

379
N81d
No. 921

THE INFLUENCE OF THE INTERACTION OF SUPERVISORY STYLE
AND EMPLOYEE LOCUS OF CONTROL ON VOTING BEHAVIOR
IN UNION REPRESENTATION ELECTIONS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Edward L. Harrison, B.A., M.B.A.

Denton, Texas

May, 1975

7/8/72

Harrison, Edward L., The Influence of the Interaction of Supervisory Style and Employee Locus of Control on Voting Behavior in Union Representation Elections. Doctor of Philosophy (Personnel and Industrial Relations), May, 1975, 121 pp., 20 tables, 1 illustration, bibliography, 87 titles.

One of the central events in collective bargaining is the representation election. In such an election, employees cast secret ballots to indicate their desires regarding union representation. Although the representation election is a critical event in the collective bargaining process, relatively little research has been conducted regarding those factors which influence the voting behavior of employees.

The purpose of this study is to examine the interaction of two variables which may influence employee voting behavior. These variables are the leadership style of the supervisor and the employee personality trait of locus of control. The hypothesis held that the interaction of supervisory style and employee locus of control will result in significant differences in the vote in representation elections. The implicit assumption was that certain combinations of leadership styles and employee internality or externality would influence employee voting behavior.

The data were collected through the administration of three research instruments to 103 employees of four business firms where representation elections had been conducted

recently. These instruments were the Supervisory Behavior Description, the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, and the supervision scale of the Job Descriptive Index. Each employee also answered two written questions concerning the direction of his vote.

The Supervisory Behavior Description provides scores on the leadership styles of Consideration and Initiating Structure. The Locus of Control Scale assesses the extent to which the subject believes that his rewards in life are contingent upon his own behavior rather than luck, fate, or other outside forces. The Job Descriptive Index is an instrument for measuring job satisfaction.

The voting data were categorized on the basis of votes for and against union representation, high and low Structure, high and low Consideration, and internal or external locus of control. These data were analyzed with 2 x 2 contingency tables in several variations using the chi-square test.

With one exception, no significant difference in voting behavior was obtained which could be attributed to the interaction of supervisory style and locus of control. The exception involved the style of high Structure where a significant difference in the voting behavior of internal employees versus that of external employees was obtained.

Associated with the testing of the hypothesis, an examination was made of the relationships between supervisory style, satisfaction with supervision, and voting behavior,

without inclusion of the locus of control variable. A chi-square test of the relationships between Consideration and voting behavior indicated that employees who perceived their supervisor as using a supervisory style of high Consideration were more likely to vote against union representation than for representation. Employees who perceived their supervisor as using a style low in Consideration were more likely to vote for union representation.

A point biserial correlation coefficient of .32 ($p < .01$) was obtained between satisfaction with supervision and vote. Through an analysis of variance, the supervisory style of Consideration was found to exert a strong effect ($p < .001$) upon satisfaction with supervision.

Based on the weight of the evidence, it was concluded that the interaction of supervisory style and employee locus of control does not influence voting behavior; that a significant relationship appears to exist between satisfaction with supervision and voting behavior; and that supervisory Consideration appears to be related to voting behavior, and may result in high levels of satisfaction with supervision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | iv |
| LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS | v |
| Chapter | |
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Leadership Theory | |
| Internal-External Locus of Control | |
| Statement of the Problem | |
| Hypothesis | |
| Purpose of the Study | |
| Significance of the Study | |
| Methodology | |
| Delimitations | |
| Definiton of Terms | |
| II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE | 16 |
| Introduction | |
| Determinants of Voting Behavior In Representation Elections | |
| Leadership Theory | |
| Internal-External Locus of Control | |
| III. ANALYSIS OF DATA | 52 |
| Methodology | |
| Analysis of Data | |
| Summary and Conclusions Regarding the Hypothesis | |
| Additional Findings of Interest | |
| Summary of Findings | |
| IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 92 |
| Conclusions | |
| Implications for Management | |
| Implications for Researchers | |
| Recommendations | |
| APPENDIX | 101 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 114 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. Voting Pattern of Employees, By Firm | 53 |
| II. Typical Validity Coefficients for Consideration and Structure for Various Criteria of Leadership Effectiveness | 55 |
| III. Score Criteria for Variables of Structure, Consideration, and Locus of Control | 59 |
| IV. Chi Square Tests of Voting Behavior of Subjects Perceiving High and Low Structure Supervision . | 61 |
| V. Chi Square Tests of Voting Behavior of Subjects Perceiving High Structure Supervision. | 62 |
| VI. Point Biserial Correlation Coefficients Between Structure and Vote for All Subjects, Internals, and Externals | 63 |
| VII. Chi Square Tests of Voting Behavior of Subjects Perceiving High and Low Consideration Supervision | 65 |
| VIII. Point Biserial Correlation Coefficients Between Vote and Consideration for All Subjects, Internals, and Externals | 66 |
| IX. Chi Square Tests of Voting Behavior of Subjects Perceiving High Structure and Low Consideration Supervision | 69 |
| X. Mean, Standard Deviation, and Number of Subjects Perceiving High Structure and Low Consideration Supervision | 71 |
| XI. Analysis of Variance for Main Effects of Structure, Consideration, and Locus of Control on Satisfac- tion with Supervision | 72 |
| XII. Mean Satisfaction with Supervision Scores of Subjects Perceiving High and Low Structure and High and Low Consideration Supervision | 73 |
| XIII. Mean Satisfaction with Supervision Scores of Subjects Perceiving High Structure Supervision . | 75 |
| XIV. Correlations Between Structure, Consideration, and Locus of Control with Satisfaction with Super- vision for all Subjects. | 77 |

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| Figure | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Contingency Table for Analysis of Voting Behavior | 9 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The union representation election is one of the central processes in collective bargaining. It evolves from the fundamental right granted to employees by the National Labor Relations Act to organize and select representatives for collective bargaining. A union representation election is an election conducted by the National Labor Relations Board for the purpose of giving the employees of a business firm the opportunity to elect a union to represent them in collective bargaining with their employer. Although the representation election is one of the decisive points in the collective bargaining relationship, and thus carries significant implications, it constitutes one of the largely ignored areas of research in industrial relations and organizational behavior (1, 2).

A critical issue inherent in the representation election involves those factors which determine the direction of the employee vote. That is, when the time arrives for the employee to cast his ballot for either representation by the union or no representation at all, what factors will influence his vote? There have been a few investigations devoted to a better understanding of this determination, but the issue

is far from being resolved. In a review of the results from 647 elections, Rose (10) found that there were a number of factors which might influence the results of these elections. These were unit related variables, such as the size of the unit being organized, the industrial classification of the firm, the union involved, the location of the firm, and prior organizing activity.

Another study by Getman, Goldberg, and Herman (4) focused more directly on those factors which influence employee voting behavior. Their study was designed to determine the extent to which the campaign tactics of both parties influence the vote of the individual employee. The pre-campaign and post-campaign attitudes of the employee voters were studied as the basis for analysis of their voting patterns. Various factors, including the general job satisfaction of the employees, had a definite relation to voting behavior.

Although employee attitudes were examined in the Getman, Goldberg, and Herman study, no research has been devoted to investigating the influence of the interaction of perceived supervisory style and employee locus of control on the direction of the vote in the election. This is the central issue with which the present study deals.

Leadership Theory

In a study of this nature, leadership theory naturally occupies one of the central roles. Thus, it is appropriate to briefly review the evolution of leadership research and

examine the role of leadership behavior in this study. Early efforts to understand leadership concentrated on the identification of those traits which characterized successful leaders. Examples of such traits are "decisiveness" and "desire for power." A consideration of this approach reveals that such a list of traits is virtually endless. And, even more important, successful leadership cannot be predicted with such an approach since all traits do not apply to all successful leaders. Such weaknesses in the trait approach led theorists to search for more definitive ways of understanding the leadership phenomenon.

One such effort was undertaken by several Ohio State University psychologists who conducted factor analyses of various leadership behavior questionnaires (5, 6). The analyses resulted in the isolation of two leadership factors which the researchers called "Consideration" and "Initiating Structure." Consideration refers to the degree to which a leader acts in a warm and supportive manner and exhibits concern and respect for his subordinates. Initiating Structure is related to the behavior of the supervisor in structuring his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment. This style will be referred to as simply "Structure" in this study.

Other research was also conducted at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center in an effort to determine whether specific leader behaviors were related to group

effectiveness. This research culminated in the identification of two concepts which the researchers labeled "employee orientation" and "production orientation" (8). These two behaviors are similar to the concepts of Consideration and Structure. Employee orientation is that behavior which is concerned with the relationships aspect of the work environment stressing the central role of the employee. Production orientation emphasizes the technical aspects of the job, with employees viewed as tools to accomplish the goals of the organization.

The initial belief stemming from this research was that the considerate or employee-oriented leader would be the most effective in terms of group productivity. Some studies produced results which supported this premise. On the other hand, the results of other studies indicated that groups working under production-oriented leaders were the most productive. This focus on the leader's behavior has produced inconsistent results. The failure of this research, as well as that of the trait theorists, to formulate a definitive theory of leadership has led to the exploration of even further leadership theories.

One theory is based on the belief that there are variables other than the leader's behavior which influence important organizational criteria such as productivity, employee satisfaction, turnover, and absenteeism. An early formulation of this belief was researched by Tannenbaum and Schmidt who stated in their now classic article (14) that there are three

forces which determine the success of a particular leader. These forces are found in the leader, the subordinates, and the situation. Hersey and Blanchard (7) have used this same approach in their leadership effectiveness model. This model holds that $E=f(l,f,s)$, or leadership effectiveness is a function of the leader, the followers, and other situational variables.

Using this general concept, some researchers are currently studying the personality of subordinates as a potentially significant variable influencing leadership effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. For example, Vroom (15) found that the positive effects of participation in decision making varied according to the subordinate's personality traits and need for authoritarianism or independence. Participation was positively correlated with both performance and job satisfaction for subordinates whose personalities indicated they were low in their need for authoritarianism and high in their need for independence. There was no significant correlation for subordinates with opposite personality scores.

Runyon (12) employed another personality trait, the employee's internal-external locus of control. In a sample of 110 rank-and-file employees, he found that satisfaction with supervision was a function of the interaction of management style and employee internal-external locus of control. Specifically, his results indicated that subordinates who

believed that they could control their own environment (internals) preferred a supervisor who employed a participative style in his supervisory behavior. Likewise, an employee who believed that his environment was controlled by outside forces (the external) preferred the directive supervisor who could structure the situation.

This approach has come to be regarded in leadership theory as one involving the preferences of employees for certain leadership styles. Researchers commonly refer to this approach as the preference model of leadership theory (16). This theory is in contrast to those earlier theories which regarded the behavior of the leader as a sufficient explanation for the variance in important organizational criteria.

Following the general approach described above, this study concentrates on subordinate personality and its relationship to leadership style. It is believed that the interaction of these two variables significantly influences voting behavior in union representation elections. As did Runyon, this study employs the internal-external locus of control personality trait, which is discussed in the following section.

Internal-External Locus of Control

The internal-external locus of control concept, which was developed principally by Rotter (11), has its foundations in social learning theory. Its central element is the reinforcement or reward. The theory holds that, as a result of social learning processes, some individuals possess an expectancy

that a reward is contingent upon their own behavior or personal characteristics. These individuals are said to believe in internal control. Other individuals hold an expectancy that a reward is controlled by outside forces and may occur independently of their own actions. As Rotter states, these individuals perceive rewards as being the "result of luck, chance, fate, under the control of powerful others, or as unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding them" (11, p. 1).

One facet of the research conducted regarding locus of control has examined the efforts of individuals to control their own environment. Studies pursuing this line of research have concluded that internals appear to be more active in attempting to control their own environment in important life situations than are externals. Some of the studies of this nature have been conducted by Neal and Seeman (9) and Seeman (13). These studies produced results which have important implications for the central issue of membership in unions. These researchers found a significant and consistent relationship between internality and membership in unions. They hypothesized that those individuals who believe in internal control viewed union membership as a means of obtaining the desired control over their environment. Externals, who view themselves as under the control of other forces, were associated with non-membership in work organizations such as unions.

Statement of the Problem

The divergence of these research results regarding the importance of personality traits and leadership styles forms the basis for this study. This study is intended to demonstrate the influence of the interaction of perceived supervisory style and employee locus of control on voting behavior in union representation elections.

The logic underlying the nature of the study involves the implicit assumption that the employee personality trait of locus of control will either coincide with or conflict with the supervisor's leadership style, as perceived by the employee, in order for the predicted results to occur. That is, based on the extent to which employees believe in internal versus external control of their environment, certain leadership styles should be more acceptable than others. The extent to which the supervisor's style coincides with the employee's need for internal or external control will influence the direction of the employee's vote in a representation election.

These relationships will be tested through the use of a 2 x 2 contingency table with the following general format.

| | Internal Locus of Control | External Locus of Control |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Employee Perception of Supervisor's Managerial Style* | Representation Election Votes | Representation Election Votes |
| Employee Perception of Supervisor's Managerial Style* | Representation Election Votes | Representation Election Votes |

*Consideration or structure

Fig. 1--Contingency table for analysis of voting behavior

Hypothesis

The interaction of perceived supervisory style and employee locus of control will result in significant differences in voting behavior in union representation elections.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of the interaction of perceived supervisory style and employee locus of control on voting behavior in union representation elections.

Significance of the Study

There are at least two factors which contribute to the significance of this research. The determinants of employee voting behavior in union representation elections have been largely ignored in organizational behavior research. This is particularly true when the personality of the employee is considered. It is important that research be undertaken so that a better understanding of the variables which influence this important process may result.

Since several plausible views in leadership theory are at least partially accepted as having some substance, a contribution can be made by research in one of these areas. In this study, a facet of the leadership preference theory is explored.

Methodology

General Design of the Study

Sources of information for this study consist of both primary and secondary types. All relevant literature in the areas of determinants of representation election voting behavior, leadership theory, and the locus of control concept as applied to similar situations are explored.

The primary data was obtained through research conducted in several business firms where representation elections were recently conducted. The subjects involved are those employees who voted in each election. Meetings were held involving

these employees at which they were asked to state, in response to a written questionnaire, how they voted in the election. They were also requested to complete the three paper-and-pencil research instruments described below. Anonymity of all subjects was maintained.

Research Instruments

The three research instruments related directly to the following areas:

Employee Locus of Control.--To determine the employee's locus of control, Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale was used (see Appendix A).

Supervisory Style.--Subjects completed Fleishman's Supervisory Behavior Description (see Appendix B). This instrument measured supervisory style as perceived by the subordinate and provided scores for the styles of Consideration and Structure. Such an instrument was used inasmuch as it was only the subordinate's perception of the supervisor's style which was important. Fiman (3) found that only the subordinate's perception of the supervisor's style, rather than the supervisor's self-perception, was associated with changes in the criterion.

Subordinate Satisfaction with Supervision.--This factor was measured by use of the satisfaction with supervision scale of the Job Descriptive Index (see Appendix C).

Analysis of Data

The voting data in the 2 x 2 design was subjected to a chi square test to determine whether the voting pattern differed significantly from that which would be expected by chance. Where a significant difference was found, the hypothesis was supported.

As a secondary test, point-biserial correlation coefficients were computed by correlating the variables of Consideration, Structure, locus of control, and satisfaction with supervision to the dichotomous vote variable. This test was used to explore the possible existence of a relationship between the four variables mentioned and the dependent variable of voting behavior.

Delimitations

The following limitations are applicable to this research:

1. The results of this research do not represent, nor do they purport to represent, a statistical representation of employee voting behavior in all union representation elections.
2. The size of the sample is dependent upon the number of recent representation elections which have been conducted and the willingness of business firms to participate in the study.

3. Since the firms willing to participate in the study varied widely in number of employees, it was necessary to use a sampling of the employees voting in the elections of large firms.

4. Post-election data were utilized since National Labor Relations Board practices preclude contamination of the "hygienic" conditions surrounding a representation election by the involvement of outsiders during the period immediately preceding the election.

Definition of Terms

1. The terms "supervisory style," "leadership style," and "leader behavior" are used interchangeably in this study. They refer to the managerial dimensions of Consideration and Structure used by supervisors in directing the activities of their subordinates.

2. The term "perceived" supervisory or leadership style is used since the leadership style scores on Consideration and Structure are the result of employee reports of supervisory behavior through the use of the Supervisory Behavior Description.

3. The symbol x^2 is used in the tables to denote chi square.

Chapter Bibliography

1. Chaison, Gary N., "The Need for a More Intensive Analysis of Union Organizing Campaigns," Academy of Management Journal, 14 (December, 1971), 518-520.
2. Ellis, Dean S., Laurance Jacobs and Gary Mills, "A Union Authorization Election: The Key to Winning," Personnel Journal, 51 (April, 1972), 82-88.
3. Fiman, Byron G., "An Investigation of the Relationships Among Supervisory Attitudes, Behaviors, and Outputs: An Examination of McGregor's Theory Y," Personnel Psychology, 26 (Spring, 1973), 95-105.
4. Getman, Julius G., Stephen Goldberg, and Jeanne B. Herman, The National Labor Relations Board Voting Study: A Preliminary Report, Urbana, Illinois, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1972.
5. Halpin, Andrew W. and B.J. Winer, "A Factorial Study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, edited by Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
6. Hemphill, J.K. and A.E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, edited by R. M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
7. Hersey, Paul and Kenneth Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
8. Katz, Daniel, Nathan Maccoby, and Nancy Morse, Productivity, Supervision and Morale in an Office Situation, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1950.
9. Neal, Arthur G. and Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 29 (April, 1964), 216-226.

10. Rose, Joseph B., "What Factors Influence Union Representation Elections?," Monthly Labor Review, 95 (October, 1972), 49-51.
11. Rotter, Julian B., "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs, (1966), 1-27.
12. Runyon, Kenneth E., "Some Interactions Between Personality Variables and Management Styles," Journal of Applied Psychology, 47 (June, 1973), 288-294.
13. Seeman, Melvin, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," The Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1966), 139-151.
14. Tannenbaum, Robert and Warren H. Schmidt, "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," Harvard Business Review, 36 (March-April, 1958), 95-101.
15. Vroom, Victor H., "Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59 (November, 1959), 322-327.
16. Yukl, Gary, "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Leadership," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6 (July, 1971), 414-440.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of research conducted in the three principal areas comprising this study. These are the areas of voting behavior in union representation elections, leadership theory, and the internal-external locus of control.

Determinants of Voting Behavior in Representation Elections

One of the principal events in labor-management relations is the representation election. The representation election was established as a part of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 allowing employees to organize and bargain collectively with their employer. Whenever a number of employees in a business firm indicate their desire to be represented by a union, they may petition the National Labor Relations Board to conduct an election in order that they may express their desires. After the necessary hearings, the director of the Board's regional office conducts an election in which the employees may vote. If a majority of the voting employees cast their ballots for a particular union, that union becomes the exclusive bargaining agent for all employees in the unit (10).

It would seem that one of the central issues in industrial relations research would center on the determinants of the direction of employee voting in these elections. That is, what factors determine whether the employees vote for or against union representation. It is surprising to learn that, with such a significant process, relatively little research has been devoted to the examination of those determinants of representation election voting behavior (9, 15). Most of the literature contains mere assumptions concerning those factors which influence the employee vote in such elections.

Traditional Assumptions

It is generally assumed that employees join unions believing they will enhance their position relative to wages or working conditions. And, "this belief is based in turn on the principle that people, when faced with stressful circumstances, will join together not only to commiserate with one another but also to gain added strength and power with which to bargain for improved conditions of employment and an increase in job satisfaction" (14, p. 200). When the literature dealing with collective bargaining is examined, the specific factors relating to the determination of voting behavior are rarely mentioned. When they are discussed, they are most often observations based largely upon the opinions of the various authors, rather than the results of intensive research. For example, one author observes that

"when an employer overlooks his employee's needs, and complaints are unheeded, frustration sets in. Then, often as a last resort, employees seek union help" (38, p. 47). Kothe believes that the "vote is not as much one for the union . . . as it is an articulation of his attitude toward the company" (41, p. 14). He further states that:

Observation of thousands of elections demonstrates that the choice of employees in a representation election is influenced by at least four factors, which are not necessarily listed in the order of their importance:

1. The past experience of employees on the job;
2. The tactics of the organizing union and the vigor with which those tactics are carried out;
3. The force of opinion of influential employees within the work group; and
4. Statements and conduct of the employer during the campaign (41, p. 14).

Another author, Sweetow, cites the importance of employee attitudes and beliefs. He states that several factors contribute to an employee vote for the union, some of which are:

1. An employee votes yes or no based on what he thinks you think of him.
2. Most employees know at the time an NLRB election is filed how he is going to vote. The rest are fence-sitters.
3. Employees generally believe that they are told in campaigns but tend to reject written material unless it is graphic.
4. Employees are easily persuaded that management-supervision personnel are not the same kind of human being they are (65, p. 25).

Dougherty stresses the importance of the supervisor, as does this study, when he indicates that:

Whether the workman's higher needs are being satisfied at the work place depends heavily on the foreman. Whether or not his self-perceived wants are being satisfied is in great part determined by foreman performance. So it is not in the least unreasonable to take a long look at the quality of supervision, if the company has doubts about the allegiance of the workmen. It is probably true that the cause of most unionism difficulties is foreman performance (12, p. 39).

In other instances, employee discontent and the failure of management to establish effective upward communication channels are often cited as significant in causing employees to vote for union representation (24).

All of these theories are assumptions based on the observation of practices which have ostensibly resulted in employees voting for union representation. Not all observations stem from this source, however. A limited amount of research has been conducted in this area and it provides a more definitive view of the question. Some of the research has focused on the influence of the pre-election campaign.

The Pre-election Campaign

As in the case of political elections, a campaign to sway voter attitudes is conducted by the parties in a representation election. Both management and the union engage in a variety of activities designed to strengthen their own position and to weaken the opponent in the eyes of the voting employee. The nature of these tactics is meticulously examined by the National Labor Relations Board.

Their legality is beyond the scope of this paper and will not be discussed. As one might assume, the Board places considerable importance on these tactics and believes that they have some influence on employee voting behavior. Getman, Goldberg and Herman (22) indicate that NLRB decisions seem to presuppose that the voter in a representation election is engaged in a careful process of evaluation in which a rational decision is eventually made.

The picture of the voter carefully evaluating his alternatives in an election appears to be a highly questionable one. Bok emphasizes this doubt when he says that "a rational decision implies that the employees have access to relevant information, that they use this data to determine the possible consequences of selecting or rejecting the union, and that they appraise those possibilities in light of their own values and desires to determine whether a vote for the union promises to promote or impair their interests" (5, p. 46). Samoff flatly states that "the influences of campaign tactics upon both the worker-voter and the citizen voter are unknown, if not unknowable" (54, p. 232).

Getman, Goldberg, and Herman are in the process of conducting the most extensive research to-date on the determinants of voting behavior in representation elections. Their work is a notable exception to the lack of research devoted to this question, and it tends to cast some doubt on

the Board's assumptions regarding the importance of the pre-election campaign. In an initial report of the first phase of their work, these researchers state that those employees who switched their voting intent were not influenced to do so by the campaign. They conclude that the NLRB may be emphasizing too heavily the relative influence of the campaign in terms of its effect on voter intent (22).

Job Satisfaction

Even the untrained observer might assume that the extent to which an employee is satisfied with his job would have some influence on his vote in a representation election. This assumption has been tested by some of the pertinent research. In the two elections studied by Getman, Goldberg, and Herman (22), analysis of the data reveals significant correlations between general job satisfaction and vote. The more highly satisfied the employee, the more likely he was to vote against the union. In one election the correlation coefficient was .58 and in the other it was .57 (22, pp. 238-239).

Protslaw (7) utilized a similar test in a study of the voting behavior of a unit of retail workers. His technique involved classifying employees as either satisfied or dissatisfied and comparing the numbers of votes for and against the union in each of these categories. The results showed a significant difference between the two categories. A large

majority (approximately three to one) of the dissatisfied workers voted in favor of union representation, while almost twice as many satisfied workers voted against union representation.

Other Variables

Most often, the research on unionization focuses on factors which are not related to employee voting behavior but rather upon broad variables which may have some relationship to the vote. As an example, Scoville (56) examined the influence of such factors as age, race, sex, occupation, region, education, marital status, industry and income on unionization in the United States during 1966. Rose (51) conducted a study of 647 representation elections during the period March through September, 1966. He focused on two major variables (unit-related variables) which included such items as the size and type of unit being organized, the industrial classification of the firm, the union involved, the location of the firm, and prior organizing activity. His results indicated that unions won the majority of elections in smaller units rather than in larger ones, and in situations where there had been prior organizing activity. There were no important differences in the results of elections when industrial classification, the union, or the location of the firm were examined.

In an earlier study focusing on voting behavior determinants, McKersie and Brown (45) examined the unsuccessful attempt of a union to organize a large hospital. These researchers correlated various factors with voting for union representation. Those factors found to be associated with joining the union were lower wages, shorter service, more dependents, younger age, Negro and born in the South.

It is apparent that the available research on the issue of voting behavior in representation elections is limited. Of the research conducted, no effort has been made to examine the interaction of the first-line supervisor's leadership style and employee personality in terms of its effect on voting behavior in the elections. It is this task to which this study is addressed.

The critical role of the supervisor is highlighted in the following review of the relevant literature in leadership theory.

Leadership Theory

It is surprising that the key role of the first-line supervisor has not been considered in the research devoted to union representation election voting behavior. The role of the leader or supervisor in the satisfaction and effectiveness of the work group has been and continues to be considered an important one.

Development of Leadership Research

The interest in leadership has been extant since the early part of the twentieth century. In what is considered to be one of the earliest papers on the subject, in 1904 L. M. Terman described an experiment which was designed to identify leaders and to assess the qualities which caused them to be considered as such (67). This paper was well in advance of the major efforts to better understand leadership. The more intensive studies began appearing near the end of the 1930s. In one such early experiment Feldman studied the supervision in the home office of an insurance company. Supervisors in twenty-two work sections were studied in terms of work group effectiveness. The supervisors were transferred to other sections and their work group effectiveness again recorded at the end of one year. The rank of the supervisors with respect to group effectiveness remained relatively unchanged, even though they were supervising different employee groups. This study is now considered to be indicative of the role of the supervisor in group productivity (70).

The emphasis on traits.--The earliest identifiable approach to the study of leadership revolved around the identification of traits which characterized successful leaders. The promulgators of this approach believed that if one could identify those characteristics that made

successful leaders, a fuller understanding of leadership could be attained. Although the trait approach suffered from inherent weaknesses, it was appropriate to its time "because of the psychologist's essential interest in individual characteristics. To measure and assess the personality of leaders seemed eminently appropriate to the psychologically-oriented investigator" (33, p. 4). The essence of the trait method of leadership study is seen in a 1948 survey of the literature by R. M. Stogdill in which numerous pertinent traits were discussed. Some of these were age, height, weight, appearance, energy, fluency of speech, intelligence, scholarship, knowledge, judgment and decision, insight, originality, adaptability, introversion-extroversion, dominance, responsibility, self confidence, emotional control, social skills, and cooperation (63, pp. 96-122).

The trait approach eventually became a victim of its inherent weaknesses, most evident of which was its failure to adequately consider the variables which confound any situation. That is, no leader operates in a vacuum but is in constant interaction with the social situation within which his role is being played. Thus, the leader's characteristics are necessarily moderated by situational factors. As Hollander so aptly summarizes:

To speak therefore of "the leader" or of leadership as if those terms conveyed an immutable "state of being" from genetics or social tradition, was to leave out a

great deal of real-life social process. Indeed, if any point stands forth in the modern day view of leadership it is that leaders are made by circumstances even though some come to those circumstances better equipped than others (33, p. 5).

The emphasis on leader behavior.--The focus on the traits of successful leaders became weakened in part by the work conducted by researchers who were studying leader behavior. The first of these was most likely the research conducted by Lewin, Lippit, and White (43) in 1939 in which children were used as subjects. Their results showed that groups under democratic leadership showed less conflict and higher sustained productivity than did groups operating under both laissez-faire and autocratic leadership. This study began the pattern wherein some leadership researchers concluded that democratic leadership will most often result in greater group productivity. The study is often cited as one of the significant milestones in the development of leadership research, most likely due to the identification of the three leadership styles of democratic, laissez-faire, and authoritarian (55, p. 117).

Major studies focusing on the leader's behavior were initiated in the 1940's at the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University. Researchers Halpin and Winer (29) factor-analyzed a leader behavior questionnaire developed by Hemphill (32) and isolated two major dimensions of leader behavior. The dimensions, called Consideration and Structure,

have subsequently become the most widely studied of the various descriptors of leader behavior. Consideration refers to supervisory behavior which is "indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth" (29, p. 42) between a leader and his subordinates. Structure involves leader behavior in which the supervisor "organizes and defines the relationship between himself and the members of his crew. He tends to define the role which he expects each member of the crew to assume, and endeavors to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done" (29, pp. 42-43). These are the two leader behavior dimensions which are used to describe the behavior of supervisors in this study. This being the case, it is appropriate at this juncture to review some of the major studies involving these dimensions.

The studies involving Consideration and Structure have focused primarily on the extent to which either dimension is associated with employee satisfaction or productivity. Since the present study is concerned mainly with employee satisfaction with supervision, rather than with productivity, only those studies dealing with satisfaction are included in this portion of the review. One of the early studies undertaken by the Ohio State University researchers Halpin and Winer involved ratings of air crew commanders on the two dimensions of Consideration and Structure (29). Results of the study showed a positive relationship between satisfaction and both

Consideration and Structure, although not as consistently with Structure as with Consideration.

In a later study administered through Ohio State University, Fleishman, Harris and Burt (19) studied the leader behaviors of foremen at the International Harvester Company. Their results showed a positive relationship between the Consideration behavior of the foremen and the morale of their subordinates, and a negative relationship between Structure and employee morale.

In an oft-cited study, Fleishman and Harris (18) analyzed the relationship between Consideration and Structure and grievances and turnover. They found a curvilinear relationship between the two dimensions and grievances and turnover. In general, low Consideration and high Structure were associated with high grievances and turnover. They also analyzed the interaction effects of Consideration and Structure and found Consideration to be the dominant factor. Their results indicate that Consideration has a greater effect upon subordinate satisfaction than does Structure. High Consideration leaders could increase Structure with little increase in turnover or grievances.

In a similar study Skinner (62) also found curvilinear relationships between Consideration, Structure and grievances and turnover. However, the Structure regression lines were positively related to both dimensions up to a score of 46-60

when the relationship became negative. Her study also showed Consideration to be positively related to employee satisfaction.

Nealy and Blood (49) investigated the relationship between the Consideration and Structure dimensions among nursing supervisors in a VA hospital. Their results indicate subordinate job satisfaction to be positively related to leader Consideration at both first and second levels of supervision. However, Structure behavior contributed to high subordinate satisfaction at the first level of supervision but low subordinate satisfaction at the second level.

Anderson (1) obtained ratings of leader Consideration and Structure behavior from graduate students who were members of 36 intercultural discussion groups consisting of one American and one Indian graduate student plus an American leader. The results show group morale to be more highly related to considerate leader behavior than to the Structure dimension, while task performance was correlated with the leader's structuring behavior.

Lowin, Hrapchak, and Kavanaugh (44), in an experimental study using students as subjects, found a positive relationship between Consideration and job satisfaction.

In a study investigating the interrelationships between Consideration and Structure, House, Filley, and Kerr (36) found that mean satisfaction scores increased as Structure increased in cases where high Consideration existed, but

found no clear pattern of relationships between Satisfaction and Structure where low Consideration existed. In one of the three organizations studied, Structure was, surprisingly, found to be positively and significantly related to satisfaction in both the total sample and under conditions of high Consideration.

Recently, Gruenfeld and Kassum (28) developed similar findings with regard to Structure. They found a significant positive relationship between Structure and satisfaction with supervision in a high Consideration group, but found no such relationship in a low Consideration group. The mean level of satisfaction with supervision was significantly higher for the high Structure-high Consideration group than for the high Structure-low Consideration group. Supervisors using both behaviors at a high level were found to be the most effective in terms of group performance.

House, Filley, and Gujarati (35) found Consideration by the leader to have strong positive relationship to satisfaction in 11 out of 16 measures of subordinate satisfaction. Structure was found to be positively related to 10 out of 16 measures of subordinate role satisfaction,

Wigdor (72), in an unpublished study focusing on the leader behavior perceptions of cosmopolitans and locals, found that Structure and Consideration were positively related to both satisfaction and performance of cosmopolitans,

but were not related to the satisfaction or performance of locals.

These studies, taken as a group, indicate that Consideration is often positively related to employee satisfaction with supervision. The Structure dimension was usually found to be negatively related to satisfaction with supervision, although in two instances it was shown to be positively related to satisfaction with supervision. Some of the recent studies suggest that the most effective leaders, in terms of employee satisfaction and work group performance, may be those who rate high on both dimensions.

In other leadership research, the results of the University of Michigan Survey Research Center were based on an approach which involved the clustering of characteristics which correlated positively with themselves and with criteria of effectiveness (40). The major result of this research was the development of two factors which were labeled employee orientation and production orientation:

Employee orientation is described as behavior by a supervisor which indicates that he feels that the "human relations" aspect of the job is quite important; and that he considers the employees as human beings of intrinsic importance, takes an interest in them, and accepts their individuality and personal needs. Production orientation stresses production and the technical aspects of the job, with employees as means for getting the work done (6, p. 363).

As can be noted, these factors are quite similar in nature to the Ohio State University dimensions of Consideration and Structure.

There were other important studies carried out at the Survey Research Center which contributed to the sustained interest in the behavior of leaders as a major independent variable. In one of these studies Katz, Maccoby, and Morse (40) examined the leadership practices of supervisors in an insurance company. After dividing the workers into high and low producing groups, they found that there were noticeable differences in the leadership styles of the high and low producing supervisors. In general, the supervisors of high producing groups used a general supervisory style while the supervisors of low producing groups used close supervision. This study has often been used to support the belief that general supervision leads to high productivity (13).

In another study at the University of Michigan, researchers analyzed the supervisory practices employed by foremen of railroad gangs on the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad (39). This classic study also supports the thesis that the behavior of the supervisor is an important factor in the productivity of the work group. The results showed that the supervisors of high producing groups assume a role which is more differentiated from the work of their subordinates than do the supervisors of low producing work groups. The high producing supervisor "clearly perceives and accepts the responsibilities of leadership . . . and sees the job in

terms of employee needs and aspirations; he is employee-oriented, but does not abdicate the leadership position" (39, p. xi).

Another study at the Michigan Survey Research Center was conducted in 1953 by Morse (46) and involved clerical workers and their supervision. This study found that work group productivity was higher under supervisors who delegate, allow freedom of action, exert no pressure for production, and treat subordinates in an understanding way. Satisfaction was found to be positively related to general supervision and freedom of action.

In a study which is rapidly becoming a classic, Morse and Reimer (47) investigated the relationships among delegation of authority, employee satisfaction, and productivity in a large organization. Although the processes involved are organizational in nature, the findings have applicability to leader behavior. Individual satisfaction of work group members increased significantly in the program with autonomous decision-making power and decreased significantly in centralized units. Both decision-making systems increased productivity, with the centralized program resulting in the highest increase.

The studies reviewed above are representative of the many early efforts designed to assess the impact of the behavior of the leader on work group processes, primarily

those of productivity and satisfaction. Although many of these studies were undertaken with the a priori belief that the leadership style involving employee orientation was most often associated with the more positive results in terms of productivity and satisfaction, this was not to be the long-run outcome of these investigations. In a review of a large number of these studies, Anderson (2) compared authoritarian and democratic supervisory styles and found neither consistently associated with high work group productivity. Researchers had become aware, even before Anderson's review, that other variables were influencing their results. One of the early problems was the failure to distinguish leadership "as a process from the leader as a person who occupies a central role in that process." He continues, "leadership constitutes an influence relationship between two, or usually more, persons who depend upon one another for the attainment of certain mutual goals within a group situation." (34, p. 515).

The situational approach.--Through a lengthy series of studies, researchers became aware that variables other than the leader's behavior may have significant influences on their results. It was apparent to some of these researchers that the most obvious of these was the other persons playing roles in the situation, the followers. In addition, other situational variables such as the nature of the task, group size, structure, and resources were recognized as influential

elements in group effectiveness and satisfaction (34, p. 516). The importance of situational factors was recognized relatively early by some researchers, although the movement did not gain full strength until recently. This early recognition is seen in the work of Hemphill, who held that "what an individual actually does when acting as a leader is in large part dependent upon characteristics of the situation in which he functions" (32, p. v).

A major impetus to the situational thrust was exerted in the 1958 article by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (66) in which they proposed that leadership effectiveness is determined by three forces: forces in the leader, in the subordinates, and in the situation.

The situational approach to the understanding of leadership continues to gain strength in the research and writings of Fiedler (16), Vroom and Mann (71), and Heller (31). Of these, the most publicized and widely-studied is the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness proposed by Fiedler. This model postulates that the performance of interacting groups is contingent upon the interaction of leadership style and situational favorableness. With respect to leadership style, the model specifies that "task-oriented" leaders perform more effectively in very favorable and very unfavorable situations, while "relationships-oriented" leaders perform best in situations intermediate in favorableness (17, p. 128). There are three dimensions which determine the

degree to which the situation will provide the leader with potential power and influence. These are leader-member relations, the degree of task structure, and the power of the position held by the leader.

The Fiedler contingency model has been tested extensively by Fiedler, who contends that the situational favorableness dimension does indeed moderate the relationship between leadership style and group performance (17, p. 147). Other researchers have attempted to replicate his results and, in some cases, have obtained conflicting outcomes. In one study, researchers found that the evidence supporting the model was developed prior to the conceptualization of the model whereas evidence developed since that time fails to provide support for the model's validity (26).

The influence of subordinate personality.--Following the situational approach, some researchers have focused on the personality of the subordinate as a potentially significant variable influencing leadership effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction with supervision. This approach is often categorized under the general label of a "preference" model of leadership. The belief expressed in such a model, either implicitly or explicitly, is that the preferences of subordinates often exert a significant influence on their ultimate satisfaction with supervision. In most instances, it is a personality trait of the subordinate which is thought to be at the root of this preference.

As an example of such research, Vroom (69) found that the positive effects of participation in decision-making varied according to the subordinate's personality traits of authoritarianism and need for independence. Participation was positively correlated with both performance and job satisfaction for subordinates who were low in authoritarianism and high in need for independence, while there was no significant correlation for subordinates with the opposite personality scores.

The expectations of subordinates were emphasized as early as 1953 by Berkowitz (4). In 1954 Gibb (23) wrote that effective leadership must be evaluated in terms of the needs, attitudes and expectations of the followers. In a 1957 study by Foa, (20) using Israeli shipping crews and their officers, it was found that sailors with authoritarian expectations working under authoritarian officers are significantly more satisfied than crews with permissive expectations. And, crews with permissive expectations were more satisfied working under permissive officers.

In 1960 French, Israel, and As (21), using Norwegian factory workers, found that the positive effects of a participative supervisory style held only for workers who experienced at least as much participation as they considered legitimate.

Greer (27) has also used a preference model to analyze employee satisfaction and performance. His results indicate that the more a leader's behavior satisfies the role expectations of subordinates, the more effective will be the group's performance.

Haythorn (30) examined groups which were composed of members that were either high or low in authoritarianism and compared their position on this dimension to their leader's authoritarianism. He found that in those situations where the group and the leader were similar in authoritarianism, group morale was higher and there was less personality conflict.

In another study using the authoritarianism dimension, Tosi (69) found that subordinates were most satisfied where the subordinate was authoritarian and worked for a directive boss. However, contrary to his hypothesis, he found a low level of job satisfaction to exist where a low authoritarian subordinate reported his superior to be high in tolerance for freedom.

In a recent study Hunt and Liebscher (37) used a preference model to analyze subordinate satisfaction with leadership style. In this study the results show that the use of leadership preferences are no more highly related to the criterion of subordinate satisfaction than is leadership behavior alone.

In an unpublished study, Burkey (8) analyzed the influence of the discrepancy between the actual and ideal behavior of the supervisor on group output. His findings indicate that the effect of the difference between the actual behavior of the supervisor and the ideal behavior of the supervisor as perceived by the subordinate is significantly and negatively related. However, he found that this difference between ideal and actual behavior of the supervisor did not correlate significantly with job satisfaction variables.

In a recent study, Runyon (53) found that satisfaction with supervision is a function of the interaction of management style and employee internal-external locus of control. Specifically, his results indicate that subordinates who believe that they can control their own environment (internals) prefer a supervisor who employs a participative style in his supervisory behavior. Likewise, an employee who believes that his environment is controlled by outside forces (the external) prefers the directive style of supervision.

It is the internal-external locus of control concept which is utilized in this study. The research dealing with the appropriate facet of this concept is described in the following portion of this chapter.

Internal-External Locus of Control

The internal-external locus of control concept was developed principally by Rotter (52) and has been utilized as the basis for extensive research since its inception. The construct is one type of expectancy theory related to the control of reinforcements or rewards. And "the role of reinforcement, reward, or gratification is universally recognized by students of human nature as a crucial one in the acquisition and performance of skills and knowledge" (52, p. 1). The result of a reinforcement following some behavior is contingent upon whether or not the person perceives a causal relationship between the behavior and the reinforcement. If the individual believes that the reinforcement is the result of his own behavior or his own relatively permanent characteristics, according to the theory, the individual is said to believe in internal control. If, on the other hand, the person believes that rewards are not contingent upon his own actions but are the result of luck, fate, chance, or are unpredictable, then the person is said to believe in external control. Individuals vary along a wide continuum in the degree to which they believe in either internal or external control. As Rotter states, "It seems likely that, depending upon the individual's history of reinforcement, individuals would differ in the degree to which they attributed reinforcements to their own actions" (52, p.2).

The internal-external locus of control construct has been employed in a wide variety of psychological studies, including studies of complex learning, cognitive activity, and achievement behavior (42). Only one segment of this research is applicable to the present study. This study uses the locus of control concept as it relates to the efforts of individuals to control their environment. A number of studies have been conducted (11, 25, 50, 57, 61, 64) which show that internals are more active in attempting to control their environment in important life situations than are externals.

The locus of control concept plays two important roles in this study. First, as was shown earlier, this personality trait has been tentatively shown to influence an employee's satisfaction with certain managerial styles (53). Second, the locus of control trait has been shown to be related to the issue of membership in unions. Studies by Neal and Seeman (48) and Seeman (57) found membership in work organizations such as unions to be related to internality. This is the secondary role for the locus of control in this study.

The first role has been examined earlier in this chapter and requires no further explanation. The second calls for a more detailed examination of the research from which it stems. Sociologists have used the concept of

"alienation" to study the problem of job satisfaction. Alienation has been adopted from the works of Marx who "maintained that workers in the Industrial Revolution became alienated or estranged from their work, and from the product of their work, as a result of the division of labour and their exploitation by employers" (3, p. 225). Alienation has been further refined by sociologists to include multiple variations, one of which is called "powerlessness." This concept refers to "the expectancy or probability held by the individual that his own behavior cannot determine the occurrence of the outcomes, or reinforcements, he seeks" (59, p. 383). As can be seen, this definition is closely akin to Rotter's concept of the locus of control. It is this concept of powerlessness which Seeman uses in his study of membership in unions. His general position is that "membership in a work organization can serve both to moderate the worker's alienation and to mute its negative effect by providing an instrument of control that the worker sees as representing his work-relevant interests" (60, p. 280). And, as Seeman states elsewhere:

Mass theory postulates that the great centers of power--government and the major corporations--are rapidly increasing in size and impersonality. At the same time, and as a consequence, jobs are becoming more specialized, more interchangeable, and the workers are moving more and more from job to job and city to city. This breakdown of personal identification with his work is supposed to make the worker feel more insignificant, expendable, and isolated ("just another

cog"). The labor organizations that mediate between him and the great bureaucracies should therefore become more and more important to him, especially as a means of providing him with some sense of control (58, p.37).

Using a variant of Rotter's Internal-External locus of Control Scale, Neal and Seeman (48) conducted a study involving American workers which supports Seeman's beliefs stated above. They found a significant relationship between a sense of powerlessness and membership in unions. The mean powerlessness score for organized workers was significantly lower (2.54) than was the powerlessness score for unorganized workers (2.94) (48, p. 220).

It is clear from these data that the locus of control dimension may be related to the issue of membership in unions. Both of the strains of thought relative to the locus of control construct described above are related to some form of job satisfaction. Herein lies one of the controversies on which this study may shed light. In one sense the locus of control concept appears to significantly interact with leadership to influence such criteria as satisfaction with supervision. In another usage, the concept has been employed to show that internality is associated with membership in unions. It is clear that these two conceptions of the dimension are not fully compatible. If it is a valid conclusion that the locus of control personality trait moderates the reaction to certain styles of leadership and that this reaction is associated with voting behavior in representation elections, as is hypothesized in this study, then it cannot be valid that

internality is consistently associated with the tendency to join work organizations such as unions.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Anderson, Lynn R., "Leader Behavior, Member Attitudes, and Task Performance of Intercultural Discussion Groups," The Journal of Social Psychology, 69 (August, 1966), 305-319.
2. Anderson, Richard, "Learning in Discussions: A Resume of the Authoritarian Democratic Studies," Harvard Education Review, 29 (Summer, 1959), 201-215.
3. Argyle, Michael, The Social Psychology of Work, New York, Taplinger Publishing Company, 1972.
4. Berkowitz, L. W., "Sharing Leadership in Small Decision-making Groups," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48 (April, 1953), 231-238.
5. Bok, Derek C., "The Regulation of Campaign Tactics in Representation Elections Under the National Labor Relations Act," Harvard Law Review, 78 (November, 1964), 38-141.
6. Bowers, D. G., and S.E. Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness With a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership," Leadership, edited by C. A. Gibb, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1969.
7. Brotslaw, Irving, "Attitude of Retail Workers Toward Union Organization," Labor Law Journal, 18 (March, 1967), 149-171.
8. Burkey, Roy E., "Effect of Discrepancy Between Expected and Actual Supervisory Behavior on Worker Performance and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study," Dissertation Abstracts, 32 (May-June, 1972), 5939A.
9. Chaison, Gary N., "The Need for a More Intensive Analysis of Union Organizing Campaigns," Academy of Management Journal, 14 (December, 1971), 518-520.
10. Chamberlain, Neil W. and Donald E. Cullen, The Labor Sector, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
11. Davis, W.L. and E.J. Phares, "Internal-External Control as a Determinant of Information-seeking in a Social Influence Situation," Journal of Personality, 35 (December, 1967), 547-561.

12. Dougherty, James L., Union-Free Management, Chicago, The Dartnell Corporation, 1968.
13. Dunn, J.D. and Elvis C. Stephens, Management of Personnel: Manpower Management and Organizational Behavior, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
14. Dunnette, Marvin D. and Wayne K. Kirchner, Psychology Applied to Industry, New York, Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965.
15. Ellis, Dean S., Laurance Jacobs, and Cary Mills, "A Union Authorization Election: The Key to Winning," Personnel Journal, 51 (April, 1972), 82-88.
16. Fiedler, Fred E., "Validation and Extension of the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Findings," Psychological Bulletin, 76 (August, 1971), 128-148.
17. _____, "Validation and Extension of the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Findings," Psychological Bulletin, 76 (August, 1971), 128-148.
18. Fleishman, E.A. and Edwin F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology, 15 (Spring, 1962), 43-56.
19. Fleishman, E.A., Edwin F. Harris, and H.E. Burt, Leadership and Supervision in Industry, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1955.
20. Foa, Uriel G., "Relation of Worker's Expectation to Satisfaction with Supervisor," Personnel Psychology, 10 (Spring, 1957), 161-168.
21. French, John R. P., Joachim Israel, and Dagfinn As, "An Experiment on Participation in a Norwegian Factory," Human Relations, 13 (February, 1960), 3-19.
22. Getman, Julius G., Stephen B. Goldberg, and Jeanne B. Herman, The National Labor Relations Board Voting Study: A Preliminary Report, Urbana, Illinois, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1972.
23. Gibb, C.A., "Leadership," Handbook of Social Psychology, edited by G. Lindzey, Cambridge, Addison-Wesley, 1954.
24. Goodfellow, Matthew, "How to go Union in Five Easy Steps," Buffalo, 14 (August, 1966), 29-31.

25. Gore, P.M., and J. B. Rotter, "A Personality Correlate of Social Action," Journal of Personality, 31 (March, 1963), 58-64.
26. Graen, George, Kenneth Alvares, and James B. Orris, "Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness: Antecedent and Evidential Results," Psychological Bulletin, 74 (March, 1970), 285-296.
27. Gree, F. Loyal, "Leader Indulgence and Group Performance," Psychological Monographs, 75 (1961), No. 516.
28. Gruenfeld, Leopold, and Saleem Kassum, "Supervisory Style and Organizational Effectiveness in a Pediatric Hospital," Personnel Psychology, 26 (Winter, 1973), 531-544.
29. Halpin, Andrew W. and B.J. Winer, "A Facotiral Study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, edited by Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, Columbus, Ohio Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
30. Haythorn, William, "The Effects of Varying Combinations of Authoritarian and Equalitarian Leaders and Followers," Readings in Social Psychology, edited by E.E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. Hartley, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1958.
31. Heller, Frank A., "Leadership, Decision-making, and Contingency Theory," Industrial Relations, 12 (May, 1973), 183-199.
32. Hemphill, J.K., Situational Factors in Leadership, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1949.
33. Hollander, Edwin P., Leaders, Groups, and Influence, New York, Oxford University Press, 1964.
34. Hollander, Edwin P., and James W. Julian, "Contemporary Trends in the Analysis of Leadership Processes," Current Perspectives in Social Psychology, edited by Edwin P. Hollander and Raymond G. Hunt, New York, Oxford University Press, 1971.
35. House, Robert J., Alan C. Filley, and Damodar Gujarati, "Leadership Style, Hierarchical Influence, and the Satisfaction of Subordinate Role Expectations: A Test of Likert's Influence Proposition," Journal of Applied Psychology, 55 (October, 1971), 422-432.

36. House, Robert J., Alan C. Filley, and Steven Kerr, "Relations of Leader Consideration and Initiating Structure to R & D, Subordinates' Satisfaction," Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (March, 1971), 19-30.
37. Hunt, J. G., and V.K.C. Liebscher, "Leadership Preference, Leadership Behavior, and Employee Satisfaction," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9 (February, 1973), 59-77.
38. Jackson, Louis and Robert Lewis, Winning NLRB Elections: Management's Strategy and Preventive Programs, New York, Practising Law Institute, 1972.
39. Katz, Daniel, Nathan Maccoby, Gerland Gunn, and Lucretia G. Floor, Productivity, Supervision and Morale Among Railroad Workers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social REsearch, University of Michigan, 1951.
40. Katz, Daniel, Nathan Maccoby, and Nancy C. Morse, Productivity Supervision, and Morale in an Office Situation, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social REsearch, University of Michigan, 1950.
41. Kothe, Charles A., Individual Freedom in the Non-Union Plant, New York, National Association of Manufacturers, 1967.
42. Lefcourt, Herbert M., "Recent Developments in the Study of Locus of Control," Progress in Experimental Research, edited by Brendon A. Maher, New York, Academic Press, Inc., 1972.
43. Lewin, Kurt, R. Lippitt, and R.K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," Journal of Social Psychology, 10 (1939), 271-299.
44. Lowin, Aaron, William J. Hrapchak, and M.J. Kavanagh, "Consideration and Initiating Structure: An Experimental Investigation of Leadership Trists," Administrative Science Quarterly, 14 (June, 1969), 238-253.
45. McKersie, Robert B., and Montague Brown, "Nonprofessional Hospital Workers and a Union Organizing Drive," Quarterly Journal of Economics, LXXVII (August, 1963), 372-404.
46. Morse, Nancy C., Satisfaction in the White-Collar Job, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1953.

47. Morse, Nancy C. and Everett Reimer, "The Experimental Change of a Major Organizational Variable," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52 (January, 1956), 120-129.
48. Neal, Arthur G. and Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 29 (April, 1964), 216-226.
49. Nealey, S.M. and Milton R. Blood, "Leadership Performance of Nursing Supervisors at Two Organizational Levels," Journal of Applied Psychology, 52 (October, 1968), 414-422.
50. Phares, E. J., "Differential Utilization of Information as a Function of Internal-External Control," Journal of Personality, 36 (December, 1968), 649-662.
51. Rose, Joseph B., "What Factors Influence Union Representation Elections?," Monthly Labor Review, 95 (October, 1972), 49-51.
52. Rotter, Julian B., "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs, 80 (1966), No. 609.
53. Runyon, Kenneth D., "Some Interactions Between Personality Variables and Management Styles," Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (June, 1973), 288-294.
54. Samoff, Bernard, "NLRB Elections: Uncertainty and Certainty," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 117 (December, 1968), 228-253.
55. Sartain, Aaron Q. and Alton Baker, The Supervisor and His Job, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965.
56. Scoville, James G., "Influences on Unionization in the U.S. in 1966," Industrial Relations, 10 (October, 1971), 354-361.
57. Seeman, Melvin, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," The Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1966), 139-151.
58. _____, "Antidote to Alienation--Learning to Belong," Transaction, 3 (May-June, 1966), 35-39.

59. _____, "On the Meaning of Alienation," Automation, Alienation, and Anomie, edited by Simon Marcson, New York, Harper and Row, 1970.
60. _____, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work," American Sociological Review, 32 (April, 1967), 273-285.
61. Seeman, Melvin and J. W. Evans, "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting," American Sociological Review, 27 (December, 1962), 772-783.
62. Skinner, Elizabeth, "Relationships Between Leadership Behavior Patterns and Organizational-Situational Variables," Personnel Psychology, 22 (Winter, 1969), 489-494.
63. Stogdill, Ralph M., "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Leadership, edited by C. A. Gibb, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1969.
64. Strickland, B.R., "The Prediction of Social Action From a Dimension of Internal-External Control," Journal of Social Psychology, 66 (August, 1965), 353-358.
65. Sweetow, Michael, "Why Do They Vote Union?," Institutions/Volume Feeding, 22 (September 15, 1973), 25-38.
66. Tannenbaum, Robert and Warren H. Schmidt, "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," Harvard Business Review, 36 (March-April, 1958), 95-101.
67. Terman, L.M., "A preliminary Study of the Psychology and Pedagogy of Leadership," Leadership, edited by C.A. Gibb, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1969.
68. Tosi, Henry L., "The Effect of the Interaction of Leader Behavior and Subordinate Authoritarianism," Personnel Psychology, 26 (Autumn, 1973), 339-350.
69. Vroom, Victor H., "Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59 (November, 1959), 322-327.
70. Vroom, Victor H., Work and Motivation, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

71. Vroom, Victor H. and Floyd C. Mann, "Leader Authoritarianism and Employee Attitudes," Personnel Psychology, 13 (Summer, 1960), 125-140.
72. Wigdor, Lawrence A., "Effectiveness of Various Management and Organizational Characteristics on Employee Satisfaction and Performance as a Function of the Employee's Need for Independence," Dissertation Abstracts, 30 (January-February, 1970), 3150-A.
73. Yukl, Gary, "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Leadership," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6 (July, 1971), 414-440.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The hypothesis investigated in this study was that the interaction of perceived supervisory style and employee locus of control will result in significant differences in voting behavior in union representation elections.

Methodology

Description of the Population

The population involved in this study was composed of 154 employees from four business firms. The subjects were rank-and-file employees whose employers are engaged in meat-packing, electronics manufacturing, paper processing, and local delivery. A substantial number of the questionnaires proved to be invalid due to the failure of some of the subjects to fully or accurately complete them. As a result, only 103 participants were actually involved in the study. Slightly more than half of these, 52 percent, were females.

In the case of the delivery service and the paper processing firms, all employees were surveyed, while only a sample was utilized in the meat packing and electronics firms. The number of subjects used from each of the four firms and

their voting pattern in the four elections is shown in Table I.

TABLE I
VOTING PATTERN OF EMPLOYEES BY FIRM

| Firm | Number of Employees Used in Study | Winner of Election (Union or Company) | Subjects' Voting Pattern in Election |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Delivery Service | 11 | C | 10 - C 1 - U |
| Paper Processor | 34 | U | 19 - C 15 - U |
| Electronics Manufacturer | 23 | C | 14 - C 9 - U |
| Meat Packer | 35 | U | 7 - C 28 - U |
| TOTALS | 103 | | 50 - C 53 - U |

Description of the Research Instruments

The following research instruments were utilized in this study: (1) the Supervisory Behavior Description (SBD), (2) The supervision scale of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and (3) the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale). These instruments are described below.

Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire.-- The Supervisory Behavior Description (SBD) was developed by E.A. Fleishman and is one of several leader behavior questionnaires resulting from the Ohio State University leadership studies described in Chapter II. The SBD is designed to provide scores on the leader behaviors of Consideration and Structure. There are 28 items related to Consideration with a maximum score of 112. There are 20 items related to Structure with a maximum score of 80.

Split-half reliability coefficients of .98 for Consideration and .78 for Structure were established through the description of first-line foremen by 394 employees (2). The SBD has been validated against various criteria including absenteeism, turnover (15), and grievances (3). Typical validity coefficients for these criteria are shown below in Table II.

TABLE II
TYPICAL VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS FOR CONSIDERATION AND
STRUCTURE FOR VARIOUS CRITERIA OF LEADERSHIP
EFFECTIVENESS

| Criterion | N | Sample | C | S |
|-------------|----|--------------------|---------|--------|
| Absenteeism | 72 | Production Foremen | -.49** | .27* |
| Turnover | 72 | Foremen | .13 | .06 |
| | 57 | Supervisors | -.69**a | .63**a |
| Grievances | 23 | Supervisors | -.43* | .23 |
| | 57 | Supervisors | -.51**a | .71**a |

a = correlation ratio (eta); all others are Pearson r's.

*p < .05

**p < .01

***Source: E.A. Fleishman, Manual for the Supervisory Behavior Description, 1972, p. 6.

Job Descriptive Index.--The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) was developed principally by Patricia Cain Smith in conjunction with long-term employee job satisfaction studies conducted at Cornell University. The JDI, rather than providing an overall measure of satisfaction with the job, provides measures of satisfaction in five areas of the job: the work itself, pay, promotional opportunities, supervision, and co-workers. The supervision scale is the only one used in this study.

In several studies conducted by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (16, p. 67), the JDI was subjected to construct validation tests. The instrument exhibited consistent discriminant and convergent validity in these studies.

Internal-External Locus of Control Scale.--The Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) is designed to assess the extent to which the subject believes that his rewards in life are contingent upon his own behavior rather than luck, fate, or other outside forces. The I-E Scale is a 29-item forced-choice test including 6 filler items intended to make more ambiguous the purpose of the test. In this study 26 of the items were used, with three items relating to school behavior omitted in that they were deemed inappropriate in view of the employees' background and current status. Runyon (12) has used the I-E Scale to successfully predict satisfaction with supervision while omitting these three items.

Reliability data has been developed in a series of studies and has been reported by Rotter (11). Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients range from .69 (N=1000) to .79 (N=50). Test-retest reliability r's range from .49 (N=63, 2-month interval) to .83 (N=30, 2-month interval) (10, p. 13).

Construct validity studies have also been reported by Rotter (10). In studies correlating the I-E Scale with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, r's ranging from -.12 (N=180) to -.35 (N=77) resulted (11, p. 13). Studies have also been conducted to correlate the I-E Scale with measures of intelligence to further establish construct validity. The validity r's range from -.11 (N=72) to

-.22 (N=46), indicating that the I-E Scale does not measure the same constructs as do the intelligence measures used.

Procedures for Collecting Data

In each of the four firms involved in this study, a union representation election had been held a few weeks prior to the collection of the data. In order to avoid the introduction of bias, data were collected from employees without regard to whether they had voted in the elections. Even so, there were few subjects involved who had not voted in the elections.

The Supervisory Behavior Description, Job Descriptive Index, and the I-E Scale were administered to the subjects during a group meeting which was held on the premises of each of the four firms. Prior to the completion of the instruments, the employees were told that they were participants in a research project being conducted by a doctoral candidate at North Texas State University. This researcher reviewed the use of the three instruments and stressed heavily the confidential nature of the data. It was indicated that the subjects should place no identification on any of the instruments. They were told that their candid responses to all of the questions would be beneficial to employees in general by providing needed information regarding the attitudes of employees who have participated in union representation elections. Upon completion of the

instruments, the subjects stapled them together and dropped them in a box as they left the room.

In addition to the three research instruments used, the subjects answered the following two questions by checking the appropriate response (see Appendix D):

Did you vote in the recent union election?
_____ Yes _____ No

If you did vote in the election, did you vote:
_____ for the union _____ against the union

Procedures for Treatment of the Data

The employee voting data were compiled into one group for analysis, rather than examining each of the representation elections separately. This procedure is appropriate in that it is the voting behavior of the employee which is being studied, and not the outcome of each election.

The data obtained from the administration of the research instruments were compiled and categorized on the basis of votes for and votes against union representation, high and low Structure, high and low Consideration, and Internal or External locus of control. The high and low Structure and Consideration parameters were established by computing the median of the distribution of scores on each of these dimensions. Those scores falling above and below the median were included in the high and low categories. With regard to the I-E Scale, any score which falls near

the low end of the range of scores is considered to denote an internal subject, while a score falling near the upper end of the range denotes an external subject. In this study, the range of I-E scores was from 2 to 15. Based on this range, the parameters of 2-7 to indicate internality and 9-15 to indicate externality were established for use in this study. The parameters for the three variables are shown in Table III.

TABLE III
SCORE CRITERIA FOR VARIABLES OF STRUCTURE,
CONSIDERATION, AND LOCUS OF CONTROL

| | SBD Scores | | I-E Scale Scores | |
|---------------|------------|------|------------------|-----------|
| | Low | High | Internals | Externals |
| Structure | 42- | 44+ | 2-7 | 9-15 |
| Consideration | 68- | 71+ | | |

The use of these score criteria resulted in the exclusion of a maximum of 20 subjects in those analyses where all three of the variables were involved. In those instances, n=83. Where Structure is examined with locus of control, n=85. Where Consideration is examined with locus of control, n=88. In those instances where satisfaction with supervision is a variable, n=80 due to the fact that three subjects did not have useable satisfaction forms.

The hypothesis was tested principally by means of the chi square test. This test was used to determine whether the observations recorded were significantly different from those which would be expected according to chance. As a supporting test, point-biserial correlations were computed correlating the factors of Structure, Consideration, locus of control, and satisfaction with supervision with the dichotomous vote variable.

Analysis of Data

The principal test of the hypothesis involves application of the chi square test to a 2x2 contingency table containing voting data from four representation elections.

Structure

The first test of the hypothesis involved the supervisory styles of high and low Structure. The voting data of employees who perceived their supervisor as employing either a high Structure or a low Structure style were compiled. These data were subjected to the chi square test to determine whether the relationships differ from those which would be expected by chance. These voting data and the results of the chi square test are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

CHI SQUARE TESTS OF VOTING BEHAVIOR OF SUBJECTS
PERCEIVING HIGH AND LOW STRUCTURE SUPERVISION

| | Votes for Union | | | Votes Against Union | | | |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------|-------|---------------------|-----------|-------|----|
| | Internals | Externals | Total | Internals | Externals | Total | |
| High Structure | 8 | 15 | 23 | High Structure | 15 | 7 | 22 |
| Low Structure | 6 | 13 | 19 | Low Structure | 9 | 12 | 21 |
| | 14 | 28 | 42 | | 24 | 19 | 43 |

$$x^2 = .01; \quad p = .91$$

$$x^2 = 1.86, \quad p = .17$$

As the p figures indicate, the voting data in Table IV are not significant at the .05 level. These results indicate that there is no significant difference in the voting behavior of internal and external employees who perceive their supervisor as using a high Structure or low Structure supervisory style. The interaction of employee locus of control and the supervisory styles of high and low Structure does not significantly influence voting behavior. These results, then, do not support the hypothesis.

The voting data in Table IV was examined visually to determine whether other meaningful relationships could be

observed. It was noted that the voting behavior of employees perceiving high Structure supervision possessed important differences. To determine whether the differences were significant, the chi square test was applied to this data, and the results are shown in Table V.

TABLE V
CHI SQUARE TEST OF VOTING BEHAVIOR OF SUBJECTS
PERCEIVING HIGH STRUCTURE SUPERVISION

| | Internals Under High Structure | Externals Under High Structure | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| For Union Representation | 8 | 15 | 23 |
| Against Union Representation | 15 | 7 | 22 |
| | 23 | 22 | 45 |

$$\chi^2 = 5.02; \quad p = .05$$

The chi square test results for Table V indicate that there is a significant difference in the voting behavior of internal employees who perceive their supervisor as using a high Structure style when contrasted with external employees perceiving the same supervisory style. Sixty-five percent of the internal employees perceiving high Structure supervision voted against union representation while 68 percent of the external employees perceiving the same supervisory style

voted for union representation. These results suggest that internal employees may prefer a supervisor who uses a style which is high in Structure while employees who are external may be adverse to supervision which they perceive to be high in Structure. These results support the hypothesis by showing that the interaction of the perceived leadership style of high Structure and locus of control significantly influences voting behavior.

A further test to determine whether the relationships among the leadership, locus of control, and voting behavior variables are significant was undertaken in the form of point-biserial correlations. Point-biserial correlation coefficients were computed by correlating the supervisory style of Structure with the dichotomous vote variable for all employees, internals, and externals. These coefficients are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI
POINT BISERIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN
STRUCTURE AND VOTE FOR ALL SUBJECTS, INTERNALS
AND EXTERNALS

| | All Subjects (n=83) | Internals (n=38) | Externals (n=45) |
|-----------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Structure | -.08* | -.005* | -.16* |

*not significant at .05

None of the coefficients shown in Table VI achieves the significance level of .05. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the perceived leadership style of Structure and voting behavior for internal and external employees. These results are consistent with the absence of significant relationships shown previously in Table IV.

Thus, in summary, only one of the test conditions involving the leadership style of Structure indicates a significant relationship between Structure, locus of control, and voting behavior. This test involved the style of high Structure. In this instance, the perceived style of high Structure interacting with locus of control did significantly influence voting behavior. However, the weight of the evidence, as far as the style of Structure is concerned, does not support the hypothesis.

Consideration

In addition to the supervisory style of Structure, an examination was also made of the relationships between the perceived supervisory style of Consideration, locus of control, and voting behavior. The same statistical tests were employed in this instance. Initially, the chi square test was applied to the voting data of those internal and external employees who perceived their supervisor as employing either a high or low Consideration supervisory style. The results of these tests are shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII

CHI SQUARE TESTS OF VOTING BEHAVIOR OF SUBJECTS
PERCEIVING HIGH AND LOW CONSIDERATION
SUPERVISION

| | Votes for Union | | | Votes Against Union | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | Internals | Externals | Total | | Internals | Externals | Total |
| High Consideration | 7 | 9 | 16 | High Consideration | 17 | 12 | 29 |
| Low Consideration | 10 | 19 | 29 | Low Consideration | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| | 17 | 28 | 45 | | 24 | 19 | 43 |

$$x^2 = .09; \quad p = .77$$

$$x^2 = .04; \quad p = .84$$

The chi square test results in Table VII do not meet the significance test of .05. This indicates that there is no significant difference in the voting behavior of internal and external employees who perceive their supervisor as using either a high or low Consideration supervisory style. Thus, the interaction between the supervisory styles of high and low Consideration and locus of control does not influence voting behavior in representation elections.

A visual examination of the raw voting data in Table VII indicates that the variable of Consideration may have a major

influence on voting behavior, without considering its relationship to locus of control. The employees perceiving high Consideration supervision cast a low proportion of votes for union representation and a high proportion of votes against representation. Since this finding does not relate to the hypothesis, discussion of its implications will be reserved until a later portion of this chapter.

As a secondary test, point-biserial correlation coefficients were computed correlating the Consideration variable with the dichotomous vote variable for all employees, internals, and externals. These coefficients are show in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN VOTE AND CONSIDERATION FOR ALL SUBJECTS, INTERNALS, AND EXTERNALS

| Voting Behavior of: | All Subjects (N=83) | Internals (N=38) | Externals (N=45) |
|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Consideration | .17* | .09* | .20* |

*not significant at .05

None of the coefficients shown in Table VIII achieves the significance level of .05. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the perceived leadership

style of Consideration and voting behavior for internals, externals, and all subjects involved in this study. These results are supportive of the results shown in Table VII.

Thus, in summary, the foregoing results indicate that the interaction of the perceived supervisory style of Consideration and locus of control does not significantly influence voting behavior in representation elections. There is no evidence of a significant relationship among Consideration, locus of control, and voting behavior. As with the results involving Structure, these results fail to support the hypothesis.

Combinations of Structure and Consideration

It seems feasible that various combinations of the Structure and Consideration supervisory styles may be more closely related to voting behavior, in conjunction with locus of control, than are either Structure or Consideration alone. Combinations of Structure and Consideration have been studied by other researchers, although these studies have not involved the locus of control variable. In a study of production employees, Fleishman and Harris (3) found that high Consideration moderates the negative effects of Structure on grievance and turnover rates. Low levels of Consideration supervisory behavior did not have the same effect.

Gruenfeld and Kassum (5) found that a significant positive relationship existed between Structure and satisfaction with supervision in a group of employees perceiving

a high Consideration supervisor, but found no such relationship in a group of employees perceiving low Consideration supervision.

In a soon-to-be published study by Swanson and Johnson (17), the supervisory styles of Consideration and Structure of U.S. Air Force pilots were found to be related to various measures of proficiency. A multiple R of .50 was obtained by a combination of Consideration and Structure with the composite criterion of proficiency. With results such as these in mind, several combinations of these supervisory styles were observed in terms of the voting behavior of the perceiving employees. A preliminary analysis of the data warranted a more detailed statistical analysis of the combination of high Structure and low Consideration styles as perceived by internal and external employees. This combination is of interest since it is the one which Fleishman and Harris (3) found to produce significant differences in grievance and turnover rates. The chi square test of voting data relevant to this combination is shown in Table IX.

The data in Table IX do not achieve the significance level of .05. This indicates that the interaction of locus of control and the supervisory styles of high Structure and low Consideration does not influence voting behavior in representation elections.

TABLE IX

CHI SQUARE TEST OF VOTING BEHAVIOR OF SUBJECTS
PERCEIVING HIGH STRUCTURE AND LOW
CONSIDERATION SUPERVISION

| | Votes for Union | | | Votes Against Union | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| | Internals | Externals | Total | | Internals | Externals | Total |
| High Structure | 8 | 15 | 23 | High Structure | 15 | 7 | 22 |
| Low Consideration | 10 | 19 | 29 | Low Consideration | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| | 18 | 34 | 52 | | 22 | 14 | 36 |

$\chi^2 = .07$; $p = .79$

$\chi^2 = .55$; $p = .46$

Summary and Conclusions Regarding the Hypothesis

In summary, the weight of the evidence calls for rejection of the hypothesis. In all test conditions except one, there was no significant influence on voting behavior. This only exception involved the supervisory style of high Structure interacting with locus of control where a significant influence on voting behavior was found. It must be concluded, then, that the interaction of perceived supervisory style and locus of control does not influence voting behavior in representation

elections. Despite the fact that Runyon (12) found that the interaction of managerial style and locus of control did influence satisfaction with supervision, it must be concluded that this interaction does not have a similar influence on voting behavior in representation elections. Thus, the hypothesis is rejected.

It is possible that the locus of control variable is responsible for the rejection of the hypothesis. This postulation is based on the fact that, in Table VII, the supervisory style of Consideration exhibited influence on the voting pattern without considering its interaction with locus of control. This suggests that supervisory style alone, without an interaction with locus of control, may be a significant independent variable influencing voting behavior.

Additional Findings of Interest

The remainder of this chapter is comprised of additional findings which are secondary to the principal findings related to support or rejection of the hypothesis. Some of these, such as the findings regarding satisfaction with supervision, are interrelated with the principal findings, but do not bear directly on the testing of the hypothesis. The first of these deals with satisfaction with supervision.

Satisfaction with Supervision

One of the secondary facets of this study involves the variable of satisfaction with supervision. Previous research

on turnover and grievances (3) and absenteeism (15) revealed a negative relationship between satisfaction with supervision and these criteria. More recent research by Runyon (12) has indicated that the interaction of managerial style and locus of control is significantly related to satisfaction with supervision. Based on these findings, it is logical to suggest that satisfaction with supervision may be helpful in explaining any relationship between supervisory style, locus of control, and voting behavior.

The major test of this viewpoint is a three-way analysis of variance in which satisfaction with supervision is used as the dependent variable, with Structure, Consideration, and locus of control serving as independent variables. The means, standard deviations, and numbers of the data employed in the analysis of variance are shown below in Table X.

TABLE X
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND NUMBER OF
SUBJECTS USED IN ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

| Variable | X | SD | n |
|------------------|-------|-------|----|
| Structure | 42.07 | 11.52 | 80 |
| Consideration | 68.99 | 19.92 | 80 |
| Locus of Control | 8.25 | 3.29 | 80 |

The results of the analysis of variance are shown below in Table XI.

TABLE XI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MAIN EFFECTS OF STRUCTURE,
CONSIDERATION, AND LOCUS OF CONTROL ON SATISFAC-
TION WITH SUPERVISION

| Source | df | MS | F | P |
|----------------------|----|---------|-------|-------|
| Structure (A) | 1 | .15 | .002 | .96 |
| Consideration (B) | 1 | 5949.55 | 86.97 | .0001 |
| Locus of Control (C) | 1 | .41 | .006 | .94 |
| A x C | 1 | 196.05 | 2.87 | .09 |
| B x C | 1 | 183.28 | 2.68 | .11 |
| A x B x C | 1 | 1.61 | .02 | .88 |

These data indicate that the supervisory style of Consideration exerts an extremely strong effect on satisfaction with supervision. This effect is significant beyond the .001 level. This is the only result in Table XI which meets the significance test of .05. As was shown in earlier tables, the effect of the supervisory style of Structure on satisfaction with supervision is not significant.

A further method of testing the importance of satisfaction with supervision is to examine the mean satisfaction with supervision scores of the subjects under the principal test

conditions. These data for both the supervisory styles of Consideration and Structure are shown in Table XII. (Table XII refers to the voting data presented in Tables IV and VII and is not intended to provide additional detail of the data in Table XI.)

TABLE XII

MEAN SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISION SCORES OF
SUBJECTS PERCEIVING HIGH AND LOW STRUCTURE
AND HIGH AND LOW CONSIDERATION SUPERVISION

| STRUCTURE | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-------|----|-----------|-------|----|
| | High | | | Low | | |
| | \bar{X} | SD | n | \bar{X} | SD | n |
| Internals | 38.3 | 12.96 | 23 | 37.8 | 12.24 | 14 |
| Externals | 36.8 | 10.93 | 22 | 33.7 | 10.34 | 24 |
| CONSIDERATION | | | | | | |
| | High | | | Low | | |
| | \bar{X} | SD | n | \bar{X} | SD | n |
| Internals | 46.0 | 4.2 | 24 | 25.7 | 12.37 | 16 |
| Externals | 42.8 | 5.59 | 20 | 28.0 | 9.56 | 25 |

The means shown in Table XII were tested for significant differences by use of the t test for testing means where the variances are unequal, as recommended by Ferguson (1, p. 143). There is no significant difference in the mean satisfaction with supervision of subjects perceiving high Structure supervision versus those perceiving low Structure supervision. These findings are consistent with the voting results shown earlier in Table IV.

The interaction of the supervisory style of Consideration and locus of control was shown in Table VII to be unrelated to voting behavior. The satisfaction with supervision of these same employees is shown under "Consideration" in Table XII. These data indicate that satisfaction with supervision is not a function of the interaction of the perceived supervisory styles of high and low Consideration and locus of control. Satisfaction with supervision is clearly related to the degree of supervisory Consideration perceived by the subordinates. That is, those employees perceiving their supervisor as employing a high level of Consideration behavior report a high level of satisfaction with supervision. Those employees perceiving their supervisor as exhibiting a low level of Consideration behavior report a low level of satisfaction with supervision. The mean satisfaction levels for employees perceiving high Consideration supervision (46 and 42.8) are significantly different beyond the .05 level from the mean satisfaction levels of employees perceiving low Consideration supervision (25.7 and 28). These

are not unexpected results in view of the findings of other research. Skinner (15) found that employees with supervisors whom they perceive to employ high levels of Consideration behavior reported high levels of satisfaction with supervision.

Thus, the results shown in Tables XI and XII indicate that Consideration significantly influences satisfaction with supervision among the subjects in this study.

A significant difference in voting behavior was shown in Table V when high Structure perceived supervisory style interacted with locus of control. These results indicated voting behavior to be a function of the interaction of high Structure supervisory style and locus of control. When observing the satisfaction with supervision of these same subjects, results of a different nature appear, as shown in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

MEAN SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISION SCORES
OF SUBJECTS PERCEIVING HIGH
STRUCTURE SUPERVISION

| | Internals | | | Externals | | |
|---------------|-----------|-------|----|-----------|-------|----|
| | X | SD | n | X | SD | n |
| For Union | 32.5 | 14.67 | 8 | 32.4 | 10.75 | 14 |
| Against Union | 41.5 | 10.73 | 15 | 45.7 | 2.81 | 7 |

Based on the voting pattern shown earlier in Table V it could be expected that satisfaction with supervision might vary as a function of the interaction of perceived high Structure supervisory style and locus of control. However, the variation in satisfaction with supervision in Table XIII is a function of voting in the elections. That is, those employees voting against the union exhibit a much higher level of satisfaction with supervision than do those employees voting for union representation. Thus, high satisfaction with supervision is related to voting against union representation. Although both internal and external employees voting against union representation report high levels of satisfaction with supervision, only in the case of externals is there a significant difference between the satisfaction means. The difference between the mean satisfaction with supervision for external employees voting for union representation (32.4) and the mean for externals voting against union representation (45.7) is significant at the .05 level.

This is an important finding with implications regarding managerial practices. These implications will be discussed later in this chapter. Earlier research (4) had shown a significant correlation between overall job satisfaction and the vote in representation elections, but previous research has not been directed toward the relationship between satisfaction with supervision and voting behavior.

To further explore the importance of satisfaction with supervision, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed by correlating the variables of Structure, Consideration, and locus of control with satisfaction with supervision. These correlation coefficients are shown in the following three tables. First, those correlation coefficients based on all subjects are shown in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN STRUCTURE, CONSIDERATION AND
LOCUS OF CONTROL WITH SATISFACTION WITH SUPER-
VISION FOR ALL SUBJECTS*

| Variable | Satisfaction With Supervision |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Structure | .23** |
| Consideration | .79*** |
| Locus of Control | -.11 |

* N=80
** p < .05
*** p < .001

The data in Table XIV indicates that a relationship exists between Structure and satisfaction with supervision and between Consideration and satisfaction with supervision. The correlation between Consideration and satisfaction with supervision is particularly impressive. Rarely is an r at this level obtained in such research. Skinner's (15) correlation

of these two variables produced a coefficient of .45. The high correlation is reflective of the major influence Consideration was shown to have upon satisfaction with supervision in the analysis of variance results in Table XI.

Although the relationship between Structure and satisfaction with supervision is moderate, though significant, the fact that a positive relationship exists is of interest. The most consistent result from previous research has been a negative relationship between Structure and satisfaction with supervision. Some of these studies have shown Structure to be a source of dissatisfaction, turnover, and grievances (3, 8). A few studies, however, have found high Structure supervision to be positively related to employee satisfaction. Nealy and Blood (10) found that Structure leader behavior contributed to high subordinate satisfaction at the first level of supervision among nurses, but low subordinate satisfaction at the second level. House, Filley, and Kerr (6) found Structure to have positive significant relationships to satisfaction scores.

The sample group was categorized on the basis of locus of control into internal and external groups. Correlation coefficients were then computed between the variables of Structure, Consideration, and locus of control with satisfaction with supervision for these internal and external groups. These correlation coefficients are shown in Table XV.

TABLE XV

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN STRUCTURE, CONSIDERATION, AND
LOCUS OF CONTROL WITH SATISFACTION WITH SUPER-
VISION INTERNALS, EXTERNALS, AND ALL SUBJECTS

| | Satisfaction With Supervision |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| STRUCTURE | |
| Internals (N=37) | .14 |
| Externals (N=43) | .31** |
| All Subjects (N=80). | .23** |
| CONSIDERATION | |
| Internals | .82*** |
| Externals | .75*** |
| All Subjects | .79*** |
| LOCUS OF CONTROL | |
| Internals | -.02 |
| Externals | -.02 |
| All Subjects | -.11 |
| ***p < .001 | |
| **p < .05 | |

Relationships which are similar to those for all subjects are found in the correlations for internal and external employees in Table XV. A note of interest is that the supervisory style of Structure is related to satisfaction with supervision for external employees but not for internals. This indicates that satisfaction with supervision increases as Structure increases for employees who are externals. Thus, externals appear to find Structure behavior on the part of the supervisor satisfying. These findings initially appear

to conflict with those displayed in Table V in which external employees are shown to vote for union representation by the ratio of 2 to 1 when working for a supervisor whom they perceive to exhibit high Structure behavior. However, when Table VII is examined, one finds that there is no significant relationship between satisfaction with supervision and vote for external employees, a possible explanation is found. These data would indicate that the results discussed above are not contradictory and suggest that voting behavior for external employees is not influenced by satisfaction with supervision but by another variable. This lends support to the position that it is the interaction of high Structure and locus of control which influences the voting behavior in Table V.

In Table XV the very strong relationship between the supervisory style of Consideration and satisfaction with supervision holds for both internal and external employees.

Table XVI, which follows, provides correlational data for groups of employees voting for union representation versus those employees voting against union representation.

TABLE XVI

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN STRUCTURE, CONSIDERATION, LOCUS
OF CONTROL AND SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISION
EMPLOYEES VOTING FOR UNION AND AGAINST UNION

| | Satisfaction with Supervision |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| STRUCTURE | |
| For Union (N=39) | .22 |
| Against Union (N=41) | .33** |
| CONSIDERATION | |
| For Union | .76*** |
| Against Union | .82*** |
| LOCUS OF CONTROL | |
| For Union | -.003 |
| Against Union | -.10 |
| ***p < .001 | |
| **p < .05 | |

The relationships shown in Table XVI are much like those in the preceding two tables, with the significant relationship between Consideration and satisfaction with supervision continuing to hold for both employees voting for union representation as well as those voting against union representation.

These data related to satisfaction with supervision do not consider the primary dependent variable under study, however, which is voting behavior. It therefore becomes

important to examine the relationship between satisfaction with supervision and voting behavior, the result of which will indicate the extent to which importance should be placed on the employee satisfaction variable. Point-biserial correlations were computed between satisfaction with supervision and vote for all subjects, internal employees, and external employees. These data are shown below in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII

POINT-BISERIAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN
SATISFACTION WITH SUPERVISION AND VOTE FOR ALL
SUBJECTS, INTERNALS, AND EXTERNALS

| | All Employees (N=80) | Internals (N=37) | Externals (N=43) |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Satisfaction with Supervision | .32*** | .32** | .27 |

*** p < .01
** p < .05

The data in Table XVII show that satisfaction with supervision is significantly related to vote for all of the employees included in the study. Specifically, they indicate that satisfaction with supervision discriminates between votes for and against union representation. The relationship which is shown to exist between satisfaction with supervision and vote for the internal employees again suggests the

possibility of a relationship between locus of control, satisfaction with supervision, and voting behavior.

These findings suggest that satisfaction with supervision is, in itself, an important variable in that it is significantly correlated with the primary dependent variable, voting behavior.

Supervisory Style and Voting Behavior

One of the more important secondary results of this study concerns the supervisory style of Consideration. In Table VII the data revealed that the interaction of Consideration and locus of control does not significantly influence voting behavior. In that table the style of Consideration alone, without inclusion of the locus of control variable, appeared to influence voting behavior. Thus, the Consideration and related voting behavior data were subjected to the chi square test, the results of which are shown in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

CHI SQUARE TEST OF VOTING BEHAVIOR OF SUBJECTS
PERCEIVING HIGH AND LOW CONSIDERATION
SUPERVISION

| | High Consideration | Low Consideration | Total |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------|
| For Union Representation | 16 | 29 | 45 |
| Against Union Representation | 29 | 14 | 43 |
| | 45 | 43 | 88 |
| $\chi^2 = 7.72; p = .0056$ | | | |

The data in Table XVIII reveal that the perceived supervisory style of Consideration significantly influences voting behavior. Employees perceiving high Consideration supervision are much more likely to vote against union representation than they are to vote for union representation. These data are similar to those in Table XIV which showed Consideration to be significantly and positively correlated with satisfaction with supervision. These relationships are reflected also in Table XVII where a significant correlation between satisfaction with supervision and vote is shown. Thus, Consideration appears to be a dominant dimension which can significantly influence important organizational criteria. This is consistent with the Fleishman and Harris (3) finding that Consideration was sufficiently powerful to moderate the negative effects of high Structure on turnover and grievance rates.

The results with regard to Consideration in this study lend support to that facet of leadership theory which holds that it is the leader's behavior alone which correlates with criteria, as opposed to being influenced by personality traits of subordinates. This finding is in support of a similar result obtained in a recent study by Hunt and Liebscher (7).

A visual examination was made of the voting data of subjects perceiving high and low Structure supervision. These data contained no significant differences.

Locus of Control and Voting Behavior

Another subject of interest in this study concerns the extent to which locus of control, as a single variable, is related to membership in unions. Previous research by Neal and Seeman (9) and Seeman (13) indicated that internals were much more likely to become members of work organizations such as unions than were externals. To explore this further, the voting data of internal and external employees in this study were tested by use of the chi square test. The results of this test are shown in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX
CHI SQUARE TEST OF VOTING BEHAVIOR OF INTERNALS AND EXTERNALS

| | Internals | Externals | Total |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| For Union Representation | 17 | 28 | 45 |
| Against Union Representation | 24 | 21 | 45 |
| | 41 | 49 | 90 |

$\chi^2 = 1.61; p = .20$

The results of the chi square test indicate that the voting data in Table XIX are not significantly different from that which would be expected according to chance. And, as an examination of the raw data in the table indicates,

internal employees are no more likely to vote for union membership than are external employees. Indeed, of the 45 employees voting for union representation, 62 percent were externals. The percentages are approximately even when votes against union representation are observed.

The results in Table XIX are substantiated when the mean locus of control scores of employees voting for union representation are compared with the same scores of those employees voting against union representation. These means are shown in Table XX.

TABLE XX
MEAN LOCUS OF CONTROL SCORES OF EMPLOYEES VOTING
FOR UNION REPRESENTATION AND EMPLOYEES VOTING
AGAINST UNION REPRESENTATION

| | \bar{X} | SD | n |
|---------------|-----------|------|----|
| For Union | 8.57 | 3.09 | 53 |
| Against Union | 7.84 | 3.05 | 50 |

Although the difference between the two means is not significant, the data are consistent with the findings in Table XIX. Those employees voting for union representation are more external than are those voting against union representation. Thus, these results do not support the findings of Seeman (13) regarding internality and union membership.

Summary of Findings

Only one variant of the leadership styles of Consideration and Structure influences voting behavior through an interaction with locus of control. Significant differences in voting behavior were observed when the supervisory style of high Structure interacted with locus of control. All other tests showed that the interaction of these supervisory styles and locus of control does not influence voting behavior. It must be concluded that the interaction of supervisory style and locus of control does not influence voting behavior in representation elections. Thus, the main hypothesis is rejected.

There were secondary results that were not directly related to the testing of the hypothesis. In some instances, these results were significant. The most consistent finding concerns the dominant influence of the supervisory style of Consideration. Although there was no significant difference in voting behavior when Consideration interacted with locus of control, when Consideration was tested as a single independent variable, its effects were strong. When the voting behavior of employees perceiving high and low consideration supervision was tested, a significant difference in voting results was indicated. Employees perceiving a high Consideration supervisor voted in significant proportions against union representation while employees perceiving a

low Consideration supervisor voted in significant numbers for union representation.

In addition, Consideration was found to be significantly related to satisfaction with supervision for all employees, for both internal and external employees, and for employees voting both for and against representation. All of this indicates that the employees in this study, both internals and externals, prefer a supervisor who is high in Consideration behaviors and demonstrate this in both their voting behavior in representation elections and in their reports of satisfaction with supervision.

The leadership style of Structure was found to be significantly and positively related to satisfaction with supervision. This finding, coupled with those involving Consideration, suggests that a supervisory style involving high levels of both Consideration and Structure behaviors is most desirable with respect to satisfaction with supervision. This is reminiscent of the findings of research on effective supervision in which researchers such as Shartle (14) and Gurenfeld and Kassum (5) found high levels of both supervisory styles to be present when work group effectiveness was high.

The rejection of the hypothesis and the findings regarding the strength of the style of Consideration shed light on one of the dilemmas of leadership theory. This revolves around the question of whether it is the leader's

behavior, or the leader's behavior interacting with another variable, which produces the most consistent and significant influence on important organizational criteria. The results of this study provide support for the position that it is the leader's behavior alone which correlates with these criteria.

Another finding of interest concerns the relationship of locus of control to membership in unions. Neal and Seeman (9) and Seeman (13) have found internality to be consistently related to membership in work organizations such as unions. In these studies, internals tended to be members of work organizations, such as unions, while externals did not. In this study, the locus of control variable was not associated with differences in voting behavior. Externals tended to vote for union membership in slightly larger proportions than did internals.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.
2. Fleishman, Edwin A., Manual for the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire, Washington, D.C., American Institute for Research, 1972.
3. Fleishman, Edwin A. and Edwin F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology, 15 (Spring, 1962), 43-56.
4. Getman, Julius G., Stephen B. Goldberg, and Jeanne B. Herman, The National Labor Relations Board Voting Study: A Preliminary Report, Urbana, Illinois, Institute for Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1972.
5. Gruenfeld, Leopold and Saleem Kassum, "Supervisory Style and Organizational Effectiveness in a Pediatric Hospital," Personnel Psychology, 26 (Winter, 1973), 531-544.
6. House, Robert J., Allan C. Filley, and Steven Kerr, "Relation of Leader Consideration and Initiating Structure to R and D Subordinates' Satisfaction," Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (March, 1971), 19-30.
7. Hunt, J. G. and V.K.C. Liebscher, "Leadership Preference, Leadership Behavior, and Employee Satisfaction," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9 (February, 1973), 59-77.
8. Korman, A.K., "Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria--A Review," Personnel Psychology, 19 (Winter, 1966), 349-362.
9. Neal, Arthur G., and Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 29 (April, 1964), 216-226.
10. Nealey, S.M., and Milton R. Blood, "Leadership Performance of Nursing Supervisors at Two Organizational Levels," Journal of Applied Psychology, 52 (October, 1968), 414-422.

11. Rotter, Julian B., "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs, 80 (1966), No. 609.
12. Runyon, Kenneth D., "Some Interactions Between Personality Variables and Management Styles," Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (June, 1973), 288-294.
13. Seeman, Melvin, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," The Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1966), 139-151.
14. Shartle, Carroll L., Executive Performance and Leadership, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.
15. Skinner, Elizabeth, "Relationships Between Leader Behavior Patterns and Organizational-Situational Variables," Personnel Psychology, 22 (Winter, 1969), 489-494.
16. Smith, Patricia, Lorne M. Kendall, and Charles L. Hulin, The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1969.
17. Swanson, R. G. and D.A. Johnson, "The Relation Between Peer Perception of Leader Behavior and Instructor Pilot Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, (in press).

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The results of this study provide no support for the hypothesis that the interaction of perceived supervisory style and employee locus of control will influence voting behavior in union representation elections. In only one of the test conditions, that involving the interaction of the supervisory style of high Structure with locus of control, was there evidence of an influence on voting behavior. The reasons underlying the significant results found in this test are not clear, however. It can only be concluded that internal employees tend to vote in significant proportions against union representation when working for a supervisor whom they perceive to employ a high level of Structure behavior. It can also be concluded that external employees tend to vote in significant proportions for union representation under the same supervisory conditions.

The weight of the evidence, however, indicates that the interaction of perceived supervisory style and employee locus of control does not influence voting behavior in representation elections. The hypothesis is rejected.

These results do not indicate whether the failure to support the hypothesis lies in the general theory that

subordinate personality moderates the influence of supervisory style on certain criteria or in the specific personality trait used in this study, the locus of control. Previous research by Vroom (7) has shown that subordinate personality traits exert a significant influence in this regard. Research by Greer (3) and Foa (1) indicate that subordinate expectations regarding supervisory style influence the effectiveness of and satisfaction with the supervisor. Research by Runyon (5) has shown the locus of control personality trait to be an effective predictor of satisfaction with supervision.

Despite these earlier findings, it is believed that the locus of control variable is probably responsible for the rejection of the hypothesis in this study. This is based on the findings involving supervisory style alone, without its interaction with locus of control. The perceived supervisory style of Consideration was significantly related to voting behavior of both internal and external employees without interacting with locus of control. Thus, further research is called for to determine the extent to which this personality trait moderates the effect of supervisory style on various criteria, one of which is voting behavior in representation elections.

Although the interaction of supervisory style and employee locus of control did not influence voting behavior in this study, supervisory style alone was clearly shown to be related to both voting behavior and satisfaction with

supervision. The supervisory style of Consideration was shown significantly related to employee voting behavior and satisfaction with supervision. The more considerate the style of the supervisor, the more likely is the employee to vote against union representation and the greater his satisfaction with supervision. This finding is very likely the most important outcome of the study. Discussion of its implications are reserved for a later portion of this chapter.

The supervisory style of Structure was also found to be significantly and positively correlated with satisfaction with supervision. This finding indicates that those employees who perceive the highest levels of Structure in the supervisory behavior of their supervisor are the most satisfied with that supervision. This finding is relatively unique in that the weight of the evidence from other research shows Structure to be negatively correlated with satisfaction with supervision. Although the style of Structure was not significantly related to the primary dependent variable of voting behavior, its significant correlation with satisfaction with supervision is important, the implications of which are discussed later in this chapter.

Thus, in summary, high levels of Consideration supervisory behavior are associated with voting against union representation; and, high levels of both Consideration and Structure are positively associated with satisfaction with supervision.

Another major conclusion of this study is that satisfaction with supervision is significantly and positively correlated with voting behavior in representation elections. This finding indicates that satisfaction with supervision effectively discriminates between those voters for union representation and those voters against union representation. The direction of the point-biserial correlational data from which this finding stems indicates that high satisfaction with supervision is associated with voting against union representation.

A final conclusion relates to the locus of control personality trait as a separate variable, apart from its primary use in this study as a moderator of supervisory style. Earlier research by Neal and Seeman (4) and Seeman (6) showed the locus of control dimension of internality to be related to the tendency of employees to join work organizations such as unions. These findings are not corroborated in this study wherein there is no significant difference in the voting behavior of internal employees and external employees.

Implications for Management

It is clear that the supervisor's leadership style is related to employee voting behavior in representation elections as well as the satisfaction employees find with their supervisor. These findings, especially those involving voting behavior, highlight the key role played by the first-line

supervisor. For those managements who wish their non-exempt employees to remain non-union, the influence of the supervisor appears to be important. The results of this study suggest that managers should place a high priority on increasing the Consideration behavior of their first-line supervisors.

Both supervisory styles of Consideration and Structure were shown to be significantly and positively related to satisfaction with supervision. This suggests that high levels of both Consideration and Structure are desirable in terms of obtaining high levels of employee satisfaction with supervision.

Satisfaction with supervision was found to be significantly correlated with voting in representation elections. This finding is of critical importance to managers. Satisfaction is an easily measured variable, using an instrument such as the Job Descriptive Index. Satisfaction data, collected prior to a union representation election, could be invaluable in isolating those departments in which dissatisfaction with supervision exists. With such data in hand, remedial action could be undertaken to alleviate the source of the dissatisfaction. The most efficient use of such data calls for the assessment of satisfaction with supervision well before the threat of a union election. If periodic satisfaction surveys were carried out, with proper managerial response to those

conditions requiring attention, it is likely that the representation election would occur less frequently.

These results suggest that managements should be aware of the significant implications of the leadership behavior of first-line supervisors. If high levels of Consideration and Structure behavior are desired, management must think in terms of developing these behaviors through the use of organizational development programs within the firm. As an example, the Managerial Grid program stresses the development of high levels of "concern for production" and "concern for people," which are roughly equivalent to Structure and Consideration.

Perhaps a more effective use of these research results can be made in the area of selection, especially in those organizations where supervisors are employed from outside the firm. In such cases, selection decisions can be more effectively made through the assessment, prior to employment, of the candidates' managerial styles. Using as guidance the results of this study, efforts would be made to employ only those candidates whose leadership style assessment indicated a tendency to utilize both high levels of Consideration and Structure in their managerial actions. It should be noted that this recommendation is a tentative one, due to the fact that it is based upon correlational data.

Implications for Researchers

One of the most evident research implications stemming from this study is related to the influence of the interaction of supervisory style with subordinate personality traits, such as locus of control, on various criteria. The results of this study indicate that this interaction does not influence voting behavior in representation elections. It is not clear whether the locus of control personality trait is solely responsible for these results, however, Thus, research efforts are needed to determine whether the results are a function of the particular trait used in this study or in the broad theory which holds that subordinate personality traits are moderators of supervisory style.

This study suggests that the perceived supervisory style of Consideration may influence voting behavior in representation elections. Satisfaction with supervision was found to be significantly and positively correlated with voting behavior. Getman, Goldberg and Herman (2) have found overall job satisfaction to be correlated with vote in representation elections. These findings, coupled with the paucity of research into influences on voting behavior in representation elections, indicate that additional research may well isolate other variables which would influence this important process.

Recommendations

There are several recommendations which are appropriate as a result of the findings in this study.

1. In general, researchers in organizational behavior should devote greater effort in the future to investigating those variables which may effect voting behavior in union representation elections.

2. Further study should be made of the value of subordinate personality traits as moderators of the effectiveness of various leadership styles. Specific attention should be directed toward the value of the locus of control trait in this regard.

3. Additional research should be undertaken in the area of leadership theory. This research should be specifically directed toward validation of one or both of two divergent strains of leadership theory. One of these holds that it is the behavior of the leader alone which significantly influences important organizational criteria. The other contends that subordinate preferences, often determined by subordinate personality traits, interact with the behavior of the leader in influencing these criteria.

4. The managements of business firms and other organizations should undertake efforts to develop in their first-line supervisors that leadership style which emphasizes high levels of both Consideration and Structure behaviors. This research suggests that the results of such efforts would be beneficial not only to the individual employee through an increase in satisfaction with supervision, but to the organization as a whole.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Foa, Uriel G., "Relation of Worker's Expectation to Satisfaction with Supervisor," Personnel Psychology, 10 (Spring, 1957), 161-168.
2. Getman, Julius G., Stephen B. Goldberg, and Jeanne B. Herman, The National Labor Relations Board Voting Study: A Preliminary Report, Urbana, Illinois, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1972.
3. Greer, F. Loyal, "Leader Indulgence and Group Performance," Psychological Monographs, 75 (1961), No. 516.
4. Neal, Arthur G., and Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 29 (April, 1964), 216-226.
5. Runyon, Kenneth E., "Some Interactions Between Personality Variables and Management Styles," Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (June, 1973), 288-29.
6. Seeman, Melvin, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," The Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1966), 139-151.
7. Vroom, Victor H., "Some Personality Determinants of the Effect of Participation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59 (November, 1959), 322-327.

APPENDIX A

This is a questionnaire to find out the way people feel about events. Each item has 2 choices which are lettered a and b. Read both choices and circle either a or b as the one which you believe to be true. Be sure to pick the one you really believe to be true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. There are no right or wrong answers--just circle the one you believe to be true.

Sometimes you may find that you believe both statements or that you don't believe either one of them. If so, still pick the one which you believe is more true. Be sure and circle a letter for each one of the items.

1. a Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
b The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.
2. a Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
b People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.
3. a One of the main reasons we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
b There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.
4. a In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
b Unfortunately, a person's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.
5. a Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
b Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.
6. a No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
b People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
7. a Heredity plays the main part in determining a person's personality.
b It is one's experiences in life which determine what they are like.
8. a I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
b Trusting in fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.
9. a Becoming a success is a matter of hard work--luck has little or nothing to do with it.
b Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

10. a The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
b This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
11. a When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
b It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad luck anyhow.
12. a There are certain people who are just no good.
b There is some good in everybody.
13. a In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
b Many times we might as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
14. a Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
b Getting people to do the right thing depends on ability--luck has little or nothing to do with it.
15. a As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand nor control.
b By taking part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.
16. a Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
b There is really no such thing as "luck."
17. a One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
b It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
18. a It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
b How many friends you have depends on how nice a person you are.
19. a In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
b Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
20. a With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
b It is hard for people to have much control over things politicians do in office.

21. a A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
b A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.
22. a Many times I feel that I have little control over the things that happen to me.
b It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important part in my life.
23. a People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
b There's not much use in trying too hard to please people--if they like you, they like you.
24. a There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
b Team sports are an excellent way to build character.
25. a What happens to me is my own doing.
b Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
26. a Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.
b In the long run people are responsible for bad government on a national level as well as on the local level.

APPENDIX B

SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION

by

Edwin A. Fleishman, Ph.D.
 American Institutes for Research
 Washington, D.C.

Name _____ Date _____
 _____ (Middle) _____
 _____ (First) _____ Position _____
 _____ (Last) _____ Company _____

| Raw Score | Percentile | Other |
|---------------------------|------------|-------|
| C | | |
| S | | |
| Description of Norm Group | | |

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have observed your own supervisor and probably you know pretty well how he operates. In this questionnaire, you are simply to *describe* some of the things your own supervisor does with your group.

For each item, choose the alternative which best describes how often your supervisor does what that item says. Remember...there are no right or wrong answers to these questions. The items simply *describe* the behavior of the supervisor over you; they do not judge whether his behavior is desirable or undesirable. Everyone's supervisor is different and so is every work group, so we expect differences in what different supervisors do.

Answer the items by marking an "X" in the box (a, b, c, d or e) next to each item to indicate your choice.

1. HE IS EASY TO UNDERSTAND. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
2. HE ENCOURAGES OVERTIME WORK. a b c d e

a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
3. HE TRIES OUT HIS NEW IDEAS. a b c d e

a. often b. fairly much c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
4. HE BACKS UP WHAT PEOPLE IN HIS WORK GROUP DO. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
5. HE CRITICIZES POOR WORK. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
6. HE DEMANDS MORE THAN WE CAN DO. a b c d e

a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
7. HE REFUSES TO GIVE IN WHEN PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP DISAGREE WITH HIM. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
8. HE EXPRESSES APPRECIATION WHEN ONE OF US DOES A GOOD JOB. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
9. HE INSISTS THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOLLOW STANDARD WAYS OF DOING THINGS IN EVERY DETAIL. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
10. HE HELPS PEOPLE IN THE WORK GROUP WITH THEIR PERSONAL PROBLEMS. a b c d e

a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
11. HE IS SLOW TO ACCEPT NEW IDEAS. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
12. HE IS FRIENDLY AND CAN BE EASILY APPROACHED. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
13. HE GETS THE APPROVAL OF THE WORK GROUP ON IMPORTANT MATTERS BEFORE GOING AHEAD. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
14. HE RESISTS CHANGES IN WAYS OF DOING THINGS. a b c d e

a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
15. HE ASSIGNS PEOPLE UNDER HIM TO PARTICULAR TASKS. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
16. HE STRESSES BEING AHEAD OF COMPETING WORK GROUPS. a b c d e

a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
17. HE CRITICIZES A SPECIFIC ACT RATHER THAN A PARTICULAR INDIVIDUAL. a b c d e

a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never

18. HE LETS OTHERS DO THEIR WORK THE WAY THEY THINK BEST. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
19. HE DOES PERSONAL FAVORS FOR THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
20. HE EMPHASIZES MEETING OF DEADLINES. a b c d e
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
21. HE SEES THAT A WORKER IS REWARDED FOR A JOB WELL DONE. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
22. HE TREATS PEOPLE UNDER HIM WITHOUT CONSIDERING THEIR FEELINGS. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
23. HE INSISTS THAT HE BE INFORMED ON DECISIONS MADE BY THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
24. HE OFFERS NEW APPROACHES TO PROBLEMS. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
25. HE TREATS ALL WORKERS UNDER HIM AS HIS EQUALS. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
26. HE IS WILLING TO MAKE CHANGES. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
27. HE ASKS SLOWER PEOPLE TO GET MORE DONE. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
28. HE CRITICIZES PEOPLE UNDER HIM IN FRONT OF OTHERS. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
29. HE STRESSES THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH MORALE AMONG THOSE UNDER HIM. a b c d e
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
30. HE TALKS ABOUT HOW MUCH SHOULD BE DONE. a b c d e
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all
31. HE "RIDES" THE PERSON WHO MAKES A MISTAKE. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom
32. HE WAITS FOR PEOPLE UNDER HIM TO PUSH NEW IDEAS BEFORE HE DOES. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
33. HE RULES WITH AN IRON HAND. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never
34. HE TRIES TO KEEP THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM IN GOOD STANDING WITH THOSE IN HIGHER AUTHORITY. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never

35. HE REJECTS SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never □ □ □ □ □
36. HE CHANGES THE DUTIES OF PEOPLE UNDER HIM WITHOUT FIRST TALKING IT OVER WITH THEM. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom □ □ □ □ □
37. HE DECIDES IN DETAIL WHAT SHALL BE DONE AND HOW IT SHALL BE DONE. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never □ □ □ □ □
38. HE SEES TO IT THAT PEOPLE UNDER HIM ARE WORKING UP TO THEIR LIMITS. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never □ □ □ □ □
39. HE STANDS UP FOR PEOPLE UNDER HIM EVEN THOUGH IT MAKES HIM UNPOPULAR. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never □ □ □ □ □
40. HE MAKES THOSE UNDER HIM FEEL AT EASE WHEN TALKING WITH HIM. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never □ □ □ □ □
41. HE PUTS SUGGESTIONS THAT ARE MADE BY THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM INTO OPERATION. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never □ □ □ □ □
42. HE REFUSES TO EXPLAIN HIS ACTIONS. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom □ □ □ □ □
43. HE EMPHASIZES THE QUANTITY OF WORK. a b c d e
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all □ □ □ □ □
44. HE ASKS FOR SACRIFICES FROM HIS PEOPLE FOR THE GOOD OF THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom □ □ □ □ □
45. HE ACTS WITHOUT CONSULTING THE PEOPLE UNDER HIM FIRST. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom □ □ □ □ □
46. HE "NEEDLES" PEOPLE UNDER HIM FOR GREATER EFFORT. a b c d e
 a. a great deal b. fairly much c. to some degree d. comparatively little e. not at all □ □ □ □ □
47. HE INSISTS THAT EVERYTHING BE DONE HIS WAY. a b c d e
 a. always b. often c. occasionally d. seldom e. never □ □ □ □ □
48. HE ENCOURAGES SLOW-WORKING PEOPLE TO GREATER EFFORT. a b c d e
 a. often b. fairly often c. occasionally d. once in a while e. very seldom □ □ □ □ □

APPENDIX C

CONFIDENTIAL

DESCRIPTIONS OF JOBS

Name _____
(please print)

Company _____

Please fill in the above blanks and then turn the page.....

Copyright 1962
Patricia C. Smith
Bowling Green State University

Reprinted, with permission, by
Productivity and Job Satisfaction
Research Center



Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word below, put

y if it describes the supervision you get on your job

n if it does NOT describe it

? if you cannot decide

IMMEDIATE SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

- _____ Asks my advice
- _____ Hard to please
- _____ Impolite
- _____ Praises good work
- _____ Tactful
- _____ Influential
- _____ Up-to-date
- _____ Doesn't supervise enough
- _____ Quick tempered
- _____ Tells me where I stand
- _____ Annoying
- _____ Stubborn
- _____ Knows job well
- _____ Bad
- _____ Intelligent
- _____ Leaves me on my own
- _____ Lazy
- _____ Around when needed

Please go on to the next page

APPENDIX D

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS.

These questions are a key part of this study. I assure you that I am the only one who will ever see your answers. And don't sign your name to this form.

Did you vote in the recent union election? (check one) _____yes

_____no

If you did vote in the election, how did you vote? (check one)

_____for the union

_____against the union

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Argyle, Michael, The Social Psychology of Work, New York, Taplinger Publishing Company, 1972.
- Bowers, D. G. and S. E. Seashore, "Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership," Leadership, edited by C. A. Gibb, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1969.
- Chamberlain, Neil W. and Donald E. Cullen, The Labor Sector, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Dougherty, James L., Union-Free Management, Chicago, The Dartnell Corporation, 1968.
- Dunn, J.D. and Elvis C. Stephens, Management of Personnel: Manpower Management and Organizational Behavior, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.
- Dunnette, Marvin D. and Wayne K. Kirchner, Psychology Applied to Industry, New York, Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965.
- Ferguson, George A., Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.
- Fiedler, Fred E., A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Fleishman, Edwin A., Manual for the Supervisory Behavior Description, Washington, D.C., American Institutes for Research, 1972.
- Fleishman, Edwin A., Edwin F. Harris, and H. E. Burt, Leadership and Supervision in Industry, Columbus, Ohio Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1955.
- Gibb, C.A., "Leadership," Handbook of Social Psychology, edited by G. Lindzey, Cambridge, Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Halpin, Andrew W. and B.J. Winer, "A Factorial Study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, edited by Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.

- Haythorn, William, "The Effects of Varying Combinations of Authoritarian and Equalitarian Leaders and Followers," Readings in Social Psychology edited by E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. Hartley, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.
- Hemphill, J.K., Situational Factors in Leadership, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Educational Research, Ohio State University, 1949.
- Hemphill, J.K. and A.E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, edited by Ralph M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons, Columbus, Ohio, Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.
- Hersey, Paul and Kenneth Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Hollander, Edwin P., Leaders, Groups, and Influence, New York Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Hollander, Edwin P. and James W. Julian, "Contemporary Trends in the Analysis of Leadership Processes," Current Perspectives in Social Psychology, edited by Edwin P. Hollander and Raymond G. Hunt, New York, Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Jackson, Louis and Robert Lewis, Winning NLRB Elections: Management's Strategy and Preventive Programs, New York, Practicing Law Institute, 1972.
- Katz, Daniel, Nathan Maccoby, Gerald Gunn, and Lucretia G. Floor, Productivity, Supervision and Morale Among Railroad Workers, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1951.
- Katz, Daniel, Nathan Maccoby, and Nancy C. Morse, Productivity, Supervision, and Morale in an Office Situation, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1950.
- Kothe, Charles A., Individual Freedom in the Non-Union Plant, New York, National Association of Manufacturers, 1967.
- Lefcourt, Herbert M., "Recent Developments in the Study of Locus of Control," Progress in Experimental Research, edited by Brendon A. Maher, New York, Academic Press, Inc., 1962.

- Morse, Nancy C., Satisfaction in the White-Collar Job, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1953.
- Sartain, Aaron Q. and Alton W. Baker, The Supervisor and His Job, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.
- Seeman, Melvin, "On the Meaning of Alienation," Automation, Alienation, and Anomie, edited by Simon Marcson, New York, Harper and Row, 1970.
- Shartle, Carroll L., Executive Performance and Leadership, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.
- Siegel, Sidney, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Smith, Patricia Cain, Lorne M. Kendall, and Charles L. Hulin, The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement, Chicago, Rand McNally and Company, 1969.
- Stogdill, Ralph M., "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Leadership, edited by C. A. Gibb, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1969.
- Terman, L.M., "A Preliminary Study of the Psychology and Pedagogy of Leadership," Leadership, edited by C.A. Gibb, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1969.
- Vroom, Victor H., Work and Motivation, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Articles

- Anderson, Lynn R., "Leader Behavior, Member Attitudes, and Task Performance of Intercultural Discussion Groups," The Journal of Social Psychology, 69 (August, 1966), 305-319.
- Anderson, Richard, "Learning in Discussions: A Resume of the Authoritarian-Democratic Studies," Harvard Education Review, 29 (Summer, 1959), 201-215.
- Berkowitz, L.W., "Sharing Leadership in Small Decision-making Groups," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48 (April, 1953), 231-238.
- Bok, Derek C., "The Regulation of Campaign Tactics in Representation Elections Under the National Labor Relations Act," Harvard Law Review, 78 (November, 1964), 38-141.

- Brotzlaw, Irving, "Attitude of Retail Workers Toward Union Organization," Labor Law Journal, 18 (March, 1967), 149-171.
- Chaison, Gary N., "The Need for a More Intensive Analysis of Union Organizing Campaigns," Academy of Management Journal, 14 (December, 1971), 518-520.
- Davis, W.L. and E.J. Phares, "Internal-external Control as a Determinant of Information-seeking in a Social Influence Situation," Journal of Personality, 35 (December, 1967), 547-561.
- Drotning, John E., "The Union Representation Election," Monthly Labor Review, 88 (August, 1965), 938-943.
- Ellis, Dean S., et al., "A Union Authorization Election: The Key to Winning," Personnel Journal, 51 (April, 1972), 82-88.
- Fiedler, Fred E., "Validation and Extension of the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Findings," Psychological Bulletin, 76 (August, 1971), 128-148.
- Fiman, Byron G., "An Investigation of the Relationships Among Supervisory Attitudes, Behaviors, and Outputs: An Examination of McGregor's Theory Y," Personnel Psychology, 26 (Spring, 1973), 95-105.
- Fleishman, E.A. and Edwin F. Harris, "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover," Personnel Psychology, 15 (Spring, 1962), 43-56.
- Foa, Uriel G., "Relation of Worker's Expectation to Satisfaction with Supervisor," Personnel Psychology, 10 (Spring, 1957), 161-168.
- French, John R.P., Joachim Israel, and Dagfinn As, "An Experiment on Participation in a Norwegian Factory," Human Relations, 13 (February, 1960), 3-19.
- Goodfellow, Matthew, "How to go Union in Five Easy Steps," Buffalo, 14 (August, 1966), 29-31.
- Gore, P.M., and J. B. Rotter, "A personality Correlate of Social Action," Journal of Personality, 31 (March, 1963), 58-64.

- Graen, George, Kenneth Alvares, and James B. Orris, "Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness: Antecedent and Evidential Results," Psychological Bulletin, 74 (March, 1970), 285-296.
- Greer, F. Loyal, "Leader Indulgence and Group Performance," Psychological Monographs, 75 (1961), No. 516.
- Gruenfeld, Leopold and Saleem Kassum, "Supervisory Style and Organizational Effectiveness in a Pediatric Hospital," Personnel Psychology, 26 (Winter, 1973), 531-544.
- Heller, Frank A., "Leadership, Decision-making, and Contingency Theory," Industrial Relations, 12 (May, 1973), 183-199.
- House, Robert J., Alan C. Filley, and Damodar Gujarati, "Leadership Style, Hierarchical Influence, and the Satisfaction of Subordinate Role Expectations: A Test of Likert's Influence Proposition," Journal of Applied Psychology, 55 (October, 1971), 422-432.
- House, Robert J., Alan C. Filley, and Steven Kerr, "Relations of Leader Consideration and Initiating Structure to R & D Subordinates' Satisfaction," Administrative Science Quarterly, 16 (March, 1971), 19-30.
- Hunt, J.G. and V.K.C. Liebscher, "Leadership Preference, Leadership Behavior, and Employee Satisfaction," Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 9 (February, 1973), 59-77.
- Joe, Victor Clark, "Review of the Internal-External Control Construct as a Personality Variable," Psychological Reports, 28 (April, 1971), 619-640.
- Korman, A.K., "Consideration, Initiating Structure, and Organizational Criteria--A Review," Personnel Psychology, 19 (Winter, 1966), 349-362.
- Lewin, Kurt, R. Lippitt, and R.K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," Journal of Social Psychology, 10 (August, 1939), 271-299.
- Lowin, Aaron, William J. Hrapchak, and M.J. Kavanagh, "Consideration and Initiating Structure: An Experimental Investigation of Leadership Traits," Administrative Science Quarterly, 14 (June, 1969), 238-253.
- McKersie, Robert B., and Montague Brown, "Nonprofessional Hospital Workers and a Union Organizing Drive," Quarterly Journal of Economics, LXXVII (August, 1963), 372-404.

- Morse, Nancy C. and Everett Reimer, "The Experimental Change of a Major Organizational Variable," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 52 (January, 1956), 120-129.
- Neal, Arthur G. and Melvin Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," American Sociological Review, 29 (April, 1964), 216-226.
- Nealey, S. M. and Milton R. Blood, "Leadership Performance of Nursing Supervisors at Two Organizational Levels." Journal of Applied Psychology, 52 (October, 1968) 414-422.
- Organ, Dennis W. and Charles N. Greene, "Role Ambiguity, Locus of Control, and Work Satisfaction," Journal of Applied Psychology, 59 (January, 1974), 101-112.
- Phares, E.J., "Differential Utilization of Information as a Function of Internal-External Control," Journal of Personality, 36 (December, 1968), 649-662.
- Rose, Joseph B., "What Factors Influence Union Representation Elections?," Monthly Labor Review, 95 (October, 1972), 49-51.
- Rotter, Julian B., "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs, 80 (1966), No. 609.
- Runyon, Kenneth D., "Some Interactions Between Personality Variables and Management Styles," Journal of Applied Psychology, 57 (June, 1973), 288-294.
- Samoff, Bernard, "NLRB Elections: Uncertainty and Certainty," University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 117 (December, 1968), 228-253.
- Scoville, James G., "Influences on Unionization in the U.S. in 1966," Industrial Relations, 10 (October, 1971), 354-361.
- Seeman, Melvin, "Alienation, Membership, and Political Knowledge: A Comparative Study," The Public Opinion Quarterly, 50 (Fall, 1966), 139-151.
- Seeman, Melvin, "Antidote to Alienation--Learning to Belong," Transaction, 3 (May-June, 1966), 35-39.
- Seeman, Melvin, "On the Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work," American Sociological Review, 32 (April, 1967), 273-285.

- Seeman, Melvin and J. W. Evans, "Alienation and Learning in a Hospital Setting," American Sociological Review, 27 (December, 1962), 772-783.
- Skinner, Elizabeth, "Relationships Between Leadership Behavior Patterns and Organizational-Situational Variables," Personnel Psychology, 22 (Winter, 1969), 489-494.
- Strickland, B.R., "The Prediction of Social Action From a Dimension of Internal-External Control," Journal of Social Psychology, 66 (August, 1965), 353-358.
- Swanson, R.G. and D.A. Johnson, "The Relation Between Peer Perception of Leader Behavior and Instructor Pilot Performance," Journal of Applied Psychology, (in press).
- Sweetow, Michael, "Why Do They Vote Union?," Institutions/Volume Feeding, 22 (September 15, 1973), 25-38.
- Tannenbaum, Robert and Warren H. Schmidt, "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," Harvard Business Review, 36 (March-April, 1958), 95-101.
- Tosi, Henry L., "The Effect of the Interaction of Leader Behavior and Subordinate Authoritarianism," Personnel Psychology, 26 (Autumn, 1973), 339-350.
- Vroom, Victor H., "Some Personality Determinants of the Effects of Participation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 13 (Summer, 1960), 125-140.
- Vroom, Victor H. and Floyd C. Mann, "Leader Authoritarianism and Employee Attitudes," Personnel Psychology, 13 (Summer, 1960), 125-140.
- Yukl, Gary, "Toward A Behavioral Theory of Leadership" Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6 (July, 1971), 414-440.

Reports

- Getman, Julius G., Stephen B. Goldberg, and Jeanne B. Herman, The National Labor Relations Board Voting Study: A Preliminary Report, Urbana, Illinois, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, 1972.

Unpublished Materials

- Burkey, Roy E., "Effect of Discrepancy Between Expected and Actual Supervisory Behavior on Worker Performance and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study," Dissertation Abstracts, 32 (May-June, 1972), 5939-A.
- Wigdor, Lawrence A., "Effectiveness of Various Management and Organizational Characteristics on Employee Satisfaction and Performance as a Function of the Employee's Need for Independence," Dissertation Abstracts, 30 (January-February, 1970), 3150-A.