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This study was designed to determine whether participation in an eight hour training program based on Adlerian theoretical principles would influence managerial attitudes. The effects of the training curriculum on three attitudinal dimensions were investigated: leadership style, acceptance of self and others and level of dogmatism. It was hypothesized that Adlerian training would increase the development of managerial human relations competence.

Eighty-one managers participated in the study. The experimental group, comprised of 40 line managers, received eight hours of Adlerian training conducted in two one-half day sessions. The training was both didactic and experiential in content and contained modules on lifestyles/management styles, conflict resolution, effective communication strategies and understanding personality dynamics. The control group, comprised of 41 managers, did not receive training but participated in the pre-testing and post-testing process.

Managers completed *The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire*, *The Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire*, and *The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale*, prior to the first training session and again two weeks after the final training session.
A one-way analysis of covariance revealed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups on both the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. This suggests that managers in the experimental group demonstrated a more participative and less authoritarian management style two weeks after training was completed. No significant differences were found between the two groups on managers' level of dogmatism or acceptance of self and others.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Industrial organizations are becoming increasingly concerned with the interpersonal relations of their employees. Businesses are anxious to reduce conflict and to promote cooperative and compatible work relationships and are continually implementing programs and policies that can be used to promote greater work satisfaction. Evidence of such concerns can be seen in the management training literature which has given considerable attention to the problems of human relations in business (Alpander, 1986; Fleishman, 1953; Lawler, 1985;). Industry wants supervisors to be able to understand and implement techniques which will enable them to develop and sustain cooperative, mutually satisfying relationships. Implicit in these practices is the assumption that such relationships will result in increased job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness (Fleishman, 1953; Lawler, 1985). To address these interpersonal and human relations concerns, managerial training and development programs have been widely implemented in most private and public organizations. Lawler (1985) noted the tremendous growth in the number of training seminars offered each year. According to Lee (1988), American corporations spend in excess of 39.6 billion dollars annually on training and development.
billion dollars annually on training and development.

The social sciences have contributed to the content and focus of management training and development, and several theories of human behavior have been successfully used as the basis of managerial training programs. The successful integration of the social sciences into management training strongly suggests that trained counselors can greatly impact business and industrial settings particularly in the area of training and development. Smith and Walz (1984) noted that training and development activities often focus on topics (e.g. communication, conflict resolution) that naturally align with a counselor's expertise. Cross (1981) noted that basic principles of human learning counselors use in therapeutic settings can be modified to facilitate the adult learning process in industrial training settings.

Since industry exists to produce a profit, industrial managers often fail to recognize the counselor's utility to the corporate structure. Many managers view counseling and similar activities as unrelated to real world problems and bottom line profits (Osipow, 1982) and fail to see the counselor's role in generating profits and performance. However, documentation in the literature indicates that a manager's lack of success is not related to technical incompetence but to the inability to relate interpersonally with subordinates (Odlorne, 1987; Blake and Mouton, 1980). Osipow (1982) indicated that counselors can assist organizations in terms of profit statements and productivity
in areas such as selection, training, health and personnel development all of which directly contribute to efficiency.

The recognition of the importance of both the social sciences and the counseling profession to industrial settings offers opportunities for counselors to utilize their skill, insights into human behavior and theoretical knowledge. One particular way counselors can integrate their theoretical and instructional expertise is to design managerial training programs focusing on developing and maintaining effective interpersonal skills. Several programs using theories of counseling as models of intervention have previously been developed. Programs based on a Rational Emotive approach (Spillane, 1982), Gestalt Psychology (Clark, 1988b), Social Learning Theory (Burnaska, 1976; Byham, Adams, & Kiggins, 1976; Goldstein & Sorcher, 1974; Mahar, 1981; Decker, 1982) and Personal Constructs Theory (Beck, 1988) all have been used successfully to influence managerial attitudes and performance.

Although various psychological approaches have been applied to the training and development of managers, no research was found which utilized principles of Individual Psychology as a training model. Individual Psychology, a humanistic, interpersonal theory of human behavior developed by Alfred Adler, has been used in a variety of settings to promote more democratic and cooperative attitudes among people. Adlerian theory has been the focus of extensive parent and teacher effectiveness training which resulted in
positive attitude and behavioral changes among participants. Kibler, Rush and Sweeney (1985) found a positive correlation between Adlerian course participation and stability of attitude change.

A large body of literature exists that demonstrates the efficacy of Adlerian theory in the classroom situation. Teachers trained in Adlerian methods exhibited more democracy in the classroom (Corsini, 1977), fostered more creativity and learning among students (Speikermann, 1985), and maintained a more cooperative, disciplined and encouraging environment than teachers trained in traditional teaching methods (Clark, 1988a; Dinkmeyer & Carlson, 1983; Dinkmeyer & Dreikurs, 1973; Dinkmeyer & Mckay, 1980; Dreikurs, Grunwald & Pepper 1971; Seese, 1978; Soltz, 1971; Speikermann, 1985; Wheeler, 1988).

The literature also supports the successful application of Adlerian methods in parent education. Parents trained in Adlerian methods developed improved communication, discipline and relationships skills (Dreikurs & Grey, 1968; Nystul, 1982; Schultz & Nystul, 1980) and demonstrated a more democratic and respectful attitude toward their children (Berrett, 1975; Dinkmeyer & Mckay, 1989; Dreikurs, 1964; Freeman, 1975; Popkin, 1987).

Because Adlerian methods have proven beneficial to parents and teachers in developing interpersonal and relationship competence, it seemed possible Adlerian theory could make a contribution to management education and offer
some solutions to the weaknesses cited in the training and development literature. Documentation in the literature has indicated strong deficits in the theory and practice of management training. Campbell (1971) stated, "the training development literature is voluminous, nonempirical, nontheoretical, poorly written and dull" (p. 565). Goldstein's (1980) review indicated that the vast majority of the management training literature is not empirical or theoretically based. Similarly, an extensive review of the supervisory training literature revealed a critical need for training in developing both upward and lateral relationships, yet no programs were found addressing these elements (Kerr, Hill, & Broedling, 1986).

Lawler (1985) noted that high involvement work organizations are typically built around work teams which require the utilization of interpersonal skills. Yet, most work team members do not receive interpersonal skills training. "The need is particularly severe in the case of managers because the interpersonal skills they need (e.g. group facilitation, counseling, participative goal setting) are not ones that are usually taught in traditional management training programs" (Lawler, 1985, p. 19). Knowles (1958) noted that when managers demonstrate skill in interpersonal competence, noticeable gains in their performance can be recognized.

The existing deficits indicated in the training and development literature appear to be areas that Individual
Psychology's theoretical foundation and emphasis on interpersonal and human relations could effectively address. A management training program using Adlerian theoretical principles seems to be a viable program for providing managers with the human relations skills necessary to enhance interpersonal relationships and managerial performance.

Statement of the Problem

Although Adlerian methods have proven effective in promoting more democratic, cooperative and responsible attitudes in parent, family and classroom settings, no studies were found which examined the application of Adlerian methods to management training in organizations. An Adlerian training program for managers, therefore, appeared to warrant investigation as to its efficacy in management education and development.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the attitudinal changes that occurred as a result of participation in an Adlerian management training program. Of particular significance were attitude changes in the areas of leadership style, acceptance of self and others and level of dogmatism.

Synthesis of Related Literature

The literature related to this study is presented in two sections: 1) Adlerian Theory and 2) Management Training in Human Relations. The Adlerian constructs of social interest, lifestyle, democracy and encouragement are
particularly emphasized because these constructs are considered to be influential in the development of human relations competence and constitute the contents of the management training program curriculum.

Adlerian Theory

According to Manaster & Corsini (1982), Individual Psychology:

is a holistic, phenomenological teleological, field theoretical and socially oriented approach to psychology and related fields. This approach is based on the assumption of the uniqueness of self-consistency, activity, and creativity of the human individual (style of life); an open dynamic system of motivation (striving for subjectively conceived goals of success); and an innate potentiality for social life (social interest). (p. 2)

The following propositions (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, p. 1) provide a summary of the theory of Individual Psychology:

1. There is one basic dynamic force behind all human activity, a striving from a felt minus to a felt plus position. Individuals strive to overcome inferiority feelings and achieve a feeling of superiority.

2. The striving receives its direction from the individual's unique goal or self-ideal, which though influenced by biological and environmental factors is ultimately the creation of the individual.
3. The goal is largely unknown to the individual and largely not understood. The unknown aspects of the goal are Adler's definition of the unconscious.
4. The goal becomes the final cause; the motivating force underlying behavior.
5. The life-style is a self-consistent personality structure that becomes firmly established at an early age. It characterizes how a person consistently thinks and behaves.
6. All objective determiners, such as biological factors or environmental influences, become relative to the goal idea. They do not function as direct causes but provide probabilities only. The individual uses all objective factors in accord with his life style.
7. All important life problems, including certain drive satisfactions, become social problems. All values become social values.
8. The socialization of the individual is not achieved at the cost of repression, but is afforded through an innate human ability, which, however, needs to be developed. It is this ability which Adler calls social feeling or social interest. Because the individual is embedded in a social situation, social interest becomes crucial for his adjustment.
9. Maladjustment is characterized by increased inferiority feelings, underdeveloped social interest
and an exaggerated, uncooperative goal of personal superiority. Accordingly, problems are solved in a self-centered "private sense" rather than in accord with "common sense" or a view others can share.

Manaster and Corsini (1982) noted that the Adlerian position is both encouraging and optimistic in that it views the human condition as one that encompasses choice. According to Individual Psychology, individuals are not mechanismistically driven but choose a life course based on their subjective perceptions of their experience. "Heredity and environment may provide some possibilities and limits, but what the individual ultimately becomes within these limits is a function of the individual's creative self" (Manaster & Corsini, 1982, p. 12). Adlerian theory posits that all individuals are creative in the sense that they have within their capacity the ability to make choices. Adlerian theory views individuals as rational, decision-making beings who have the capability to develop their potential and become productive, socially useful members of society.

Adlerian theory will now be examined in a larger context. The focus will be particularly on those constructs applicable to the training and development of managers.

Social Interest

A leading idea of Individual Psychology is found in Adler's recognition of the importance of human society. To emphasize the importance of human relations, Adler made such
"deliberate overstatements as equating reality with society: Reality, that is society, the community" (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, p. 133). Consequently, Individual Psychology is essentially a social psychology. Rather than consider individuals in an isolated or static situation, the theory views them in light of their actions and of the reactions of society. "Social interest is some kind of conscious and preeminent motive structure oriented toward universal welfare" (Bickhard & Ford, 1976, p. 29).

An axiom of Individual Psychology is what Adler called the law of absolute truth (Ellenberger, 1970), a fictional norm set for the conduct of the individual that consists of an optimal balance between the requirements of the community and those of the individual. According to Adler, "the individual who conforms to that ideal stands in absolute truth, meaning that he conforms to the logic of life in society and, as it were, to the rule of the game" (Ellenberger, 1970, p. 610). According to Adlerian theory, social interest is a criterion for mental health, and an individual's level of adjustment can be measured in terms of the social interest displayed in daily living.

The term social interest denotes the innate aptitude that enables individuals to become responsive to reality, which for Adler is the social situation. Traits expressive of social interest include friendliness, empathy, cooperation, sharing, compromising, helping and having faith in others (Kaplan, 1986). Dinkmeyer, Dinkmeyer and Sperry's
(1987) definition of social interest as the willingness to contribute to the common good has been widely accepted and proliferates the Adlerian literature. Another widely accepted definition has been provided by Ansbacher (1977) who defined social interest as an "interest in the interests of others" (p. 57).

Adler (1954) wrote:

No human being ever appeared except in a community of human beings. This is very easily explained. The whole animal kingdom demonstrates the fundamental law that species whose members are incapable of facing the battle for self-preservation gather new strength through herd life. (p. 35)

Human existence has always required cooperation and the serious consideration of the interests of others. Adler emphasized the importance of not allowing one's own interests to become isolated and at variance with the interests of others. Edgar (1975) noted that "healthy people are those who are able to cooperate with others, to consider the interests of others and who behave in ways that have usefulness to people in general; in ways that have general validity" (p. 21). Adlerian theory maintains that it is within the power of every person to live in a cooperative and socially useful way.

Adler (1954) maintained that the human community sets three life tasks for every individual. They are work, which
involves making a contribution to society through occupation; friendship, which embraces social relationships; and love, which is an intimate connection with a member of the opposite sex. Lowe (1989) redefined the life tasks in a more contemporary context. He used the term productivity rather than work to denote the contributions individuals can make to themselves and society without the necessity of monetary compensation. He redefined the love task as securing intimate relationships and redefined the friendship task as an individual's attitudes and beliefs about the larger social context. Dreikurs (1950) noted that the level of social interest that individuals display is a factor which influences their ability to fulfill the life tasks. He noted that the vast majority of human suffering results from failure to demonstrate social interest toward others. "The better this is developed and the happier the relationship between the individual and the human community, the more successfully does he fulfill the three life tasks, and the better balanced his character and personality appear" (Dreikurs, 1950, p. 5).

Work or productivity is considered to be the most fundamental of the life tasks (Dreikurs, 1950; Sweeney, 1981). The first reason for maintaining the importance of work is it offers individuals who have not developed the courage to be friendly or intimate the opportunity to contribute to the community. A second rationale for proposing that work is the most basic life task is that "in
our society there is no single situation which is potentially so capable of giving some satisfaction at all (Maslovian) levels of basic needs as is the occupation" (Roe, 1956, p. 31). A third reason for asserting the primacy of work is that it is connected so closely with health. Palmore (1969) noted that work satisfaction is the most significant predictor of longevity.

According to Adlerian theory, individuals with social interest view work as an opportunity to contribute to the welfare of others. By contributing to society through work, individuals "embed themselves in webs of significance which extend them beyond egocentric limits" (Sweeney, 1981, p. 80). Individuals who extend themselves into the community perceive work as an opportunity to assert themselves, enhance their self-esteem and express their personalities through productive action (Sweeney, 1981).

The focus of this study will be on the life task of work. The concept of social interest and the primacy of work as a life task are necessary and essential elements in organizational and management effectiveness. Since social interest is a trait that can be developed through education (Edgar, 1986; Shoenaker, 1985), it is assumed that managers can be trained to cooperate and develop an interest in members of their work group.

Research supports the idea that cooperation promotes productivity (Laughlin, 1978). In a meta-analysis of over 100 studies, Johnson, Maruyama, Hohnson, Nelson, and
Skon (1981) found that cooperation induced higher productivity than either competition or individual effort. Cooperation was also found to encourage mutual support and positive feedback and build employee self-esteem (Argyris, 1970; Coopersmith, 1967). Johnson et al. (1981) noted that cooperation repeatedly has been found to strengthen work relationships, build morale, increase productivity and create a balance between fulfilling both individual and organizational needs.

The finding that cooperation enhances interpersonal relations and promotes productivity has implications for leadership. Tjosvold (1984) revealed that employees with cooperative leaders were more satisfied with their jobs, perceived their leader as helpful and contributing to their job performance and remained on the job longer than individuals with competitive or individualistic leaders. Tjolvold (1984) pointed out that organizational members rely on each other and that training programs need to be developed to teach skills in cooperation and helping behavior.

**Lifestyle**

Individual Psychology views the lifestyle as a series of conclusions that individuals have about themselves, the world, how to interact with others and what behaviors will succeed. The lifestyle denotes a person's philosophy of life or life course. It is a series of working hypotheses about life that guide an individual's consistent pattern of
thinking, feeling and behaving (Manaster & Corsini, 1982).

Adler maintained that the central issue for all people at the philosophical level is achieving significance and belonging in their social context. Since the family is the first context to which a child aspires to belong, the lifestyle develops based on the child's perceptions of what he or she needs to do to secure a place of importance in the family. Lifestyle, therefore, denotes the way individuals see themselves and view life (Dinkmeyer, Dinkmeyer & Sperry, 1987).

Individual Psychology views an individual's actions as teleological; directed toward purposes and goals. An individual's goals form the basis of the personality. Immediate goals are the individual's means of finding a place in society. Individuals are typically unaware of their basic concepts though their actions are always consistent with the goals they have set. It usually is not difficult to recognize the goals of a person since an individual's actions are aligned with their goals. Knowledge of the goal provides an indication of a person's personality (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956).

According to Individual Psychology, by the time individuals are approximately five years old, their lifestyle convictions are usually fixed. People usually find it difficult to extricate themselves from the patterns and perceptions they have formed during the first years of life, although life changing experiences and psychological
or educational interventions can be influential in changing lifestyle patterns and perceptions (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956).

Individual Psychology's goal-oriented view of behavior may be of special significance in understanding organizational behavior and has relevance to first line supervisory training. Knowledge of lifestyle is beneficial in helping managers understand how their personality influences their interactions with subordinates which, in turn, influences productivity. For example, managers with a controller lifestyle may try to exercise authority and fail to promote democracy in the workplace. Harrison (1987) noted that when employees feel controlled, they withdraw their commitment to the organization. Since first line supervisors work most closely with employees, they have the most substantial influence over employee performance.

Schoenwald and Kopp (1986) discussed how the controller lifestyle influences a manager's work and proposed a controller/organizer type to illustrate the constructive and nonconstructive expression of the typology at the workplace. The controller/organizer's goal is to achieve significance by creating and sustaining order. A manager who attempts to achieve this goal through autocratic controls characterizes the controller while the organizer describes striving through cooperation. The controller may use authoritarian behaviors in an effort to achieve superiority in relation to others. The organizer's approach involves making a
contribution through neatness, punctuality and efficiency (Schoenwald & Kopp, 1986).

Mintzberg (1975) noted that a supervisor's job consists of eight role functions which can be grouped into three clusters: conceptual/decision roles, interpersonal roles and technical roles. A manager's lifestyle influences the strategy chosen to fulfill these roles. The controller lifestyle will be used as an illustration.

In the decision maker role, the controller attempts to use decision making as a way to exercise authority over subordinates (Schoenwald & Kopp, 1986). The organizer, in contrast, seeks participation from subordinates to facilitate rather than impose decisions that will benefit both the individual and the organization.

Interpersonally, the controller often fails to demonstrate human relations skills. The controller espouses a Theory X style of management (McGregor, 1960), which assumes that employees will not produce unless coerced. The controller assumes an autocratic position and seeks obedience. The organizer, on the other hand, attempts to gain employee commitment through motivation. Motivation is accomplished through a participative style which encourages employee involvement. Stimulation from within rather than pressure from without is utilized (Dreikurs, 1957).

As a communicator, the controller lectures, demands and dictates to gain employee compliance (Schoenwald & Kopp, 1986). One-way communication is used thus discouraging
employee involvement or input. The organizer uses the communicator role to convey goals and objectives and to encourage employee participation. Two-way communication is used to demonstrate respect for employees.

The controller uses the technical role of trainer to impose rigid rules and procedures (Schoenwald & Kopp, 1986), while the organizer views the process of training as an opportunity to help employees increase their level of competence so they can work independently.

Managers with an understanding of lifestyle may be better able to maximize their positive potential since they are aware of the strengths and vulnerabilities of their style. Managers can maximize their effectiveness by capitalizing on the strengths inherent in their own style and modifying those characteristics that may interfere with successful managerial performance.

Democracy

Adler was considered a man ahead of his time (Hall & Lindzey, 1978) and was one of the first to espouse the notions of democracy, equality and reciprocity. Adler suggested that "anything other than true human social equality presents an unstable situation" (Pew, 1971, p. 36). Pew (1971) noted that "one solution to the crisis of authority is to teach people an alternative to autocracy without abdication of leadership" (p. 36). The option is to move from autocracy to equality with participative and democratic leadership.
Democracy, according to Individual Psychology, is a way of life. The underlying principles of democracy involve social equality, relationships based on trust and mutual respect, human dignity and a sense of connectedness. Dreikurs (1964) noted that autocratic methods have become obsolete due, in large part, to the impact of democracy.

The concept of democracy has implications for management training. Evidence exists in the literature supporting the benefits of a democratic organizational climate (Likert, 1961) and a participative management style (McGregor, 1960).

The primary benefits of such a climate include improved productivity and increased job satisfaction among employees. Fleishman and Harris (1962) noted that leadership behavior characterized by an autocratic orientation with a low concern for interpersonal relationships was related to high turnover, absenteeism, union grievances and reduced satisfaction.

Lawler (1985) noted that today's workforce is much better educated than its predecessors. Data support the idea that better educated workers want to provide input into workplace decisions (Lawler, Renwick & Bullock, 1981) and have different preferences and expectations with regard to work.

Traditional bureaucratic organizations assume that power and decision-making rest solely with those at the higher level of the organization. Individuals functioning
in these jobs are expected to control and organize the work of others. The result of such a structure is counterproductive in a society which has highly educated employees. Given that education increases individuals' desire for control, influence and skill utilization (Lawler, 1985), people who are restricted from using their skills and decision-making capacities will experience dissatisfaction. As a result of this dissatisfaction, employee turnover and/or absenteeism may increase.

A democratic management style characterized by increased employee involvement, more interesting and challenging jobs and more employee control over day-to-day work activities is needed to be congruent with today's workforce (Hackman & Suttle, 1977; Lawler, 1985). A participative paradigm appears to offer a solution to the incongruence between a knowledge-based workforce and an autocratic management and organizational style. A participative organization characterized by employees who are highly involved, a climate of trust and open communication and consensus decision-making is desirable for attracting and retaining qualified individuals.

Encouragement

Encouragement is a leading construct in Adlerian theory. Adlerian writings have emphasized the importance of encouragement in facilitating both personal and professional growth. According to Dinkmeyer and McKay (1989), encouragement is focusing on individuals' strengths and
assets rather than on mistakes. It differs from praise in that encouragement recognizes effort displayed rather than focusing solely on the finished product. Encouragement involves a kind of non-verbal attitude, which is communicated to people in an atmosphere of respect and assurance of their value and competence.

Encouragement is used specifically to help discouraged individuals who feel inferior to others regain a sense of self-confidence (Losoncy, 1977). According to Adlerian theory, encouragement is one of the primary approaches for mobilizing people. It conveys positive expectations which, in turn, help people feel good about themselves and their abilities.

Encouragement is aimed at helping people experience feelings of independence and adequacy, and is best achieved when people participate in activities and tasks that they can achieve. Successful experiences help people realistically evaluate their capabilities and motivates them to participate in more activities that they consider meaningful. Encouragement attempts to teach people to accept themselves. In autocratic environments people often evaluate themselves based on external rewards and punishments. In democratic settings, encouragement can be used to inspire intrinsic motivation.

Encouragement can be a useful tool for managers to influence employee work performance and to foster motivation, yet many managers fail to encourage employees.
Instead, they focus on employees' mistakes and rarely recognize when employees are performing well. As a result, employees may become discouraged and lack self-confidence. Losoncy (1977), in recognizing the impact of the self-fulfilling prophecy, noted that one important way to encourage people is to communicate confidence in them. Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy or pygmalion effect (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968) has concluded that one person's expectations can influence another's behavior. Livingston (1988) noted that if managers communicate high expectations to employees, productivity is likely to be high. If their expectations are low, productivity is likely to be poor. The way managers treat their employees is indicative of what they expect of them. Superior managers are those who create high performance expectations that promote employee confidence and appreciation of their worth. Less effective managers fail to develop positive expectations, and as a result foster discouragement and low productivity levels. Livingston (1988) stated, "the difference between employees who perform well and those who perform poorly is not how they are paid but how they are treated" (p. 125).

Management Training in Human Relations

Despite the fact that interpersonal effectiveness is crucial to an individual's career success and that a workforce of people skilled in human relations can enhance overall corporate health, few people enter the workforce with interpersonal relationship skills. Macher (1986) noted
that training in human relations could offer a solution to the problem of interpersonal ineffectiveness in organizations. The widespread application of training in managerial effectiveness is well recognized, and several studies support the effectiveness of management training in human relations skills.

Burke and Day (1986) in a meta-analysis of 70 studies on the effectiveness of management training and development, evaluated the relative effectiveness of managerial training. Four criterion-measure categories were used: subjective learning, which included measures that assessed principles, attitudes and skills learned as a result of training as communicated in statements of opinion, attitude or judgment; objective learning, which included measures that assessed principles, facts and skills learned as a result of training by objective means such as number of errors made; subjective behavior which evaluated changes in on-the-job behavior as perceived by trainees, supervisors or co-workers; and objective results which measured tangible results such as reduced costs. Burke et. al (1986) found that most management training in organizations is devoted to improving job performance in the following content areas: human relations, self-awareness, problem-solving and decision-making, motivation and general management.

In the area of subjective learning, the study indicated that organizations can be fairly confident that human relations training will be effective in improving trainees'
subjective learning. The findings for the objective learning criteria indicated negative results for all content areas with the exception of motivation and values training. Managerial training for change in motivation and values was found to produce changes as measured by objective learning criteria. The results for managerial training content that used subjective behavior criteria indicated that both human relations and self-awareness training was effective in changing managerial behavior on the job. Studies using objective results criteria indicated that human relations training was found to be very effective and likely to produce some improvement in managerial performance. The overall results of the meta-analysis indicated that management training is moderately effective in improving learning and job performance. Hunter and Schmidt (1983) noted that even small effects have been shown to lead to a substantial economic impact on an organization, which further supports the utility of a training and development effort.

In a study conducted to determine the effects of a human relations training program on managerial effectiveness, Hand and Slocum (1972) reported positive training results. Subjects included an experimental and control group of 42 line and staff managers in a specialty steel plant. Training was administered which comprised weekly 90-minute training sessions conducted for 28 weeks. Topics included leadership style and theories of motivation.
More than 60% of training time was devoted to exercises in group dynamics. The results of the training indicated that managers developed a more positive attitude toward the human relations aspects of their work. Participants became more aware of themselves, were more sensitive to subordinates' feelings, demonstrated respect for subordinates' ideas and were more oriented toward developing positive relationships with employees 18 months after training. Results also indicated that subordinates of managers in the experimental group perceived their managers as demonstrating improved two-way communication skill.

Hand, Richards and Slocum (1973) noted that organizational climate has a significant effect on a manager's performance, job satisfaction and leadership style. Managers who perceive their organizational climate as participative and encouraging were typically more satisfied and had better job performance than managers who perceived their organization as lacking in encouragement and support. The purpose of their study was to determine the effectiveness of a human relations training program while controlling for the possible effects of organizational climate. A major proposition of the study was that participative managers who perceived their organization as favoring such a style would be more open to adopting a human relations attitude.

Subjects were 21 line and staff managers from a specialty steel plant who participated in the training cu29-
curriculum utilized in the Hand and Slocum (1972) study. Results of the training indicated that managers in the experimental group perceived themselves as more aware of their behavior and the impact they had on their subordinates. Subordinates whose managers had undergone training perceived their superiors as having a greater concern for the human element in the work environment, while subordinates of managers in the control group perceived less concern from their supervisors on this dimension. Top management in the organization favored managers with a consulting versus an autocratic style which strengthened the training induced attitudinal changes.

In an effort to measure the effectiveness of a supervisory training program for police officers, Price and Adelberg (1977) evaluated the results of POSIT, a training program for police officers with first line supervisory responsibilities. The program was divided into three components which spanned a six-week time period. Content areas covered included interpersonal skills, styles of leadership, motivation, problem-solving, job enrichment, communication strategies and supervisory techniques. The program also included a field laboratory period where participants returned to their departments to practice applying the skills they had learned. The results of the training revealed that participant attitudes improved in the area of leadership initiative which indicated a greater willingness to work effectively in the supervisory role.
When the post-test scores were compared to the participants' scores one year later, results indicated that the initial improvement remained stable.

Bennett & Grosser (1978) conducted a study to determine if a human development course would increase police officers' interpersonal competence and provide them with concrete behavioral skills. Thirty-four master's degree candidates in a criminal justice program participated in a human development course. The course involved workshops on listening, applied communication skills and values clarification. Results of the program indicated that students viewed themselves as becoming less aggressive and more assertive, more willing to take initiative, and less suspicious and more trusting. Participants' new learning also was found to generalize beyond the classroom setting.

Fleishman (1953) noted that the purpose of human relations training is to produce lasting behavioral changes, but in order to insure that changes remain constant, reorganization of the social environment is necessary. In a study of 122 foreman at a motor truck plant, participants completed a leadership questionnaire the first day and again the last day of a human relations training program. The results of the before and after evaluation indicated positive attitudinal changes. A comparison of the before and after evaluation with behavior in the actual job setting revealed a discrepancy. Fleishman concluded that the stability of attitude change is dependent upon the culture
of the work situation.

The literature in the area of management training indicated that training in human relations is effective in producing attitudinal changes that translate into more effective on-the-job behavior. Argyris (1964) noted that self-awareness and sensitivity to the needs of others can be modified in human relations training sessions and are salient factors affecting managerial performance.
CHAPTER 2

PROCEDURES

This chapter provides a definition of terms used in this study, delineates the research hypotheses tested and describes the selection of subjects, instrumentation and procedures for the collection and treatment of data.

Definition of Terms

To provide clarity, the following definitions are used in this study:

Human Relations Training - training focusing on problems of leadership, supervision, attitudes toward employees, communication and awareness of self and others. For the purpose of this study, human relations training will be an Adlerian training program.

Consideration - a dimension measured by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire which reflects the extent to which a manager's style is characterized by mutual trust, respect and consideration of subordinates' feelings. The Adlerian constructs measured by the Consideration dimension include democracy, social interest and encouragement.

Structure - a dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire which reflects the extent to which a manager's style is characterized by directive and authoritarian actions. Since management style is synonymous with the Adlerian
Adlerian construct of lifestyle (R. Kopp, personal communication, September 15, 1990), a manager scoring high on the Structure dimension would exhibit behaviors consistent with a controller lifestyle.

**Dogmatism** - an individual's level of authoritarianism and closed-mindedness (Rokeach, 1960). For the purpose of this study, dogmatism will be an individual's score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale.

**Acceptance of Self** - reliance primarily upon internalized values rather than external pressures as a guide for appropriate behavior (Berger, 1952). For the purpose of this study, acceptance of self will be an individual's score on the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire.

**Acceptance of Others** - an attitude demonstrating interest and desire to establish mutually satisfactory relationships with others despite individual differences or standards of behavior (Berger, 1952). For the purpose of this study, acceptance of others will be an individual's score on the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire.

**Research Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. Managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show more Consideration than a control group as measured by The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire when controlling for pre-test differences.

2. Managers who participate in an Adlerian training
program will show less Structure than a control group as measured by The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire when controlling for pre-test differences.

3. Managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will reveal greater acceptance of self than a control group as measured by The Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire when controlling for pre-test differences.

4. Managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will reveal more tolerance of others than a control group as measured by The Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire when controlling for pre-test differences.

5. Managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show a decrease in dogmatism as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale when controlling for pre-test differences.

Subjects

Subjects for this study were 81 first line supervisors from two corporations within the North Texas area. Participants were asked to volunteer for the study based on interest and availability. Permission from the Institutional Review Board of the University of North Texas was obtained permitting the participation of selected subjects.

Of the managers who participated in the Adlerian training program 34% held no college degree, 54% held a Bachelor's degree and 12% held advanced degrees. Sixty-
seven percent of participants had zero to five years of supervisory experience, 18% had six to ten years of experience and 15% had eleven or more years of supervisory experience. The mean age of participants was 32. Thirty eight percent of participants were male and 62% were female.

Procedures and Collection of Data

Permission to conduct the Adlerian training program (Appendix A) was obtained orally and in person from the senior manager of each participating corporation. Two corporations located in the same office building participated in the study; an asset management corporation and an education management corporation. The researcher elicited the participation of six companies and was rejected by four either due to lack of interest, unwillingness to invest effort in a project that would not promise immediate gains or unavailability of enough managers to comprise a training class. The researcher speculated that since organizations are in business to produce a profit and want to see immediate benefits and results, it would be difficult to obtain corporations willing to participate. The criterion for selecting companies, therefore, was willingness to participate and cooperate in the study. Since neither corporation would allow employees time away from their work stations to attend the seminar, the seminar was conducted in the evening, after work hours. It was speculated that it would be difficult to obtain participants due to outside obligations and commitments.
The researcher requested from the senior manager of both participating corporations a list of employees eligible to participate in the training. Eligibility criteria were that employees hold a first-line management position, supervise at least one employee and be willing to attend both evening sessions. The researcher elicited managers' participation by asking them to respond in writing to a written memo inviting their participation (Appendix B). This memo also served as the individual's consent form and biographical data sheet. Volunteers were assigned to either an experimental or control group based on their ability and willingness to participate in the actual training program. Individuals unwilling or unable to participate in the seminar (due to time constraints, schedule conflicts, etc.) were asked to participate in the pre-test/post-test process by responding to a written memo (Appendix C). One-hundred managers were invited to participate in the study. Nineteen people declined participation either by indicating unwillingness to participate in either the experimental or control group or by consenting to complete the pre/post instruments and never returning the forms.

The experimental group comprised of 40 managers, received eight hours of training, conducted in two one-half day sessions, in Adlerian theory including lecture and experiential activities. There were three separate training groups. Managers from the asset management corporation comprised two groups each consisting of 15 participants.
Managers from the education management corporation comprised one group of 10 participants. The sessions were conducted one day apart, (i.e., Tuesday and Thursday evening) for all three groups. All three training groups were conducted in the evening from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. The researcher facilitated all three training seminars. All participants attended both sessions.

The control group, comprised of 41 managers, was invited to assemble prior to the first training session as a large group to complete the pre-test assessment and to discuss the option of receiving training at a future time. Pre-testing for the experimental group was conducted in a pre-seminar meeting prior to the first training session. During this meeting the researcher conducted a brief orientation and established a norm of confidentiality for all information communicated throughout the training seminar. Both the experimental and control groups completed the post-tests two weeks following the last training session.

Training Program

The training program designed for the study (Appendix A) was an eight hour interpersonal skills training seminar intended to assist managers in developing human relations competence. The seminar included both lecture and experiential exercises and contained modules on understanding personality dynamics, using effective communication strategies, encouraging employees for positive
performance and resolving interpersonal conflict. The seminar was conducted in the evening, after work hours, from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Adlerian theory was used as the theoretical base from which the training curriculum was developed. The Adlerian constructs of lifestyle, democracy, social interest and encouragement were used as the primary basis for curriculum development. These constructs were chosen because of their interpersonal and human relations orientation. Dyadic and experiential program content focused on providing participants with knowledge and understanding of these constructs as well as strategies for translating their knowledge into interpersonally effective workplace behaviors.

Instrumentation

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ)

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was developed by Fleishman (1960) to provide a measure of leader behavior. The LOQ was selected for this study because it has been used extensively to evaluate supervisory and management training programs (Fleishman, 1989; Miller, 1964). The instrument provides a brief measure (40 items) of leadership attitudes on the two dimensions of Consideration and Structure. Individuals respond on a five point Likert-type scale according to the frequency they feel they should engage in the behavior described in each item.

Consideration reflects the extent to which an
individual displays mutual trust, respect and openness toward subordinates. This dimension emphasizes a concern for group members' needs and includes such behaviors as allowing employees participation in decision-making and encouraging two-way communication. A high score is indicative of a consultative approach and good rapport.

Structure reflects the extent to which a manager directs the activities of others in reaching organizational goals. Individuals scoring high on this dimension typically define the role each group member is expected to assume, assigns tasks and monitors productivity.

The LOQ is self-administering, and most individuals can complete the instrument within 15 minutes (Fleishman, 1989). Items are scored 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4, and there are 20 items in each scale. The maximum possible score is 80 on each scale though scores generally range from 30 to 70. Consideration and Structure scores can be interpreted by comparing them to the means and standard deviations provided in the manual. The manual provides mean scores and standard deviations of Consideration and Structure for 73 samples.

The dimensions of Consideration and Structure were based on a factor analysis of 140 items administered to supervisory personnel. Scores on each scale are independent of each other; an individual can score high on both scales, low on both scales or high on one scale and low on the other. The independence of scales is partly a function of the factor analytic development of the questionnaire.
Internal consistency reliabilities for the LOQ have been obtained using the split-half method and range from .62 to .89 on the Consideration dimension and .64 to .88 on the Structure dimension. Test-retest reliabilities for a sample of 31 first-line supervisors and 24 Air Force non-commissioned officers have been reported as .80 and .77 respectively for Consideration and .74 and .67 respectively for Structure. Reliability estimates were also obtained in a study of 554 teachers, 120 executives, 122 first-line industrial supervisors, 80 pharmaceutical company foreman, 90 Swedish supervisory candidates and 394 manufacturing employees. Test-retest reliabilities from these samples ranged from .74 to .89 for the Consideration dimension and from .64 to .88 on Structure.

The LOQ was developed to maximize construct validity (Fleishman, 1989). The dimensions of Consideration and Structure were developed by factor analytic procedures, and an item analysis was used to provide homogeneous measures of each dimension. In general, the pattern that emerges as most undesirable is one in which managers are low in both Consideration and Structure. The high Structure low Consideration manager is more likely to experience high turnover and dissatisfaction among employees, though managers high in Consideration can be higher in Structure without these adverse effects (Fleishman & Harris, 1962). In most situations, managers high in Consideration and high in Structure were found to be most effective (Fleishman,
1973). No studies found low Consideration to correlate significantly with positive work performance. Low Consideration scores were found to be indicative of undesirable work situations.

The Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire

The Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire was developed by Berger (1952) as an attitude measure. Although the questionnaire is administered as a single test, it contains two scales; one scale measures attitude toward self and one scale measure attitude toward others. Shaw (1967) commented that "this is the most carefully developed scale to measure attitude toward self that we found in the literature" (p. 433). The self-acceptance scale contains 36 items and the acceptance of others scale is comprised of 28 items. Response selections are of a modified Likert type. Subjects respond to each item by entering a 1 for "not at all true of myself," a 2 for "slightly true of myself," a 3 for "about halfway true of myself" a 4 for "mostly true of myself," and a 5 for "true of myself." The score for any item ranges from 1 to 5, and the scale scores are computed by summing item scores. A high score indicates an acceptance of self and others.

Subjects used for item selection included 200 students from first year psychology and sociology courses. Subjects differed significantly in socioeconomic backgrounds and vocational concentrations. Ages ranged from 17 to 45, however, 90 percent of the subjects were in the 17 to 30 age
group. Split-half reliabilities of .89 were reported for the self-acceptance scale and from .78 to .88 for the acceptance of others scale.

Several estimates of validity were obtained for both the acceptance of self and the acceptance of others scales (Shaw & Wright, 1967). In one study, a group of stutterers (N=38) was compared to non-stutterers matched on age and sex. Stutterers revealed lower mean scores on the self-acceptance scale (p < .06) than non-stutterers. For the acceptance of others scale, prisoners were compared to college students matched for age, sex and race. Prisoners scored lower on both the acceptance of self and the acceptance of others scales (p < .01).

In another study, one group (N=20) was asked to write an essay about their opinions of themselves and the other group (N=20) was asked to write about their attitudes toward others. The essays were rated by four judges, and the mean ratings correlated with the concurring scale score. Correlations were .897 for the acceptance of self scale and .727 for the acceptance of others scale.

**The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale**

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (RDS) measures individual differences in authoritarianism and general intolerance (Rokeach, 1960). The RDS was chosen for this study because theoretically, it is similar to Adlerian theory with respect to the construct of authority. According to Rokeach (1960), individuals who feel inferior or threatened in a
given situation are motivated to reduce the threat by becoming overreliant on power. On the other hand, a more open person is more likely to view the world as a more friendly place and to display more consultative behaviors. It has been repeatedly established that more open managers foster more satisfying and productive work environments. (Collins, Ross, & Ross, 1989; Fleishman & Harris, 1962; Larson, 1989; Likert, 1961; McGregor, 1960)

Form E of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale consists of 40 Likert-type items. Subjects indicate agreement or disagreement with each item on a scale ranging from -3 to +3. The zero point is omitted in order that subjects respond in the direction of agreement or disagreement. For scoring purposes the scale is converted to a 1-7 scale by adding a constant of four to each item score. The total score is derived by summing the scores obtained on all items of the instrument. For all statements agreement is scored as closed and dogmatic, and disagreement is scored as open and tolerant. Scores range from 40 to 280 with an elevated score indicating a high level of dogmatism.

Reliability data were obtained from college students in the Midwest, New York and England who were taking beginning courses in psychology. In addition to psychology students, the English college sample also consisted of volunteers who were from the college at large. Among these were 13 members of a Communist student organization. Other samples for whom reliability estimates were obtained included a group of
aged, destitute veterans living in New York Veteran's Administration Domiciliary and a worker sample from a British automobile factory. The Dogmatism Scale was administered to various groups ranging in size from 10 to fifty students, and subjects were tested in the years 1952, 1953, 1955 and 1956. The Dogmatism Scale underwent a series of revisions in order to increase reliability. Test-retest reliabilites range from .68 to .93.

Reliability estimates are considered to be quite satisfactory (Rokeach, 1960) considering that the Dogmatism Scale contains a collection of items that cover a diverse range of ideas and appear on the surface to be unrelated to each other. The fact that subjects agree or disagree with items on the scale in a consistent manner is borne out by item analysis.

The Method of Known Groups was used to assess the validity of the Dogmatism Scale. In one study, graduate students in psychology were asked to select among their friends and acquaintances individuals with open and closed belief systems. Students were given a list of the defining characteristics of both open and closed systems and were asked to make their selections. Twenty subjects were obtained; ten judged to be high in dogmatism and ten judged to be low. The selected subjects were contacted and administered the Dogmatism Scale which also contained items from the California F Scale and the Ethnocentrism Scale (Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, Else, Levinson, D. J., &
Sanford, R. N., 1950). Results not only indicated a statistical significance between the two groups on mean dogmatism scores, but that high dogmatism subjects also scored higher on the F Scale and Ethnocentrism Scale.

Data from a correlational analysis of the Dogmatism Scale with the F Scale (Adorno, et al., 1950) revealed a positive correlation (ranging from .54 and .77) between the two scales indicating that the Dogmatism Scale performed essentially the same diagnostic function as a similar scale which is further evidence of its validity.

Treatment of Data

Upon completion of the training program and the post-testing process, the instruments were hand scored, and the data were sent to the Computer Center of the University of North Texas for entry into the computer and data analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

All Hypotheses were tested using an analysis of covariance using the appropriate pre-test as a covariate. Analysis of covariance was chosen because it is ideally suited for analyzing differences between intact groups (Kachigan, 1986) and was used in this study in an effort to determine the treatment effects on the criterion variables while holding the effects of confounding variables constant. By eliminating confounding influences on the criterion variables, any observed differences in participants' adjusted post-test mean scores could be attributed to the training program itself, rather than to the concomitant
variable which is confounded with it. Analysis of covariance was especially appropriate for this study because it allowed for the adjustment of between group differences that may have been inherent due to the voluntary nature of participation and the non-randomization of subjects.

F-ratios were computed and reported to determine changes on the criterion variables for the treatment and control groups. The $p < .05$ level was used to test for significance.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the findings of an investigation of managers' attitudes as a result of participation in an eight-hour Adlerian management training program. The study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the training by statistically distinguishing between program participants and non-participants on the attitudinal dimensions of acceptance of self and others, level of dogmatism and interpersonal management style. The data are presented and examined related to each hypothesis. A collective discussion follows the presentation of the research results.

Analysis of Data

To provide a measure of each group's change on the attitudinal dimensions of interpersonal management style, acceptance of self and others and level of dogmatism, each post-test variable was separately analyzed using an analysis of covariance using the appropriate pre-test score as a covariate in each analysis. Both the experimental and control groups' mean score on each post-test were adjusted on the basis of the pre-test mean score. The final adjusted means were compared to determine if significant differences
occurred between the two groups. The means, standard deviations and analysis of covariance data for each hypothesis are presented in the following tables.

Hypothesis 1 stated that managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show more Consideration than a control group on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Means and standard deviations for the Consideration dimension are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Consideration Dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.22</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54.39</td>
<td>54.40</td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the pretest and posttest mean scores and adjusted posttest means indicates a positive gain for the experimental group.

The results of the analysis of covariance data for the Consideration dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire are illustrated in Table 2. The analysis of covariance, computed to compare the posttest adjusted means of the two groups, yielded an F-ratio of 7.43 which was
found to be significant at the .008 level. Thus, Hypothesis 1, which stated that managers who participate in an

Table 2

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for the Consideration Dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>182.31</td>
<td>182.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1913.34</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2941.50</td>
<td>36.76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at $p < .008$

Adlerian training program will show more Consideration than a control group on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was accepted.

Hypothesis 2 stated that managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show less Structure than a control group on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Means and standard deviations for the Structure dimension are presented in Table 3 below. A comparison of the pretest and posttest mean scores indicates a decrease in Structure in the experimental group and no change in Structure in the control group.
Table 3

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Structure Dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48.47</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>43.87</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted posttest mean scores indicated that the experimental group showed less Structure than the control group.

The results of the analysis of covariance data for the Structure dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire are illustrated in Table 4. The analysis of covariance yielded an F-ratio of 6.26 which was significant at the .014 level. Thus Hypothesis 2, which stated that managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show less Structure than a control group on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was accepted.
Table 4

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for the Structure Dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>160.10</td>
<td>160.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>1993.66</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4041.43</td>
<td>50.51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the p < .014

Hypothesis 3 stated that managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show more acceptance of self than a control group on the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire. Means and standard deviations for the Acceptance of Self dimension are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Acceptance of Self Scale of the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>152.07</td>
<td>155.25</td>
<td>154.40</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>16.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>150.12</td>
<td>150.12</td>
<td>153.28</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the data in Table 5 indicates that mean posttest scores increased for the experimental group while the control group's score remained unchanged. Adjusted
posttest mean scores also indicated a slightly greater acceptance of self in the experimental group. The analysis of covariance data for the Acceptance of Self dimension of the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire is presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6

Summary of Analysis of Covariance for the Acceptance of Self Dimension of the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>8704.66</td>
<td>111.59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28317.58</td>
<td>353.97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the data in Table 6 indicated no significant differences between the adjusted posttest means of the two groups. The analysis of covariance yielded an F-ratio of .227 which was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Hypothesis 4 stated that managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show a greater acceptance of others than a control group on the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire. Means and standard deviations for the Acceptance of Others dimension is presented in Table 7.
Table 7

Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for the Acceptance of Others Scale of the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>103.57</td>
<td>108.42</td>
<td>110.03</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>109.95</td>
<td>109.95</td>
<td>108.49</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>10.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the data in Table 7 indicates that mean posttest scores increased for the experimental group and control group posttest mean scores remained unchanged. Adjusted posttest mean scores also indicated a slightly greater acceptance of others in the experimental group. The analysis of covariance data for the Acceptance of Others dimension of the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire is presented in Table 8 on the following page.

Examination of the data in Table 8 indicates no significant differences between the adjusted posttest means of the two groups. The analysis of covariance yielded an F-ratio of .756 which was not significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was rejected.
Table 8

**Summary of Analysis of Covariance for the Acceptance of Others Dimension of the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5168.32</td>
<td>66.26</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7642.84</td>
<td>95.53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was rejected.

Hypothesis 5 stated that managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show less dogmatism than a control group as measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. Means and standard deviations for level of dogmatism are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

**Summary of Means and Standard Deviations for level of Dogmatism on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>133.42</td>
<td>130.90</td>
<td>125.85</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>23.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>121.60</td>
<td>121.95</td>
<td>125.55</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>27.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 9 reveals that experimental posttest mean scores decreased slightly while control group posttest
mean scores remained unchanged. The adjusted posttest mean scores revealed only a .35 difference between the experimental and control groups. The analysis of covariance data for level of dogmatism is illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10
Summary of Analysis of Covariance for Level of Dogmatism on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>11291.19</td>
<td>144.75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54314.88</td>
<td>678.93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of covariance data indicated no significant difference between the adjusted posttest mean scores of the experimental and control groups. The analysis of covariance yielded an F-ratio of .012 which was not significant. Thus, Hypothesis 5 stating the managers who participate in an Adlerian training program will show less dogmatism than a control group was rejected.

Summary of Findings

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were accepted and Hypotheses 3, 4 and 5 were rejected. Based on the five analyses of covariance summarized in Table 11, significant differences were found only on the adjusted posttest mean scores of the Consideration and Structure dimensions of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire.
Opinion Questionnaire. No significant differences were found on the adjusted posttest mean scores of the experimental and control groups on the other variables tested in the study.

Table 11

Summary of Analysis of Covariance Data for the Experimental and Control Groups on the Five Criterion Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted Post Means</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>57.74</td>
<td>54.58</td>
<td>7.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>6.26 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Self</td>
<td>154.40</td>
<td>153.28</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Others</td>
<td>110.03</td>
<td>108.49</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>125.85</td>
<td>125.55</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .008 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were inherent in the study:

1. To compensate for small sample size due to lack of participants and to achieve statistical power, data were analyzed as one population although two organizations and three separate training groups were represented in the study. This prohibited an analysis of each individual group's before and after training results. Since employees from the asset management corporation comprised 75% of the population, overall training results may have been skewed.

2. Initial differences, specifically initial resistance among participants, may have influenced training
results. Although the analysis of covariance technique controlled for pretest differences on the variables tested in the study (leadership style, dogmatism and acceptance of self and others), the statistical technique did not control for participants' level of initial resistance. Since the managers from the asset management corporation displayed more initial resistance, it may be that resistance was a confounding variable influencing overall training results.

3. Managers' attitudes in the study were analyzed without differences in organizational climate considered as a moderating variable. Managers may have felt compelled to respond to the research instruments in a manner supportive of their organizational climate which might have been inconsistent with the premise of the training. Respondent veracity may have influenced training results.

4. The eight hour length of time devoted to the training program may have been insufficient to influence major shifts in attitude.

5. The researcher was unable to facilitate all program material within the scope of the eight hour time period. Approximately 25% of material was not covered in all three training groups.

6. Although the researcher utilized the best instruments to be found to measure the attitudinal dimensions in the study, the history of the instruments was based on longer term studies and did not reflect participant
attitude changes in the short term. No studies were found which utilized the instruments in short term training programs.

7. The training population consisted of significantly more females than males. Although it is difficult to speculate the effects of this unequal distribution, that more females than males participated is contrary to the gender stereotype in business that males typically hold corporate management positions.

Discussion

The theory of Individual Psychology maintains that democratic relationships based on encouragement and mutual respect are essential elements in interpersonal relationships and that cooperation and an interest in others is a necessary criterion for successful fulfillment of the work task (Adler, 1954; Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956). Adlerian theory proposes a human relations orientation which has implications for management. The literature in management training suggests that interpersonal and human relations effectiveness is crucial to both a manager's career success and to overall corporate health, yet few training programs were found which addressed the human relations component of management. It thus seemed warranted to investigate the possibility of using Adlerian principles to influence managerial attitudes in the direction of increased interpersonal effectiveness and participation in the workplace.
The Adlerian training program designed for the study contained lecture and experiential curriculum based on the Adlerian constructs of democracy, social interest, lifestyle, and encouragement. By testing for the change in managers' attitudes using pre-testing and post-testing measures, it was possible to measure the impact of an Adlerian training program on first line management personnel. The results of the study indicate that managers who participated in an Adlerian training program adopted a more participative and less autocratic attitude toward employees. The results did not indicate that managers became less dogmatic or more accepting of self and others.

The evidence presented by this research suggests several possible insights into the effects of an Adlerian training program. The evidence suggests that Adlerian principles have relevance not only to parent and teacher education but to the training and development of managers as well. It also suggests that an Adlerian training curriculum could be a viable method for addressing interpersonal relationship issues in the workplace. That managers scored in a more consultative direction on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire two weeks after training was completed suggests that managers adopted a more democratic, participative attitude toward employees at least in the short term.

There are several possible explanations for the positive results obtained on the Leadership Opinion
Questionnaire. It appeared that managers had little difficulty completing the instrument, were able to relate training content to their personal work attitudes and behaviors and were able to assess their management practices before and after the training. Since the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire is based on a manager's self report, managers were actually able to assess their management practices before and after the training program. It is unclear, however, whether or not managerial attitude shifts were actually translated into behavioral changes in the work environment and whether or not employees perceived a change in their managers' attitudes. It is also unclear whether or not the training produced any kind of permanent change in participants' attitudes.

The lack of significant change on the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire or the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale poses several possible explanations. One possible reason for lack of significance was the length and complexity of both research instruments. The researcher observed that participants became frustrated with the time and effort necessary to complete the questions during both the pretesting and posttesting processes. It is also entirely likely that the eight hour period of time devoted to the program was inadequate to accomplish major shifts in attitude especially in light of the nature of the assessment items. Although items on the questionnaires were valid measures of Adlerian constructs, the items measured
individuals' long held philosophies about themselves, others and the world; ideas that are not easily changed within the scope of an eight hour program. Although these instruments have yielded significant posttest changes in past human relations training studies, the previous studies were longitudinal and involved more actual training time. The literature, however, in no way indicated that the instruments were intended solely for longitudinal research. The researcher, therefore, had no reason to believe that the instruments would be inappropriate for measuring short term training effects.

The Adlerian literature maintains that individuals find it difficult to extricate themselves from patterns and perceptions formed early in life (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956) which offers a viable explanation for the lack of significance on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire. In addition, unlike the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, the items on the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale are not isomorphic to the training content and thus might not be expected to yield entirely relevant pre-post changes. It may be that managers could see no relevance between assessment items and their daily management practice, so their responses may not have reflected new learning or attitude changes that may have occurred as a result of the training.

The fact that two organizations and three training
groups were represented in the study may pose an explanation for the lack of significant findings. The researcher observed a difference in culture between the two organizations which not only influenced participants' attitudes and willingness to take part in the training, but any lasting effects that could have taken place. Both organizations espoused a participative management approach, yet each organization implemented a different method of enlisting employee participation in the training. Individuals from the asset management corporation, although volunteers for the program, expressed that their organization "strongly suggested" their attendance at the training. It appeared the majority of participants felt compelled to attend the seminar which in their minds contradicted the entire premise of the training. Consequently, the researcher experienced more initial resistance from the two groups of asset management employees. Participants from the education management corporation, on the other hand, reported no pressure from their organization to attend the training and demonstrated extreme receptivity to the program. That 75% of the training population consisted of asset management employees may have contributed to the lack of significant findings.

Based on the method each organization used to elicit employee participation in the training, it appeared the climate in the asset management corporation was inconsistent with the premises and philosophies of the Adlerian training.
A fundamental tenet in training is to develop a climate for individuals to utilize newly acquired skills and to be rewarded appropriately by the organization for the implementation of such skills. It is difficult to produce a change in individual behavior toward being more responsive to the needs of others if the culture is embedded with other values. It may be that during the two-week period that elapsed between the last training session and posttesting, asset management employees realized an incongruence between their corporate culture and the values espoused in the training and may have actually been discouraged from implementing their newly acquired skills and attitudes. The incongruence between the attitudes participants may have adopted in the seminar and the organization's culture may have been reflective of employee responses on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire.

A possible relationship between corporate culture and years of supervisory experience may have influenced training results. Of the participants from the asset management corporation, 72% had between zero and five years of supervisory experience. Since a manager's style is usually based on years of experience and is slow to form and slow to change (Price & Adelberg, 1977), it may be that the culture of the organization discouraged new supervisors from developing an open, accepting approach and reinforced more experienced supervisors to maintain a closed, dogmatic
posture. This speculation might suggest an ongoing process during which an organization's decisions and policies reinforce the attitudes learned in a training program. With decisions reinforcing training, it might be speculated that attitude changes would more likely occur and remain consistent. It might also be speculated that if managers above the supervisory level, particularly those in senior management positions were to participate in Adlerian training, the probability of more lasting training effects may increase.

In addition to the implications inferred from the data, some practical implications of the Adlerian training program may be inferred especially with regard to participants' response to the program. Upon completion of the training, participants were asked to complete an evaluation form indicating their perceptions of the program (Appendix D). Participants were asked to respond on a Likert scale with 1 indicating a rating of poor and 10 indicating an excellent rating. Participants were also asked to share their comments on the facilitator's effectiveness in presenting the material, the topics they considered most helpful and other additional comments they wished to add. All participants completed the evaluation form. The mean participant rating of the program was an 8.7, and participants considered conflict resolution and understanding lifestyle the most valuable topics. The participants' improvement on the leadership dimensions
assessed as well as their favorable evaluation of the program suggests that the training program achieved one of its major goals; to motivate participants to assume a more consultative posture and to increase interpersonal effectiveness in the supervisory role.

Conclusions and Recommendations

From the findings of this study and in light of the limitations cited, it seems reasonable to conclude that a management training program employing Adlerian theoretical principles could be influential in impacting managerial attitudes at least in the short term. Managers' self-reports on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire at posttesting reported an increased tolerance for two-way communication with employees, improved rapport and a preference for an environment based on mutual trust and respect. It is difficult to conclude, however, how effective the training was in developing permanent attitude changes among the managers or if subordinates perceived a change in their managers' behavior.

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, it is recommended that a longitudinal study be conducted to determine the stability of attitude change resulting from Adlerian management training. It is also recommended that the larger context of the organization be studied to determine if the organizational climate is consistent with Adlerian philosophies. A study employing Adlerian management training while controlling for organizational
culture could help clarify the influence of culture on maintaining and reinforcing participant attitude changes that occur in an Adlerian training program. It would appear that if middle and upper managers were to participate in an Adlerian management training program and adopt a more consultative approach, a climate would develop that would support and reinforce new learning that occurs in management training programs. It is therefore recommended that intensive training of managers above the supervisory level be conducted.

On the basis of this study, some re-examination of the instruments used might be made. Since The Acceptance of Self and Others Questionnaire and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale measure long held lifestyle beliefs which are not readily susceptible to change, these instruments might better be utilized in situations where an organization is committed to an ongoing training effort as opposed to having managers attend one program. If managers were to attend training seminars supporting Adlerian ideas on an ongoing basis and the organization were to support and encourage such ideas, the potential for change scores on these instruments might increase. It might also be recommended that an instrument such as the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire be administered to subordinates before and after an Adlerian management training program to analyze employee perceptions of their managers' behavior as a result of training.
APPENDIX A

ADLERIAN TRAINING SEMINAR
A Human Relations Training Program

Management may be defined as "getting things done through the work and accomplishments of others by guiding and motivating their efforts." In order to obtain a commitment from employees to produce quality work, managers must be equipped to handle each interaction with employees, peers, supervisors and vendors with the skills, knowledge and techniques that represent their personal best. This highly participative seminar is designed to provide managers with the skills and techniques required for outstanding people management.

SEMINAR OBJECTIVES

Upon completion of the seminar, participants will be able to:

- identify their personality style (lifestyle) and the lifestyles of their employees
- develop pragmatic strategies for maximizing their positive potential by capitalizing on the strengths inherent in their lifestyle
- encourage employees for positive performance
- utilize effective conflict resolution strategies
- demonstrate effective communication skills
- develop an action plan for improved management performance
I. INTRODUCTION

Facilitated Discussion: "Effective Management"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOAR D RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Manager's roles/responsibilities: What are a manager's roles/responsibilities with regard to his/her employees?

Value of Effective Management: What are some of the positive experiences you have had as a supervisor of others? What were some of the benefits of these experiences?

Barriers to Effective Management: What are some of the issues that preclude you from functioning effectively as a manager? (e.g. environmental/systemic issues, employee related issues, etc.)

Today's Focus

DISCUSS HANDOUT #1 (Workshop Agenda)

II. UNDERSTANDING PERSONALITY STYLES (LIFESTYLES) AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

As managers, our primary job is to get things done through the work of our employees. This is not always an easy task. But it can be a lot less difficult if we understand our own personality styles and how our style affects others.

By the same token, it is important that we understand our employees' styles so we can interact with them in the most effective manner.

So the first component of effective management is understanding how personality develops and how different peoples' personality patterns influence their behavior at work.

Once you understand certain aspects of your own personality you will be better able to capitalize on your strengths in both your personal and professional life.
Once you understand more about your employees you will have a better idea of why they behave the way they do.

**DISCUSS HANDOUT #2 (Principles of Personality)**

1. Human behavior is goal-directed.
2. All behavior has purpose.
3. Throughout life the goals of achieving belonging and significance are the primary motivators of human behavior.
4. Behavior is the result of subjective perception.
5. By the age of five, people develop patterns of interacting which form the basis of their personality.

**HAVE PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE LIFESTYLE SCALE**

**Processing Results**

**DISCUSS HANDOUT #3 (Lifestyles)**

1. Controller
2. Perfectionist
3. Need to Please
4. Victim
5. Martyr

There are no right or wrong answers to this instrument. Although there is strong support for the findings no instrument is perfect. You may not think your score fits your style. If you are going through a major transition in your life, your results may seem off.

**FACILITATE DISCUSSION OF THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES INHERENT IN EACH STYLE. BOARD RESPONSES.**

**HAVE PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE HANDOUT #4 (Employee Profile Worksheet)**

Now, consider your style and each of your employees' styles.
Where is there conflict? What is not working between you?

How can you and your employees work together more effectively considering your differing styles?

III. STYLES OF MANAGEMENT

Facilitator forms two groups of approximately six (6) persons each. One person in each group is designated the group leader and one person in each group is designated an observer.

The facilitator distributes the leader instruction sheet to each group leader, and instructs each leader to follow their particular instructions exactly and to not show their instructions to anyone.

NOTE - The leader instruction sheet will instruct each group leader to behave in accord with either an autocratic or democratic style.

The facilitator distributes the Pins and Straws Observer Sheet to each observer.

The facilitator distributes straight pins and straws to each group. He announces that each group has 15 minutes to build a structure out of pins and straws. (The group leader is to behave either autocratically or democratically; depending on the instructions noted on his/her sheet).

At the end of the construction phase, have observers share their responses to the questions on the Observer Worksheet.

As a large group, have participants share their responses to the following questions:

- How did it feel to work under the style of your leader?
- How did it feel to lead with that style?
- What are the effects of each style?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of each style?

In most work situations, we typically see one of these management styles. One is the autocratic style and one is the democratic style.

The autocratic manager assumes that he/she must know all, handle all situations and dictate how things should be done. This style usually leads employees to feel demotivated and uninvolved. In fact, studies have proven that employees who work for an autocratic manager are less productive, less satisfied and have a shorter tenure than individuals who work for a more democratic manager.

Democratic managers see themselves as people developers. They involve their employees in decision-making, invite their input and utilize their ideas. Democratic managers help their employees to feel part of a team, and people usually take better care of things when they feel a sense of ownership. Democratic leaders usually gain commitment while autocratic managers get compliance.

As a manager you want to have influence over your employees in order to gain cooperation. You can't coerce people into doing what you want through power/autocratic controls because in the final analysis you will create a situation of retaliation and resentment. People will usually go the extra mile to let you know that "you can't tell them what to do." Remember, MANAGEMENT IS GETTING THINGS DONE THROUGH THE WORK OF OTHERS, AND YOU DON'T WANT EMPLOYEES TO JUST DO THE WORK BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO. YOU WANT THEM TO FEEL A SENSE OF COMMITMENT TO YOU AND YOUR SHARED GOALS. Cooperation is an essential element here. The goal is to "win cooperation."

What are some of your "my way or the highway" behaviors? What can you do to demonstrate more behavioral flexibility?

IV. INFLUENCE WITHOUT AUTHORITY

In order to "win cooperation" we have to:

1) influence (not threaten or coerce) our employees to achieve organizational goals

2) create an equitable (balanced) work situation for our employees so they perceive they are being paid (not necessarily monetarily) for their work/commitment.

One way to influence employees is through the effective use
of power.

**DISCUSS HANDOUT #6 (Types of Power)**

1. **Position Power** - Power held by virtue of one's position.
   - Legitimate Power - leader's right to decision-making because of his/her title
   - Coercive - leader's control over punishment
   - Reward - leader's control over rewards

2. **Personal Power** - Has to do more with the leader's desirable characteristics rather than his formal position.
   - Expert Power - the manager's task-relevant knowledge as seen by subordinates
   - Referent Power - subordinate loyalty to leader because of perceived desirable characteristics

Typically, using position power gets compliance, using personal power gets commitment.

Creating a balanced work situation involves the use of exchange with employees. There are also other situations where you may be reliant on other people you do not supervise. How do you operate effectively and get what you need from these individuals?

**One technique is using Reciprocity and Exchange.**

Employees have to feel they are being adequately compensated for the work they are putting in. There must be a sense of balance or the employee will leave the organization to find a more equitable solution.

**DISCUSS HANDOUT #7 (Principles of Reciprocity and Exchange)**
HAVE PARTICIPANTS LIST THE CURRENCIES THEY MOST WANT FROM THEIR ORGANIZATION.

HAVE PARTICIPANTS LIST EACH EMPLOYEE AND THE CURRENCIES HE OR SHE MOST VALUES.

How can you reward your employees for positive performance using these currencies? What can you do to facilitate an atmosphere of cooperation?

V. EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

- Encouragement
- Communication
- Conflict Management

Encouragement

As managers we want our employees to be as productive as possible as we are constantly looking for ways to increase productivity. There are basically three approaches to increasing productivity:

1. Fear
2. Reward
3. Encouragement

Fear - Historically, fear has been the most common approach to motivation. Managers either use threat or punishment.

"Produce or lose your job"
"Produce or be humiliated in front of your peers."
"Produce or suffer the consequences."

More often than not these threats take the form of loss of esteem or personal integrity. If you use this approach, you may get short run compliance, but in the long run it will result in withdrawal or hostility on the part of the one being threatened. The result: the most capable people leave because they don't want to work under such conditions.

Punishment does nothing to redirect the employee to more productive action. What it does do is create a damaging relationship with the employee. Employee withdrawal and avoidance is the least harmful effects of employee reaction to punishment. Hostility in the form of sabatoge, vandalism, theft, etc. may result.

Rewards - The second approach to achieving productivity
through your people is to give employees rewards and incentives. These too work... temporarily. If you stimulate or excite people through reward they will perform, but soon they will consider the reward their right and it is no longer motivating. So, to recreate the excitement you have to offer a bigger, better reward. When rewards are offered, employees will do just enough to get the reward and no more.

Encouragement - The third way to motivate performance is through encouragement. Most employees do not perform because they don't want to succeed. They don't perform because they are discouraged and have lost faith in themselves. Lack of belief generates lack of performance. Truly productive people achieve because of their belief in themselves and their inner strengths.

Definition: Encouragement is focusing on a person's strengths and assets rather than focusing solely on the finished product. Encouragement emphasizes a person's contributions and minimizes mistakes. It is therefore effective in helping employees develop self-confidence. PEOPLE WHO FEEL GOOD ABOUT THEMSELVES PRODUCE GOOD RESULTS.

Encouragement can be inspired by helping people experience feelings of independence and adequacy and is best achieved when people participate in activities and tasks they can achieve. Successful experiences help people realistically evaluate their capabilities and motivates them to participate in more activities that they consider meaningful. In autocratic environments people often evaluate themselves based on external rewards and punishment. In democratic environments, people are inspired and motivated by encouragement.

There is a difference between encouragement and praise. Praise is a type of reward granted for winning and excelling. It conveys the underlying message, "If you do something I consider good you will be rewarded. It is an attempt to reward people through external means. Praise increases competition among employees.

Encouragement, on the other hand, does not concentrate on how people compare to each other, but helps them appreciate the value they bring to a situation or task. Encouragement attempts to influence people through internal means. Unlike praise it can be used at any time and not exclusively as a reward for success.
Unfortunately many managers fail to encourage employees. Instead of catching employees doing something right, they are constantly looking for the mistakes employees make. As a result, employees become discouraged and lack self-confidence.

One important way to encourage employees is to communicate confidence in them. Research on the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy or Pygmalion Effect has proven that a manager's expectations can influence an employee's performance. If you communicate high expectations to employees, performance is likely to be high. If you communicate low expectations, your employees will probably conform only too well. They way you treat your employees is indicative of what you expect of them.

Superior managers are those who create high performance expectations that promote employee confidence and appreciation of their worth.

Having employees solve their own problems is a form of encouragement. The more we solve peoples' problems for them the more we subtly communicate that we don't believe they can do it. As a result, the employee becomes more dependent on us and less dependent on himself. Denying employees the opportunity to solve their problems denies them a growth opportunity, and you fail that person.

The test of a good manager is not what he can do, rather it is what his people can do without him.

Discouragement occurs every day in both the work and home environment. Discouraged employees are de-motivated and give up on maximizing their potential. Understanding of the discouragement process can help you as a manager create positive changes in your employees.

There are four primary kinds of discouragement:

Discouragement through Domination - Managers who dominate through domination take on all the responsibilities. They allow employees no chance to think for themselves or make their own plans. Since they assume they know it all, they become frustrated with others' "inferior ways." Employees
who feel discouraged by these dominators feel inadequate, incapable and dependent.

Surface Message

"Here, let me help you with that."

Underlying Message

"You'll mess up."

Discouragement through insensitivity - Managers who discourage through insensitivity can cause great damage to an employee's self-esteem. Sometimes their insensitivity is unintentional and sometimes it is to accomplish their own goals of power, closed-mindedness, etc.

Surface Message

"I will meet with you in later on your performance review"

"Your presentation was ineffective."

Underlying Message

I'm much more interested what I am doing.

"Your presentation was excellent and it threatens me."

Discouragement through silence - Managers who discourage through silence fail to communicate employees' positive performance to them. Positive information you have about a person is meaningless unless you share it with them. Too often, only when people withdraw their services are they noticed.

Discouragement through intimidation - Manager's who discourage through intimidation either impose unrealistic expectations on employees or elevate themselves in order to put others down. Intimidators are frequently manipulative and want to be in control. Intimidators like to activate feelings of inadequacy in others.

In what ways have you been discouraged by your supervisor or your co-workers? In what ways have you discouraged your employees?

What can you do to begin encouraging your employees?

DISCUSS HANDOUT #10 (Goals of Discouraged Employees)

1. Attention seeking
2. Avoidance of responsibility
3. Lack of Confidence
4. Thoughts of worthlessness
5. Avoidance of Competition
6. Need for power and control
7. Revenge seeking
8. Need for perfection
9. Dishonesty
10. Closed mindedness

Communication

Communication is the #1 problem in business organizations.

HAVE PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE THE SQUARES EXERCISE

Squares Activity

Have participants form dyads. Have participants sit facing each other with a barricade between them so they cannot see each other's work/desk space. One person is the communicator and the other person is the receiver.

Each member of the dyad is handed an envelope with geometric shapes inside. Both individuals have identical shapes inside their envelopes, i.e. each has two triangles, one circle, etc.

The communicator is instructed to construct a pattern or design with his/her shapes and to communicate to his/her partner how to construct the design in order to replicate it exactly.

The receiver is told not to ask any questions of the communicator and to simply follow the communicator's directions.

Upon completion of the activity, participants are instructed to switch roles; the communicator becomes the receiver, and the receiver becomes the communicator.

Communicating effectively involves:

- using assertive and non-defensive verbal communication
- listening to others

Interpersonal relationships are an important factor in worker productivity and job satisfaction. Effective, people-oriented managers use particular modes of communication. People-oriented communications demands that
managers develop a participatory interaction style with employees. This requires a 1) de-emphasis on authority using a problem-solving rather than a directive approach and 2) an increased use of listening.

There are three modes of communication in business: upward, two-way and downward.

The problems of downward communication

Communications from manager to employee can be threatening to employees because it emphasizes control, the giving of instructions or evaluation (feedback). Messages oriented either to control or to judge produce defensiveness on the part of the employee. Supervisors can minimize the defensive effects of downward communication by adopting a democratic stance.

The communication attributes of a democratic style would include:

1. using problem-solving language versus authoritarian, directive language
2. using active listening skills (non-verbal attention and verbal restatements)
3. Delegating decisions to employees
4. paying attention to employees' esteem needs
5. Give employees the reasons or the why's for doing things
6. Asking employees' suggestions on how a job should be done
7. Avoid acting self-important and relying on your power

The problems of upward communication

Because of the power variable, there are many organization barriers to upward communication. On the one hand, supervisors are often in the habit of not listening to subordinates. As a result, employees may withhold valuable information and withhold valuable ideas. Another problem with upward communication is that managers typically only want to hear good news so employees are reluctant to communicate information unless it is positive. Management, therefore, does not get an accurate view of what is going on.

Sometimes, messages that are sent up, especially those concerning worker dissatisfaction are ignored because managers are preoccupied with productivity or because they don't know how to deal with such problems. When messages are ignored, employees believe there is no point in sending them. Dissatisfaction increases and often turns into major problems.
In both downward and upward communication systems management controls the process. Management bears the larger responsibility for establishing an maintaining effective internal communications.

Two way communication involves interacting with employees in a mutually respectful way without emphasis on power and who will control

Communicating Assertively but Non-Defensively (Message skills)

Message skills serve as a basis for managing interpersonal relationships.

Message skills involve communicating our experience to another person in an effort to create understanding. This can be done through the use of "I" statements or "Self-awareness" statements.

Typically, people communicate through "You" statements, inferences and interpretations such as:

"You are so inconsiderate"
"Why are you so careless?"

Such statements usually put the receiver on the defensive and provide very little basis for making a response. All he or she is tempted to do is use verbal aggression: "Well, you're crabby." There is little or no mutual satisfaction to the transaction.

| DISCUSS HANDOUT #11 (Constructing "I" Messages) |

Constructing "I" messages

1. State your feeling about the consequence an undesirable behavior produces for you.

   "I become frustrated...."
   "I feel concerned...."

2. Describe the behavior which is troublesome for you. 

   DESCRIPT DON'T BLAME.

   "When you arrive late to work...."
   "When you don't attend scheduled meetings...."
3. State the consequence or the effects of the undesirable behavior.

"because I have to cover for you."
"because you miss valuable information."

When you use "I" statements you have given the employee the data to explain your interpretation. You have also clarified how you feel about the situation. Such an expression of self-awareness assists the receiver in making a satisfactory response.

In order to keep the lines of communication open, ask the employee for an "I" statement. Do this cautiously so as not to foster defensiveness:

"I feel concerned when you miss meetings because you miss valuable information." "How do you feel about this?"

"I am concerned when you don't talk in meetings because I sense you feel uncomfortable." "Am I on the right track?"

HAVE PARTICIPANTS LIST THREE UNDESIRABLE EMPLOYEE BEHAVIORS AND WRITE "I" MESSAGES. HAVE THEM SHARE THEIR RESPONSES WITH THE LARGE GROUP.

Effective Listening

HAVE PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE HANDOUT #12 (Listening Quiz)

Listening is an important element in effective management because so much of our work involves eliciting information from others. Studies indicate that 45% of the time people spend communicating is devoted to listening.

What are some of the costs of not listening?

DISCUSS HANDOUT #13 (Listening)

DISCUSS HANDOUT #14 (Keys to Good Listening)

HAVE PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE LISTENING EXERCISE
Listening Exercise (Practice in Active Listening)

Have participants as a large group engage in a conversation on a controversial topic. Have participants share their views on the subject, but before they share their ideas they must paraphrase what the person before them said.

Have participants respond to the following questions:

1. Does controversy make it more difficult to listen?
2. How did it feel to paraphrase others?
3. What effect did active listening have on the quality of the communication?

Conflict Resolution

Conflict in the workplace is inevitable. If some form of conflict does not occur people are probably so uninvolved or bored that they don't care what is going on. Conflict is a natural part of the exchange of ideas and should not be avoided or ignored.

The word conflict has a negative ring to it because it suggests a disturbance or battle. But conflict is neither good nor bad. How people manage conflict can be productive or unproductive.

Conflict operates on two levels:

1. content or topics
2. relationship - the characteristics of a relationship such as power, status, rules, etc.

USUALLY, ALTHOUGH THE SOURCE OF CONFLICT MAY APPEAR TO BE ON THE CONTENT LEVEL, THE REAL SOURCE OF CONFLICT HAS TO DO WITH RELATIONSHIP ISSUES SUCH AS WHO WILL WIN. Thus, the real source of conflict is often not dealt with.

DISCUSS HANDOUT #12 (Unproductive Ways of Dealing with Conflict)
Unproductive ways of dealing with Conflict

Avoidance - Conflict will probably surface again

Force - Forcing your way of thinking and behaving on someone else

Minimization - acting as if conflict is unimportant, using humor to detract from conflict, or minimizing someone's irritation, anger etc. "What are you so mad about?"

Blame - a way to avoid dealing with the conflict by blaming others

Surrender - giving in immediately to avoid conflict. Surrender is negative for two reasons: decisions should be made on merit not to avoid conflict and surrender infuriates the other person

Gunnysacking - unloading stored up past grievances so the original problem doesn't get addressed.

DISCUSS HANDOUT #13 (Do's and Don't's of Conflict Resolution

Do's and Don't's of conflict resolution

Do.....

cooperate rather than compete
use language that suggest equality between you and the other person
use statements that indicate tentativeness.."Could it be?"
use "I" statements
pinpoint the real the issue
realize all behavior is an agreement

Don't.....

communicate in ways that show low regard for the other person
emphasize power differentials
sound absolutely certain of what you say. Everything could be different
blame or find fault
confuse facts and inferences

The objective of conflict resolution is working through a
conflict to a mutually acceptable solution. The following are four steps to conflict resolution (F E R N)

DISCUSS HANDOUT #14 (FERN Train to Conflict Resolution)

FACTS FIRST - "Friday was the third day this week that you were more than 10 minutes late for work."

EXPRESS EMOTIONS - "I am worried and I am annoyed."

REQUEST ACTION - "I would like to be able to count on you to be on time from now on."

NEGOTIATE AND AFFIRM AGREEMENT

- negotiate a solution
- describe consequences
- ask for agreement

HAVE PARTICIPANTS CHOOSE A CONFLICT THEY HAVE HAD WITH AN EMPLOYEE OR CO-WORKER. HOW WAS THE CONFLICT HANDLED? HOW COULD IT HAVE BEEN HANDLED DIFFERENTLY?

HAVE EACH PARTICIPANT READ CASE A. IN GROUPS HAVE THEM DISCUSS THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- Nina is discouraged by the existing situation. What are some of the signs of her discouragement? What is the goal of her discouragement?

- What might be some of the reasons underlying her performance problem?

- What kinds of things could Nina's supervisor have done to redirect Nina's behavior on a productive course of action.

- What unproductive style of conflict has Nina's supervisor demonstrated?

- How should Joan handle this situation?

HAVE PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE SEMINAR EVALUATION
handout #1

WORKSHOP AGENDA

SESSION 1 (The Dynamics of Personality)

- Understanding Personality Styles and Their Implications
- Styles of Management
- Winning Cooperation; Influence Without Authority

SESSION 2 (Effective Management Strategies)

- Using Encouragement
- Effective Communication Strategies
- Conflict Resolution
PRINCIPLES OF PERSONALITY

- All behavior is goal-directed.

- All behavior has purpose.

- Throughout life the goals of belonging and achieving significance are the primary motivators of human behavior.

- Behavior is the result of subjective perception.

- By the age of five, people develop patterns of interacting which form the basis of their personality.
handout #3

LIFESTYLES

THE CONTROLLER

Must be in control and never controlled. Oftentimes this paradoxically puts him/her out of control. There are two kinds of controllers: those who want control over self and those who want control over others.

THE PERFECTIONIST

Must have everything perfect in order to feel worthwhile. These people are conscienous, but perfectionism is often their ploy to controlling the situation. They do it better than anybody else; more perfectly.

THE PLEASER

Feels worthwhile only when pleasing others. They typically believe that if they don't please they will be rejected. If you are excessively high in pleasing you are probably not as effective in confronting.

THE VICTIM

Everything always happens to the victim who attributes causality to external factors. The victim typically does not assume responsibility for self and blames others for his/her suffering. Typically the victim has low self-esteem, and behavior is used to help the person achieve feelings of worth.

THE MARTYR

Similar to the victim but suffers for a cause. Elevates self above others through suffering. Is more arrogant than the victim. "Look how much I sacrifice, and look how ungrateful people are."
PERSONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Your lifestyle:

Your tendencies:

Environment you most desire:

What you need from others:

What will it take for you to be most effective:
handout #5 (adapted from Jill Kanter)

EMPLOYEE PROFILE WORKSHEET

Employee's name

Employee's lifestyle (your best guess)

Employee's tendencies:

Environment employee desires:

Employee's needs from others:

What will it take for the employee to be more effective?
STRATEGIES FOR BLENDING AND CAPITALIZING

What are the strengths inherent in your style?

What strengths are inherent in your employee's style?

List areas of conflict between your style and the style of your employees. Include specific examples.

How could you work together more effectively considering your differing styles? List some concrete things you could do (Address conflict areas above).

List concrete things your employee could do to work more effectively with you (Address conflict areas above).
TYPES OF POWER

1. **Position Power** - Power held by virtue of one's position
   
   o **legitimate power** - leader's right to decision-making because of his/her title
   
   o **coercive power** - leaders' control over punishment
   
   o **reward power** - leader's control over rewards

2. **Personal Power** - Has to do more with leader's desirable characteristics rather than his formal position.
   
   o **expert power** - the manager's task related knowledge as perceived by employees
   
   o **referent power** - subordinates loyalty to leader because of perceived desirable characteristics

* Position power usually requires the support of personal personal power to be effective.
PRINCIPLES OF RECIPROCITY AND EXCHANGE

(1) Everyone who gives something (e.g., working late, coming in on a weekend, etc.) expects to be paid back in some way, shape or form.

(2) People make exchanges for work-related goods and services as a part of everyday work life. Different "currencies" are involved as well as different "trade rates."

(3) Effective managers know what "currencies" will be of value to each of their employees, and have established formal or informal "fair trade rates."

(4) Effective trading creates win/win results.

TYPES OF CURRENCIES

- Inspiration-related: vision, excellence, moral/ethical correctness, etc.

- Task-related: new resources, money, assistance, challenge, information, learning, etc.

- Position-related: recognition, visibility, reputation, contacts, etc.

- Personal-related: gratitude, ownership/involvement, self-concept, comfort, etc.

- Relationship-related: understanding, acceptance/inclusion, etc.
handout #9

POSSIBLE ENCOURAGERS

- verbal recognition
- request for employee's advice
- increased responsibility
- increased decision making power
- choice of work assignments or special work assignment
- recognizing employee improvement
- recognizing employee effort
- passing on compliments from others
- interest in person's welfare
- showing faith in employee's ability
TECHNIQUES OF DISCOURAGEMENT

- Discouragement through Domination

- Discouragement through Insensitivity

- Discouragement through Silence

- Discouragement through Intimidation
GOALS OF DISCOURAGED EMPLOYEES

- attention seeking
- avoidance of responsibility
- lack of confidence
- thoughts of worthlessness
- need for power and control
- revenge seeking
- need for perfection
- avoidance of competition
- dishonesty
- closed-mindedness
CONSTRUCTING "I" MESSAGES

1. State your feeling about the consequences an undesirable behavior produces for you.

"I feel frustrated...."
"I feel concerned...."  

2. Describe the behavior which is troublesome for you. DESCRIBE, DON'T BLAME.

"When you arrive late to work...."
"When you don't attend scheduled meetings...."

3. State the consequences or the effects of the undesirable behavior.

"Because I have to cover for you."
"Because you miss valuable information."
LISTENING ANALYSIS GRID

On the Listening Analysis Grid below are some statements against which to rate yourself. Think about your overall listening behavior. What percent of the time do you demonstrate the practices in each of the statements below? For each statement, blacken the dot indicating the percent of the time you practice the behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENT</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>position yourself so you can see and hear the speaker</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintain eye contact</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refrain from judging the speaker</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refrain from assuming you know what the speaker is going to say next</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paraphrase back to the speaker what you heard him/her say</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remain attentive</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refrain from jumping to conclusions</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen attentively to what the speaker is saying without planninging what you are going to say next</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, connect the dots marking your percentages. The area to the left of the line you drew is how you perceive your listening competence. The area to the right is what you perceive as needing improvement.
LISTENING

silence

door openers

"Would you like to talk about it"?

"Tell me more about that."

acknowledgement responses

nodding

"I see."

attending

eye contact

paying attention

facing the speaker

communicating understanding (active listening)

paraphrasing for the meaning of words

example: "By sorry situation do you mean you are not getting the cooperation you need from your staff?"

paraphrasing for the speaker's feelings

example: "It sounds like you're angry and frustrated because your employee keeps coming in late."
BAD LISTENING HABITS

1. Your thoughts race ahead of the speaker so you tune out what is being said.

2. You think you know what will be said so you listen with only one ear.

3. You look instead of listen (especially when meeting someone new) and forget what has been said.

4. While listening, you are distracted by radio, TV, other conversation, etc.

5. You disagree with the speaker and plan what you will say next instead of hearing the speaker's point of view.

6. You judge, evaluate, approve or disapprove before you really listen to what has been said.

7. You send your message back rather than listen to what is being said.

8. You miss the main idea - You listen to just the words and not what is really meant.

9. You jump to conclusions and jump to unwarranted assumptions about what the other person is going to say.

10. You interrupt the speaker.

11. You react to the person rather than the ideas the person is trying to convey.
UNPRODUCTIVE WAYS OF DEALING WITH CONFLICT

- avoidance
- force
- minimization
- blame
- surrender
- gunnysacking
DO'S AND DON'T OF DEALING WITH CONFLICT

DO...................

- cooperate rather than compete
- use language that suggest equality between you and the other person
- use statements that indicate tentativeness: "Could it be that...?"
- use "I" statements
- pinpoint the real issue
- realize that all behavior is an agreement

DON'T...................

- communicate in ways that show low regard for the other person
- emphasize power differentials
- sound absolutely certain of what you say. Everything could be different
- blame or find fault
- confuse facts and inferences

*adapted from Julianne Johnson
FACTS FIRST: "Friday was the third day this week you were late to work."

EXPRESS EMOTIONS: "I am worried and annoyed"

REQUEST ACTION: "I would like to be able to count on you to be on time from now on."

NEGOTIATE, AFFIRM AGREEMENT, DESCRIBE CONSEQUENCES:

CONSEQUENCE +

"Thank you for agreeing to this compromise. I feel better knowing you are going to be here on time."

CONSEQUENCE -

"I'm sorry we couldn't reach agreement. To make sure there are no surprises, I want to tell you that a repetition of this behavior will result in a written warning which will be put in your file."

*adapted from Julianne Johnson
Your task is to observe the group's behavior. You do not participate. Position yourself where you can observe the behavior of all the group members.

1. Who was the group leader?

2. Describe his/her leadership style. Give some examples of his/her behavior that illustrate that style.

3. Note any group member's behavior that you think was related to the leader's style of management. Note the member's name next to each specific behavior.

4. Describe the climate or atmosphere of the group. Give some examples of group member's behaviors that illustrate this climate. Record the members' names and their specific behaviors.

5. Describe the involvement or participation of the group members in this task.

6. Cite some examples of behavior of individual members to illustrate the participation characteristics of your group. Record the members' names and note their specific behaviors.
LEADERS INSTRUCTION SHEET

Your job is to be as much of a dictator as you possibly can. It is important that you demonstrate this style of leadership to your group without informing them of what you are doing. Give orders about the planning and construction, and insist that the sculpture is to be constructed from your ideas.

Your job is to be as much of a democratic leader as you possibly can. It is important that you demonstrate this style of leadership to your group without informing them of what you are doing. When a suggestion is made by you or any group member ask to see how many of the group members agree with the idea. Push for some degree of consensus before any idea is acted on. The sculpture is to be the result of the group's ideas with you simply facilitating.
APPENDIX B

MEMO TO MANAGERS
Dear Manager or supervisor,

You are invited to participate in an eight hour management training program designed to address the issues involved in supervising people. The seminar will involve both lecture and experiential content and will contain workshops on management styles, conflict resolution, communication strategies and understanding personality dynamics.

As part of my doctoral dissertation, I have researched, designed and developed this program and ask your participation in helping me evaluate its effectiveness. Your participation is totally voluntary. There are no medical, financial, social or psychological risks associated with your participation.

The seminar will be conducted in two half day sessions; Wednesday April 24, from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and Thursday April 25, from 6:00 to 10:00 p.m. Due to the nature of this research study, it is necessary that if you choose to participate you attend both sessions.

If you would like to attend, please complete the bottom portion of this form and return the completed portion to me. Your participation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Amy Preiss, M.S., LPC

Please complete and return.

[ ] YES! I would like to participate  [ ] No, I am unable

NAME________________________________________________________AGE______

JOB TITLE__________________________________________________________

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL________________________________________________

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES SUPERVISED____________________________________

NUMBER OF YEARS OF SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE________________________

NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION________________________________

BIRTH ORDER (I.E. FIRST BORN, SECOND, ETC.)__________________________

SIGNATURE___________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C

MEMO TO CONTROL GROUP
Dear Manager or Supervisor,

I am requesting your participation in assisting me collect data for my doctoral dissertation research. Attached are three separate forms. Please complete each form. In approximately two weeks I will reissue you the same forms for you to complete a second time.

In addition, please complete the biographical information below and return to me with your forms.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Amy Preiss

NAME________________________________________AGE________

JOB TITLE________________________________________

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL____________________________________

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES SUPERVISED____________________

NUMBER OF YEARS OF SUPERVISORY EXPERIENCE__________

NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT POSITION_________________

BIRTH ORDER (I.E. FIRST BORN, SECOND, ETC.)__________

SIGNATURE____________________________________________
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION FORM
EVALUATION FORM

1. What is your overall reaction to this workshop?
   Poor  Excellent
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   Please explain.

2. What about the workshop was most helpful (e.g., particular topics covered, types of exercises, etc.)? Please explain.

3. Are there any changes you would suggest for this workshop?
   Please explain.

4. How effective was the facilitator in presenting the workshop? Please explain.

5. Please provide any additional comments below and on the back of this sheet.
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