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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

The Problem

This study was conducted at an industrial training center to determine if there were perceived changes in the behavior of the first-line supervisors who had participated in a Basic Management Program. Available data on the effectiveness of these programs had been based upon limited evidence previous to this study.

Background of the Problem

An industrial engineer can easily justify his existence and justification for expenditures for specific projects, in fact most managers insist that these projects pay for themselves and that periodic reports be submitted to show expenditures, annual savings, return on investment, and follow-up to determine if the savings did occur as predicted.

This has not been the case with education and training directors in industry or other organizations because in the past people "knew" that education and training were essential, and that there was "no" way to measure accomplishments and return on investment.

The purpose of this study was to help the Education and Training Director justify his existence with more tangible
evidence than has been available up to this time. This study was originated to gather data which could help to determine if a Basic Management Program had an effect on the Person Orientation and System Orientation of the participants.

Importance of the Study

Many industrial leaders believe that the success or failure of a company depends primarily upon its managers. The managers in industry consist of people on different steps of the management ladder from the first-line supervisor to the president. All of these people are in leadership positions and most companies want the managers to continually improve their leadership abilities, thereby leading to more efficient goal attainment. Many managers are provided the opportunity to participate in learning experiences and formal education and training programs to help improve their leadership abilities.

Research has been conducted to try to determine the effectiveness of some of these formal programs. Some of the research concentrated on traits and the usual conclusions were that traits were but a small part of the leadership process. Others concentrated on measuring the improved or retained knowledge that a participant gained, but this did not indicate if the knowledge was contributing to improved leadership, thus leading to improved goal achievement.

More recent studies indicated that one of the more important factors of leadership was behavior.
Formal education and training programs for managers tend to have loosely defined objectives such as: better understanding of responsibilities and how to best carry out these responsibilities. It appeared that the primary objective was to change behavior of management people so they were more efficient in achieving the goals of the organization.

Changing behavior is also a broad statement that needs clarification and direction. Behavioral studies indicated that leadership behavior tends to be in two areas: 1) behavior that responded to the needs of the plant or organization, and 2) behavior that responded to the needs of the people on the staff.

Modern managers believe that leadership like education, is something to be learned and continually improved. Some believe that organizational needs are far more important than people needs. These managers tend to advocate an autocratic type leadership. Others believe that satisfaction of people needs will lead to satisfied employees, thus leading to improved production. This type of leadership is often referred to as democratic. There are others who believe that a combination of the two types is necessary. The percentage mix of the combination can vary as much as the number of people giving their opinions.

Leadership studies have shown that all of the above mentioned styles of leadership can be successful with differential success rates in various environments.

Some managers advocate that their people in leadership positions should improve their leadership abilities by
participation in formal programs, but many of these managers do not know what effect the program will have on their supervisors. A manager may advocate and practice an autocratic style of leadership that has proven successful in a particular environment, then send his supervisors to a program that advocates democratic leadership. This could lead to changes in behavior and conflict back on the job that could lead to less effective leadership.

People who are responsible for education and training in organizations may have to devote more time to appraising the different environments of the organization, determining the needs of those particular areas, designing or finding a program which will meet those specific needs, then evaluating the programs to determine if they contributed to the direction desired.

A major focus in this study was to determine if behavior did change as a result of the participation of first-line supervisors in a Basic Management Program, and if behavior did change, how much, and in what direction.

Literature and research evidence in the field of leadership tended to agree that leadership behavior is a prime factor in determining the successful accomplishment of goals. These studies also indicated that leadership behavior could be analyzed and that it could be classified into two categories. One was that behavior which is exhibited for the purpose of meeting the needs of the organization. This has also been called Initiation of Structure, Production Emphasis, and System Orientation. The other was that behavior which is exhibited
for the purpose of meeting the needs of people. This has
also been called Consideration, People Emphasis, and Person
Orientation.

If a primary purpose of leadership programs is to change
behavior, it would seem possible that perceived behavior descriptions
could be obtained at different times and that these changes could
be measured.

With more tangible evidence, program designers could measure
perceived changes in behavior and its direction. This would
allow them to redesign programs to accomplish specific objectives.
This could also lead to goal accomplishment in fewer hours,
therefore at less cost. Program directors could then have more
useful data to support their contentions that programs do have
an effect on participants. These data could show if participants
were perceived as having a changed behavior, how much, and in
what direction.

A review of the related literature indicated that many
studies have been done to evaluate education and training programs.
Some of these studies tend to be supportive of this inquiry,
others contradictory, but all the earlier ones appeared to be
different from the present investigation. The results of some
of the studies suggest that changes took place because of a
particular program, but it was not known if the change would
have taken place without the program due to the lack of control
groups. Other studies indicated that changes in participants
were observed immediately upon completion of the program, but
few attempted a follow-up to determine if there were long lasting changes.

Some of the studies took time into consideration, but administered two instruments at the same time some months after the program had been completed, asking the respondents to describe a person as he was perceived at that time, and as he was perceived before enrolling in the program.

To measure actual change in behavior would be an extremely difficult, time consuming, and costly procedure. This study was not an attempt to determine actual change in behavior, but to measure and compare perceived change in behavior. In industrial organizations perceptions of behavior are more important than reality, because interaction and reactions of people are based on the perceptions of a situation and/or the people.

The present investigation was an attempt to obtain perceived descriptions of behavior of first-line supervisors before and after their participation in a two week Basic Management Program. The purpose was to obtain a perceived description of the participants behavior in the areas of Person Orientation and System Orientation, then to compare the differences to determine if there was perceived behavioral change, and if so, how much, and in which direction. The descriptions were obtained from the participants themselves, their superiors, and their peers prior to being in the program and again three months later.
A comparison group of non-participants was also described by themselves, their superiors, and their peers at the same time intervals as the experimental group, so that if changes were perceived in the participants and not in the comparison group, this would be helpful in determining if the changes could be attributed to the program.

**Review of Related Literature**

This section will review three major areas of concern in this study: 1) education and training programs, 2) orientation toward the organization and toward persons, and 3) perception.

**Education and Training Programs**

A review of the literature on the effectiveness of education and training programs in bringing about behavioral change indicated that numerous methods of research have been utilized with a wide variety of conclusions drawn.

Stephenson\(^1\) stated that the effectiveness of management training programs is often presumed, but seldom specifically known. Still, the past decade has witnessed the training program emerging as an organizational panacea.

---

Mann assumed that training supervisors in human relations would result in changes in the supervisors' attitudes and philosophy, that these changes would be reflected in their behavior toward employees on the job, that change in behavior will be observed by the employees and they would in turn become more satisfied with their work situation, thus more highly motivated, and then more productive workers.

In other words, the basic objective of training was behavior which would result in greater production, and it was assumed that behavior change will occur as attitudes change. Mann made the assumption that human relations training would ultimately lead to greater production, but available evidence does not allow one to make a blanket statement like this because it may be true in one environment, but not in another.

Goodacre believed that much time and effort have been spent in trying to change supervisory attitudes and behavior. Most of this effect has been through the use of classroom training. The relatively few experimentally controlled studies of the effectiveness of these training programs have not produced encouraging results.

---


Goodacre later conducted an experimental evaluation of a management training program at the B. F. Goodrich Company. The program called the BFG Leadership Series, included five topics which were: 1) Understanding Human Behavior, 2) Decision Making, 3) Employee Selection, 4) Employee Progress, and 5) Job Evaluation. The 800 persons eligible for training were divided at random into two groups of 400 each; one group was the experimental group and the other the control.

In comparing the two groups, no significant measurable improvement in the attitudes or job performance of the trained group was found. Significant improvement was found in the following areas: 1) self confidence in understanding personnel policy; 2) knowledge of how to train subordinates in decision making; 3) knowledge of how to select employees; 4) knowledge of the job evaluation plan; 5) ability to develop and improve employees; 6) ability to select employees; and 7) overall job performance. The last three items were obtained from the immediate superior's rating criteria, and the researcher suggested that the ratings were biased by the rater's knowledge of who was and who was not trained.

Blumenfield stated "that attitude change appears to be a most relevant criterion for use in the evaluation of programs

1Daniel M. Goodacre, III, "Stimulating Improved Man Management," Personnel Psychology, XVI (Summer, 1963), 133-143.

whose objectives are to change attitudes." However attitude change is but an immediate criterion. There is an interest in attitude change only insofar as it leads to some specified behavior on the job which in turn furthers the goals of the organization. Attitude changes are not goals in themselves; they are indicators that the longitudinal goals of the program may be served.

Abbatiello\(^1\) did a study to determine whether changes in attitudes occurred as a result of exposure to and participation in a training program for the development of supervisory talent. He concluded that: changes would be expected to appear whenever anyone participated in a learning experience, and that these changes would be peculiar to the population sampled, to the materials to which the participants were exposed, and to the training methods used in the program. The amount or direction of change would be limited by these peculiarities.

In an attempt to evaluate human relations training in terms of changed attitudes, Carron\(^2\) obtained attitude measurements on both experimental and control groups at four different times: before training, immediately after training, six months later, and a followup study seventeen months after the end of the training.

---


training. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and the F-Scale were used for attitude measures.

In these investigations vector geometry was used to analyze the Structure and Consideration dimensions of the LOQ. The findings revealed statistically significant change from authoritarian to democratic attitudes in the experimental group. It was found that the change persisted over the seventeen month follow-up period.

Ayers obtained LOQ scores from 305 first line foremen and 97 second and third line supervisors who took part in a one week training course in "Management Techniques." These foremen and supervisors represented eight training groups, the first five of which answered the questionnaire at the beginning and end of the training period with no knowledge of outcomes. LOQ scores were also obtained for the last three groups on a pre and post-training basis. In the latter three groups, the supervisors scored their own questionnaire and then referred to an instruction sheet which defined the leadership dimensions and presented a norm table computed from data provided by the first five groups. He found that knowledge of results and their derivation produced no greater occurrence of significant score changes than lack of knowledge of outcomes.

The designing of a course for supervisors at the National

---

Bank of Commerce in New Orleans was approached from the standpoint of attempting to improve ability to make decisions, or judgments, by changing attitudes of the participants.

At the beginning of each course a Test of Supervisory Judgment was administered to the participants. At the end of the course, a second such test was given. White concluded that supervisory judgment could be improved by a training course in human relations. There was no control group and no follow-up at a later date. The questionnaire was filled out by participants only. There was no way of judging if their behavior changed or if perceptions of their behavior changed.

Anderson stated that human relations training for first-line supervisors was not as efficient as many others believed. He thought it to be more effective for those who started out as blue collar workers, and approximately fifty per cent fell in this category. He stated that sociological studies have shown that blue collar workers have a markedly different attitude toward success, but that their interest in human behavior in general was considerably less. He stated that there was a very real possibility that blue collar workers saw no need to change their present ways of dealing with employees for two reasons: 1) they

---


were quite satisfied with their way of doing things, and/or 2) they were completely unaware of their own behavior and how it strikes them.

Papaloizos\(^1\) made an evaluation of the human relations aspect of a training class for foremen in Switzerland. He analyzed two attitude questionnaires administered before and after the course as well as a personality inventory administered after the course was completed. The evaluation showed a favorable change in attitude toward subordinates in thirty-three per cent of the cases. This group was characterized as "normal-extraverted" by the researcher based upon the data from the personality instrument. In this particular study there was no follow-up done to determine if the change had lasted after a period of time and the participants were the only ones describing themselves. There was no indication of behavioral change.

Allis-Chalmers\(^2\) initiated a training program for all supervisors which they believed was making a quick contribution to their profits, but they also theorized that results over a period of time are the true test of a training program. In a survey rating, the first-line foremen were found to be interested in the same topics rated most important by upper level management,


and much to the same degree.

In 1949 Canter developed and administered a human relations training course for the first-line supervisors in a large insurance company. With a battery of before and after pencil and paper questionnaires he measured the effects on the trainees and a control group. Six tests were used including: 1) General Logical Reasoning; 2) "How Supervise"; 3) Social Judgment Test; 4) Supervisory Questionnaire; 5) Test for Ability to Estimate Group Opinion; and 6) General Psychological Facts and Principles. Mean scores obtained for the trainees were higher than for the control group.

On five out of twelve developed scores the results for the trained group were statistically significant at the five percent level. Whether or not this change carried over into the on-the-job performance was not studied.

In the spring of 1952 Osterberg and Lindbom sent questionnaires to a group of oil company supervisors who had received human relations training for five and a half days during the summer of 1949. It was noted that definite changes in behavior occurred, yet the results were somewhat speculative since no control group was involved and only the participants described themselves after a three year lapse of time.

---


Miles\textsuperscript{1} administered pre and posttests to a sample of thirty-four subjects in a trainee group of elementary school principals participating in a two week training laboratory at Bethel, Maine in August, 1958. Measures used on the trainees and a control group included the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Group Participation Scale, and an open-end perceived change measure. He concluded that the training had favorable results, but this was based on self-perceptions only.

Stroud\textsuperscript{2} of the Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania evaluated the results of a training program called Personal Factors in Management. The purpose was to determine if behavioral changes actually did occur as the result of training. It was concluded that there was a favorable change in the participants behavior in the area of consideration. The study was not initiated until after the course was completed. The respondents filled out the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire twice after the program, once at the end of the program, and again a year later. Stroud did not have a control group, or descriptions from other people. The results were based on the participants self perceptions only, and there was no indication of behavior change as perceived by others.


Buchanan tried to determine the impact of a supervisory training program at a large research and development laboratory. In place of before and after measurements, the supervisor and subordinate of each participant were asked two months after the workshop to return a questionnaire reporting specific behavior, if any, which represented a favorable change in the job performance of the participant and which, in the respondent's judgment, was attributal to the training. The critical part of the evaluation system tested the judgment and observation of the respondents. The participants supplied the names of superiors and subordinates to whom the questionnaires were sent. It was concluded that the training was effective, and two-thirds of the participants were observed to have modified their job performance. There was no control group, and if there was a perceived change, there was no basis for comparison to indicate if the change was significant.

The Management Development Laboratory of the Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, completed the evaluation of a management training program conducted within a large industrial organization. An evaluation was sought to determine its over-all effectiveness of the "boss-involved" and the standard case approaches to training. Criterion measures of the achievement of course objectives were developed and administered before and after the course to an experimental group of managers who did not receive training. The researchers concluded that the

management training course was partially successful in achieving its objective. Significant improvements in ability to apply a special analytical approach and in attitudes toward self-development were associated with the training; no significant improvements in knowledge of management principles or in the intensity of case analysis were achieved. The attempt to involve superiors of the participants in the training program apparently had no effect upon the achievement of the immediate training objectives.

Spector\(^1\) used the Attitudes Test in Human Relations to evaluate the amount of cadet attitude change as a result of a new seminar offered in the senior year of the Air Force ROTC program. On twenty-six of the thirty-nine items the cadet's responses changed significantly. The findings indicated that there were sufficient attitude changes in the direction of the criterion group to warrant confidence in the seminar's effectiveness in changing human relations attitudes. There was no indication in this report that there was a follow-up study done to determine if the results were lasting, or if they had an effect on the participants behavior.

Viteles\(^2\) reported on a ten month program of humanistic studies for executives from the Telephone System, which was

---


conducted at the University of Pennsylvania. He concluded that the fundamental nature of leadership is of prime importance. "The need for developing systematic and acceptable theory of leadership is a real one. It is still too early to estimate the extent to which the program of humanistic education for executives will either contribute to the development of such theory, or markedly influence the future behavior in industry of participants." There is no scientific evidence to support these remarks; they are one man's opinion based on personal observation.

Barthol and Zeigler\textsuperscript{1} did an evaluation of a supervisory training program at the Westinghouse Electric Corporation. A group of supervisors were tested before and after a training program with alternate forms of How Supervise? The group was subdivided by educational level. Although all groups improved significantly, the greatest gains were made by supervisors who had gone to college. Lower ranking subjects who had previous training showed more improvement than the lower ranking subjects who did not have previous training although the mean score of the two groups were the same. It was suggested that the instrument may be useful for assessing the effectiveness of a supervisory training program, but that more work must be done on the readability of the test and on the meaning of change scores.

following a training program. This study was only to measure increased knowledge or facts, there was no attempt to measure changes in behavior.

Fleishman\(^1\) did a comparison of the leadership attitude scores of workers, foremen, general foremen, and superintendents in an industrial corporation. The questionnaires were designed to measure two relatively independent dimensions of leadership attitudes. These dimensions were called "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure".

A comparison of the leadership attitude scores at four plant levels revealed that the higher people were in the plant hierarchy, the less "Consideration" they felt the workers should get, and the more "Structuring" they felt should be initiated. The attitudes of the foremen group on each dimension fell somewhere between what the workers expected and what their own supervisors expected, but were much more similar to the attitudes of their supervisors.

With reference to the workers attitudes concerning the amount of "Consideration" they would like in an "ideal foreman", the results indicated that this depended to a large extent on the particular work group. There were significant differences with respect to the amount of "Structuring" desired. Based on limited data, it was found that departments with high worker

grievance rates contained foremen who perceived their own supervisors as expecting them to lead with a lower degree of consideration and a higher degree of structuring. This leadership attitude study did not attempt to evaluate a program or measure behavior change, but it complimented this present investigation.

Schwarz, Stilwell, and Scanlon\(^1\) conducted a study for a large midwestern insurance company. Fifty-seven managers representing the top five levels participated in a series of management development seminars. These managers were divided into two groups to receive training at different times. The subordinates filled out the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, XII describing each manager before and after training, but the authors did not say how many subordinates per manager, or how long after training. Twenty-four \(t\) tests were conducted, but only two reached the .05 level of significance. A negative change was perceived in one group in the area of Initiation of Structure, and a positive change was perceived in the other group in the area of Production Emphasis. The conclusions drawn were vague, and there was no control group. The investigators might have been able to draw difference conclusions if they had factor analyzed the twelve sub-scales into the two areas of Person Orientation and System Orientation.

Historical Perspective

The terms Person Orientation and System Orientation as used in this study are similar to many others that have been used over the past years in leadership studies. An historical review will be given.

Prior to the Hawthorne studies in 1933, people in industry were concerned with the functional school of management where the primary assumption was that man was primarily motivated by monetary incentives and would produce and accept the authority of management in return for such remuneration. This model of "economic man" did not allow for the social and psychological forces that could affect people at work.

Mayo\(^1\) concluded that man is motivated by social and psychological forces as well as economic forces, and that productivity can be affected by the perception of workers that management is interested in them. He also learned that production can be restricted by social pressures to conform to group-determined students. This study was probably the beginning of the Human Relations Movement, or concern with people: their needs, perceptions, attitudes, and motives.

In 1939 Lewin, Lippitt, and White\(^2\) used children as subjects,

---


and found that groups under democratic leadership showed less conflict and higher sustained productivity than the groups under laissez-faire and autocratic leadership. The groups under autocratic leadership were capable of high production when the leader was present.

In 1948 Coch and French did a study of resistance to change at the Harwood Manufacturing Company. The investigators used group sessions where workers could participate in discussing and making suggestions concerning new production line changes. There were three experimental treatments: participation groups in which workers themselves joined in the discussions; groups of representatives from different departments who were the only ones to join in the discussions; and control groups who had no participation of any kind.

The results showed that workers directly involved in group participation sessions learned the new techniques faster and reached production levels quicker than either the workers who were represented in the participation sessions or the control groups.

In a 1962 study Fleishman, Harris and Burtt replicated their findings between Initiating Structure and turnover with the opposite effects under Consideration. They also found an

---


interaction between Consideration and Initiating Structure. Turnover and grievances were highest under supervisors who combine high Initiating Structure and low Consideration. A moderate amount of Initiating Structure and low Consideration resulted in the lowest rate of grievance and turnover.

Likert\(^1\) noted that supervisors who used group methods of supervision and had favorable attitudes toward their men achieved higher performance than supervisors who did not use such methods and had unfavorable attitudes toward their men.

Dunteman and Bass\(^2\) found that Task Oriented supervisors were rated more effective than those who were Interaction Oriented. Close supervision and pressure for efficiency were reported by Patchen\(^3\) to increase group performance when the supervisor "went to bat" for his workers, and when he was the source of rewards. Patchen stated that close supervision may be perceived by subordinates as a demonstration of the supervisor's interest in their welfare. His findings suggested that various measures of participative or employee-centered

---


supervision may not always be comparable. Such supervision might be perceived differently when it is accompanied by other interacting supervisory styles.

Oaklander and Fleishman\(^1\) determined that consideration reduced intra-unit stress and served 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. Thus Initiating Structure could be interpreted solely as a means of encouraging production. It seemed to be a means of encouraging production. It seemed to be a means of reducing interference, political influence, and arbitrary rule by higher authority.

Gibb\(^2\) suggested that leadership behavior may interact with group member needs and expectations. He concluded that leadership could be regarded as a unitary trait. It must be evaluated in terms of the needs, attitudes, and expectations of the followers. Effective leadership of people with certain need patterns differed from effective leadership of people who had different need and personality patterns.


Vroom found an interaction between 1) participation and workers' authoritarianism, and 2) participation and need for independence. His findings indicated that individuals high in independence were significantly more motivated and better satisfied under participative supervision than were individuals low in independence. Individuals who were found to be high in authoritarianism tended to be less satisfied and less motivated under participation than individuals who were low in authoritarianism.

The previously cited studies indicated that Person Orientation and similar supervisory styles usually led to job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, lower absenteeism, turnover, and grievances. These variables tended to be related and could be summarized as a favorable attitude toward work. System Orientation and similar types of supervision often produced the opposite effect. However, Person Orientation did not always lead to higher production, and in some types of jobs, it was negatively related to production. On the other hand, System Orientation and similar types of supervision were found to be positively related to performance in certain types of settings. The type of job might be an important determiner of which supervisory style was most effective. There also appeared to be an interaction between Person Orientation and System Orientation with respect

---

to turnover and grievances, and perhaps, production and motivation.

Perception

Since perception is of such importance to the present investigation it was deemed advisable to include a section devoted to defining this concept with a brief review of the literature.

Perception has been defined as the power exercised in reacting to sense presentations, and modifying them further by attention, interests, and previous experience.¹

Many people believe perception to be a combination of apperception and cognition. Apperception is the process by which past sensory experiences, attitudes of attention and feeling modify immediate sensory experience resulting in perception. Cognition is the act, power, or faculty of knowing and perceiving.

Each person sees through his own eyes and interprets what he sees in terms of his own experience and his own fund of meanings. Every situation and every person in it will be seen differently by each person doing the looking.

Person perception refers mostly to the observations made about intentions, attitudes, emotions, ideas, abilities, purposes, and traits. These events are said to be inside the person.

Perception of an object, such as a watch, can be changed

by removing the case and examining the inside, but this is not possible with people. In order to see inside a person interaction must take place.

Persons are action centers: they can do something to one another, they can benefit or harm others intentionally, and others can benefit or be harmed by them.

People are perceived as having abilities, as acting purposefully, as having wishes or sentiments, as perceiving or watching others. They can be friends or enemies.

Little is known about a person from the shape of his face and the color of his hair. The real clues to his personality are his behavior and speech. In most cases people cognize a person's traits, and especially his wishes, sentiments, or interactions from what he does and says, considerably less is known when there is a limit to what can be seen of him as a static object.

Research has been done in areas of leadership that show self-perception to be different from that of peers, subordinates, and superiors.

Carson and Schultz¹ used the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire to do a comparative analysis of leadership behavior of the Junior College deans as seen by students, presidents, and subordinates.

and department heads. A "Real" and "Ideal" rating was done by each group. Evidence was obtained that discrepancies or perceptions and expectations existed between student leaders and other referent groups, suggesting that role conflicts existed for the deans.

This same type of research has been done with people in industry, the military, education, and other areas showing the same type of results and evidence of misconceptions of perceptions.

Tagiuri and Petrullo\(^1\) stated that to act in the social field a knowledge of social facts of persons and groups is required. To take a place with others people must perceive each other's existence and reach a measure of comprehension of one another's needs, emotions, and thoughts.

People in leadership roles are beginning to investigate and to understand some of the reasons for human behavior.

Perception can become more accurate by awareness of expectations that effect behavior. A more thorough understanding of expectation could help a person see himself and others in a more accurate perspective, thus leading to improved communication and goal achievement.

A leader must anticipate and play many roles. He is expected to be a good boss, a good husband and father, a good organizational man, a good citizen, and a good guy. The different role demands

placed on the leader confront him more often simultaneously than they do separately, and they are often in conflict.

An understanding of the culture is also viewed as an important area. Culture has the advantage of predictability. It is a body of learned behavior, a collection of beliefs, habits, practices, and traditions, shared by a group of people and successively learned by members who enter the society.

Mead\(^1\) emphasized this in her description of a UNESCO agricultural specialist:

Once he had included in his expectations the possibility that in his attempt to get land organized in fields sufficiently large enough for the use of agricultural machines, he may have to take account of graves and ghosts, sacred trees, oracles, shrines, dowries, sex habits, and unborn children as well as inheritances, property lines, rights of way, and ancient rites, he will then be more ready to follow out the implications of any particular resistance he meets in the foreign country where he goes as a specialist.

In dealing with perceptions people must recognize that each person sees through his own eyes and interprets what he sees in terms of his own experience and his own fund of meanings. What is clear to one person may be totally muddled for another.

**Hypotheses**

After a considerable review of related literature, interaction in a research seminar, working with education and training directors in industry, discussions with plant staff personnel

and conference leaders, plus the first-hand experience in industry and the educational background in management of the researcher, the following research hypotheses were developed to be investigated in this study:

1. Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will be perceived as being more Person Oriented three months after the classes than before as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.

2. Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will be perceived as being more System Oriented three months after the classes than before as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.

3. Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will show a greater change in Person Orientation than in System Orientation after the classes than before as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.

Definitions of Terms

The terms used frequently throughout the report are defined as follows:

Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program are those new first-line supervisors, or about to become supervisors, selected by their superiors to participate in the classes. The learning experiences in the classes are designed to help them acquire fundamental knowledge, skills, and techniques needed by a supervisor. The classes meet for eight hours daily for an intensive two week program. The conferees come to a central institute from various plants of the corporation. Perceived Behavior is based upon observations of an individual. Each observer interprets from his own frame of reference. Person Orientation as used here and elsewhere in this study is
the perceived leader behavior that responds to the needs of the people on the staff.

System Orientation as used here and elsewhere in this study is the perceived leader behavior that responds to the needs of the plant or organization.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The present investigation was designed to evaluate a Basic Management Program and to determine if perceived behavioral changes of participants occurred, as a result of the program. The subjects selected for participation in the training program were first line supervisors from a large Midwestern corporation.

The Instrument

Various instruments and means to obtain the evidence were investigated. Consideration was given to reliability, validity, cost, ease of administration, time, and equipment needed for administration. Written descriptions were eliminated as a source of data because of the difficulty in comparing differences. Instruments pertaining to attitudes in human relations, social judgment, supervisory judgment, and methods of supervision were rejected because they would not provide the type of evidence needed to evaluate the classes. The instrument finally selected was the LBDQ,XII (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, form XII).

This instrument was reviewed with the Director of Management Training, his assistant, the Director of Research and Development, his assistant, four trainers from the Corporate Training Center, and the Doctoral Committee of the researcher. All agreed that
for the purpose of this study the LBDO,XII would be a satisfactory instrument to obtain the data needed. The LBDO,XII was developed by the staff of the Ohio State Leadership Studies. It was developed to obtain descriptions of supervisors. It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader in any type of organization, provided the person filling it out has had the opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of his group.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII consists of twelve subscales, with each subscale composed of either five or ten items. A subscale is necessarily defined by its component items, and represents a rather complex pattern of behaviors.

The Ohio State staff found through empirical research that a large number of hypothesized dimensions of leader behavior could be reduced to two strongly defined factors: Consideration and Initiation of Structure. For the purposes of this study, the Consideration dimension will be referred to as Person Orientation, and the Initiation of Structure dimension will be referred to as System Orientation as used by Brown.1 These two empirically defined subscales have been widely used in empirical research in military organizations, industry, and education. Studies have been conducted by the researchers at Ohio State where they found agreement among respondents in describing

leaders.\textsuperscript{2}

The subscales defining Person Orientation are: 1) Demand Reconciliation—reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system; 2) Tolerance of Uncertainty—is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset; 3) Tolerance of Freedom—allows followers scope for initiative, decisions, and action; 4) Consideration—regards for the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers; 5) Predictive Accuracy—exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately; 6) Integration—maintains a closely knit organization, resolves intermember conflicts.

The subscales defining System Orientation are: 1) Representation—speaks and acts as the representative of the group; 2) Persuasiveness—uses persuasion and argument effectively, exhibits strong convictions; 3) Initiation of Structure—clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected; 4) Role Assumption—actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others; 5) Production Emphasis—applies pressure for productive output; 6) Superior Orientation—maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them, is striving for high status.

The staff members of the institute for education and training were interested in a detailed analysis of each of the twelve

\textsuperscript{1}Ralph M. Stogdill, \textit{Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire} (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1963), p. 1.
subscales. For the purpose of this study the researcher analyzed the dimensions of Person Orientation and System Orientation. When the twelve subscales were factor analyzed as done by Brown, it was found that six of the subscales load on the factor of Person Orientation and the other six load on the factor of System Orientation. The subscales which were previously described as defining Person Orientation are those which load on that factor. The subscales which were previously described as defining System Orientation are those which load on that factor.

The items loading on System Orientation reveal perceived leader behavior that responds to the needs of the system, while items loading on the factor of Person Orientation reveal perceived leader behavior that responds to the needs of the staff members.

The Setting

The corporate education and training facility is located in the Midwest and serves a large corporation that has plants throughout the country. The Management Training section of the institute has offered courses and programs to all levels of management for many years.

The Basic Management Program is the first step in the hierarchy of management programs. A complete outline of the Basic Management Program may be found in the Appendix.

---

The Basic Management Program at the training facility was designed on the theory that an intensive two week program could bring about changes in a supervisor's leadership behavior. The program included experiences which were planned to motivate the conferees to become both more Person Oriented and System Oriented. Until this study was designed, there had been no evaluation of the program to determine if the expected changes were taking place.

In the past, the emphasis in industry had traditionally been on System Orientation. The training facility staff planned some learning experiences which could help the new supervisor in his System Orientation. The following is a list of units and the hours devoted to each: Job of the First-Line Management (13), Principles of Sound Management (1), History and Organization of Corporations (2), Industrial Economics (4), Functions in a Manufacturing Organization (6), Problem Solving (2), Induction (1), Safety (1), Job Instruction (4), Controlling Costs (2), and Methods Improvement (4). These units accounted for approximately sixty-three per cent of the classroom time.

Units in Labor Relations (14) and Employee Development (2) emphasized both System Orientation and Person Orientation, for twenty-one per cent of the class time.

The units on Human Relations and Communications were covered in twelve hours, or approximately sixteen per cent of the class time. The staff also touched on human relations or Person Orientation in the units emphasizing System Orientation.
The personnel, administrators, teachers, and trainers had a variety of backgrounds. Some had their doctorates, some had taught in high schools and colleges, and others had been management people in the plants without college educations. The majority had college degrees with some having degrees beyond the Bachelors.

A large percentage of management people from the corporation have participated in the programs over the years. The corporation had been successful, and many of these management people believe that much of the success is due to the education and training received at the training facility.

The programs are offered to the plants at cost. The plants are responsible for their own training and development and they are not required to take advantage of the education and training facility programs. It is done on a voluntary basis and there is a charge for services received. The demand has been growing continually over the years. One of the reasons for the success of the institute is that many of the programs are designed and developed with a plant to meet the specific needs and objectives of that plant.

The environment was designed to be conducive to learning, that is, no grades were given, the faculty was seen as "conference leaders", not teachers, and little lecturing was done. The conference leaders used lecture discussions, case studies, role playing, incident process, in-basket, television, T-grouping, films, video tapes, business games, and panels.
At the conclusion of the programs, the participants were usually asked to do a written evaluation of the program. The majority of the conferees wrote favorable comments about the program and the conference leaders. Several of the staff members have been assigned the task of developing a more scientific method of evaluating the programs.

Subjects

The subjects in this study were new first-line supervisors. There were twenty conferees enrolled in the program. These men came from twelve plants located in different states. Terminations and transfers cut the number to seventeen.

The Basic Management Program is offered several times annually with the Training Directors at each plant receiving literature explaining the program and when it will be offered. The Training Directors then make reservations for their employees to participate. Reservations are limited to twenty, made on a first-come, first-served basis.

Prior to the program, the staff at the institute made contact with the Training Directors who had made the reservations for the twenty supervisors. They also worked with the plant superintendents to select two peers and supervisors who had adequate knowledge of the conferees. The research was explained with an emphasis on the evaluation of the Basic Management Program, not individuals or plants. Each Training Director was asked to distribute the LBDQ questionnaires and explain the project to
those involved. Complete anonymity was assured to those in the project.

Each questionnaire was coded in order to determine pre and posttest scores. Each respondent was given a coded questionnaire with a stamped envelope in which to return it to the institute.

Control Group

A control group was to be used to help determine if there was any reason to believe the experimental group was representative of other first-line supervisors on the two dimensions studied: Person Orientation and System Orientation. It was also believed that such a procedure would be helpful in determining if any perceived changes in the experimental group could be attributed to the Basic Management Program.

At the time of the pretest of the participating conferees, a pretest was also to be given to a control group selected by the same supervisors who selected the participants. If a supervisor selected more than one conferee, he was to be asked to select an equal number for the control group. These men were to be attending a Basic Management Program in the future at least three months after the experimental group. The men were expected to be as similar as possible to the participating conferees, that is, they were to have approximately the same supervisory experience, educational background, be near the same age, and were expected to have approximately the same growth potential as assessed by the supervisor. Each member of
the control group was to describe himself, be described by two of his supervisors, and two of his peers selected by the Training Director and superintendent in the same manner as for the experimental group. The LBDO,XII was used in each case.

**Administration of Instrument**

The instrument was administered during the last two weeks of April in 1968 to all members of the experimental and control groups, and their peers and supervisors. The follow-up was administered during a two week period in mid August 1968. The procedures previously outlined were followed.

**Statistical Evaluation**

1. The means obtained from the LBDO,XII pretests were computed for both the experimental and control groups on the two dimensions of Person Orientation and System Orientation. These mean scores then provided a basis for determining if the conferees in the training classes differed from the control group on these dimensions. *t* tests were used to determine the statistical significance of any change. There was a separate test done for the peers, the superiors, and self groups.

2. *t* tests were then conducted on the conferees' pre and post scores from the LBDO,XII on Person Orientation and System Orientation to determine the statistical significance of any changes on these dimensions after the classes. There was a separate test done for the peers, superiors, and self
groups.

3. The mean change scores for conferees on Person Orientation and System Orientation were compared to determine which change score was greater. Peers, superiors, and self groups were compared separately.

4. *t* tests were conducted on the control groups pre and post scores from the LBDQ,XII on Person Orientation and System Orientation to determine the statistical significance of any changes on these dimensions three months after the completion of the program.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the data collected in the study. For convenience in reporting, and in so far as practicable, a tabular style will be used and discussion of the findings will accompany the presentations of the data as gathered for this inquiry.

This study was conducted in a large corporation central training facility. The subjects were relatively new first-line supervisors from plants in different parts of the country. There were twenty potential subjects enrolled in the class, but only seventeen remained at the end of the three month follow-up period due to terminations and transfers.

The instrument used in this study, the LBDQ,XII, was completed by the conferee, two of his peers, and two of his superiors before the training classes had commenced and again three months after the classes were completed. The data from this instrument at these two time intervals produced a perceived description of the conferee's behavior in the areas of Person Orientation and System Orientation.

A control group of twenty was selected at the same time as the experimental group. These subjects were to be as similar as possible to the experimental group, except that they would not become conferees in the Basic Management Program until after
the three month follow-up period was over. This number was also reduced to seventeen at the end of the follow-up period due to terminations, transfers, and insufficient information.

For the purpose of this study p levels were used rather than an arbitrary point of significance, thus allowing the reader to determine the significance based on his point of view.

Comparison of Experimental and Control Groups

The pretest data obtained on the experimental and control groups were subjected to t tests to determine the statistical significance of the difference between the means, if any. The two groups were compared in the areas of Person Orientation and System Orientation as perceived by self, peers, and superiors. Table 1 shows the results of the comparison.
TABLE 1

COMPARISON OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS IN THE AREAS OF PERSON ORIENTATION AND SYSTEM ORIENTATION AS PERCEIVED BY SELF, PEERS, AND SUPERIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Area of Orientation</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>28.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>26.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest possible mean score for Person Orientation was 37.5, and 45.8 for System Orientation.

Person Orientation

In the area of Person Orientation the mean score for the experimental group self description was 28.60 and the score of the group was 28.43. The standard deviation for the experimental group was 1.84 and 1.68 for the control group with a t of .28.
which was not statistically significant.

Person Orientation peer descriptions for the experimental group had a mean of 26.31, and a mean of 26.10 for the control group. The standard deviation for the experimental group was 1.60 and 1.49 for the control group. The $t$ was .39 which was not statistically significant.

Superiors' descriptions in the area of Person Orientation had a mean of 26.54 for the experimental group and 26.85 for the control group. The experimental group standard deviation was 1.68 and the control group standard deviation was 2.08. The $t$ was .48 which was not statistically significant.

System Orientation

In the area of System Orientation the mean score for the experimental group self descriptions was 36.35 and the score of the control group was 36.14. The standard deviation for the experimental group was 2.50 and 2.42 for the control group. The $t$ was .25 which was not statistically significant.

The System Orientation peer descriptions for the experimental group had a mean of 32.38, and a mean of 32.58 for the control group. The standard deviation for the experimental group was 3.99, and 2.69 for the control group. The $t$ was .16 which was not statistically significant.

Descriptions by Superiors in the area of System Orientation had a mean of 32.58 for the experimental group and a 33.58 for the control group. The experimental group standard deviation
was 3.47 and the control group standard deviation was 4.51. The $t$ was .72 which was not statistically significant.

Results of the Comparison of the Experimental and Control Groups

The difference between the means for each area of orientation as viewed by each reference group was not statistically significant. Self descriptions were higher than those of the superiors and peers. Superiors and peers were close in their descriptions, but superiors' descriptions were slightly higher than those of the peers.

The data in Table 1 indicated that there was no reason to believe that the experimental group differed from the control group before the training on the two dimensions studied: Person Orientation and System Orientation, therefore any observed differences between the experimental and control group after the training could more readily be attributed to the training.

**Hypotheses**

Results for Hypothesis One

1. **Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will be perceived as being more Person Oriented three months after the classes than before as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.**

Changes in Experimental Group

An analysis of data obtained on perceived changes in the area of Person Orientation is presented in Table 2.
Self Reference Group

In the area of Person Orientation the self descriptions of the experimental group had a pretest mean of 28.60, and a posttest mean of 27.54. The pretest standard deviation was 1.84, and the posttest standard deviation was 2.03. The *t* was 1.59 which was significant at the .10 level suggesting a relationship between the perceived changes and participation in the program. The self-perceived change was in a negative direction which indicated that the conferees saw themselves as being less Person Oriented three months after the program than they did before the program.
The peers and superiors saw the conferees as being more Person Oriented. thus suggesting that the conferees were actually more Person Oriented after the program than before. At the same time the self-description scores were lower, but more in line with those of their peers and superiors, which would indicate that the conferees saw themselves more realistically after the program than before.

Peer Reference Group

Person Orientation descriptions by peers had a pretest mean of 26.31 and a posttest mean of 26.80. The pretest standard deviation was 1.60, and 2.12 for the posttest. The t was .92, and was significant at the .25 level which indicate that perceived change could have occurred by chance 25 out of 100 times, but when considered with the other changes in this study, it indicated there was a relationship between the observed behavioral changes and the Basic Management Program.

Self Reference Group

Descriptions by superiors in the area of Person Orientation had a pretest mean of 26.54 and a posttest mean of 27.34. The pretest standard deviation was 1.68, and 1.49 for the posttest standard deviation. The t was 1.47 which is significant at the .10 level, thus indicating a relationship between the perceived behavioral changes and the participation in the program.
Results of Experimental Group Person Orientation Changes. — Although the perceived changes in the three reference groups did not reach the .05 level of significance, they all showed changes which suggested that the differences observed were related to the program.

Changes in Control Group

Pre and posttest scores for the control group were analyzed to determine if perceived changes took place during the three month experimental period. An analysis of the pre and posttest scores for the control group is presented in Table 3.

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF CONTROL GROUP IN THE AREA OF PERSON ORIENTATION AS PERCEIVED BY SELF, PEERS, AND SUPERIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>mean 28.43</td>
<td>28.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.68</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t not significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>mean 26.10</td>
<td>24.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.49</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t -2.33</td>
<td>significant at .025 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>mean 26.85</td>
<td>26.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 2.08</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t -0.72</td>
<td>significant at .25 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self Reference Group

The self descriptions of the control group in the area of Person Orientation did not change significantly from the pre to the posttest. The mean for the pretest was 28.43, and 28.54 for the posttest. The pretest standard deviation was 1.68, and the posttest standard deviation was 1.89. The $t$ was .17 which is not statistically significant, therefore the control group did not perceive any change in themselves in the area of Person Orientation during the pre and posttest time interval.

Peer Reference Group

Peers perceived the control group as being less Person Oriented after the experimental time. The pretest mean score was 26.10, and the posttest mean was 24.86. Pretest standard deviation was 1.49 and posttest standard deviation was 1.58. The $t$ was 2.33 which is statistically significant at the .025 level. This would seem to indicate a significant change in the control group as perceived by the peers in the area of Person Orientation. It is possible that the control behavior actually did change, or the level of significance occurred by chance.

Superior Reference Group

The superiors also perceived the control group as being less Person Oriented at the time of the posttest, but not as
significant a change as observed by the peers. The pretest mean was 26.85, and the posttest mean was 26.35. The standard deviation for the pretest was 2.08, and 1.99 for the posttest. The $t$ was .72 which was significant at the .25 level. Something in the environment may have caused the control group to be perceived as less Person Oriented during the experimental period.

Results of Control Group Person Orientation Changes.---Self perceived changes in Person Orientation were so minimal that they were not statistically significant. Superiors perceived a decrease on this dimension at the .25 level, while peers perceived a decrease at the .025 level. Peers of the experimental group perceived an increase in Person Orientation at the .25 level as shown in Table 2. Comparing peer perceptions for the experimental and control groups indicated a great difference which would suggest a strong relationship between the program and the perceived behavioral changes in the area of Person Orientation as perceived by peers.

Comparison of Experimental and Control Groups in the Area of Person Orientation

The $t$ tests and levels of statistical significance presented in Table 2 and 3 are compared and presented in Table 4.
TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS IN THE AREA OF PERSON ORIENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Experimental T</th>
<th>Control T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .10 level</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .25 level</td>
<td>significant at .025 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .10 level</td>
<td>significant at .25 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 4 revealed that the experimental group self perceived change was in a negative direction and was significant at the .10 level. The data also revealed that the control group did not perceive themselves as changing in the area of Person Orientation. These findings indicated a relationship between the training program and a lower score in self perception on the part of the conferees. In the pretest the experimental group perceived themselves much higher than did their peers and superiors. The lower posttest scores in self perception were not below the scores recorded by their peers and superiors, but were just slightly above them. This indicated that the experimental group was better able to see themselves as they were perceived by others. This type of change suggested that the experimental group
might be more effective in the work environment after this.

Peers perceived the conferees as having changed their behavior in a positive direction at the .25 level of significance which one could expect to happen by chance. The data in Table 4 revealed that the peers perceived the control group behavior as changing in a negative direction at the .025 level of significance indicating a strong relationship between participation in the Basic Management Program and perceived behavioral change as observed by peers. Even though self perception scores had decreased, the perception scores of peers and superiors increased, indicating that the conferees behavior may have been perceived as increasing in a positive direction bringing their self perceptions closer to the perceptions of their peers and superiors.

Superiors also perceived the experimental group as improving in the area of Person Orientation at the .10 level of significance, while superiors of the control group perceived a decrease in the Person Orientation scores at the .25 level. This was another indication of a relationship between participation in the Basic Management Program and the increased behavioral change of the experimental group as perceived by superiors.

The comparison of the pre and posttest levels of statistical significance for the experimental and control groups in the area of Person Orientation support hypothesis one which stated that the experimental group of conferees would be perceived as being more Person Oriented as a result of participating in the Basic Management Program.
Results for Hypothesis Two

2. Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will be perceived as being more System Oriented three months after the classes than before as perceived by self, peers and superiors.

Changes in the Experimental Group

An analysis of data obtained on perceived changes in the area of System Orientation is presented in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

ANALYSIS OF PRE AND POSTTEST DATA ON SYSTEM ORIENTATION AS PERCEIVED BY SELF, PEERS, AND SUPERIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>36.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .40 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>33.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .25 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superiors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>32.58</td>
<td>33.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .25 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceived changes in System Orientation did not reach levels of significance as high as those in the area of Person Orientation, but changes were observed by each group and all were in the same positive direction, which indicated there was...
a relationship between the program and the perceived changes.

Self Reference Group

The pretest self-perceived mean was 36.35 and the posttest mean was 36.58. The standard deviation was 2.50 for the pretest and 2.01 for the posttest. The t was .29, which is significant at the .40 level. This would indicate that the change could have occurred by chance 40 out of 100 times. The self-perceived change in System Orientation was less than that perceived by peers and superiors, but this might have been a situation where participants saw themselves more as others saw them, because the differences between self-perception of themselves as seen by their peers and superiors narrowed after the training program.

Peer Reference Group

Peers perceived a change in the participants in the area of System Orientation at the .25 level of significance, which would indicate that the change could have occurred by chance 25 times out of 100. This perceived change again indicated there was a relationship between the program and the perceived change. The pretest mean was 32.38 and the posttest mean was 33.68 with a pretest standard deviation of 3.99, and a posttest standard deviation of 3.32 which resulted in a t of 1.02.

Superior Reference Group

Superiors perceived a change in the participants in the area of
System Orientation at the same .25 level of significance that the peers perceived. This indicated the change could have occurred by chance 25 out of 100 times, but the other 75 times out of 100 it indicated that there was a relationship between the training program and the behavioral change. The pretest mean was 32.58 and the posttest mean was 33.75 with a pretest standard deviation of 3.47 and a posttest standard deviation of 3.07 which resulted in a t of 1.04.

Results of Experimental Group System Orientation Changes.—All three groups perceived change in the same direction which corroborated the findings that indicated that perceived changes were related to the training program.

Changes in the Control Group

Analysis of the data obtained on perceived changes of the control group in the area of System Orientation is presented in Table 6.
TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF THE CONTROL GROUP IN THE AREA OF SYSTEM ORIENTATION AS PERCEIVED BY SELF, PEERS AND SUPERIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>36.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>32.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>33.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Reference Group

In the area of System Orientation self perceptions by the control group increased during the period of the study. The pretest mean was 36.14, and the posttest mean increased to 37.34. The standard deviation for the pretest was 2.42, and 2.41 for the posttest. The t was 1.45 which is statistically significant at the .10 level.

Something in the work environment may have happened during the time of the study which caused self perceptions in the area of System Orientation to increase slightly, but perceptions of the
control group in the area of System Orientation by peers and superiors did not change during the same period of time.

Peer Reference Group

The peers pretest mean was 32.58, and the posttest mean was 32.34. The standard deviation for the pretest was 2.69 and for the posttest it was 3.36, resulting in a t of .22 which is not statistically significant.

Superior Reference Group

The mean scores by superiors were 33.58 for the pretest, and 33.60 for the posttest. The standard deviation for the pretest was 4.51 and 4.57 for the posttest. The t was .01 which is not statistically significant.

Results of Control Group System Orientation Changes. --The results of the analysis would seem to indicate that there was no significant change in the control group in the area of System Orientation therefore supporting the conclusion that the experimental group changes were related to the training.

Comparison of Experimental and Control Groups in the Area of System Orientation

The t tests and levels of statistical significance presented in Tables 5 and 6 are compared and presented in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Experimental <em>t</em></th>
<th>Control <em>t</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.29 significant at .40 level</td>
<td>1.45 significant at .10 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>1.03 significant at .25 level</td>
<td>.23 not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>1.04 significant at .25 level</td>
<td>.01 not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

System Orientation self perception scores for the experimental group increased slightly during this study and were significant at the .40 level. The control group self perception scores showed a greater increase which was significant at the .10 level, indicating a greater change in the behavior of the control group. Self perceptions of the experimental group at the time of the posttest were more in line with those of their peers and superiors than at the time of the pretest.

Peers perceived a change in the experimental group in the area of System Orientation in a positive direction that was significant at the .25 level, while peers of the control group perceived such a slight decrease it was not statistically significant.
Superiors also perceived a positive change in the experimental group in the area of System Orientation which was significant at the .25 level, while superiors of the control group perceived little or no change on this dimension.

The three reference groups of the experimental group, self, superiors, and peers each perceived positive changes in the behavior of the conferees in the area of System Orientation during this study. Peers and superiors perceived little or no change in the behavior of the control group on this dimension during the study, thus indicating a relationship between the perceived changes in the experimental group and participation in the program. These findings support the second hypothesis which stated that the experimental group would be perceived as being more System Oriented as a result of participation in the Basis Management Program.

Results for Hypothesis three

3. Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will show a greater change in Person Orientation than in System Orientation after the classes than before as perceived by self, peers, and superiors

Changes in the Experimental Group

The writer observed the program in process and had discussions with the program directors and leaders regarding the amount of time and effort devoted to System and Person Orientation parts of the program. This led to the hypothesis that if
perceived changes did occur there would be more of a change in Person Orientation than there would be in System Orientation due to the value systems of the Training Directors and conference leaders.

The Training Directors and conference leaders at the Training Center "knew" that plant superintendents were more concerned with System Orientation than they were with Person Orientation. The staff at the Training Center believed that Person Orientation deserved more attention than the plant people were willing to accept, therefore they disseminated much more Person Oriented material and training than was outlined in the written program description.

The findings were the complete opposite of those hypothesized.

To test this hypothesis change scores were compared in the areas of Person Orientation and System Orientation as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.

A comparison of the change scores for the conferees is presented in Table 8.
TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF CHANGE SCORES FOR CONFEREES IN THE AREAS OF PERSON ORIENTATION AND SYSTEM ORIENTATION AS PERCEIVED BY SELF, PEERS, AND SUPERIORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Area of Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant at .25 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self Reference Group

The self perceived change score mean for Person Orientation was a -1.05 which indicated that the Self group perceived themselves lower in the area of Person Orientation after the program than before. The mean change score for System Orientation was .28 which indicated that the Self group saw themselves higher in System Orientation after the program than before. The standard deviation for Person Orientation was .99, and .91 for
System Orientation. The $t$ was 4.09 which was statistically significant at the .01 level which indicated that this difference could have occurred by chance only one time out of 100. This indicated that participants in the training program were influenced to make more changes in a positive direction in the area of System Orientation than in the area of Person Orientation. The participants saw themselves as being less Person Oriented three months after the program but their peers and superiors perceived them as being both more System Oriented and Person Oriented after the program.

Peer Reference Group

Peers perceived more of a change in the participants in the area of System Orientation than in Person Orientation. The mean of the change in Person Orientation had increased .48, and the change in System Orientation had increased to 1.29. The standard deviation of Person Orientation was .64, and .88 for System Orientation. The $t$ was 3.03 which is significant at the .01 level.

These differences in change scores as perceived by peers suggest that changes in orientation of participants after the training program appeared to be more significant in the area of System Orientation than in the area of Person Orientation.

Superior Reference Group

Supervisors also perceived more of a change in the participants
in the area of System Orientation than in Person Orientation, but the difference in change scores did not reach as high a level of statistical significance as did those of the peer and self groups. The superiors mean score increase in the area of Person Orientation was .80, and 1.16 in the area of System Orientation. The superior group perceived more positive change in both areas than did the self and peer groups, but the difference between Person Orientation and System Orientation was less than the other two groups. The standard deviation for Person Orientation was 1.00, and 1.18 for System Orientation resulting in a t of .95 which is significant at the .25 level.

**Additional Findings**

Changes in Self Perception in the Area of Person Orientation

A comparison of how self descriptions differ from those of peers and superiors in the area of Person Orientation is presented in Table 9.
### TABLE 9
A COMPARISON OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEAN DIFFERENCES IN THE AREA OF PERSON ORIENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>%Difference</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>%Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>26.80</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>26.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.54</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all cases, self perceptions were higher than those of the superiors, and perceptions of the group by the superiors were higher than those of the peers. This was true with the pretest and posttest scores, but the percentage of difference for the experimental group decreased while that of the control group increased.

The higher the score achieved, the more person or system oriented the group was perceived to be. The highest possible mean in the area of person orientation was 37.5.
Experimental Group

The experimental group pretest mean for the self reference group was 28.60, while the superior reference group mean score was 26.54, which was a difference of 2.96, or 7.2 per cent difference. The peers pretest mean score was 26.31, or 2.29 different from the self score or an 8.0 per cent difference.

The posttest mean score for the experimental self reference group decreased to 27.54, while the superiors mean score increased to 27.34 for a difference of .19, or .7 per cent difference. This difference decreased from 7.2 per cent to the pretest to only .7 per cent in the posttest. The peers mean score increased to 26.80 in the posttest for a difference of .74, or 2.7 per cent difference.

The mean scores also indicated that ones peers were his strongest critics.

These data indicated that the experimental group was perceived as having changed behavior in the area of Person Orientation as a result of the training program, while another interpretation suggested that those who participated in the program were better able to see themselves as others see them after having finished the program. This would seem to be a very important finding, for when one sees himself as others see him, he may become more effective in his role as first-line supervisor.
Control Group

The control group pretest mean for the self reference group was 28.43. The superiors pretest mean was 26.85, which is 1.57 lower than the self mean, or 5.5 per cent change. The pretest mean of the peers was 26.10, which is a difference of 2.33, or 8.2 per cent lower than the self mean.

The posttest mean score for the control self group increased to 28.54. The superiors mean score for the posttest was 26.35, which was lower than the self group mean by 2.18, or 7.7 per cent. Peers posttest mean score was 24.86, or 3.67 lower than that of the self group. This difference was 12.8 per cent lower.

The control group differences increased during the time of this study, while the experimental group differences decreased. This suggested that the training had a positive effect on the experimental group.

It was possible that something happened to the control group in their work environment during this period.

Changes in Self Perception in the Area of System Orientation

A comparison of how self descriptions differed from those of peers and superiors in the area of System Orientation is presented in Table 10.
### TABLE 10

**A COMPARISON OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST MEAN DIFFERENCES IN THE AREA OF SYSTEM ORIENTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimental Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>32.58</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>36.14</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>32.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest possible mean in the area of System Orientation was 45.8.

In the area of System Orientation at the time of the follow-up study the experimental group did not perceive themselves lower as they did in the area of Person Orientation. The experimental self group perceived a slight increase, but the superiors and peers perceived a greater increase.

In System Orientation as in Person Orientation, both the
experimental and control group self perceptions were higher than those of the peers.

**Experimental Group**

Pretest self descriptions of the experimental group, in the area of System Orientation, had a mean of 36.35. This was 3.77 higher than the 32.58 mean of the superior group or 10.4 per cent. The self group mean was 10.9 per cent higher, or 3.97, than the peer mean of 32.38.

The posttest mean for the experimental group increased to 36.58. The superiors mean increased to 33.75, which was 2.82 lower than that of the self group, or for a difference of 7.7 per cent. The mean of the peers was 33.68, or a difference of 2.90 which is 7.9 per cent lower than the self group.

These data suggested that the training program had a positive influence on the participants in the area of System Orientation and in helping the participants see themselves more as others do.

**Control Group**

The self pretest mean of the control group was 36.14, which was 2.55 higher than the superior mean of 33.58, or a 7.1 per cent difference. The peer mean of 32.58 was different by 3.55, or 9.8 per cent lower than the self mean.

The posttest self mean of the control group increased to 37.34, which was 3.74 higher than the superior mean score of 33.60, for a difference of 10.3 per cent as compared to the pretest
difference of 7.1 per cent. The peers posttest mean was 32.34, which was 5.00, or 13.4 per cent lower than the self group mean. This difference increased from 9.8 per cent in pretest to 13.4 per cent in the posttest.

The analysis of these data implied that positive results were achieved by the experimental group as a consequence of participating in the training program. The control group appeared to have negative results during this same period of time. It would be difficult to determine the reason for this.

In the next, and final chapter of this report, Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendation, there will be a restatement of the problem and procedures used in this study, as well as the conclusions reached, and the implications of the findings of the study for suggested changes in existing programs of courses, and also suggestions about further research.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

A major purpose of this inquiry was to study the perceived behavioral changes of first line supervisors who attended a two week Basic Management Program at a training center for a large Midwestern corporation. The perceptions of three reference groups were analyzed: the self, peers, and superiors. Further purposes of this study were to: 1) develop or to locate an instrument that would provide evidence of behavioral change in a two week training class; 2) utilize this instrument in an effort to determine if there were perceived behavioral changes in the conferees; and 3) utilize the data obtained to evaluate the classes, make recommendations for changes in existing programs, and to make recommendations for further research.

Procedures Used in this Study

After examining several possible instruments which might provide evidence of behavioral change in a two week training class, it was decided to utilize the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, form XII, usually called the LBDQ,XII which was developed by Stogdill at Ohio State University. This instrument was selected because it was mutually agreed by the doctoral committee, the researcher, and the directors of the training
program that the LBDQ,XII would allow measurement of perceived
behavioral change.

The LBDQ,XII has twelve subscales, each composed of either
five or ten items. The twelve subscales were analyzed in the
two areas of System Orientation and Person Orientation. Items
loading on System Orientation define perceived leader behavior
that responds to the needs of the System, while items loading on
Person Orientation define perceived leader behavior that responds
to the needs of the staff members.

The LBDQ,XII was administered as a pretest to twenty conferees
enrolled in a Basic Management Program and to twenty future
conferees who were to serve as a control group.

Three months after the completion of the training classes,
the LBDQ,XII was administered as a posttest to the conferees
enrolled in the class and to the control group. Due to transfers
and terminations, the number in each group had decreased to
seventeen at this time.

At the same times two peers and two supervisors of each
experimental and control group member filled out an LBDQ,XII
describing the man.

The data from the instrument were coded and key punched on
cards. The tests of statistical significance were done at the
Computer Center at Western Michigan University.

Data analysis followed and for convenience of reporting,
and in so far as was practicable, a tabular style was used with
discussions of the findings accompanying the presentations
of the data gathered for the study.

Summary

The summary of the findings related to the three hypotheses that were tested in this study are:

Based upon the statistical comparison of the experimental group, called the conferees, and the control group of future conferees, in the areas of System Orientation and Person Orientation, there was no reason to believe the two groups differed significantly before the training program.

Changes in the hypothesized direction three months after the training program were:

1. Conferees were perceived as being more Person Oriented by their peers.
2. Conferees were perceived as being more Person Oriented by their superiors.
3. Conferees were perceived as being more System Oriented by themselves.
4. Conferees were perceived as being more System Oriented by their peers.
5. Conferees were perceived as being more System Oriented by their superiors.

There were two changes in the opposite direction from that hypothesized in the study three months after the classes that did not reach the .05 level of statistical significance:

1. The conferees perceived themselves as being less Person Oriented.
2. All groups perceived the conferees as changing
more in System Orientation than in Person Orientation.

There were two changes in the opposite direction from that hypothesized three months after the classes ended that reached the .01 level of statistical significance:

1. Conferees perceived themselves as changing more in Person Orientation than in System Orientation, but this self perceived change was in the opposite direction from that hypothesized.

2. The conferees were perceived as changing more in System Orientation than in Person Orientation by their peers.

The following is a summary of relevant data that was not related to testing of the hypotheses:

1. The control group did not perceive themselves as changing in the area of Person Orientation.

2. Peers perceived the control group as being less Person Oriented at a statistically significant level.

3. Superiors perceived the control group as being less Person Oriented but not at a statistically significant level.

4. The control group perceived themselves as being more System Oriented but not at a statistically significant level.

5. Peers and supervisors did not perceive a change in the control group in the area of System Orientation.

6. The comparison of pre and posttest mean scores indicated that self descriptions for both the experimental and control groups were higher than those of their peers and superiors in both areas of Person and System Orientations.

In all cases the scores by the peers were the lowest, self scores the highest, with those of the superiors falling between self and peer scores.
A comparison of the differences indicated that the percentage of differences decreased for the experimental group and increased for the control group.

**Results of the Three Hypotheses**

Three hypotheses were tested to determine whether there was a significant relationship between perceived behavioral change and participation in a Basic Management Program. Pre and posttest scores were subjected to t tests to determine the statistical significance of perceived change in conferees as a result of participation in a two week Basic Management Program. The posttest was administered three months after the program to determine, if perceived changes did take place, and if changes did occur, were they lasting.

**Hypothesis One**

Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will be perceived as being more Person Oriented three months after the classes than before, as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.

Self perceived changes in the area of Person Orientation were in the opposite direction of that hypothesized. The perceived change was significant at the .10 level. This would seem to imply that the conferees were less Person Oriented as a result of the program, but peers and superiors perceived the conferees as being more Person Oriented three months after the program. The perceived change as observed by the peers was significant at the .25 level, and the change observed by superiors was significant at the .10 level. (See Table 2)
The posttest scores of the self group were lower than the pretest scores, but they were not lower than posttest scores of the peers and superiors, which would indicate that the self group perceived themselves more as others saw them, and the changes as perceived by the superiors and peers suggest that the conferees did become more Person Oriented as a result of the Basic Management Program.

Hypothesis Two

Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will be perceived as being more System Oriented three months after the classes than before, as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.

Self, peer, and superior groups perceived changes in the hypothesized direction. The self perceived change was significant at the .40 level. The change perceived by the peers and superiors were each significant at the .25 level. The self group perceived less of a change than did the peers and superiors, but again as in the area of Person Orientation, the self group posttest scores were higher than those of the peers and superiors. This would indicate that participation in a Basic Management Program would help conferees better see themselves as they are perceived by others.

All three reference groups perceived a change in System Orientation in a positive direction which would indicate that the change was a result of the Basic Management Program.

(See Table 5)
Hypothesis Three

Conferees enrolled in the Basic Management Program will show a greater change in Person Orientation than in System Orientation after the classes than before, as perceived by self, peers, and superiors.

Prior to the research of this study, the researcher observed a Basic Management Program in action, had discussions about the program with the conference leaders, course designers, and administrators at the training institute. The emphasis on Person Orientation led to Hypothesis Three.

Hypothesis Three must be rejected because more positive change was perceived by all three reference groups in the area of System Orientation than in the area of Person Orientation.

The self group change scores were statistically significant at the .01 level, but they were in the opposite direction than hypothesized since the self group perceived themselves as being less Person Oriented and more System Oriented three months after the program than before.

Peers did not perceive changes in a negative manner as did the self group, but the change scores were greater in the area of System Orientation than in the area of Person Orientation. Subjecting these change scores to a t test indicated statistical significance at the .01 level, with larger positive change in the area of System Orientation than in Person Orientation.

Superiors also perceived more change in the area of System Orientation than in the area of Person Orientation. The change observed by the superiors was significant at the .25 level.

(See Table 8)
These results would indicate that more positive perceived change would be observed in the area of System Orientation than Person Orientation.

The findings of this study indicated that changes in behavior did occur as a result of a Basic Management Program, and the perceived changes that were observed should make the conferees more capable of achieving goals of the organization.

Conclusions

In so far as the techniques employed in this study may be valid, the following conclusions seem justified:

1. The experimental group of seventeen first-line supervisors who were the subjects in this study did seem to be representative of other first-line supervisors in the corporation on the two dimensions studied: Person Orientation and System Orientation, therefore perceived changes observed in the experimental group, but not observed in the control group emphasized the relationship between these behavioral changes and participation in the Basic Management Program.

2. The Basic Management Program did have an effect on the perceived behavioral changes of first-line supervisors over the three month period studied. The conferees, or the experimental group, generally had positive perceived change, while the comparison group generally had negative or little change.

The experimental group of seventeen first-line supervisors, who were subjects in this study, viewed themselves as being
less Person Oriented at the end of the three month period than before. Although the difference was minimal, it was statistically significant at the .10 level. This would seem to indicate that the training program was responsible for the conferees perceiving themselves as becoming less Person Oriented, but their peers and superiors perceived them as being more Person Oriented at the end of the three month period, which would indicate that self perceptions were more in line with those of their peers and superiors at that time.

In all situations self descriptions were higher than descriptions by superiors, and the descriptions of the conferees by the superiors were always higher than those of the peers. A significant finding in the area of Person Orientation for the experimental group was that the difference between self, superior and peer descriptions was reduced at the end of the three month experimental period. This would indicate that the training program was responsible for the conferees becoming more Person Oriented as perceived by peers and superiors, and that the conferees perceived their Person Oriented behavior more as they are perceived by others. (See Table 9)

At the end of the three month experimental period the conferees perceived themselves as being more System Oriented but the self perceived increase was not as great as that of their superiors and peers. (See Table 5)

This would indicate behavioral change in the area of System Orientation as a result of the training program, and the
decreased difference between self perception and that change perceived by superiors and peers was also a result of the program whereby the conferees had improved self perception. (See Table 10)

Plant and Training Center Attitudes About Training

Discussions with managers, who selected subordinates to attend the Basic Management Program, led the researcher to the conclusion that the majority of these manager were primarily interested in a return on their investment for sending a man to the Basic Management Program. The return that the majority expected was in the area of increased productivity.

The following are some of the comments made by these managers:

"Teach him how to get eight hours of work out of each of the employees for eight hours of pay."

"Show them how to use the contract to our advantage."

"Keep the worker's nose to the grindstone."

"Teach him how to meet and beat production standards."

These comments tend to be a general opinion of the majority of the managers who select men to attend the training program.

The corporation involved in this study is results oriented with engineered standards for practically all operations. Data collection and analysis is as sophisticated and scientific as any progressive organization of this day. The manager of a production area that does not meet standards on a particular day expects a call from the corporate office by 10:00 A.M. the
following day to explain why production standards were not achieved. The manager of each production area has the previous day's production reports on his desk by 8:00 A.M. each morning and he demands explanations from his subordinates before he gets his call from the corporate office.

Top management of this corporation is also concerned with problem areas other than productivity, but the direct contact is much less frequent unless a specific area appears to be getting out of control.

The directors, conference leaders and program designers are aware of manager attitudes about what type of training is desired for participants, but the people at the training center believe that Person Oriented courses are as necessary as the System Oriented courses, therefore the Basic Management Program includes more Person Oriented time than the course outline indicates.

Suggestions for Additional Research

Industrial goal achievement is usually in the direction of increased profits. Therefore measurable criteria can be established and analyzed through statistical tests to determine if there is a significant relationship which would indicate that particular Person Orientation or System Orientation programs are more meaningful in accomplishing predetermined goals.

It has been hypothesized that System Orientation programs will lead to greater productivity, decreased waste, downtime,
and fewer customer complaints, while Person Orientation programs will lead to decreased absenteeism, grievances, quits, tardiness and transfers, but there is little scientific evidence to confirm these beliefs.

In addition to perceive behavioral changes, the previously mentioned criteria could be analyzed before and after participation in management development programs and these changes could be subjected to statistical tests of significance to determine if relationships do exist which may help accept or reject the hypotheses.

There appears to be little evidence to indicate that a "shotgun" approach to management training is justified for all environments. Analysis of the above criteria may lead to reduced time and costs of some programs, and at the same time the conferees could be getting education and training that would help them function more effectively in their predetermined type of environment. To train a man to be more Person Oriented, then send him back to function in a System Oriented work situation could lead to conflict, thus leading to unfavorable results.

Some managers may want to experiment with controlled environments and measurable criteria to determine the most meaningful results. Many managers desire quick meaningful results, but this type of research could lead to decisions that may appear to be those desired, but could eventually bring results that are just the opposite.
If Education and Training Directors believe that Person Oriented program are the best means to accomplish organizational goals, then it is the responsibility of the directors to see that the research is done to test their claims.

Suggestions for Redesigning Basic Management Programs

Goal achievement is one of the basic purposes of leadership. To this date there is little, if any, evidence which indicates that a particular style of leadership is most effective in all environments. Therefore each environment may have to be analyzed and a determination made as to what style of leadership is desired by the managers of a particular organization.

The Basic Management Program may have to become two or more separate programs, one dealing almost entirely with System Orientation courses or programs, another concentrating on Person Orientation programs, and others with some combination of the two.

System Orientation programs may have to be designed to yield: increased production, decreased waste, decreased downtime, and decreased customer complaints.

Person Orientation programs may concentrate on reducing absenteeism, grievances, quits, tardiness and transfers.

These above mentioned management problems are relatively easy to measure in the industrial environment of today. Therefore managers who select conferees to participate in programs can determine the areas of strength and weakness thus leading
to programs that are designed to meet the specific needs of his people.

There may be breakdowns in communication between training directors and managers who select conferees to participate in programs. Some managers may not want their people to be trained in certain areas because of the needs and environment of his organization.

The program designers may have to be more specific about the objectives of each segment of the total program. Some participants or conferees may be so Person Oriented that they neglect their responsibilities to the system. Others may be at the other extreme where their lack of Person Orientation may be detrimental to organizational goal achievement.

It appears that the environment is of prime importance, therefore education and training directors may have to design programs with this in mind. Then the management of the environment could determine what style of leadership they actually have, and what style they want.

Some managers may analyze the environment and determine that they would prefer to change from one type to the other. The results may indicate that the work situation is predominately System Oriented, and that the management believes that both the organization and the people could benefit by a change to a more Person Oriented environment. To make a quick radical change could lead to confusion, chaos and decreased productivity. A gradual, pre-planned change is more likely to lead to the
desired objectives.

**Final Summation**

The data analyzed in this study indicate that behavior did change, but during the three month period those perceived changes appeared to be relatively small. There was little statistical significance in the perceived behavioral changes, but since the majority of the perceived changes were in the desired direction, there may be practical significance.

The newly trained supervisors may realize that a "radical" change in their behavior may disrupt the environment. The subordinates of the supervisor who had just gained new supervisory knowledge, probably have a fair understanding of their supervisors behavior and these subordinates can predict much of this behavior. The supervisor may want to make gradual changes that will not upset the employees expectations.

It is possible that this supervisor's behavior may change as a result of participation in the Basic Management Program over a period of months and possibly years.

It is also possible that a Basic Management conferee could become involved in several additional programs where he could be a subject for research. This individual may be analyzed for behavioral change as a result of a following program, but much of the observed change may be due to the first program. The future researchers will have to do a careful job of analyzing the background of participants and control groups.
This study indicated that the conferees did change their behavior as a result of the Basic Management Program, but these seventeen supervisors returned to twelve environments. It is possible that one or more of the conferees returned to a work situation that was in conflict with his new knowledge, which could lead to frustration in achieving organizational goals.

Management is more of a science than an art, and success and growth in management depends on continual improvement and up-to-date knowledge of modern management. This continual growth appears to be the key to successful goal achievement, therefore it appears that more organizations will have to structure and make available education and training programs for all levels of management.
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BASIC MANAGEMENT
Institute Management Development Program

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE
The Basic Management program is designed to enable the new supervisor to do his job more effectively by better understanding WHAT his responsibilities are, WHY they are his responsibilities, and . . . through the acquisition of fundamental knowledge, skills, and techniques . . . HOW he can best carry out these responsibilities.

PROGRAM CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Registration and Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Job of First Line Management (Parts I, II and III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principles of Sound Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>History and Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Industrial Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Human Relations (Parts I, II, III and IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Functions in a Manufacturing Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Job Instruction (Parts I, II, III, IV, plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Presentation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Labor Relations (Parts I, II, III, IV and V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Roger Young&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;Lifer's Lament&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Controlling Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employee Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Methods Improvement (Parts I, II and III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAM CANDIDATES (Limited to 20 per group)

Designed primarily for the new first-line supervisor or the man who is about to be made a supervisor.
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

REGISTRATION AND ORIENTATION

This is the first contact the conferees have with each other and, in addition to general introductions, the group completes information and enrollment forms, is introduced to Institute facilities and views a movie, "Engineers in the Making" which gives them a representative view of the Institute and its functions.

JOB OF FIRST LINE MANAGEMENT

PART I.

The objective of this session is to introduce the conferee to:
- The duties, responsibilities and authority accompanying his job.
- The functions of Planning, Organizing, Directing and Controlling.
- The qualities of successful leadership.

PART II.

In this session, the primary goal is to increase the first-line manager's knowledge and understanding of his role in attaining management's objectives of Quality, Quantity and Economy.

PART III.

Here the aim is to tie up all of the information previously presented relative to the job of first-line management. This is done through use of problem situation requiring key management decisions. Group members are divided into three teams for the purpose of examining the problem from three distinct angles.

PRINCIPLES OF SOUND ORGANIZATION

The need for effective management is seen in relation to the growth of business; that the need for specialists has grown as business has expanded, and that only the well-managed organization can survive.

HISTORY AND ORGANIZATION

Salient points of the history from the early beginnings to the present time are presented, together with a discussion of the thinking behind the organizational structure of the Corporation.
INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS

Management decisions are viewed here in terms of supply and demand situations for long-term benefits, as opposed to primary considerations of Gross National Product, government spending, and related indicators of economic activity for short-run decisions.

HUMAN RELATIONS

PART I.

The need for effective human relations is established with the realization that, though people differ in many ways, they have one thing in common—work. It is pointed out that, since people do the job and the supervisor's responsibility is to get the job done, effective human relations is necessary.

PART II.

The second session in human relations is concerned with the factors which influence human behavior, the ways in which these factors affect job performance, and how the job should be a means for accomplishing the objectives of both the worker and the supervisor. The idea is advanced that a successful human relations approach requires that each man be treated as a thinking, feeling individual.

PART III.

The things first-line supervision can do to prevent sources of conflict by satisfying the influencing forces that affect job performance are discussed in relation to:

--the job itself
--the knowledge and skill of the supervisor
--the treatment of the individual

PART IV.

Some commonsense principles of human relations are presented in this session. These are then used as basis for analysis of actual shop problems posed to the group.

COMMUNICATIONS

The three hours in Communications are designed to help the supervisor understand:

--the process of communication
--why effective communication is important
the common barriers to effective communication
methods for improving communications

Includes a lecture-discussion approach to in-plant communication situations, video-tape playback of a conference on plant communication problems as presented by the conferees.

FUNCTIONS IN A MANUFACTURING ORGANIZATION

Helping the first-line supervisor to increase his understanding of the various specialized functions present in a manufacturing organization and the nature of their relationship, is accomplished through team study and present assignments on each of the primary manufacturing functions. Assignments are based on experience and/or according to any particular interests in a given function.

PROBLEM SOLVING

An approach to the systematic study of typical supervisory problems, with an explanation of the "brainstorming" technique, is the main consideration of this unit.

INDUCTION

This session is designed to develop an awareness of the importance of properly introducing the new or transferred employee to his new job situation. Effective methods of accomplishing this are discussed.

SAFETY

In addition to the preparation of safety talks based on a pattern outlined for the conferees, the "Seven Basic Principles of Safety" are stressed.

JOB INSTRUCTION

PART I.

The objective in this session is to motivate each conferee to improve the effectiveness of job training in his area of operation. This is accomplished through the utilization of a case study which emphasizes the need for job training of the problems that can arise from improperly trained individuals, whether foreman or hourly rate employees.

PART II.

In order to appreciate what happens in the training process, the several factors that affect the learning process are introduced, with particular emphasis on individual Differences, Motivation and Emotion. Each of these is illustrated to dramatize their importance.
PART III.

The conferees are told that no haphazard method of job training can be successful. A pattern or specific approach that can be applied as a practical and effective training technique is presented for their consideration. Use of a job training film, "Instructing the Worker on the Job" serves as emphasis.

PART IV.

Understanding the importance of a Job Requirement Chart in determining what each trainee needs to be taught is accomplished by the following formula:

"Job Requirements Minus what the Trainee knows of the Requirements Equals what the Trainee needs to be Taught."

TEAM PRESENTATIONS

The final four hours of Job Instruction are concerned with skill development. Teams of 4 to 5 men each instruct an individual or group on how to do a particular job. At the end of each 20 to 30 minute presentation, a critique of that presentation takes place by the other conferees concerning both the positive and negative aspects.

LABOR RELATIONS

PART I.

This session is primarily concerned with the philosophy underlying labor-management relations. Consideration of rights and responsibilities of the Union and Corporation are examined, along with the importance of Local Agreements in Labor Relations.

PART II.

The second part of Labor Relations is given over to a discussion of discipline as understood within Labor Relations principles in general, including kinds of offenses, are discussed, with primary attention on the Doctrine of Corrective Discipline.

PART III.

In this session, the Grievance Procedure is of primary concern. Emphasis is placed on Step One with Paragraphs 28, 29 and 30 discussed in detail.
PART IV.

The first two hours of this unit are devoted to a study assignment concerned with the foreman working, foreman's role in strikes and stoppages, and the foreman's relationship with the committeeman. Use of umpires' decisions comprise the material covered in the study assignment. The second two hours are primarily concerned with the results of the assignment, as they relate to the foreman's role in operating under the terms of the Agreement.

PART V.

The last session in Labor Relations offers an opportunity for each conferee to bring a specific labor relations situation before the group for discussion and analysis. Umpire cases covering some of the more common problems the foremen face are used as source material.

CASE STUDIES

"Roger Young"
A situation concerning the problems that arise from the promotion of a man with limited experience on the job, but with a strong educational background and good work record.

"Lifter's Lament"
An "Incident Process" approach based on Umpire Decision G-95. The conferees, acting as the umpire, ask questions in order to arrive at a solution to the case. The importance of getting the facts in order to make valid judgments is emphasized.

CONTROLLING COSTS

In this session, the supervisor looks at the budget and cost phase of his job. Particular interest is paid to the areas of Direct Labor, Direct Material, Super Burden and other manufacturing expense accounts over which the manager has the greatest direct control. Specific attention is centered on the 3000, 5000, and 7000 accounts.

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT

The value of improving employees on their present jobs and preparing them for advancement to positions of greater responsibility within the organization is emphasized. Importance is placed on the realization that such development is best accomplished on the job. A sound film, "Eye of the Beholder" is shown in conjunction with this session.
METHODS IMPROVEMENT

PART I.

The term "Methods" is defined in this unit, along with a discussion of why methods is essential to the continued success of any business. Stressed particularly is Paragraph (101 a) of the Agreement. Exercises designed to develop preliminary skill in observation and retention are included in this session.

PART II.

Primary emphasis here is placed on developing the ability to observe and evaluate improvement possibilities in the field of worker movements. This is accomplished by a simple assembly operation involving the use of a pegboard.

PART III.

In the concluding session on Methods Improvement, various methods "tools" are used to select to detect improvement possibilities in the field of material moves. The development of Flow Charts and Process Charts become two of these "tools" for the conferee. It is pointed out that material moves account for a major part of the total work as expressed in terms of time and cost. A film, "We Sell Our Time," is used to illustrate the basic principles involved in the establishment of reliable work standards.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

At the close of the Basic Management Program, each conferee is requested to answer several questions in writing concerning the following:

- what he felt the program offered him most as an individual
- what could be done to strengthen a session or sessions
- an overall evaluation of the program

This information represents a significant contribution to the maintenance of quality in the program because of the influence it has on subsequent changes that may result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mon.</th>
<th>Tues.</th>
<th>Wed.</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Registration and Orientation Film: &quot;Engineers in the Making&quot;</td>
<td>HISTORY ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>Human Relations Part III Film: &quot;Inner Man Steps Out&quot;</td>
<td>Functions In a Manufacturing Organization: Assignment</td>
<td>Functions In a Manufacturing Organization: Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Job of First Line Management Part I</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL ECONOMICS</td>
<td>Human Relations Part IV</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Job Instruction Part I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Induction Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:30</td>
<td>Job of First Line Management Part II</td>
<td>-- Human Relations --</td>
<td>-- Communications --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Job of First Line Management Part II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job Instruction Part II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Principles of Sound Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Job of First Line Management Part III</td>
<td>Case Study &quot;Roger Young&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Labor Relations Part I</td>
<td>Labor Relations Part II</td>
<td>Employed Development</td>
<td>Job Instruction:</td>
<td>Job of First Line Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Labor Relations Part II</td>
<td>Case Study: &quot;Lifter's Lament&quot;</td>
<td>Methods Improvement Part I</td>
<td>Team Presentations</td>
<td>Part III Team Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Labor Relations Part II</td>
<td>Labor Relations Part V</td>
<td>Methods Improvement Part II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Study Assignment</td>
<td>Controlling Costs</td>
<td>Job Instruction Part IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Umpire Cases Part IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case Study:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Lifter's Lament&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>