the group.
7. He is friendly and approachable.
8. He encourages overtime work.
9. He makes accurate decisions.
10. He gets along well with the people above him.
11. He publicizes the activities of the group.
12. He becomes anxious when he cannot find out what is coming next.
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he (A) Always, (B) Often, (C) Occasionally, (D) Seldom, or (E) Never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

c. MARK your answers as shown in the examples below.

Example: He often acts as described ....................A B C D E
Example: He never acts as described .....................A B C D E
Example: He occasionally acts as described ..........A B C D E

1. He is friendly and approachable. A B C D E
2. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
3. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation. A B C D E
4. He treats all group members as his equals. A B C D E
5. He gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E
6. He keeps to himself. A B C D E
7. He looks out for the personal welfare of group members. A B C D E
8. He is willing to make changes. A B C D E
9. He refuses to explain his actions. A B C D E
10. He acts without consulting the group.

11. He lets group members know what is expected of them.

12. He encourages the use of uniform procedures.

13. He tries out his ideas in the group.

14. He makes his attitudes clear to the group.

15. He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done.

16. He assigns group members to particular tasks.

17. He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members.

18. He schedules the work to be done.


20. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.